

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER ON MONDAY 20th SEPTEMBER 2004 AT 7PM.

PRESENT: Councillors J. Barnett
Mrs. P. Desorgher
G. Loftus
H. Mordue
Mrs. P. Stevens
P. Strain-Clark (Chairman)
R Stuchbury (Mayor)

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W.McElligott

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillor R. Lehmann.

4690 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4691 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd August 2004 and ratified on 13th September 2004 were received; there were no matters arising not dealt with later on the agenda.

4692 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

04/02164/ATP

SUPPORT

Corner House, 16A West Street (amended to 2 Bostock Court, Bulletin 33/04)

Fell 1 Fir and 1 Elder and crown reduction of 2 Willows

Support was given subject to the arboriculturalists' report; it was suggested for more long-term effect that the willows be coppiced at a convenient height rather than crown-reduced.

The following two applications were considered together

04/02213/ALB

SUPPORT

Café Porcini, 24 Castle Street

Replacement of 2 fascia signs, 1 new wall fixed sign and 1 hanging sign

04/02309/AAD

SUPPORT

Café Porcini, 24 Castle Street

Replacement of 2 fascia signs, 1 new wall fixed sign and 1 hanging sign

Support was given subject to the Historic Buildings Officer's report.

The following applications were not received in time for the meeting:

04/02184/ALB

Radcliffe Centre, Church Street

Internal works, ramps and handrails for disabled access

04/02187/APP

Radcliffe Centre, Church Street

Internal works, ramps and handrails for disabled access

04/02186/APP

Yeomanry House, Hunter Street

Ramps for handrails and disabled access

04/02188/ALB

Yeomanry House, Hunter Street

Ramps for handrails and disabled access

04/02281/APP

SUPPORT

Esso Petrol Filling Station, Buckingham Ring Road

Raising of forecourt and canopy lid by 700mm

04/02289/APP

OPPOSE

15 Windmill Close

Two storey side extension

Minor amended plans had also been received for this application, showing the ridge height of the extension had been dropped 0.5m; the front of the extension recessed from the building line 0.5m; the rear wall of the extension extended 1.0m.

Members noted that the proposed extension more than doubled the floor area of the house; that there was no indication how close the proposed extension came to the property boundary and whether the existing trees/shrubs would be retained; and that there was no yellow notice posted near the site.

The application was opposed on the grounds of visual effect on the street scene and the green area adjacent.

04/02308/APP

SUPPORT

20 Lenborough Road

Single storey and first floor rear extension

04/02350/APP

OPPOSE

70 Moorhen Way

Conversion of existing garage to living accommodation and erection of replacement detached double garage with revised access

Members had no objection to the conversion of the garage.

However the erection of a double garage would have a negative impact on the openness of the street scene and could set a precedent. Concern was also expressed about the paving over of the garden area to provide the new access, and the extent of the hard surface.

04/02392/AAD

SUPPORT

Lloyds TSB, 19 Market Square

Internally illuminated lightbox and double sided projecting sign over existing ATM cash dispenser

04/02403/APP

OPPOSE

4 Addington Road

Two storey rear extension and rear access

Members supported the proposed extension to the house.

Members opposed the access from Mary McManus Drive as adding traffic movements to an already difficult junction, and the effect on the street scene (an attractive brick wall and an old stone wall) especially as there was no indication of the style or height of the proposed gates.

04/02463/APP

SUPPORT

Block D, Tingewick Road Industrial Park

Change of use from commercial vehicles to plant machinery sales, hire and repair depot

The following application was not received in time for the meeting:

04/02471/APP

52 Deerfield Close

Two storey front extension

04/02486/AAD

SUPPORT

Buckingham Filling Station, Stratford Road

New and replacement fascia sign

The following application was not received in time for the meeting:

04/02509/APP

Bridge House, Bourton Road

First floor sun room

The following minor amended plans were posted for members' information only:

04/01837/APP 1 Glynswood Road Single storey front and rear extensions

Depth of rear platform terrace had been reduced from 2m to 1m. Members SUPPORTED the original application; Application had been approved (see below)

04/01909/APP 33 Moreton Road Two storey side, single storey side and rear extensions and single storey front extension to form porch

The windows in the first floor extension had been changed: Front elevation (facing Moreton Road): two windows now one window obscure glazed; side elevation (facing Minshull Close): three windows now four. Members OPPOSED the original application.

Members criticised the constant permitting of extensions, especially to smaller houses, when there was a demonstrable requirement for affordable housing and smaller units.

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Desorgher, and **RECOMMENDED** that this Council write to the Planning Authority asking them to set a maximum percentage increase when extending a dwelling; to consider the change in the distribution of housing sizes when permitting extensions; and to adjust the percentage of affordable housing requirements on developers accordingly.

Members proposed also that each District Councillor be sent a Town Map to aid them in discussions regarding Buckingham.

ACTION THE CLERK

4693 PLANNING CONTROL

The following planning decisions were received from Aylesbury Vale District Council;

APPROVED

03/03228/ACD12-18 Stratford Road	Demol.buildings inc.underground petrol tank	
	Support	
04/01505/APP 24 Page Hill Avenue	Single storey rear extn and first floor side extn	Oppose
04/01649/APP Esso Petrol Stn,By-pass	Demol.carwash; add carparking, binstore, paving	Support
04/01650/AAD Esso Petrol Stn,By-pass	Part illum. & non-illuminated canopy and signage	Support
04/01652/APP 11 Pitchford Ave.	Conservatory to rear	Support
04/01705/APP 24 Chandos Road	Amend approved plans 01/01704/APP, rear extn	Support
04/01706/APP 9 Bristle Hill	Repl.stair,back & front door,other internal works	Support
04/01768/APP 36 Embleton Way	Single storey front extension	Support
04/01771/AAD Manor Farm, Bourton Rd.	Non-illuminated 2.4m high tenants board	Support
04/01837/APP 1 Glynswood Road	Single storey front & rear extensions	Support
04/01849/APP 61 Aris Way	Conversion of garage into habitable room	Support
04/01850/APP 14 Coots Close	Single storey side extension	Support
04/01973/APP 96 Moreton Road	Removal of porch & amendment to 03/01238/APP	Support

REFUSED

04/01809/APP Braeside, Lenboro'Rd.	Rear roof extension	Support
04/01832/APP 32 Addington Road	Two storey rear extension	Support
		Support withdrawn (4687.2)

WITHDRAWN

03/03245/APP Stratford Ho, High St.	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 6 apartments with associated parking and erection of car parking port building with two flats above	Oppose
-------------------------------------	--	--------

REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Reports on the following applications had been received and were available in the office:

04/00607/APP Land adj.14 Adams Close	Ch.of use amenity land to residential garden & enclosure by 1.8m fence
04/01505/APP 24 Page Hill Avenue	Single storey rear extension & first floor side extension
04/01809/APP Braeside, Lenborough Rd.	Rear roof extension
04/01947/APP 12 Robin Close	Two storey front and single storey rear extension

4694 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS

4694.1 (02/03028/AOP:Land at Burleigh Piece) Planning Appeal

Advice had been received that the applicant had appealed against the refusal of outline permission for 7 terraced and 1 pair semi-detached dwellings; the hearing was set for 5th August 2005.

Members decided that a letter would be sent notifying AVDC that the Town Council would send a representative, who would be named nearer the time.

ACTION THE CLERK

4694.2 Access road to Cornwall's Meadow Car Park
Members were asked to select a name for this road.

Proposed by Cllr. Strain-Clark, seconded by Cllr. Barnett, and **RECOMMENDED** that "Cornwall's Drive" be put forward as a suggestion.

4695 CORRESPONDENCE

4695.1 04/01505/APP 24 Page Hill Avenue: Reasons for decision contrary to BTC response.

Members had responded (28th June):

Members were happy to see the application modified with respect to the proximity to the side boundary but felt that turning the extension roof ridge at right angles to the existing and not making it subsidiary made the effect very blocky; a subsidiary ridge would add variety to the street scene.*

*Previous application 04/00872/APP had been refused and on 19th July:

(Minor amended plans - the ridge line of the extension roof had been made subsidiary by dropping it 0.5m below the existing roof ridge line.) *Members made no further comment.*

AVDC:

As you are aware the development was amended during the processing of the application to reduce the ridgeline of the extension to below that of the main ridge of the dwelling. Members were satisfied that the design of the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and on the existing dwelling and as such the application was approved.

4695.2 04/01809/APP Braeside, Lenborough Road: Reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

Members had supported (19th July), commenting:

Members asked a condition be imposed that materials and colour should be matched to the existing.

AVDC refused the application:

It was considered that the proposed rear dormer would appear as a large and intrusive feature in the rear roof slope and would not respect the character or appearance of the host dwelling. The proposed dormer was box-like in appearance, projected above the existing roofline and filled a high proportion of the roof slope. The dormer was specifically contrary to the advice the Residential Extensions Design Guide relating to dormer windows.

It was considered that the proposal may have resulted in overlooking into the rear garden of Luzern, the adjacent property, thereby reducing the residential amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling.

4695.3 (4667.1.1) SPG: Delivering Affordable Housing: recommended changes as per BTC response

4695.4 (4667.1.2) SPG: Sport & Leisure Facilities: recommended changes as per BTC response

The list of BTC comments and AVDC recommendations were circulated to Committee Members at the meeting.

4695.5 (4678.2) Buckingham Buildbase: response from AVDC

Mr. Skedge had replied to the letter sent to Mr. Carr outlining this Council's dissatisfaction with the Planning Authority's lack of action in this matter.

An application for a Certificate of Lawful Use was expected by the beginning of September, based on an alleged use of the land for this purpose for a period exceeding 10 years.

Members were informed that no application was listed on the AVDC website up to 20th September 2004, and felt that more decisive action should be taken to enforce the planning regulations. A letter would be sent, enclosing copies of the letter to Mr. Carr and the response from Mr. Skedge, to the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Planning, and copied to all the other Cabinet Members indicating that this Council was not satisfied with the diligence shown in pursuing the complaints of residents relayed by this Council.

If no action ensued the matter would be taken to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

4695.6 (4685.1) Vodaphone mast

One response had been received to the letter sent to all 10 MEPs for the South East, from the Political Assistant to Nigel Farage. It recommended action which has already been taken, and which was so described in the Town Council's letter.

AVDC Legal Department had replied that it was not possible to rescind planning permission after building works were completed. In addition, no evidence that interference with reception had been put forward when the application was being considered and so no condition was imposed under PPG8 paras 102-104 which can allow this; and in 1997 a court case had ruled that interference to television reception did not amount to an actionable nuisance.

4695.7 (04/02026/APP) New mast application: response from Gawcott PC.

Gawcott PC had sent thanks for the offer of further information, but this was not required.

Meeting closed at: 8.10pm

CHAIRMAN DATE