

Dear Member

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Planning Committee, which will be held in the Council Chamber, Town Council Offices, Buckingham, on Monday, 1<sup>st</sup> November 2004 at 7pm.

The public is invited to attend.

Signed: Mrs P J Heath  
Town Clerk

### AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declaration of interest for items on the agenda
3. To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2004 ratified on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2004, and consider any matters arising
4. To consider planning applications received from AVDC, and other applications.
5. To receive for information details of planning decisions made by AVDC as per "Bulletin" and Reports to Development Control received.
6. Any other planning matters
  - 6.1 To receive a presentation on behalf of Location 3 Properties Ltd.
  - 6.2 To receive for information the *Planning News* section of Bulletins 40/04 and 41/04 (appended)
  - 6.3 To discuss the Speed Limit Review: Area 12 *referred from Full Council 25/20/04; details with Full Council agenda*
7. Correspondence
  - 7.1 (04/01909/APP) AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response (appended, p3)
  - 7.2 (04/01970/APP land adjacent to Pightle Cottage, Western Avenue) response from AVDC Tree Officer (appended, p3)
  - 7.3 Caspar Heine re felling of tree, Moreton Road
8. Chairman's items for information

To:

Cllr J. Barnett	Cllr. H. Mordue	
Cllr.P. Desorgher	Cllr P. Stevens	
Cllr R. Lehmann	Cllr P. Strain-Clark	(Chairman)
Cllr G. Loftus	Cllr R. Stuchbury	(Mayor)

A public session of no more than 15 minutes will be held prior to this meeting at 7pm if required

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1<sup>st</sup> November 2004

App. No.	Particulars
1. 04/02218/APP	5 Market Square Change of use of ground floor from A1 – A3 fast food takeaway <i>Mohammed</i>
2. 04/02552/ALB	Lloyds TSB, 19 Market Square Installation of illuminated projecting sign and 1 light box over ATM <i>Lloyds TSB</i>
3. 04/02696/APP	8 Middlefield Close First floor extension <i>Hemming</i>
4. 04/02735/APP	Land at Swan Business Park, land to the south of Buckingham by-pass Erection of non-food retail warehouse (class A1) with access, service arrangements, car parking and landscaping <i>Location 3 Properties Ltd.</i>
5. 04/02738/ATC	Hill House, 12 Castle Street Works to 4 yews and magnolia and removal of 1 sycamore and 1 elder <i>Thorogood</i>
6. 04/02824/APP	The Old Dairy, 25 Chandos Road Conversion of garage to provide bedroom and office and velux window. Erection of front canopy and balcony <i>Johnson</i>
7. 04/02842/APP	8 Glynswood Road Two storey front extension <i>Carter</i>
8. 04/02878/APP	17 Pitchford Walk Change of use from takeaway to restaurant <i>Islam</i>

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

**04/02308/APP** 20 Lenborough Rd. Single storey and first floor rear extension Support

*Amendment consists of two letters protesting against Officer's comments*

**04/02498/APP** 2 Sandhurst Drive Solar collector on south western facing roof Support

*Amendment shows panel relocated at other end of south west facing roof*

**03/03224/APP** 12-18 Stratford Rd. Conversion and extension to former cottages to form 3no. dwellings and 2no. semi-detached dwellings Oppose

*NB: This application is re-listed on the web site, but the Planning Officer informs us that it is a minor adjustment to the red line surrounding the site. AVDC deferred decision on the application pending a satisfactory solution to the number of parking spaces provided.*

## PLANNING DECISIONS PER BULLETINS

### APPROVED

04/01909/APP	33 Moreton Road	Two storey side, single storey side and rear extensions and single storey front extension to form porch	Oppose
04/02463/APP	Block D, Tingewick Rd. Ind.Pk.	Change of use from commercial vehicles to plant machinery sales, hire and repair depot	Support

### PARTIAL CONSENT

#### APPROVED

04/02392/AAD	Lloyds TSB	Internally illuminated lightbox over existing ATM	Support
--------------	------------	---	---------

#### REFUSED

04/02392/AAD	Lloyds TSB	Internally illuminated doublesided projecting sign over existing ATM	
--------------	------------	--	--

## REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Reports on the following applications have been received and are available in the office

04/02289/APP	15 Windmill Close	Two storey side extension
04/02308/APP	Braeside, Lenborough Rd.	Single storey and first floor rear extension

## CORRESPONDENCE

### 7.1 (04/01909/APP) AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

Members had opposed “*Members felt that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site, and introduced a two-storey element in a single-storey environment.*” Members had made further comment when Minor Amended plans were supplied about the large extensions to houses removing smaller dwellings from the housing pool.

AVDC had approved: “At the meeting Members had regard for the design and scale of the proposal and considered the neighbouring properties including the two storey dwellings located to the north and east of the site. A decision was reached and it was considered that the proposal would be in keeping with neighbouring properties in the vicinity. In addition the dwelling sits within a generous garden and it was considered that the proposal would be in keeping with its curtilage.”

### 7.2 (04/01970/APP land adjacent to Pightle Cottage, Western Avenue)

Members had responded “*Members were concerned that the plans did not show the surrounding area, in particular the mature trees adjacent to the site; that access to the site was across Public Open Space and very close to the trees; that there was inadequate provision for parking, which could lead to parking on the grass area or the road. Members asked that the Arboriculturalist report on the trees with a view to covering the group with TPOs.*”

The Arboriculturalist has written: “The trees on this verge are attractive for their spring blossom and autumn colour. They stand on land owned by AVDC but managed by BCC as highway verge. I have been told by our planning department that the application 04/01970/APP was refused.

There seems to be only a low level of threat to these trees and it is not normal practice to impose TPOs on other local authorities (as they can give themselves consent to remove or prune their preserved trees and are expected to manage trees in accordance with best modern practices).

For these reasons I am reluctant to recommend a new TPO at this time.”