

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON MONDAY 1<sup>st</sup> NOVEMBER 2004 AT 7PM.**

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

Also Attending: Cllr. P. Collins  
Cllr. D. Isham  
Mr. S. Hoare Community Connect } for Location 3  
Mr. R. Birtles RPS Planning Consultants } Properties Ltd.

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W.McElligott

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillor Mrs. P. Stevens.

**4703 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest

*Proposed by Cllr. Loftus, seconded by Cllr. Stuchbury, and AGREED that Standing Orders be suspended and item 6.1 on the agenda be taken at this point of the meeting.*

**4704 PRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF LOCATION 3 PROPERTIES LTD.**

Mr. Hoare noted that PPS6 requires developers to demonstrate a need for a particular building use; the need for a DIY warehouse had been identified in the Local Plan by AVDC and confirmed by the Planning Inspector. He quoted the Inspector's comment that "it would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the town centre". The proposed Focus store (application 04/02735/APP) would meet 92% of the identified DIY retail requirement in the town with 25,000 € devoted to DIY, 10,000 € to a garden centre, and parking for 116 vehicles. This would obviate the need for local people to travel to Milton Keynes or Aylesbury for such items together with the 'leakage' – other types of shopping – which accompanied travel to another retail centre, and the store would therefore benefit other local businesses.

Though the site was designated as a Business Park and not for retail use, 40 jobs would be created, and this use of the land would not harm the employment prospects of the town to any great extent as there was still adequate land at the Business Park for expansion.

The company had investigated the use of Wharf Yard; not only would they be constrained to using the western part of the Yard only by flood plain considerations, with 13-18 parking

spaces restricting viability, the owner was not willing to sell, and the current leases had some considerable time to run. The new Focus store being on the bypass would not preclude the future development of Wharf Yard when the leases were nearer term. However a site so close to the Town Centre, with existing attractive buildings nearby, would not be enhanced by the “shed-like” warehouse building appropriate to DIY use.

Questioning from Members elicited the following information:

- The 40 jobs would be full- and part-time ⇔ 30 full-time jobs
- The Tingewick Road Industrial Park had also been considered, and its situation on the town boundary would be subject to the same PPS6 tests as the bypass site; however no suitable area was available
- The existing hawthorn hedge could be retained, and the boundary treatment and landscaping could be discussed

Members expressed concern at the corporate colours (blue and yellow) and the contrasts with the adjacent award-winning Buckingham Colour Press building; asked that the building supplies be stored away from the bypass side of the site; and that adequate screening be provided to preserve the rural aspect of the bypass.

The Chairman thanked Mr Hoare and Mr. Birtles for attending.

*Proposed by Cllr. Loftus, seconded by Cllr. Stuchbury, and AGREED that Standing Orders be reinstated, and the meeting reverted to the published agenda order.*

#### **4705 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2004, ratified on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2004, were received; there were no matters arising.

#### **4706 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

##### **04/02218/APP**

**OPPOSE**

5 Market Square

Change of use of ground floor from A1 – A3 fast food takeaway

*Members discussed the proposal at some length, citing over 20 existing food outlets of various sorts in the town. Concerns were expressed about the noise, smell and litter nuisance to residents, parking problems particularly the blocking of the adjacent entry, and the introduction of this type of premises into an area predominantly in retail and residential use. The pavement was too narrow to permit the installation of the necessary litterbin.*

##### **04/02552/ALB**

**SUPPORT**

Lloyds TSB, 19 Market Square

Installation of illuminated projecting sign and 1 light box over ATM

*Members noted that this was a dark area and that security would be improved by adequate lighting; however Members asked that this be downlighting to minimise light pollution.*

##### **04/02696/APP**

**SUPPORT**

8 Middlefield Close

First floor extension

**04/02735/APP****SUPPORT**

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

*The Chairman outlined the points of criticism made in writing by the Buckingham Society and a resident of Gawcott Fields: retail activity on the edge of town, the visual impact, the increased traffic on the bypass and the possible light pollution.(the resident had asked that any lighting be switched off during the hours the store was closed).He also summarised the traffic survey provided by the applicants; the principal impact at weekends would be less than 5% increase, weekday impact minimal.*

*A query was raised over the site earmarked for warehouse-type development between Tesco and Wipac some years ago. It was felt that this was not currently available.*

*It was also noted that the spice factory further along Osier Way had a retail element, and that the bypass already had hotels and other non-industrial sites on it.*

*Members discussed the scheme and, while realising that a DIY store is innately shed-like and that the corporate colour scheme is bright blue and yellow, decided to support it with following provisos:*

- 1. That boundary treatment and landscaping should be designed to screen the parking, storage and building so far as was possible*
- 2. That the existing hedgerow boundary between the site and the bypass be retained*
- 3. That thought be given to the development sitting well beside the Buckingham Colour Press building*
- 4. That discussion take place with the developer over incorporating local design elements into the scheme, using the Vision & Design Statement and consulting the Buckingham Society to make the building appropriate to a rural market town*
- 5. That exterior lighting be restricted to opening hours and be directed downwards only*

**04/02738/ATC****SUPPORT**

Hill House, 12 Castle Street

Works to 4 yews and magnolia and removal of 1 sycamore and 1 elder

*Support was given subject to the arboriculturalist's report.*

**04/02824/APP****SUPPORT**

The Old Dairy, 25 Chandos Road

Conversion of garage to provide bedroom and office and velux window. Erection of front canopy and balcony

**04/02842/APP****SUPPORT**

8 Glynswood Road

Two storey front extension

*Support was given subject to there being adequate parking provision as per guidelines for the extended dwelling.*

**04/02878/APP****SUPPORT**

17 Pitchford Walk

Change of use from takeaway to restaurant

*Members queried why a change of use application was required for a usage in the same class. Members would not support the incorporation of the adjoining shop premises into a restaurant and asked for assurance that this was not included in the proposal.*

**04/02838/APP**

**OPPOSE**

23 Lime Avenue

Single storey rear extension & first floor side extension

*Members felt that the proposed extension changed the character of the house and presented a monolithic end view. Members opposed on the grounds of overdevelopment and effect on the street scene.*

*The following minor amended plans were 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

*Amendment 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.*

#### **4707 PLANNING CONTROL**

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

#### **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 had been received and were 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

#### **4708 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS**

4708.1 To receive for information the *Planning News* section of Bulletins 40/04 and 41/04  
Copies of the above had been circulated with the Agenda and gave information on BCC Minerals & Waste Local Plan Second Deposit Draft, an update on growth issues at Aylesbury and Milton Keynes and the Draft PPS for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

4708.2 Speed Limit Review: Area 12 referred from Full Council 25/20/04

Members had no comments to make.

## **4709 CORRESPONDENCE**

4709.1 (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."

4709.2 (04/01970/APP land adjacent to Pightle Cottage, Western Avenue) response from AVDC Tree Officer

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 had 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."

4709.3 Mr. Caspar Heine re felling of tree, Moreton Road

Mr. Heine had been concerned about the felling of a mature oak on Moreton Road, and had asked if the tree had been Protected.

The Tree Officer had responded that he had inspected the tree several weeks ago and confirmed to the tree surgeon that it was an old tree with severe die-back, and though it was a shame to lose such a large tree, it was not worth preserving. It would have been unreasonable to compel the owners to retain it.

Members felt that the Tree Wardens should review the important trees and tree groups of the town and recommend those they felt should be protected.

**ACTION TREE WARDENS**

**4710 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS**

4710.1 Signage at the White Hart

A large sign had been installed in the garden of the White Hart some weeks ago, and other signage had since been added.

The Clerk reported that the signage had been reported when it first appeared to Planning Enforcement at AVDC who had acknowledged the report and were looking into it.

4710.2 Milton Keynes and South Midlands Study

The study report had been published; comments were due by 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2004. The electronic version of the report had been passed to the Chairman.

Meeting closed at: 8.30pm

CHAIRMAN ..... DATE .....