

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY 22<sup>nd</sup> NOVEMBER 2004  
at 7.30pm following the Interim Council Meeting and Public Session**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Mrs. P. Desorgher  
R. Lehmann  
G. Loftus  
H. Mordue  
Mrs. P. Stevens  
P. Strain-Clark (Chairman)  
R. Stuchbury (Mayor)  
Also attending: Councillors H. H Cadd  
D.R.Isham

For the Town Clerk Mrs. K.W.McElligott

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillor J. Barnett.

**4711 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4712 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2004 to be placed before the Council on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2004 were received and accepted.

The Clerk confirmed that no response had been received to the suggestion that Development Control meetings be held in Buckingham from time to time to allow local people to attend.

**4713 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following planning applications were received and discussed. -

04/02360/ALB

**OPPOSE**

5 Market Square

Change of use from A1 – A3 fast food takeaway

*Members reiterated their views expressed at the previous meeting on the parallel application 04/02218/APP; concerns had been 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. In addition, the pavement was too narrow to permit the installation of the necessary litterbin.*

04/02886/APP **OPPOSE/SUPPORT**  
4/6 Fox Way  
Two storey side extension and pitched roof over detached garages  
*Members felt that such a large extension, though 'subsidiary', to the boundary of the property on a corner plot closed off the view and affected the balance of the street scene. Members supported the pitched garage roof.*

04/02913/ALB **SUPPORT**  
Woolwich plc, 15-16 Market Hill  
Change of use of first and second floor to provide four apartments

04/02960/APP **SUPPORT**  
Avenue House, Avenue Road  
Single storey side extension and two storey rear extension

04/02955/APP **SUPPORT**  
27 Mitre Street  
Two storey and single storey rear extension

04/02988/APP **CONDITIONAL SUPPORT**  
5 Kingfisher Road  
Two storey side extension  
*Members agreed to support the application if the extension was made clearly subsidiary.*

04/02902/APP **SUPPORT**  
Manor Farm, Bourton Road  
Erection of an one and a half storey workshop & garage

The following two applications were considered together:

04/03016/ALB **OPPOSE**  
The Bakery, 27 West Street  
Conversion of first floor and internal alteration to create flats

04/03017/APP **OPPOSE**  
The Bakery, 27 West Street  
Conversion of first floor and internal alteration to create flats  
*Members considered that the previous application (04/02605/ALB) was to be preferred, with its hallway entry; this application proposed two flats on the first floor, one of which was entered via its kitchen. Members also remain concerned at the use of the old fire escape as a principal means of access to all the flats, and asked if the Fire Authority had been consulted about the general access and the entry via a kitchen, the most likely source of fire.*

## **4714 PLANNING CONTROL**

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

### **APPROVED**

04/02184/ALB Radcliffe Centre	Int. <sup>1</sup> works, ramps & handrails for disabled access	Support
04/02186/APP Yeomanry House	Int. <sup>1</sup> works, ramps & handrails for disabled access	Support
04/02187/APP Radcliffe Centre	Ramps and handrails for disabled access	Support
04/02188/ALB Yeomanry House	Int. <sup>1</sup> works, ramps & handrails for disabled access	Support
04/02289/APP 15 Windmill Close	Two storey side extension	Oppose
04/02498/APP 2 Sandhurst Drive	Solar collector on south western facing roof	Support
04/02509/APP Bridge Ho., Bourton Rd.	First floor sun room	Support
04/02580/APP 32 Addington Road	Two storey rear extension	Support
04/02634/APP 2 Bernardines Way	Erection of Conservatory	Support

### **REFUSED**

04/02471/APP 52 Deerfield Close	Two storey and single storey front extension	Oppose
---------------------------------	--	--------

### **REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

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

04/02403/APP 4 Addington Road	Two storey rear extension and rear access
04/02639/APP 12 Gawcott Fields	Erection of 1½ storey side extension and demolition of lean to

*Cllrs. Isham & Cadd left*

## **4715 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS**

(4710.2) Report on the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Study – Secretary of State’s proposed changes, for consultation.

The Chairman reported on the changes to the strategy proposals. AVDC’s summary of the proposed changes had been circulated with the Agenda.

1. The original had included maps for each growth town with possible locations for growth shown; the new maps do not specify precise locations. The Town Council had considered the original not specific enough; it was now even more vague.
2. Leighton-Linslade is now identified as a growth area and this will affect roads in the Vale area.
3. In the Milton Keynes area 44900 new homes and 44900 new jobs are recommended; in Aylesbury 15000 and 12690 respectively, implying some housing for commuters.
4. Some time in the next 12 years the dualling of the A421 would be considered; no improvement to the A422 is proposed, despite a growth area of MK on the Calverton side, and the A413 does not appear on the map. Much emphasis is laid on the E-W rail link although this is not definitely scheduled for improvement. No regard has been paid to the fact of the A422 and A413 passing through the centre of Buckingham.
5. Brackley and Towcester have been recognised as having special problems which need to be recognised by the authorities; although Buckingham and Winslow have similar problems, no such recognition has been made of them.

Members discussed the points raised, noting that the map was diagrammatic only; nevertheless the A413 was important for access to the scheduled housing development to the north of the town, and the possibility of a new rail station at Winslow to the south.

Members also asked how much of the housing was designated for key workers in existing jobs – there is no detail of that.

The MP would be contacted with a view to his arguing Buckingham's case and if possible arranging a meeting with the Chairman.

These above matters, together with Mrs Cumming's points raised in the preceding public session, would form the response to the document.

#### **4716 CORRESPONDENCE**

##### 4716.1 04/02289/APP, 15 Windmill Close: AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

Members had responded: *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.*

Minor Amended plans were provided subsequently, showing the relationship of the extension to the property boundary.

AVDC: "The impact upon the street scene and the scale of the proposal were considered and it was noted that the proposal would be set back 0.5m from the original dwelling providing a design break. It would also have a ridged roof which would be set down 0.3m below the original roof line and would therefore be subservient to the original dwelling as recommended in "Design Guide: Residential Extensions". As such members considered that the design and scale of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing dwelling and its curtilage and would not have a detrimental effect upon the street scene.

Following these (ie the Town Council's) comments an additional drawing was submitted which indicating that the existing hedge would be retained. In addition to this a condition was used stating that the hedge screen shall be retained to a minimum of 1.5m above ground level and should any part die or become damaged during the course of development, replacement planting shall be undertaken in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Planning Authority and the hedge shall thereafter be retained.

##### 4716.2 (03/02871/APP:3 Stowe Avenue) Breach of Condition – response from AVDC Enforcement Officer

A complaint had been made that the householder had taken out the front hedge in breach of a condition of his planning consent, and replaced it with a black fence and sliding gate.

The Enforcement Officer would be writing to the owner requesting that he submit an application to relax the condition imposed.

Members felt that if the hedge was sufficiently significant to be the subject of a condition, then that condition should not be relaxed to legitimize the breach. Response to be made accordingly.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

4716.3 (4701.6) Vodafone mast – response from AVDC Planning Officer

AVDC noted the information given by the MEP, and would be looking at the documents to assess whether there were points or practices they could use.

4716.4 (4701.3) Buckingham Buildbase – response from Enforcement Team Leader

The preferred course of action would be for Buildbase to submit an application for a certificate of lawfulness of the existing use, but this submission cannot be required. However, Buildbase's planning consultant has indicated that they are still intending to submit an application, but that it has been delayed pending receipt of evidence from the landowner.

Members felt that the lack of enforcement of a succession of Orders should be drawn to the attention of the Head of Development Control.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

**4717 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS**

4717.1 Transport Symposium at Green Park, 1<sup>st</sup> November 2004

The Chairman reported on this event which he had attended. The documents would be available from the office for interested Members.

The morning had been taken up with a general discussion of the Local Transport Plan and specific applications in Aylesbury, and the afternoon on the remainder of the Vale. Attendees were asked to use a map of the Vale parishes to group them together for future discussions.

Members suggested that a corridor group based on the A413 – Buckingham, Winslow and Whitchurch – would be useful and this would be suggested to the County Council.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

*Cllr. Lehmann left the meeting*

4717.2 04/02842/APP 8 Glynswood Road

Members had supported the front extension application subject to the parking provision being adequate according to the Guidelines.

The Planning Officer had pointed out that the extension contravened the 45° rule with respect to a habitable room in n<sup>o</sup>. 7 Glynswood Road, and consequently he would be recommending refusal to Development Control. He asked if the Council would consider changing their response to 'NO OBJECTIONS' which would allow the decision to be made under delegated powers and not referred to Development Control.

Members reviewed the plans and considered that the 45° line impinged on a porch which was not 'habitable'; Cllrs. Stevens and Strain-Clark offered to visit the site again and check. The response would stand if this was so.

**ACTION CHAIRMAN/CLLR.STEVENS**

Meeting closed at 8.45pm.

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