

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
MONDAY 13th DECEMBER 2004 at 8.30pm following the Special Council meeting.**

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

Also Attending: Cllr. Mrs. C. Strain-Clark

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W. McElligott

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

4718 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4719 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on November 22nd 2004, ratified on 6th December 2004, were received; there were no matters arising not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

4720 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following planning application had not been received
04/03253/APP
2-18 Homestall
Demolition of 3 industrial units and erection of 2 storey office extension

4720.1 Minor Amended Plans

Members discussed the 'Minor Amended' system, noting that the plans were issued for information only and no response was expected. Decisions on such amended applications were often listed on the same agenda as the Minor Amendment.

The matter had been raised at the 2nd August meeting (Minute 4681.2) and a letter sent to AVDC as a result, but no response had yet been received. Members felt that 'Minor' required definition; that where an amendment made a significant difference to the application it should be readvertised to allow the public to comment; that the Council

should be able to comment on any amendment should it so wish, and time should be allowed for this before the decision was made.

Members thought that a meeting of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Mayor with the Chairman of Development Control, the Chief Executive and the Senior Planning Officer (North) to discuss these matters, and other concerns such as Enforcement, would be useful.

ACTION THE CLERK

The following Minor Amended plans had been received:

04/02486/AAD

BP Garage, Stratford Rd. New and replacement fascia sign

(Amendment is reduction of illuminated canopy signage to 4m strip plus 'Helios' device)

Members noted the concerns of members of the public over the light levels and placing of the signs, and the Chairman reported that the Planning Department had apologised for scheduling the application for decision at the 9th December Development Control meeting before the consultation period had expired (web site gives standard consultation period ending 20/12/04). While he had been at the site that afternoon, foodstuffs were being delivered to the shop/restaurant in preparation for the scheduled opening on 14th December although painting and other finishing operations were still being completed. Members asked whether the Environmental Health Department had inspected and passed the premises.

Cllr. Lehmann left the meeting.

Members also felt that work on the lighting and signage had gone ahead on the assumption that permission would be granted in order to have the premises open as scheduled.

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Stevens, that Standing Orders be suspended in order that Mrs. Robinson could address the meeting.

Mrs. Robinson referred to the previous renovation, when the green lighting was very bright and lit the premises across the road and to each side of the site; pressure from residents had led to an agreement that the tanker lights were only switched on during deliveries, and the carwash lights were switched off at night, when the carwash was not operated. Local residents had been notified when Sunday working had been necessary.

During this work all the lights had been on continuously, and the green colour was now an acid yellow-green. The workmen had also worked all Sunday without notice.

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Stevens, that Standing Orders be reinstated.

Members also wished to clarify the opening hours of the petrol station and restaurant and expressed concerns about the possibility of groups of people congregating at or near the premises late at night.

The Committee decided to withdraw support of the application, notwithstanding the reduction in length of the canopy lighting to 4m, on the grounds that the light levels were excessive given the road layout and masking buildings and intrusive on the street scene and for adjacent residents.

04/02838/APP

23 Lime Avenue Single storey rear extension & first floor side extension
Amendment of description from 'Single storey rear extension'.

04/02878/APP

17 Pitchford Walk Change of use from takeaway to restaurant

Only the application form and site plan had been supplied when the original had been discussed at the 1st November meeting: (Members had responded '*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*'. No reply had been received to these queries.)

Additional documents had now been sent comprising: further information including opening hours; map indicating entrance for deliveries/customer car parking for 8-9 cars/existing takeaway/bin store; proposed internal layout of restaurant.

Members were concerned that the parking area had to accommodate customers for the shop and visitors to the houses in Pitchford Walk (which have no road frontage) as well as the customers of the takeaway and proposed restaurant, and that parking would spill over onto the street, on a dangerous bend. So far as Councillors were aware this parking area was for general public use.

04/02902/APP

Manor Farm, Bourton Rd. Erection of 1½ storey workshop and garage

Amendments: Red line has been re-drawn to include farmhouse. Proposed building is now single storey; the garage area has been reduced to two bays from three, the end bay becoming the office. This has enabled the exterior staircase and roof windows to be deleted, and the roof ridge height to be reduced approximately 0.5m. Roof is no longer hipped.

Members felt that the removal of the upper storey and associated structures could not be described as a Minor Amendment. Apart from the resulting less interesting building shape, Members had no objections to the amended plans, but wished to reiterate that the difference between Amended and Minor Amended Plans must be defined.

4721 PLANNING CONTROL

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

APPROVED

03/03224/APP	12-18 Stratford Rd.	Conv.cottages + erect 2 semi-detached houses	Oppose
04/02403/APP	4 Addington Road	2 storey rear extension & rear access	Oppose
04/02552/ALB	Lloyds TSB	Installation of light box over ATM	Support
04/02605/ALB	The Bakery,27 West St.	Conv./alt.1 st & 2 nd floor into flats	Support
04/02639/APP	Springfield, Gawcott Fields	Erection 1½st. side extn + demol. of lean to	Oppose
04/02696/APP	8 Middlefield Close	1 st floor side, single st.front and dormer windows	Support
04/02689/APP	Braeside, Lenboro' Rd.	Single storey rear extension	Support
04/02738/ATC	Hill Ho.,12 Castle St.	Wks to 4yews,1magnolia,remove 1sycamore,1elder	Support

REFUSED

04/02665/APP 25 Moreton Drive 1st floor extn. over garage & single storey extension Support
04/02842/APP 8 Glynswood Road Two storey front extension Support

4722 CORRESPONDENCE

4722.1 (4692) Extensions and Affordable Housing

Members had been concerned that the number of extensions permitted reduced the number of smaller houses in the town, and asked whether the Planning Authority took account of this when calculating the numbers for Affordable Housing provision.

Mr. Cannell had replied that AVDC's current policy is not to restrict the size of extensions other than by design and impact, and enclosed a copy of the SPG on Affordable Housing. The LDF would eventually be an appropriate means of expressing the Town Council's views.

Councillors felt strongly that the percentage of affordable housing in the town should be maintained, and a statement of intent to that effect was necessary; the supply of new affordable houses depended on there being new developments of appropriate size, and meanwhile the stock was diminishing because of permitted extensions.

4722.2 (4716.4) Buckingham Buildbase

The Town Council had written formally to Cllr. Isham as Chairman of AVDC Development Control over their concerns at the lack of response from AVDC to letters about the enforcement orders placed on Buckingham Buildbase.

Cllr. Isham had looked into the matter and been assured that the lack of response would be addressed as a matter of urgency.

4723 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS

4723.1 (4715) Milton Keynes & South Midlands Study

Attention had been drawn to ¶105. "Additional growth, over and above that already allocated in local plans, should be focused entirely on Aylesbury urban area. Aylesbury town should seek to accommodate at a total of 15,000 homes in the period up to 2021, with the remainder of the district accounting for an additional 3,300 dwellings in total to 2016. These figures exclude any additional housing provided within Aylesbury Vale District to meet the proposals for growth in Milton Keynes urban area as a result of the joint preparation of LDDs."

Members asked for clarification on whether this affected Buckingham.

ACTION THE CLERK

4723.2 Flood Alleviation Scheme

Cllr. Stevens summarised a letter sent by the Environment Agency to the Buckingham River Action Group:

- The current scheme does not meet the required criteria for Defra grant aid. Local levy funding was limited and subject to other commitments. It was not therefore possible to provide a timetable for the works.
- Objections had been received to the proposed walls at Ford Street (04/00563/AOP) and permission would not be granted unless the objections were removed. Alternatives had

been investigated but these had proved unsuitable for various reasons. The Agency was considering withdrawing their proposal, which would leave four properties exposed, although the Water Stratford storage scheme would reduce the risk.

Members noted that progress on the Water Stratford scheme seemed to have slowed considerably. Contact should be made with Stony Stratford on their alleviation scheme and make common cause if possible to protect both towns.

ACTION THE CLERK

Meeting closed at: 9.25pm

CHAIRMAN DATE