

Minutes of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** meeting held on Monday 11<sup>th</sup> April following the Interim meeting in the Council Chamber, Town Council Offices, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham

**Present:** Cllr. Mrs. J. Bates  
 Cllr. M. Cole  
 Cllr. J. Harvey  
 Cllr. P. Hirons (Chairman)  
 Cllr. D. Isham  
 Cllr. A. Mahi  
 Cllr. Mrs. L. O'Donoghue  
 Cllr. M. Smith  
 Cllr. Mrs. C. Strain-Clark (Vice Chairman)  
 Cllr. R. Stuchbury

**Also present:** Mrs. C. Cumming (co-opted member)  
 Mrs. C. Carter (Committee Clerk)

**For the Town Clerk:** Mrs. K. McElligott

#### 835/15 **Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Try.

#### 836/15 **Declarations of interest**

None

#### 837/15 **Minutes**

The minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> March to be ratified at Full Council on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2016 were received and accepted. There were no matters arising.

#### 838/15 **Buckingham Neighbourhood Development Plan/Vale of Aylesbury Plan**

To discuss a way forward should the AVDC figures in the new Local Plan be significantly higher than predicted.

Cllr Hirons informed Members that the VALP plan would be presented at the Interim Scrutiny meeting of AVDC on the 11<sup>th</sup> May, inclusive of site allocations.

The public consultation would then follow between July and September.

AVDC was required to have a plan in place by 2017 or the Government would impose a plan upon them.

Cllr Hirons presented a copy of AVDC's proposed 'offered' sites for allocation seen at the recent North Bucks Parishes Planning Consortium (NBPPC) meeting; the plan showed Buckingham and Maids Moreton as one settlement, with Radclive surrounded by several of the marked 'offered' sites.

Comments at the NBPPC had also included that Milton Keynes Council had 4 areas proposed but not decided upon; Luton's numbers were not known; The Chilterns had stated they were not taking any further allocation and yet a proposed 30,000 homes were to be built in Buckinghamshire as a whole.

Bucks County Council's had strongly recommended development in Aylesbury, Haddenham and Buckingham.

Cllr Stuchbury said that the Town Council should look at those sites which it wishes to strategically argue and recommended that Members ask County Highways

Officer Chris Urry at what stage County would release proposals on traffic integration for the town.

**ACTION: PLANNING CLERK**

It should be considered of utmost importance to use that information to form a basis for discussion on those sites which would bring tangible benefits to the town.

Cllr Smith commented that preservation of Buckingham's Neighbourhood Plan was of utmost importance.

### 839/15 Action Reports

To receive action reports as per the attached list.

*The Clerk apologised for not having had time to carry out any but the urgent actions before publication of the agenda. Any responses will be reported at the meeting.*

Due to the heavy number of planning applications and interim meeting on the same evening, Members **AGREED** to postpone the item to the next Planning meeting.

**ACTION: PLANNING CLERK /25<sup>TH</sup> APRIL AGENDA**

### 840/15 Planning Applications

**16/00313/APP**

**OPPOSE**

Buckingham Primary School, Foscoate Way

Erection of a modular nursery building and creation of new pedestrian footpath

*Members felt that – as the first building visible to visitors to both schools – this was unattractive and unimaginative for a nursery. Concern was also expressed that this was a temporary structure use of which might well be extended beyond its natural lifetime, to the detriment of the children housed in it.*

**16/00419/APP**

**PARTIAL SUPPORT**

24 Meadway

Single storey extension and repositioning of fence

*Members had no objections to the extension, but felt the realigned fence was detrimental to the open aspect of the street scene.*

**16/00713/APP**

**NO OBJECTIONS**

7 Glynswood Road

Single storey front extension

**16/00874/APP**

**NO OBJECTIONS**

3 Well Street

Variations to internal and external layouts and elevations including infilling to rear light well (amendments to planning permission 15/03645/APP)

*Members were informed that the parallel application 16/00533/ALB, considered at the 21<sup>st</sup> March meeting, had been approved: in view of this Members decided to make the same response i.e. "Members had no objections to the amendments, but asked that the stairlift and glazing be looked at again."*

**16/00880/APP**

**NO COMMENT**

35 Meadway

Replacement of existing flat garage roof with new pitched roof

*Members declined to comment as the garage abutted the Council's play area.*

**16/00901/APP**

**NO COMMENT**

41 Whitehead Way

Single storey rear extension and detached garden store (retrospective)

*Enforcement case reference 15/00397/CON3 preceded this application. It is Members' practice not to comment on retrospective applications.*

**16/00910/APP**

**NO OBJECTIONS**

6 Busby Close

First floor side extension comprising ridged roof over existing flat roof with rear facing dormer and forward facing rooflight

*Members noted that only two parking spaces were to be provided for the proposed 4-bedroom house and would like to see an amendment with an additional space.*

*The following two applications were considered together:*

**16/00917/APP & 16/00918/ALB**

**OPPOSE AND ATTEND**

The Old Police Station, 50 Moreton Road

Conversion of redundant police station into 5 apartments and alterations to elevations

*Members noted that additional accommodation on a site with inadequate parking space already might lead to on-street parking at an exceptionally dangerous part of the Moreton Road, or encroachment into adjacent areas which could cause friction with existing residents.*

*It was noted that this, and six other applications considered at the meeting, were lacking an application form on the website.*

*Members also asked that it be established where the boundary of the town centre lay in respect of waiving standard parking guidelines. **ACTION PLANNING CLERK***

**16/00929/APP**

**OPPOSE**

11 Sandhurst Drive

Erection of first floor side extension over existing extension and converted garage, and single storey front and rear extensions to existing extension and converted garage

*Members noted that no attempt to make the considerable extension subsidiary to the original building had been made.*

**16/00940/APP**

**SUPPORT**

West End Bowls Club, Brackley Road

Removal of existing Bowls Club and erection of one dwelling

*Members noted the recommendation of the AVDC ecologist of a 10m buffer zone along the riverbank and hoped that efforts would be made to enforce this provision.*

**16/00991/APP**

**NO OBJECTIONS**

Nursery Bungalow, West Street

Demolition of bungalow and former nursery buildings, construction of four dwellings with attached single garages and associated works, including new access onto West Street

*It was reported that historically there had been public access to the river here (notably for fire engines to replenish their tanks) and it would be pleasant to still have access to the river's edge. The Buckingham Society had suggested a bridge link to the south side of the river and the Riverside Walk.*

**16/01009/APP**

**OPPOSE**

Denbigh House, Chandos Road

Two storey side and rear extensions and alterations to existing access

*Members opposed on the grounds of overdevelopment of the plot and an awkward parking arrangement which could lead to on-street parking on an overcrowded road. Concern was also expressed about the safety of the trees, including their root spread, both on site and those on the adjacent George Grenville Academy land during building works.*

*The Clerk was asked to check whether the notable tree on the northern boundary of the site was Protected; it is not.*

**16/01124/APP**

15 Kestrel Way  
Single storey rear extension

**NO OBJECTIONS**

**16/01125/APP**

5 Badgers Way  
Single storey front, side and rear extensions

**NO OBJECTIONS**

Applications not for consultation, for information only:

**16/00911/HPDE**

57 Badgers Way

The erection of a single storey rear extension which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4.55m, for which the maximum height would be 3m, and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m

**16/01092/ATN**

Telecommunication Antenna, Gawcott Road

Telecommunication equipment comprising replacement of 15m phase 1 monopole with a 17.4m phase 4 monopole and one additional equipment cabinet

**16/01098/ATP**

2 Bostock Court, West Street

- T14 & T13 Willow - 30% crown reduction to contain growth and balance trees
- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Fir Trees - reduce height of 1 & 5 by approx 3 metres to balance with the height of 2, 3, 4. 3 is leaning from midway - on inspection, the roots appear sound. The tree surgeon will climb and identify any issues.
- 6, 7, 8, 9 Crack Willows - 6, 7, 8 30% crown (G1) reduction and balance growth.
- 9 Tree shows signs of disease, extensive loss of bark, fungi growing, softness of trunk. The tree surgeon advises - reduce to 3m height to reduce the weight and allow the tree to (hopefully) strengthen and recover.

**16/01138/HPDE**

Avenue House, Avenue Road

The erection of a single storey rear extension which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 5.5m, for which the maximum height would be 3.6m, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.5m.

**16/01156/ATC**

10 Chandos Road

T1 Blue Conifer - Fell to ground due to shading in garden

T2 Western Red Cedar – Fell to ground level

T3 Norway Spruce (on boundary line, neighbours garden) – Fell to ground level

## 841/15 Planning Decisions

To receive for information details of planning decisions made by AVDC and other decisions.

		<b>BTC response</b>	<b>Officer recomm<sup>n</sup></b>
<b>Approved</b>			
16/00420/APP 60 Moreton Road	Replace roof, conv. loft, rear extrn.	No objections	-
<b>Refused</b>			
15/04176/APP 25 Hillcrest Way	Hot food counter w/i existing pizza delivery business	No objections	-
<b>Withdrawn</b>			
15/00051/AOP Land E of Buckingham	400 houses and associated works	Oppose	
15/04268/APP 2 Otters Brook	Erection of 1.8m fence	Oppose	

## 842/15 Development Management Committee Meetings

### 842.1 Strategic Development Control (6<sup>th</sup> April 2016)

*No Buckingham applications*

### 842.2 Development Control (7<sup>th</sup> April 2016)

*No Buckingham applications*

Noted

*Due to time restrictions Members **AGREED** to move to item 10 DCLG Consultation and then return to agenda order*

*Cllrs. Harvey, O'Donoghue and Stuchbury briefly left the chamber during the following item*

## 843/15 (924/15) DCLG Consultation on Implementation of Planning Changes (response date 15<sup>th</sup> April)

Members agreed at the last meeting that all but the following matters should be considered:

(note that the AVDC summary attached to the last agenda does not match the Chapter numbers of the consultation document; the following numbers refer to the document which can be found at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/501239/Planning\\_consultation.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/501239/Planning_consultation.pdf) )

Chapter 1 – Changes to planning application fees

Chapter 3 – Permission in principle

Chapter 4 – Small sites register

Members were asked to view the document on-line, as the remaining 10 Chapters amounted to about 50 pages.

Agreed responses were:

Question 2.6: Do you agree with our proposals for community and other involvement?

*Town and Parish Councils must remain as Statutory Consultees*

Question 2.9: Do you agree with our proposals for the expiry of on permission in principle on allocation and application? Do you have any views about whether we should allow for local variation to the duration of permission in principle?

*The period should be one year – use it or lose it – to reduce speculative applications*

Question 2.10: Do you agree with our proposals for the maximum determination periods for a) permission in principle minor applications, and b) technical details consent for minor and major sites?

*Determination periods must be extended if insufficient information is provided by the applicant and has to be requested. Otherwise developers may supply skimpy details, not supply further documents speedily, and then claim 'non-determination'*

*when the 5 weeks is up. If it was made clear that each required document added a week to the determination period after receipt, applicants might take care to provide all the information at the outset.*

Question 6.2: Do you agree that decisions on prioritising intervention to arrange for a local plan to be written should take into consideration a) collaborative and strategic plan-making and b) neighbourhood planning?

*Neighbourhood plans must be included and built into higher level plans.*

Question 6.5: Is there any other information you think we should publish alongside what is stated above?

*LPA's should include how many Neighbourhood Plans/proportion of district covered by Neighbourhood Plans into their reporting.*

Question 7.1: Do you agree that the threshold for designations involving applications for non-major development should be set initially at between 60-70% of decisions made on time, and between 10-20% of decisions overturned at appeal? If so what specific thresholds would you suggest?

Question 7.2: Do you agree that the threshold for designations based on the quality of decisions on applications for major development should be reduced to 10% of decisions overturned at appeal?

*No. If an application is refused or delayed on the grounds of badly thought out or poor quality plans, or being contrary to emerging or made Neighbourhood or Local Plans, an applicant with deep pockets may well appeal knowing LPA's have limited funds. This amounts to bullying an approval. An alternative quality measure should be investigated.*

Question 8.6: Do you have any other comments on these proposals, including the impact on business and other users of the system?

*There is a risk that large developers will set up 'approved provider' reviewing units within their organisations, and have cosy agreements with other developers. All approved providers must be provably independent and given access to a full range of Statutory Consultees.*

Question 9.1: Do you agree with these proposals for the range of benefits to be listed in planning reports?

*Yes, and also costs to be set against them, such as additional facilities and infrastructure provision; there should be total transparency.*

Question 10.1: Do you agree that the dispute resolution procedure should be able to apply to any planning application?

*A scheme of 'pendulum arbitration' should be used which would encourage both the LPA and the developer to submit reasonable cases for decision by the appointed arbitrator.*

Question 11.1: Do you have any views on our proposals to extend permitted development rights for state-funded schools, or whether other changes should be made? For example, should changes be made to the thresholds within which school buildings can be extended?

*No. A plethora of temporary buildings does not form a good learning environment, and the definition of temporary could be infinitely extended if the provider pleads funding difficulties.*

Question 12.2: Where an extension of time to respond is requested by a statutory consultee, what do you consider should be the maximum additional time allowed? Please provide details.

*14 days, provided all the required information is provided at the outset.*

## **844/15 Enforcement**

844.1 To receive the updated report.

Members are advised that AVDC has finally solved its IT problems and sent a comprehensive Enforcement Bulletin for 1<sup>st</sup> January 2015 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016, which has been added to our previous list as appropriate. Cllr. Whyte has also contributed the Luffield Abbey Ward information. New information is in bold type. Cases which have been opened and closed in these 15 months have been omitted – if Members would like to see the complete list, please ask the Clerk.

Noted.

844.2 To report any new breaches

None reported

#### **845/15 Transport**

845.1 To report any damaged superfluous and redundant signage in the town.

Cllr Smith reported that the signage reduction program should have followed recent works to London Road Bridge, County Cllr Warren Whyte was chasing up via Transport for Buckingham.

The Addington Rd works following recent consultation should shortly be announced.

#### **846/15 Access**

To report any access-related issues.

Cllr Strain-Clark raised the issue of the ongoing poor state of pavements in the town and reported that Cllr Whyte had said there was no budget at County, and therefore no intention to repair any damaged areas. The exception would be if an item reported was deemed dangerous.

Members wanted to know what criteria necessary were for both a path to be considered dangerous, and what the maximum amount of damage that can be considered safe was. Did this vary between different settlement types and if so, which settlement type did Buckingham fit in and what was the difference between the settlement types?

**ACTION: PLANNING CLERK**

#### **847/15 North Bucks Parishes Planning Consortium**

To receive a verbal report from the Chairman on the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2016 (may be incorporated in Agenda 4 if relevant).

Cllr Hirons had reported information above in item 4, Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan/Vale of Aylesbury Plan.

#### **848/15 Correspondence**

To receive for information correspondence from Mr. Finnis re his FoI request re Tingewick Road industrial Park trees/riverbank, and discuss whether to pursue the matter independently of the residents.

Members discussed the response from County's Freedom of Information Officer, finding it to be a wholly unsatisfactory and not formal response; the response did not even quote relevant reasons from the FOI act.

Cllr Stuchbury stated that the works to the riverbank had been within 9 metres of the watercourse and therefore breached both the 1991 watercourse and 1981 county and wildlife habitat act. Cllr Stuchbury was in conversation with the Planning Clerk to pursue the matter.

Cllr Harvey would look into the appropriate part of the Freedom of Information Act.

**ACTION: PLANNING CLERK/CLLR HARVEY**

**849/15 News releases**

None

**850/15 Chairman's items for information**

None

**851/15 Date of the next meeting:**

Monday 25<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at 7pm.

Meeting closed at 9.45pm

Chairman..... Date.....