

Dear Member

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Planning Committee, which will be held in the Council Offices, Cornwall's Meadow, Buckingham, on Monday, 4th April 2005 at 7.30pm following the Interim Council meeting.

Signed: Mrs Heath
Town Clerk

The public is invited to attend.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declaration of interest for items on the agenda
3. To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 2004 to be placed before the Council on 2004
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 (05/00412/APP 17 The Holt) Request from Planning Officer to reconsider decision (see attached correspondence p3-4)
7. Correspondence
7.1 (04/03204/APP: 2 Edmonds Close) AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response (appended, p4)
7.2 (4748.3) Response from John Byrne
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. H. Lewis	Cllr R. Stuchbury	(Mayor)
Cllr G. Loftus		

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

4th April 2005

App. No.	Particulars
1. 05/00412/APP AMENDED PLANS	17 The Holt Two storey side extension and rear conservatory <i>Burnham</i>
<i>Amendment details parking arrangements & shows side extension moved forward approximately 1 metre</i>	
2. 05/00526/APP	61 Meadway Single storey rear extension <i>Burgess</i>
3. 05/00531/APP	52 Deerfield Close Two storey rear extension and single storey front extension <i>Medlands</i>
4. 05/00549/ATC	Land. Adj. Castle House, Western Avenue Works to 1 sycamore <i>Edmonson</i>
5. 05/00582/APP	14 Deerfield Close Single storey front and side extensions <i>Clarke</i>
6. 05/00618/APP	Barracks House, West Street Erection of detached single garage <i>Shipp</i>
7. 05/00621/APP	26 Highlands Road Single storey rear extension <i>Suggate</i>
<i>Minor Amended plans for this application reduce the depth of the extension from 4.7m to 3.6m</i>	
8. 05/00623/APP	Stowefield, Stowe Avenue Addition of front and rear dormers and removal of one chimney <i>Anton</i>
9. 05/00636/APP	20 Lenborough Road Single storey and first floor rear extension <i>Steer</i>
10. 05/00672/ATP	Maids Moreton Avenue Fell one oak, crown balance one lime, crown reduction by 15% one oak and one lime, clean crown three limes, one beech and one horse chestnut tree <i>AVDC Leisure</i>
11. 05/00686/APP	14 Aris Way Enclosure of land by repositioning of 2metre high boundary fence <i>Pegg</i>
12. 05/00704/APP	47 Westfields Two storey side extension <i>Forsyth</i>

13. 05/00771/APP 39 Embleton Way
Change of use of shop unit to create one residential flat
W.E. Black Ltd
14. 05/00795/APP 17 Badgers Way
Single storey side extension and resiting of garage
Maranatha Properties Ltd.
15. 05/00796/APP 8 Nightingale Place
Conversion of garage to residential use
Shaw
16. 05/00801/APP 22 Embleton Way
Conversion of Garage to residential use and erection of detached
garage and creation of new access
Cox

PLANNING DECISIONS PER BULLETINS

APPROVED

- | | | | |
|---------------|------------------|---|---------|
| 04/03392/AAD | Tesco, Market H. | Erection of front fascia sign and projecting sign | Support |
| 05/00140/APP | 5 Treefields | Single storey side extension | Support |
| 05/000269/APP | 7 Cropredy Ct. | Conversion of garage to habitable room | Support |

REFUSED (Gawcott with Lenborough)

- | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| 04/01001/APP | Burrows Field | Ch/use land for siting 16 mobile homes etc. | No objections |
|--------------|---------------|---|---------------|

REFUSED

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| 04/03204/APP | 2 Edmonds Cl. | Two storey front extension | Support |
| 04/03251/AAD | White Hart Hotel | Erection of banners | Oppose |
| 04/03504/APP | Tennis Courts | Erection of 12no.10m high floodlights | Support |

WITHDRAWN

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------------|---|-----------|
| 04/03407/APP | 14 Deerfield Cl. | 1½ storey and single storey rear extensions | (Oppose) |
| 04/03426/APP | 25-26 West St. | Conv. outbuildings & first floor offices into flats | (Support) |
| 04/03427/ALB | 25-26 West St. | Conv. outbuildings & first floor offices into flats | (Support) |

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

6.1 (05/00412/APP 17 The Holt) Request from Planning Officer to reconsider decision

Members were concerned that the solid side wall of the proposed replacement conservatory breached the 45° rule. Members supported the extension, though they criticised the design of the windows which was not in keeping with those of the existing house.

Stephen Mogridge, AVDC: I received the Town Council's comments for the above today. Members have indicated that they partly support and partly oppose the proposals. Comments ought to give a single indication in the tick box and make additional comments if there are other concerns.

I note that the members were concerned that the solid wall of the proposed replacement conservatory breached the 45° rule. The 45 degree rule is for extensions of more than single storey. In this instance it should not be considered.

Bearing this in mind I would appreciate it if I could have revised written confirmation that the application is either supported, opposed or if there are no objections.

BTC: Chairman of Planning: in that case we have no option but to oppose on the grounds of loss of amenity to the neighbour.

Members would prefer not to be put in this situation - as they have said on previous occasions - and to have separate applications. Members have frequently responded, for example, that a front extension is not acceptable while there was no problem with a rear extension on the same application. The split response has not caused comment before.

AVDC: I understand that the Council still wish to oppose on the grounds of loss of amenity to the neighbour. I feel I ought to point out that the conservatory only projects 3m to the rear of the dwelling, under our guidelines we would not object if it were 3.6m deep. Also there is a 1.8m panel fence between the properties and the roof of the proposed conservatory slopes away from the boundary lessening its impact. The proposals for the conservatory are entirely within our guidelines. I would urge the Council to re consider their comments.

Regarding split responses. The public is entitled to make a single application with distinctly separate elements. The Planning Authority cannot ask for separate applications for each element. If comments are received with a split response and part of the response is an opposition to a particular element then we have to take the view that the entire application is being opposed.

In this particular case I responded because the element being objected to was in accordance with our guidelines on residential extensions so I was hoping that the council would reconsider. - I still do, as we would be unable to argue the case for loss of amenity to the neighbour when their conservatory proposals are well within our guidelines.

CORRESPONDENCE

7.1 04/03204/APP: 2 Edmonds Close. Two storey front extension Reason for decision

Members had supported this application.

AVDC: Members considered that proposed extension which would be located to the front of the property which occupies a corner plot would be too large in scale and would appear overly dominant within the street scene. As such it would have a detrimental impact upon the original dwelling, its setting and other buildings in the locality.