

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON MONDAY 11<sup>th</sup> JULY 2005 AT PM FOLLOWING THE INTERIM COUNCIL**  
**MEETING**

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

Also Attending: Cllr. D. Isham

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W.McElligott

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**4782 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were declarations of interest from Cllr. Loftus (applications 05/01468/APP and 05/01564/AOP) and Cllr. Lehmann (application CC/34/05).

**4783 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2005 to be placed before the Council on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2005 were received and accepted. There were no matters arising not dealt with later in the meeting.

**4784 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

**05/01440/APP** **OPPOSE**

16 Sandhurst Drive

Erection of two storey rear extension and first floor rear/side extension

*Members opposed on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site.*

**05/01463/APP** **SUPPORT**

3 Dukes Piece, Linden Village

Erection of conservatory to rear

**05/01468/APP** **SUPPORT**  
Building 4, University of Buckingham, Chandos Road  
Change of use from academic use to commercial cinema building and academic use

**05/01495/APP** **SUPPORT**  
Kya, Stratford Road  
Erection of conservatory to rear

The following three applications were considered together:

33 High Street  
**05/01517/ALB** **SUPPORT**

Removal of staircase and replace with oak staircase  
**05/01522/ALB** **SUPPORT**

Internal works to create an ensuite shower and walk in wardrobe  
**05/01523/ALB** **SUPPORT**

Removal of shed and replace with conservatory (retrospective)  
*Support for each application was given subject to the report of the Historic Building's Officer.*

**05/01549/APP** **OPPOSE**  
Pine Lodge, Avenue Road  
Erection of 4 dwellings with garaging (amendment to 03/02897/APP)  
*Members had opposed the original application on the grounds of*  
*1) High ridge height and steep pitch of the roofs, inappropriate in a mainly bungalow environment;*  
*2) Concern about the trees on and around the site;*  
*3) Access opposite that of the house across the road, forming a crossroads, and additional traffic generated onto the playing field access and Avenue Road;*  
*4) Unimaginative layout on the site.*  
*Members felt that, though the application was for minor variations to the approved scheme, apart from the protection of the trees the original criticisms had not been addressed and their opposition stood.*

The following two applications were considered together:

**05/01561/APP** **OPPOSE**  
13-16 Stratford Road  
Demolition of 13-16 Stratford Road and erection of two storey building comprising 4 one bedroom flats

**05/01568/ACD** **OPPOSE**  
13-16 Stratford Road  
Demolition of 13-16 Stratford Road  
*Members noted that no parking facilities were shown for this part of the development, and that the complex of remaining buildings was now within the Conservation Area. Members felt that the original decision on retention of the façade should be enforced to preserve the street scene and would welcome the Historic Buildings Officer's views on this.*  
*Concern was expressed at the erection of scaffolding on No.12 Stratford Road which appeared to obstruct the footway, and the Clerk was asked to check the terms of the permit with BCC.*

**ACTION THE CLERK**

**05/01564/AOP**

**SUPPORT IN PRINCIPLE**

Former Railway Station site, Station Road  
Erection of 4 detached dwellings

*Members asked that a full environmental and arboricultural survey of the site be carried out to ensure that no important trees or group of trees would be affected by the proposal and that suitable wildlife corridors would be maintained.*

*If the appropriate Officers were subsequently satisfied that the proposed development would have no material effect, Members would support the application.*

*These plans had not arrived in time for the meeting:*

**05/01667/APP**

68 Bourton Road  
Two storey rear extension

**CC/34/05**

**SUPPORT**

Buckingham Youth Centre, London Road  
Proposed replacement of existing timber close boarded boundary fence with a powder coated steel palisade fence (2.4m) backed by a new timber close boarded fence 1.8m high.

**4785 PLANNING CONTROL**

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

**APPROVED**

05/00777/APP 11 Sandhurst Drive	2st. rear & 1 <sup>st</sup> floor side ext'n + single st.rear extn.	Object
05/00893/APP 39 Fox Way	Two storey side extension	Support
05/00985/APP 26 Kingfisher Road.	First floor side extension	Support
05/01055/APP 12 Wharfside Place	Conservatory to rear	Support
05/01070/ATP Land rear EdgeHillCt/Naseby Ct.	Works to trees	Support
05/01090/ALB Buckingham Lodges, Stowe.	Repair, restoration works to E. & W. Lodge	Support
05/01091/APP 127 Burleigh Piece	Single storey rear extension	Support

**REFUSED**

04/03431/APP land off Western Ave. Erection of a new dwelling Support

**REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

A report on the following application had been received and was available in the office

05/00777/APP 11 Sandhurst Drive Two storey rear and first floor side extension and single storey rear extension

## **4786 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS**

### (4781.1) (04/03434/APP) Land behind Stratford House

*Amended plans for this application had arrived the previous Friday. Members decided not to make formal comment until they could be placed appropriately on the agenda.*

The Chairman outlined the problem which had arisen with the site and location plans for this application and the changes made by the developer. The decking areas by the rear doors had been deleted, and a fence had been installed along the site boundary with the garden of Fern Cottage. Whilst the location plans on the original application had indicated the site boundary to lie between Stratford House land and Elmdale, the site plan took the boundary between Elmdale and Fern Cottage as its north-eastern edge. Apart from the installation of the fence, all work on the site had been stopped.

Members regretted the inconsistency, which they felt had led them to assume that the Elmdale land would act as a buffer between the proposed housing and the garden of Fern Cottage, lessening the impact on the residents of Fern Cottage.

Cllr. Stevens had attended the Planning Appeal on an earlier application for this site, and recalled that the Environment Agency had opposed any development or planting on the floodplain, including the extension of the Riverside Walk.

It appeared that the Environment Agency had raised no objections to this development, and furthermore the District Council were not minded to remove permitted development rights for the ground treatment, so it might not remain as grass, although p.d. rights for structures like sheds would be removed.

Members asked that a letter be sent expressing these concerns, and the application to be brought formally to the next meeting. In particular, the EA would be asked to confirm the reversal of its attitude to building in the flood plain.

*Cllr. Collins left the meeting*

## **4787 CORRESPONDENCE**

### 4787.1 (05/00623/APP; Stowefield: Addition of front and rear dormers and removal of one chimney) AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

*Members had SUPPORTED the application.*

AVDC: Members had regard for the design and location of the proposed dormer windows in the front and rear slopes of the property. Having regard for policy GP35, which seeks to ensure that the new development respects and complements the physical characteristics of the site and surroundings, the local building tradition and the scale and context of its setting, Members concluded that the proposed alterations would add significantly to the bulk of the building and would be particularly visible when viewing the building from the Brackley Road and Stowe Avenue approach and therefore appear unattractive in the street scene and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the original building and the visual amenities of the locality contrary to policies GP34, GP35 and GP53 of the AVDLP.

Members considered the relationship of the rear dormer windows to the adjacent residential properties and concluded that the proposed dormer windows in the rear elevation would result in an overbearing impact upon the occupiers of the property to the rear, a detached

bungalow and would result in the potential for overlooking of both Appledore and 6 Stowe Close contrary to policy GP8 of the AVDLP.

4787.2 (05/00777/APP; 11 Sandhurst Drive: Two storey rear and first floor side extension and single storey rear extension) AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response  
*Members had OPPOSED, noting that this application was for a noticeably larger extension than that granted permission in 2003 (02/02959/APP) and voted to oppose on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site.*

AVDC: Members noted the extent of the previous approval in 2003 and noted that the application in part varied the previous in that the two storey extension extends forward at first floor level in line with the front of the existing garage.

Members had regard for the scale and location of the single storey rear extension and the side extension and noted that the extensions would be set down from the ridge of the original property ensuring that the development would appear clearly subservient in accordance with Design Guide on Residential Extensions and considered that the proposals would not detract from the character and appearance of the original property.

Having regard for the above Members concluded that the proposed extensions would ensure that there was a sufficient level of residential curtilage retained to ensure that the development would not result in over-development of the site in accordance with policies GP9 and GP35 of the AVDLP.

4787.3 (4780.2; 14 Deerfield Close) Response from the Chairman of Development Control  
The response had been copied to Members with the agenda. The minutes had also been received; no vote had been requested or taken.

4787.4 (4781.2; 27 Waine Close) To receive and discuss the applicants' reply.  
The Chairman proposed that no further action be taken in this matter, particularly as the officer's recommendation to DCC was for approval.

*Cllr. Lehmann left the meeting.*

#### **4788 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

Cllr. Strain-Clark summarised Mrs. White's comments at the preceding public session for the Chairman, who had missed the early part of the session, and requested that a letter be sent to AVDC asking for further measures to be taken in the matter of acoustic and visual screening of the Chandos Close houses from the traffic on the access road to the Brookfield Lane site. Members agreed.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

Meeting closed at: 9.05pm

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