

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON MONDAY 12th FEBRUARY 2007 AT 7.00pm

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

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W. McElligott

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillors R. Lehmann and Mrs. C. Strain-Clark.

5006 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr. Cadd indicated that, as a result of a recent ruling, it would be possible for him ethically to attend meetings of the Planning Committee and contribute to the discussions. He reserved the right to express different views at meetings of the District Council's Development Control Committee. He would not be commenting on application 06/03332/AOP.

5007 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th January 2007 ratified on 5th February 2007 were received.

5008 ACTION LIST

The Action List had been circulated with the agenda: there were no further comments.

5009 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

06/03185/APP

SUPPORT

Manor Farm House, Moreton Road

Erection of two storey detached dwelling

Members asked that matching materials sympathetic to the rural setting be specified in the conditions of approval, if given.

06/03189/APP

SUPPORT

Park Manor Farm, Moreton Road

Two storey front and side extension and incorporating of garage with first floor extension over to create granny annexe

Members asked that matching materials sympathetic to the rural setting be specified in the conditions of approval, if given.

06/03234/APP

SUPPORT

Esso Petrol Filling Station, Ring Road

Rear extension

The following application had been withdrawn before the meeting:

06/03325/APP

Ring Road Garage, Gawcott Road

Erection of 17.5metre monopole mast with 3 antennas and associate equipment cabinet

06/03332/AOP

SUPPORT

Tingewick Road Industrial Estate

Demolition of existing structure and erection of commercial (Class B1 (a) and (c)) and 93 residential units and provision of associated landscaping and carparking.

The Clerk's summaries of the 10 supporting documents had been circulated with the agenda. Members praised the traffic management scheme separating residential from commercial access and the amount of green space especially at the river side. The developer was commended for the incorporation of local wishes expressed during the consultation process. This Council would like to see incorporated in the s106 agreement:

- 1. that provision be made for the affordable housing to be retained for people having long-term links with Buckingham both on initial allocation and re-sale of the properties;*
- 2. that litter bins, dog bins and other furniture be provided by the developer before occupation, particularly those serving the riverside walk.*

07/00058/APP

SUPPORT

The Whale PH, Market Hill

Erection of side lean-to structure

07/00069/APP

SUPPORT

Puratos Ltd., Middle Slade

Erection of building for technical centre and associated parking

Members hoped that the barrier of trees adjacent to the site would be retained, and possibly reinforced.

07/00126/APP

SUPPORT

Roseway, Stratford Road

Single storey side extension and front and rear dormer windows

Members asked that appropriate materials be specified for the dormer windows.

The following two applications were considered together:

07/00140/APP & 07/00146/ALB

DEFERRED

36-37 High Street

Single storey rear extension, associated external alterations and conversion from A4 to restaurant (A3)

The Chairman reported that she had asked for clarification of the application as follows:
[Planning Officer's answers inserted]

1. Application form part 2 section (d) iv & v construction of a new access to a highway

Form states 'NO pedestrian access/alteration of existing access' but there is clearly a new entrance/gateway shown on the plan. This new entrance requires a considerable length of grass verge removing to achieve levels; is this correct, and do Highways accede to this?

[The proposal does not include a new access onto a highway. It is an alteration to an existing pedestrian access which joins the footpath. We have not received a consultation response from Highways as yet.]

2. Application form part 5 section (b) does proposed development involve felling trees

Answer 'NO'

Plan shows removal of 5 trees - what species are these and are they of merit/worthy of retention?

[The plan does show the removal of trees although the application forms say no trees will be removed. I have asked the agent to amend this and have consulted the Council's Tree Officer for their comments.]

3. Application form section (c)(ii) would proposed development affect footpath

Answer NO

Plans clearly show the opposite (& also see 1 above)

[I have checked the site constraints and the proposal would not affect a public footpath.]

4. Two sets of doors are shown opening out onto the pavement - surely these should open internally?

[The doors are shown to open out onto the area to the west which I believe is under the ownership of the applicant although it is not included in the red edge of the location plan. I have asked the agent to clarify this.

Once I have received clarification from the agent on points 2 and 4 I will e-mail you again.]

Members felt that without correct information they could make no valid response and elected to defer comment; if the time did not allow this, they asked that their response be recorded as **OPPOSE**. Concern was expressed at the loss of trees significant in the townscape.

07/00144/APP

OPPOSE

43 Embleton Way

Two storey side extension and rear conservatory

Members queried whether the conditions imposed permitted such a development of an affordable housing unit, deploring its consequent loss to the pool of affordable dwellings, and also noted that the fall of the land meant that the proposed extension would overlook neighbouring properties; the application was opposed on the grounds that it was visually intrusive and would have a detrimental effect on the street scene.

07/00147/APP

SUPPORT

Army Cadet force and Air Training Corps, Stratford Road

Demolition of part of ATC with rear extension and link. New construction of end buildings and alterations to ACF tube range

The following two applications were considered together:

07/00175/APP & 07/00177/ALB

SUPPORT

51 & 51A Well Street

Conversion of shop with flat over to No.2 dwelling houses

Support was given subject to the recommendations of the Historic Buildings Officer; Members would have liked to see the roof-level balcony retained if possible as it added interest to the rear elevation.

The following application had not arrived in time for the meeting:

07/00274/ATP

Land at St. Bernardines Way

Fell one Thorn, one Ash, one multi stem Rowan. Crown works to various trees.

The following minor amended plans were posted for Members' information only:

06/02977/APP rear of Stratford House

Alterations to garage building to form 2 flats above and associated parking

Amendment shows car port piers in line with front of building, as built per approved 04/03434/APP not inset as application drawing.

06/03018/APP 32-34 Bourton Rd.

Demolition of dwelling house presently used for shared living learning disabled accommodation and erection of 7no. one person self-contained learning disabled apartments and common room.

Amendments to elevations agreed with Planning to sit better with neighbouring properties.

06/03150/APP Rose Cottage, Bourton Road

Internal works for removal of wall, moving of bathrooms, insertion of French doors, replace back doors and repair to gable end

Amendment retains more of existing timber frames than original application.

06/03167/ALB 8 West Street

Conversion of existing building into 6 residential apartments

Amendment to comply with building regulations: substitute bedsit apartment for maisonette - means no new openings in the historic part of the building

5010 PLANNING CONTROL

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

APPROVED

06/02795/AAD	Lloyds Bank	Erect. non-illuminated signs to front & side	Oppose
06/03066/ALB	<i>[response changed to Support when all signs changed to 'non-illuminated']</i>		
06/02913/APP	Bourton Mill Annexe	Single storey front extension	Oppose
06/02939/APP	Gwynfa, Stratford Rd.	Porch, 2-st. rear extn, rear conservatory+det. garage	Support
06/02940/ATC	3 Bostock Court	Fell three conifers	Support
06/03017/APP	8 Busby Close	New pitched roof over garage and rear extension	Support
06/03077/APP	7 Poplars Road	Single storey side extension	Support
06/03141/APP	16 Mallard Drive	Two storey rear extension & alts. to front porch	Support
06/03150/ALB	Rose Cottage	Internal works & insert French doors, etc.	Support

REFUSED

06/02661/APP	117 Burleigh Piece	Erection of fence & incl. land w/i resid'l curtilage	Oppose
06/03047/APP	32 Portfield Way	Two storey side extn & single storey rear extn	Support
06/03080/APP	land.beh.Barracks Ho.	Erection of new dwelling	Oppose

REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

A report on the following application had been received and was available in the office
06/02913/APP Bourton Mill Annexe Single storey front extension

5011 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS

(5002.1) Report on PGS consultations

Cllr. P. Strain-Clark had prepared a report which was circulated with the agenda.

His principal concerns were the lack of local involvement, self-assessment by the developer, and that residents would have no means of knowing what sums were involved, or what fraction was expended locally. The current system was preferable, especially if the highway authorities became part of it, and s106 monies covered a much wider spread of uses than that proposed. The PGS system seemed weighted in favour of the developer rather than the community affected by the development.

Members agreed the responses in the report and asked that the letter be copied to the District and County Councils; it was also felt that residents should be alerted to the proposed changes.

ACTION THE CLERK

5012 CORRESPONDENCE

5012.1 06/02469/APP 22 Grenville Road: Two storey side extension

Members had **OPPOSED**: The extension was felt to be an overdevelopment of the site and detrimental to the street scene. Minor amended plans reduced the width of the two storey extension from 4.5m to 4.0m; Members made no further comment (13/11/06).

AVDC **APPROVED**: "With regard to the site and the street scene AVDLP policy GP.9 and the Design Guide on 'residential extensions' state that extensions to dwellings should not adversely affect the character and appearance of the original building, the street scene, or the area in general.

The original dwelling has a width of 5.3m and enjoys a very wide side garden. The proposed single storey side extension is small measuring 2.3m x 2.8m. Being set back by 0.3m from the front face of the original dwelling, it would not affect the character or appearance of the original dwelling or the site in general. With regard to the proposed 2 storey extension, the amended plan indicates that it would be 4m and 7.6m deep. It would be set back by 3.1m from the front face of the original dwelling. Although the ridge would not be set lower than the main ridge, being set back significantly from the main dwelling, the extension would not dominate the original dwelling.

With regard to the site and surroundings, Grenville Road comprises mainly of pairs of semi-detached properties with wide gaps between each block allowing driveway access leading to the garage in the side/rear garden. In this case the gap would be retained as the extension would be set back from the main face of the dwelling. The two storey side extension would be at a minimum distance of 3.4m from the side boundary. Hence it would not cause a terracing effect and would retain the open character of the site.

The scale of the extension as amended would be subservient to the existing dwelling. As the site is within a wide side garden and a fairly long rear garden it would not be an overdevelopment of the site and would not be detrimental to the street scene.

5012.2 06/01793/APP: Buckingham Filling Station car wash, extension of hours of operation

Members **OPPOSED**: Should the Planning Authority be minded to permit the extended hours Members asked that this not apply to Sundays and Bank Holidays, to allow local residents some respite from the noise and spray. Other car washes are available on the outskirts of town, away from residential property, on these days.

Members also asked for a condition that the lights on the car wash and jet wash be turned off when the washes were not in operation. Complaints had also been received that the tanker lights, which were supposed only to be on during tanker attendance, had been left on all the time in recent months, to the detriment of residents' amenity.

AVDC had **APPROVED**: "At the meeting Members considered the information submitted within the noise assessment report, the comments received by the Council's Environmental Health Officer, and that the fact that the petrol station could be used by the general public within and beyond those hours requested for the car wash, and concluded that the proposal on balance would be unlikely to result in such a significant further reduction in the level of amenity enjoyed by the occupants of the nearby residential properties. In fact the indications are that the installation of the doors to the car wash building, even with the proposed extended hours of operation, reduce overall noise levels in the vicinity of the site to a level considered acceptable by the Council's Environmental Health Officer.

With regards to the concerns raised relating to the spray from the jet wash, the tanker light and the lights remaining on within the car wash beyond the permitted hours of operation, I refer you to my letter dated 18th December 2006, sent to the applicants agents [*Clerk's note: Minute 5003.2*] regarding each of these matters. I can advise that confirmation has been received that this letter has been forwarded to BP."

5012.3 Environment Agency re Cecil's Yard

Concern had been expressed by local residents that the estate agent's details for the Cecil's Yard houses indicated that the rear gardens were to be 'fully patioed' and that this reduced still further the absorption capability of the site to the detriment of neighbouring properties in flood conditions. A letter had been sent to the Environment Agency and the Planning Officer in November 2006. The installation of the patios had since taken place.

The EA had written that the developer had produced a Flood Risk Assessment, and that they had further requested that surface water drainage details be approved prior to development commencing.

Members asked that the letter be copied to AVDC with a request that it be confirmed in writing that these conditions have been complied with.

5012.4 (4985.3) Enforcement notification: use of sandwich bars as cafes

Complaint had been made that the Subway and Golden Crust take-aways were serving food to be eaten at tables on the premises.

The Planning Officer's opinion was that a material change of use had not taken place, but the matter had been passed to Enforcement; acknowledgements had been received from Enforcement with reference numbers for both 4 and 22 Market Hill.

5012.5 (5000; re BTC response to 06/03254/APP)

AVDC Refuse & Recycling: Advice Note for Developers November 2006; received from AVDC Forward Plans Dept.

Members had pointed out in their response to this application that the planned bin store would not accommodate the 'brown bin' which is larger than the standard green bin, and

enquired if the Planning department had guidelines for the housing of refuse and recycling containers.

Three copies of the above publication had been received, which covered all Members' concerns; minor amended plans for the application would be available for the next meeting.

5013 PRESS RELEASES

A press release would be drawn up on the Planning Gain Supplement proposals as above.

ACTION CLLR. P.STRAIN-CLARK/THE CLERK

5014 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS

5014.1 Buckingham Buildbase and Wharf Yard

Mrs. Robinson had asked that a copy of a letter to Mr. Barker, AVDC, be circulated to Members; this included an advertisement for Buildbase outlining their extended services and facilities, which she felt were detrimentally affecting nearby residents' quality of life.

5014.2 Flooding problems, Osprey Walk

The residents of 5, 7 and 9 Osprey Walk complained of severe flooding due to run-off from the by-pass; this had caused considerable damage to both their homes and their gardens. It appeared that BCC were no longer intending to maintain the gully and pipe on a regular basis, but only as problems arose. BCC contractors had done some work following a meeting with Highways, but Mr. Goodgame felt that this would not be a long term solution. Members decided a letter should be sent to BCC seeking assurance that the gully and pipe would be kept cleared on a regular basis, and the reply sent to Mr. Goodgame for reference in case of future problems. The complaint would be circulated to Members for their information.

5014.3 BCC Waste & Minerals Plan – further consultation

Cllr. P. Strain-Clark offered to report on this for the next meeting.

5014.4 Future Planning meetings

Cllr. Mordue pointed out the usefulness of having the plans displayed at the meeting. In light of the decision made at Full Council on 5th February (Min.2899) Members asked that a discussion of contingency plans for optimum organisation of planning meetings be placed on the next agenda.

Meeting closed at: 8.00pm

CHAIRMAN DATE