

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON  
TUESDAY 28<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2007 AT 7.00pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Mrs. G. Collins  
P. Hirons  
A. Mahi  
H. Mordue (Mayor)  
R Stuchbury  
W. Whyte (Vice Chairman)

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W. McElligott

In the absence of the Chairman, the meeting was taken by the Vice Chairman. Cllr. Mahi was welcomed on to the Committee.

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillors T. Bloomfield, Mrs. P. Desorgher, G. Loftus, M. Smith, Mrs. P. Stevens (Chairman) and M. Try.

**5082 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**5083 ACTION LIST**

The Action list had been circulated with the agenda. Items not otherwise listed on the agenda were:

(5012.3) Cecil's Yard. The Clerk was asked to contact the Case Officer re the recent meeting with the developer.

(5054.2) BCC had written indicating that the Verney Close disabled bay was to be reinstated.

**5084 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2007 ratified on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2007 were received. There were no matters arising.

*Cllr. Mahi arrived during the discussion of the first application.*

## **5085 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

*The following application is in the parish of Gawcott-with-Lenborough and was considered at the request of the Chairman of the Parish Council*

### **07/01931/ADP**

Former Abattoir site, Radclive Road, Gawcott

Approval of reserved matters of siting and design and external appearance for development of B2/B8 industrial units

*Members discussed the application at some length; concern was expressed at the traffic disruption caused by slow-moving vehicles carrying large crane parts, the height of the cranes (particularly those permanently installed), the number of HGV movements per day especially with respect to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists accessing other workplaces on the site, the impact on the skyline in a rural site and the effect of floodlighting at night, and the lack of sustainability features in the design.*

*Members supported the principle but asked that attention be paid by the Planning Authority to the following and appropriate conditions imposed:*

- *whether floodlighting was necessary all night*
- *that the lighting be directed downwards and spillage avoided*
- *sealed storage tanks and on-site processing be provided for solvents and other industrial products*
- *additional planting to screen the building from the road properly*
- *incorporation of sustainability into the design, for example with porous hard surfaces, and adequate drainage capacity for run-off*
- *consideration given to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on the Radclive Road (concern on this point has already been expressed to this Council by another company occupying the site)*
- *negotiation with the Highways Authority over the provision of a slip road at the A421 junction to enable the slow-moving low-loaders to get up speed before joining the traffic flow.*

### **07/02020/APP**

**SUPPORT**

National Westminster Bank, 2 Market Hill

Rear spiral fire escape staircase with replacement adjoining handrails

*Concern was expressed at the proposed material for the staircase and support was given subject to the Conservation Area Officer's recommendations.*

### **07/02042/APP**

**SUPPORT**

The Bungalow, Bath Lane

Commercial vehicles garage/workshop for existing vehicles and non ferrous metal storage area

*Members noted that the site is now close to the Conservation Area and asked that the materials used reflect those used in the new housing opposite, including those for the roof which could be seen from the Scenic Walk; and queried the proposed height of the roof.*

- 07/02076/ATP** **SUPPORT**  
 Land at Bernardines Way  
 Crown reduce one oak by 25 – 30%  
*Support was given subject to the arboriculturalist's report*
- 07/02078/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 11 Chandos Road  
 Formation of new external basement stairway to front
- 07/02084/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 13 Busby Close  
 Conservatory
- 07/02104/ATC** **SUPPORT**  
 10 Market Square  
 Removal of all trees and woody vegetation from rear of property  
*Support was given subject to the arboriculturalist's report*
- 07/02117/ATC** **SUPPORT**  
 Nelson Court, Nelson Street  
 Works to trees  
*Support was given subject to the arboriculturalist's report*
- 07/02139/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 2 Foxglove Close  
 Conversion of one garage to living accommodation
- 07/02150/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 Unit 2, Tingewick Road Industrial Estate  
 Installation of external compactor system  
*Support was given but Members asked that conditions be imposed re noise suppression measures and the restriction of the hours of use, given the proximity of a residential area.*
- 07/02155/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 3 Busby Close  
 Single storey front extension
- The following two applications were considered together:*
- 07/02200/APP & 07/02201/ALB** **SUPPORT**  
 Ground floor, 6 Well Street  
 Change of use from shop (A1) to use as beauty salon
- 07/02211/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 12 Brackley Road  
 Erection of 1½ single storey rear extension
- 07/02212/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 44 Embleton Way  
 Conversion of garage

**07/02217/APP**

**SUPPORT**

24 Chandos Close

Amendment of 06/02626/APP – first floor rear extension with alterations to windows to be top openers with obscured glass

**07/02227/APP**

**SUPPORT**

138 Moreton Road

Single storey rear extension and first floor front extension

**07/02283/APP**

**SUPPORT**

6 Naseby Court

Single storey rear and side extension and front porch

**07/02288/ATC**

**SUPPORT**

20-21 High Street

Fell No.3 Trees

*Members supported the removal of the sycamore and buddleia, but asked that the holly be retained if the arboriculturalist's report showed this was a good specimen, and a TPO applied for.*

*Cllr. Mordue left the meeting*

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

**07/00784/APP** 43 Embleton Way Two storey side extension and rear conservatory, and retention of shed in rear garden

*[Amendments: addition of the (not previously mentioned) shed to plans and description; additional planting along the side boundary]*

**07/01313/APP** 68 Moorhen Way Extension of boundary wall to enclose land for residential use

*Amendment shows modified wall height [see reason for deferred decision on main agenda]*

**07/01709/APP** 42 Bourtonville Single storey side extension

*Previously 'Two storey side extension'; entire proposed first floor extension deleted  
Reduces the %increase to 30% from 50.9%*

**07/01917/APP** 84 Moorhen Way Conversion of part of garage into habitable room

*[Original application was to use part of garage as bedroom 4; now this is to be a dining room. Photos are also included of parking spaces adjacent to property]*

*[Second minor amendment shows plan of parking area]*

**5086 PLANNING CONTROL**

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

**APPROVED**

07/01213/APP	32 Portfield Way	Two storey side & single storey rear extension	Oppose
07/01301/APP	8 Gifford Place	Single storey front extension	Support
07/01302/APP	5 Bath Lane	First floor rear extension	Support
07/01308/APP	Danube, Stratford Rd.	First floor rear extension	Oppose

07/01331/APP 10 Plover Close	2 st. side & front extension & detached garage	Oppose
07/01410/APP 14 Portfield Cl.	Single st. rear extension and detached garage	Oppose
07/01447/APP 34 Mare Leys	Erection of conservatory	Support
07/01491/APP 22 March Edge	Single storey rear extension	Support
07/01497/APP 44 Kingfisher Rd.	Single storey side extension	Support
07/01537/APP 17 Beech Close	Single storey side extension	Support
07/01556/APP 24 Bourton Road	Single storey side extension	Oppose
07/01560/APP 7 Willow Drive	First floor side extension	Support
07/01589/AAD Beales Hotel	Internally illuminated pylon sign	Support
07/01595/APP 30 High Street	Ch/use ground+1 <sup>st</sup> floors residential>B1 medical	Support
07/01676/ATC University Prec.	20% crown reduce 4 fruit trees, pollard 1 willow	Support
07/01688/ATP rear Fishers Field	Works to weeping willow and horsechestnut	Support
07/01689/ATC Former railway line	Works to trees	Support
07/01690/ATC Tingewick Rd.	Works to sycamore tree	Support
07/01733/APP 14 Moreton Dr.	Single storey front and side extension	Support
07/01799/ATC Town Centre	Works to lime trees	Support

### **REFUSED**

07/01405/AOP 2 London Road	Erection of dwelling	Oppose
<i>Minor amended plans were received in the same post</i>		
07/01538/APP Salisbury Cott.	Install'n of south facing roof panels	Support subj.Cons.Area Officer's report.
<i>Planning Officer contacted office indicating that C. Area Officer had recommended refusal, and asking if BTC would in that case withdraw support; Chairman agreed.</i>		
07/01612/APP 16 Bourtonville	Single storey rear extension	Oppose

### **DEFERRED**

<b>07/01003/APP</b>	Land off Bridge St. Erection 99 flats, 4 houses, retail unit, etc.	
<i>Reason for deferral: recommendation agreed</i>		
<b>07/01313/APP</b>	68 Moorhen Way Ext'n of boundary wall to enclose land for residential use	
<i>Reason for deferral: negotiate to seek reduction on height of wall</i>		
<b>07/01331/APP</b>	10 Plover Close 2 storey side and front extension and detached garage	
<i>Reason for deferral: seek clarification on size of parking space and right of applicant to gain access</i>		
<i>[Decision has now been received – see above]</i>		

### **REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

Reports on the following applications had been received and were available in the office		
<b>07/01308/APP</b>	Danube, Stratford Rd.	First floor rear extension
<b>07/01331/APP</b>	10 Plover Close	2 storey side and front extension and detached garage
<b>07/01410/APP</b>	14 Portfield Cl.	Single storey rear extension and detached garage
<b>07/01556/APP</b>	24 Bourton Road	Single storey side extension

### **NOTICE OF APPEAL**

**06/02977/APP** Stratford House, High St. Alterations to garage building to form 2no. 1 bedroomed flats above and associated parking. Appeal start date 27<sup>th</sup> July 2007

### **APPEAL ALLOWED**

06/03254/APP Arthurs Radio, 24 West St. Erection of 2 apartments

## **5087 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS**

### 5087.1 (5078.4) LDF Core Strategy consultation response

Members noted that the response had been ratified by the full Council on 20<sup>th</sup> August and sent to Forward Plans (by fax and post).

### 5087.2 (5074) Report on the meeting with Mr. J. Cannell on 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2007

The meeting notes had been circulated to Members at the meeting. Cllr. Whyte expanded on some points in answer to questions. Summarising, he hoped that more details could be expected on tree applications, that planning would become a proactive rather than a reactive process, that there would be more time to consider the Rural Areas LDF consultation, and there would be better enforcement of planning conditions.

Cllr. Stuchbury thanked Cllrs. Whyte and Smith, and the Clerk for attending the meeting. Members were happy at the results of the meeting and Mr. Cannell's responses.

The Clerk would continue to monitor anomalies and errors.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

### 5078.3 (5078.3) BCC Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Issues & Options Consultation Report

Cllr. Whyte's report had been circulated with the agenda.

Members agreed Cllr. Whyte's suggested responses with the following comments:

Q1: 2026 rather than 2021

Q3: North Bucks. may have better transport links with neighbouring counties than with South Bucks.

Q4: Preservation of the landscape.

Q9: Temporary facilities should be under the same restrictions as permanent, and 'temporary' needs to be defined as a set number of years – say, 5 – after which renewal permission must be sought.

Q10: Minimum buffer zones need to be wider in residential localities than in other contexts.

Q12: The use of restored sites should be predominantly decided by the local council and amenity groups, rather than the County Council.

Q13b: The contribution should also be spent in the locality not elsewhere in the County.

Q14: Sanctions such as removal of the site licence should in place for non-compliance with the year.

Q15: A joint policy needs to be drawn up by the District Councils (the refuse collection agencies) and the County Council (the waste disposal agency) especially in respect of recycling. Provision for communal recycling bins must be made in residential areas, particularly town centres/conservation areas where a multiplicity of bins and crates is not feasible.

Members also noted that no mention was made of incineration as a means of disposal; that campaigns to reduce packaging aimed at manufacturers should be supported; and that export, particularly of noxious substances, to the third world should cease.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

5078.4 The Validation of Planning Applications: Draft guidance for local planning authorities (DCLG August 2007)

A summary of this document was circulated with the agenda. Cllr. Whyte asked that Members read it with care and bring suggestions to the next meeting on which matters should be suggested to AVDC for inclusion in the Local Requirements. It was hoped to have the whole document available in the office within the next fortnight, as soon as it is published.

The Clerk would ascertain from AVDC the date by which suggestions were to be received.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

**5088 CORRESPONDENCE**

5088.1 (5065) Mr. Cannell re outstanding matters

Mr. Cannell had sent two letters: one had been circulated with the agenda, the second at the meeting.

The Enforcement Team's reports had not been received within the stated ten days; the Clerk would pursue these.

There seemed to be a misapprehension about the position of the complained-of gate at Waglands Garden; a map would be sent.

A timetable for compliance was requested.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

5088.2 (07/01213/APP: 32 Portfield Way, two storey side and single storey rear extension

Members had **OPPOSED**: Members felt that the (unscaled) diagram of parking provision for two vehicles was untenable and that access would have to be via the neighbour's frontage, or that one vehicle would be parked in the road to the detriment of other residents of the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, there was no indication of materials or finishes to the extensions.

AVDC had **APPROVED**: "In terms of parking provision, it is considered that the proposed extension would remain as a three bedroom dwelling and the current 3<sup>rd</sup> bedroom would become part of the first bedroom. The Council's parking guidelines state that for a three bedroom dwelling, two parking spaces should be provided with at least one space within the cartilage of the dwelling. The current parking provision for the dwelling is the garage and one space in front of the dwelling. The amended plan received on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2007, with a scale of 1:40 shows that the existing parking would be widened and would dedicate the whole front garden for parking to provide 2 parking spaces. The site can accommodate two parking spaces as proposed without affecting the neighbour's frontage or the necessity to park in the road. Therefore the proposal is in accordance with the parking standards and GP24 of the AVDLP.

With regards to materials and finishes to the extensions, it was indicated in the application form under 'Materials' in part 7 that the walls would be with facing brickwork and horizontal boarding to match existing. Similarly the roof would be of concrete tiles to match existing."

5088.3 07/01308/APP Danube, Stratford Road: first floor rear extension

Members had **OPPOSED**: Members felt that the successive extensions amounted to over-development of the site.

AVDC had **APPROVED**: "AVDLP policy GP9 and DG advice on 'residential extensions' state that extensions to dwellings should not affect the character and appearance of the original building, its setting and the area in general.

The application site refers to "Danube" is within a wide and deep front and rear garden. Although there is already a detached double garage in the front garden there are no other extensions to the dwelling except for the existing single storey rear extension on which the proposed first floor would be built over.

As the dwelling is located within a very deep and wide rear garden measuring 35.5m deep and 16m wide, the proposed addition of the first floor over an existing 3.6m deep single storey rear extension, is considered not to overly dominate the existing dwelling and would be unlikely to adversely impact upon its character or appearance. Given the size of the original house and the large garden the proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment to the house or site. It is therefore in accordance with the Design Guidance on Residential Extensions and policy GP9 of AVDLP."

5088.4 07/01331/APP 10 Plover Close: Two storey side and front extension and detached garage

Members had **OPPOSED**: It was noted that the existing drive was barely long enough to accommodate a family car, and that the proposed would lead to blockage of the footway or on-street parking. Access arrangements for the detached garage were unclear. Members opposed on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and inadequate parking space within the curtilage.

AVDC (DCC) had **APPROVED**: "In reporting the application to committee on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2007 and 9<sup>th</sup> August 2007, the case officer recommended that the application be approved, having regard for policies GP8, GP9, GP24 and GP35 of the AVDLP. With regard to policies GP9 and GP35 it was concluded that the proposed two storey side and front extensions and the erection of a double garage to the rear of the site would not adversely alter the appearance of the original dwelling or the character of the surrounding area. It was also considered that the proposed extensions would not have a detrimental impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents and the approval was conditioned to limit the insertion of first floor side facing windows. It was therefore concluded that the proposed works would accord with policy GP8. With regard to policy GP24 the Council's car parking guidelines aim to achieve a maximum of three spaces for a property. The proposal would result in the loss of the existing garage space but the creation of a new garage to the rear of the site and the provision of two parking spaces to the front of the property. The proposal was therefore considered to be in accordance with policy GP24 of the AVDLP and with the supplementary planning guidance of car parking standards."

5088.5 07/01410/APP 14 Portfield Close: Single storey rear extension and detached garage

Members had **OPPOSED**: Members opposed the flat roof of the extension and recommended that the guidelines in the Design Guide be drawn to the applicant's attention. The plans also lacked an indication of access arrangements.



AVDC had **APPROVED**: "With regard to the design of the extension, AVDLP policy GP9 and DG on 'residential extensions' state that extensions to dwellings should not affect the character and appearance of the original building. The proposed extension to the rear would replace an existing extension which is slightly smaller. The flat roof of the proposed extension is considered acceptable because the single storey element of the original attached garage to side was built with a flat roof. As such the proposed single storey rear extension would be in keeping with the original design of the dwelling. Considering the extension would be to rear with a single storey height and with matching brick it would not adversely affect the appearance of the existing dwelling. It is therefore in accordance with the Design Guidance on Residential Extensions and policy GP9 of AVDLP. As far as the access arrangements are concerned the proposed garage would be served by the existing hardstanding area in the front garden using the existing vehicular access."

5088.6 07/01556/APP 24 Bourton Road: Single storey side extension

Members had **OPPOSED**: Members noted that the previous extension to the dwelling (96/00679/APP) had increased the total floor area by 64%; together with the present proposal the original floor area was increased by 101.9%. Members felt that this was overdevelopment of the site and would have a detrimental effect on the street scene.

AVDC had **APPROVED**: "It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in significant additions to the original dwelling, however the proposal was considered to be subservient and would preserve the characteristics and integrity of the property. The impact of the extension on the street scene was considered to be acceptable given the set back from the highway, the subservient design, the retention of a 1m gap to the side boundary, and the existing tree screen along the front of the site."

## **5089 PRESS RELEASES**

Although no press releases were agreed, it was felt that residents should be made aware of the work of the Committee in responding to consultations. The Planning section of the Newsletter would incorporate some reference to this.

## **5090 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS**

### 5090.1 Ford Meadow

Recent press coverage of the future of Ford Meadow had caused comment, and Cllrs. Mordue and Whyte had received correspondence on the subject. The Town Council had been referred to as supporting development of the site for housing, although no approach to the Council had been made (before or since the article) by the owners to seek the Council's views.

Members felt that Mr. Rosenberg should be invited to attend the next planning meeting, and the *Advertiser* would be informed that the invitation had been issued.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

5090.2 Tree work applications

Cllr. Whyte had been investigating the forms required for applications for work on protected trees (ATP) and trees within a Conservation Area (ATC). The notes included useful diagrams and descriptions of the various tree works. These would be circulated with the Minutes.

Meeting closed at: 9.21pm

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