

PL/10/19

Minutes of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** meeting held on Monday 30th November 2020 at 7pm, via Zoom.

Present: Cllr. M. Cole JP (Vice Chairman)
 Cllr. G. Collins Town Mayor
 Cllr. J. Harvey
 Cllr. P. Hirons
 Cllr. A. Mahi
 Cllr. Mrs. L. O'Donoghue (Chairman)
 Cllr. A. Ralph
 Cllr. R. Stuchbury
 Cllr. M. Try

Also present: Mrs. C. Cummings (co-opted member)
 Mrs. K. McElligott Planning Officer
 Mr P. Hodson Town Clerk
 Mrs. S. McMurtrie Town Plan Officer
 Mrs L. Stubbs Communications Clerk
 Cllr. W. Whyte Buckinghamshire Council

PUBLIC SESSION

20/00886/ADP (Land at Tingewick Road)

A representative from Barratts (BDW North Thames) spoke about the amended plans for the south site at St Rumbold's Field, an additional nine homes. These changes bring the total number of homes to 328, within the 400 originally granted permission for. Discussions were held with the planner and landscape officers to ensure the additions fitted within the proposed parameters.

Members raised a variety of questions about the site and the representative promised to make enquiries with the site team and report back to the Planning Officer. These included:

- A timeline for the resumption of talks between Barratts and the Council about the long term arrangements for the maintenance of the green and public spaces within the development.
- A timescale for the refurbishment of St Rumbold's Well and an indication of what that refurbishment would include.
- The change of the kissing gate bordering St Rumbold's Park into a normal gate that would allow access to cyclists. (An answer with 24 hours)
- When the s106 cycleway from the development along the scenic and railway walk towards the schools would be delivered.
- What could be done to stop the amount of water coming from the site onto the railway walk. This may include spring water from St Rumbold's which is no longer being directed to the well.

The representative also committed to future changes of plans being submitted with an accompanying sheet indicated the changes, to prevent the planning officers time being wasted playing spot the difference between large plans.

844/20 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies.

845/20 Declarations of Interest

Cllr. Stuchbury declared an interest as a member of the Buckinghamshire Fire Authority and Member of Buckinghamshire Council North Bucks Area Planning Committee.

846/20 Minutes

Members received the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Monday 12th October 2020 and 2nd November 2020, to be ratified at the Full Council meeting 18th January 2021.

847/20 Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan/Vale of Aylesbury Plan

847.1 Members received an update from the Town Plan Officer. Work is ongoing to identify a suitable provider or platform for the Buckingham Survey, which will take place in the new year. The Design Guide group will meet on 1st December 2020. Cllr. Stuchbury asked that a meeting reminder be sent out.

ACTION: TOWN CLERK

A decision on VALP had not yet been made, with the latest update on the 29th October 2020 saying that a decision was being made about whether to hold more hearings. A decision had been made about additional modifications, based on the 2012 legislation, not the most up to date legislation, likely answering a challenge on that basis.

Cllr. Stuchbury raised the concern that neighbourhood plans were not being considered as valid planning documents in planning decisions, and the impact on BNDP. The Town Plan Officer reiterated that BNDP remains the most recent planning document for the area, and is valid, however the actions of the planning authority must be watched closely to ensure they were continuing to abide by BNDP, as the most recent made plan for Buckingham.

Cllr. Harvey raised the concern that the planning authority's decision to approve 16/00151/AOP, Walnut Drive was indicative that Planning Officers at the authority did not want to undermine VALP. The Town Plan Officer felt there was a possibility that the site, even if planning approval was rejected, could have been allowed under permitted development at appeal, given its proximity to Buckingham.

847.2 Members were extremely concerned at the implications of Buckinghamshire Council's withdrawal from the Knowledge Arc. The Town Plan Officer was disappointed with the tone of the withdrawal, and was concerned that the north of Buckinghamshire would not receive the benefits or be able to deflect unwanted aspects of the east-west railway, due to being excluded from decisions.

Cllr. Cole raised that the Oxford-Cambridge Arc was launched in 2003 by three development agencies. Along this arc also runs Motorsports Valley, with numerous towns and cities along the arc heavily involved in the motorsports industry. Buckingham itself has twenty motorsports business locally, the valley is home to six of the ten Formula One teams and Silverstone, one of the world's biggest Formula One circuits; one of two employment hubs in Aylesbury Vale. The gross added

valley of motorsport valley was 90 billion in 2019, rising to 163 billion once the east west railway is finished. The decision to leave the Knowledge Arc could mean Buckingham lose out on the benefits of this increased industry while suffering the negatives and should be opposed by the Town Council as the main town in North Buckinghamshire.

Cllr. Stuchbury reminded members that the exact route of the Expressway was not known to Buckinghamshire Council as they had not signed the confidentiality agreement.

Standing orders were suspended so that Cllr. Whyte could speak.

Cllr. Whyte stated that the agenda was not quite correct and that the Knowledge Arc was a separate project to Technology Cluster, Motorsports Valley and the Economic Heartland. Buckinghamshire Council was planning and ensuring that national objectives for the area would happen through the Buckinghamshire Growth Board and Industrial Strategy for Buckinghamshire. The Arc itself had no offered any additional value to Buckinghamshire outside of the other projects, whereas the representative from Buckinghamshire Council to the growth board had been vocal in their support of the north of the County.

Standing orders were resumed.

Cllr. Harvey stated that he had previously attended an Arc meeting and found it vibrant and useful. Cllr. Harvey proposed and Cllr. Cole seconded that the Council write to the Arc offering to be a partner or to be involved in lieu of Buckinghamshire Council. Cllr. Stuchbury proposed an amendment to write to Buckinghamshire Council to find out more about the situation before writing to the arc. There was no seconder and the amendment fell. Members **AGREED** to Cllr. Harvey's proposal.

ACTION: TOWN CLERK

Cllr. Stuchbury felt it was important to understand Buckinghamshire Council's decision. Cllr. Stuchbury proposed and Cllr. O'Donoghue seconded that the Council write to Buckinghamshire Council to find out more about why Buckinghamshire removed themselves from the Arc group, and that the Town Clerk investigate further about the implications of this withdrawal for a report to the next meeting of the Planning Committee. Members **AGREED**.

ACTION: TOWN CLERK

848/20 Action Reports

848.1 The action reports were noted.

848.2 Cllr. Cole proposed and Cllr. Harvey seconded that the Planning Officer write to Mr. Essam and ask for a "New Road Layout" sign, indicated as permissible in diagram 7014. Members **AGREED** unanimously.

ACTION: PLANNING OFFICER

848.3 The Town Clerk reported that the application to list the North End and Verney Close GP Surgeries as Community Assets would be submitted this week.

ACTION: TOWN CLERK

849/20 Planning Applications

Cllr. Stuchbury reminded Members that as a Member of Buckinghamshire Council North Bucks Area Planning Committee he would refrain from voting on any of the planning applications.

For Member's information the next scheduled Buckinghamshire Council – North Buckinghamshire Planning Area Committee meetings are on Wednesday, 16th December 2020 and 13th January 2021 at 2.30pm. Strategic Sites Committee meetings are the following day at 2pm.

Draft responses 30/11/20

20/03677/APP

OPPOSE

32 Bradfield Avenue

Erection of dwelling

Members felt this proposal was an overdevelopment of the site and allowed only minimal separation from the existing dwelling.

A SuDS report was requested, with particular reference to the capacity of the ditch along the field boundary.

20/03784/APP

NO OBJECTIONS

32 Bradfield Avenue

Single storey rear extension, two storey front extension, removal of porch and repositioning of front door

Should the LPA be minded to approve 20/03677/APP, Members asked that the new parking space be of porous construction.

20/03840/APP

OPPOSE

5 The Villas, Stratford Road

Single storey side extension

Members noted that there was little difference between this application and the previous, withdrawn, application; the footprint of the extension was the same, and thus the overfilling of the site and the impact on the neighbouring properties unchanged. The garage area under №3a had been made temporarily accessible by a ramp of loose cobbles, but given the slope of the parking area these would migrate over time.

The Flood Risk Assessment was dated September 2008 and included a letter from the EA stating that the 1/100 year modelled flood levels were taken from 2005 data, and the AVDC Flood Map is dated April 2007. Members pointed out that the document was therefore very much out of date and took no account of the very serious flooding that took place in July 2007.

A condition prohibiting the parking of construction and delivery vehicles on the A422 was requested.

20/03873/AAD

NO OBJECTIONS

Unit 1 Osier Way

Two elevation signs

Members noted the application was retrospective

20/03950/APP

OPPOSE

Land between 38 Moreton Road and the Old Police Station (50 Moreton Road)

Erection of nine detached dwellings

- *Members' response was agreed before the application had been advertised in the neighbourhood. If, after the statutory notices have been posted, neighbours make comment and possibly raise valid planning reasons not obvious to Members viewing from the public domain, they reserve the right to amend their response.*
- *Members felt that this proposal was an overdevelopment of the site; the 9 dwellings were on cramped sites with little private amenity space, which was further reduced by the slope of the land and the use of gabions to support the upper layer, and contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Policy DHE6. Two have their rear garden further reduced by the accommodation of parking bays.*
- *The proposed planting is also crowded, and little attention seems to have been paid to the eventual root run of the proposed trees, particularly the oaks. The mature Lawson Cypress mentioned and photographed in the Ecology documents does not feature either as a tree to be retained or removed on the landscape drawing and virtually all other existing trees are to be removed (contrary to DHE1).*
- *The development would loom over the bungalows in Mary MacManus Drive, a sheltered housing scheme, and overlooking of their private space would be possible due to the height difference.*
- *There was no evidence of reference to the Buckingham Vision & Design SPG.*
- *The vision splay at the access point was compromised by the permitted kerbside parking on Moreton Road immediately to the south, which reduced the carriageway to single width.*
- *The lamp standard, bench and bin on the Moreton Road verge was not represented on drawings, so it was difficult to tell whether its current position obstructed the proposed access.*
- *The house on the southern side of the access was far too close to the existing dwelling (№38) to permit the owner to carry out necessary maintenance, and the single parking bay provided in recompense for the previous parking area occupying the site was not adequate. Members would welcome the CPDA's views on the connecting pathway to the resident's rear garden.*
- *In-line drive parking often leads to on-road, or on-pavement, parking for convenience, and there was no accommodation for visitors. Doubts were expressed about easy accessibility to the parking bays off the side turning.*
- *In severe storms, rainwater can flow straight over drains, and the kerbs at the new access could well capture excess surface water flows from Moreton Road and direct them into the site due to the slope; the site roadway would convey this directly on to 24 Mary MacManus Drive. There was no detail of means of preventing this or the siting of any attenuation tanks. An existing bare site would become largely covered by buildings and hard landscaping, losing almost all its absorbent capacity, and the stated intention was to dispose of all surface water via the drains in Mary MacManus Drive without any indication of whether they could cope with the additional flows.*
- *The Heritage Statement mentions 7, not 9, dwellings, and two documents refer to the site as adjacent to 28 Moreton Road.*
- *Though the houses are described as being suitable for home-office working, none has a study or even a separate dining room, and there is little space to build an extension.*

- *The Transport Statement is 5½ pages long, and the Public Transport facilities amount to giving the walking distance to the Western Avenue and town centre bus stops. There is no information on the convenience or timing of the services available, and the feasibility of using them for travel to work or school (and back), nor is there any information on sustainable transport in this submission and compliance with VALP Policy S1 in this respect was contested. As a consequence, it would be likely that the majority of trips will be by private car, adding to the already congested junction at the Old Gaol. The steep hill between the site and the Town Centre would discourage walking, especially if shopping had to be carried.*
- *As this was a previously undeveloped site, Members asked for an archaeological exploration to be conditioned.*

Amended Plans

20/00886/ADP

NO OBJECTIONS

Land at Tingewick Road

Variation of condition 10 of planning permission 17/04668/ADP – to vary drawing references within condition 10 to allow amended distribution and give effect for 10 additional homes

Not for consultation

Tree applications

20/03689/ATC

NO OBJECTIONS

University of Buckingham Hunter Street Campus

Located Directly on the Edge of the Hunter Street Student Car Park: T1 and T2 Willow Pollards - remove as close to ground level as possible.

T3 and T4 D2 Willow Pollards Located Adjacent to the Brook - coppice at approximately 18" above ground level.

All trees have fungus and are decayed and at risk of failure in a public area.

20/03738/ATP

NO OBJECTIONS

Oakwood, 2 Manor Gardens

Partial crown reduction of 2 Common Ash

20/03742/ATP

NO OBJECTIONS

Sandmartin Close, Stratford Road

1m crown reduction of 12 field maples

20/03831/ATP

NO OBJECTIONS

15 Moreton Drive

T1 Beech. DBH – 1.1m; Height – 24m; Crown spread – 16m

Work required: 6m crown reduction. See survey for further information

20/03839/ATP

NO OBJECTIONS

Open space fronting Nos 2-16 Bernardines Way

Oak on open space. Propose crown lift up to 3m to allow mower under tree and above car parking spaces. Cut back crown no more than 3m away from properties No2 and No4 to prevent damage

20/03994/ATC

NO OBJECTIONS

Land to rear of 22 Nelson Street [on Tingewick Road]

T2 (Scots Pine) Fell and remove roots T4 (Scots Pine). Fell and remove roots H1 (Conifer hedges) Cut out sections to allow formation of new access and parking bays

Members noted this was linked to the recent approval of 19/00391/APP, which they had opposed.

850/20 Planning Decisions

To receive for information details of planning decisions made by Buckinghamshire Council.

Application Number	Description	BTC Response
19/00391/APP	Workshop, Tingewick Road Ch/use to office and new access	Oppose & Attend
19/02627/AAD 19/03624/ALB	The Old Town Hall, Market Square [Spratt Endlicott] Installn of fascia & other signage (retrospective)	Oppose & Attend*
19/03531/APP	Hamilton Precision site Variation of conditions of 16/02641/APP	Oppose & Attend
20/03066/APP	2 Jacob Single storey front extension	No objections
20/03256/APP	29 Plover Close Extension of existing conservatory	No objections
20/03287/APP	4 Castle Street Installation of cast iron vents	No objections
20/03412/APP	15 Chandos Rd. S/st. rear garden room	No objections

*Members should note that AAD & ALB applications cannot now be called-in.

Refused

Application Number	Description	BTC Response
20/03130/ATN	Market Hill Notification to remove payphone	Oppose

Members were pleased to note that the refusal of permission to remove the payphone 20/03130/ATN and that this had been covered in the local newspaper.

Withdrawn

Application Number	Description	BTC Response
20/03139/COUC	6 Cornwall Pl. Determination of impacts	No Objections
20/03676/ACL	32 Bradfield Ave. Single storey rear extension <i>Withdrawn before meeting – 20/03784/APP substituted</i>	n/a

Not Consulted on: Approved

Application Number	Description	BTC Response
20/03495/ATP	20 Waglands Gdn Trim Thuja hedge	No Objections
20/03373/ATP	Watchcroft Drive Fell dying and diseased sycamore	No Objections
20/03375/ATP	M. Moreton Ave. Hedge-lay trimmed prunus, fell dead trees	No Objections

Prior Approval not required

Application Number	Description	BTC Response
20/03545/HPDE	23 Overn Ave. S/st.rear extension within permitted dimensions	n/a

851/20 Buckinghamshire Council Committee meetings

851.1 There were no Buckingham applications at the North Bucks Area Planning Committee 18th November 2020.

851.2 Cllr. Cole gave a verbal report about the 19th November 2020 Strategic Sites Committee meeting, including repeated comments during the meeting by a Senior Planning Officer that if 16/00151/AOP (Maids Moreton, Walnut Drive) application was not approved the 170 houses would need to be located elsewhere in Aylesbury Vale. Despite planning permission being granted the Walnut Drive site has not been confirmed as a site to be included in VALP, as the inspector has not yet made a decision on this.

Cllr. Cole proposed that Buckingham Town Council Planning Committee consider its response to the 16/00151/AOP (Maids Moreton, Walnut Drive) s106 proposals, which have yet to be finalised, and requests that it be involved in the consultation process as a major stakeholder. Cllr. Cole to liaise with the Planning Officer over this action. Members **AGREED**.

ACTION: PLANNING OFFICER

Cllr. Stuchbury informed Members that he has continued to raise the choice to decide 16/00151/AOP (Maids Moreton, Walnut Drive) at Strategic Sites Committee and not at the North Bucks Area Committee with Bucks Council, members **AGREED** that the Town Clerk should also raise this issue with Bucks Council.

ACTION: TOWN CLERK

Cllr. Harvey reported that a Freedom of Information request had been made about the decision making process behind the decision to decide 16/00151/AOP (Maids Moreton, Walnut Drive) at the Strategic Sites Committee and that a response was expected in four weeks, and would be reported back to the next meeting.

ACTION: CLLR. HARVEY

852/20 Buckinghamshire Council Members

852.1 Cllr. Stuchbury spoke about a motion they have put to Buckinghamshire Council about whether the Council will be providing social housing in Buckinghamshire.

852.2 Cllr. Cole proposed and Cllr. Stuchbury seconded that the Council ask Buckinghamshire Council to reconsider its new planning applications policy, which as it currently stands is undemocratic and wrong. Members **AGREED**.

ACTION: TOWN CLERK

852.3 Members **AGREED** that the following requests should be made to Buckinghamshire Councillors:

- Cllr. S. Cole and Cllr. Clare to be asked to call in 20/03677/APP 32 Bradfield Avenue
- Cllr. Stuchbury volunteered to call in 20/03950/APP Land between 38 Moreton Road and the Old Police Station (50 Moreton Road)
- Cllr. Whyte to be asked to call in 20/03840/APP 5 The Villas, Stratford Road

The Planning Officer reported that Cllr. Mordue has been taking to the Planning Officer about modifications for an application that may not now need to go to Committee.

852.4 Mrs. Cummings asked about Station House, Planning Officer reported that the application had gone to the Inspectorate for appeal against non-determination. There would be an opportunity for the Council to make additional comments for the inspector on this application at the next meeting.

Postponed from previous meeting:

853/20 (768.2/20) Government Consultations

Members noted the press release.

854/20 (768.3/20) To receive a response from Mr. Greg Smith MP

Members noted the statement, and that concerns had been relayed to the relevant minister.

855/20 (769/20) Draft Milton Keynes Planning Obligations SPD

Members noted the statement. Cllr. Stuchbury and Cllr. Harvey announced their intention to write a question for Buckinghamshire Council cabinet, quoting paragraphs 2.3 and 2.10 of the Milton Keynes Document, regarding working with parishes over s106.

856/20 (771/20) Tree Felling

Members discussed possible additions to the BNDP about tree felling including the planting of three to four new trees for every tree that was felled. Cllr. Harvey proposed and Cllr. O'Donoghue seconded that research should be done into other Neighbourhood Plans to see what policies around the maintenance and conservation of trees had previously been included. Members **AGREED.**

ACTION: TOWN CLERK

Cllr. Stuchbury proposed and Cllr. Harvey seconded that a press release talking about the work done to conserve trees in Buckingham by the Planning Committee be released during National Tree Planting Week. Members **AGREED.**

ACTION: COMMITTEE CLERK

857/20 Enforcement

Cllr. Harvey reported the hedge blocking the path on the Bourton Road next to Bourton Mill. Town Clerk reported that Officers were aware and would escalate the matter with the land owner.

ACTION: TOWN CLERK

Cllr. Hirons was concerned about changes to two homes on Chandos Road. Planning Officer asked for photographs and an address in order to investigate.

ACTION: CLLR. HIRONS/PLANNING OFFICER

Cllr. O'Donoghue stated that they had received a report about potential land grabbing on Page Hill, and agreed that they would ask for photographs and addresses of the homes involved to be sent to the planning officer.

ACTION: CLLR O'DONOGHUE/PLANNING OFFICER

Cllr. Cole asked about the temporary traffic bollard at the entrance to Well St, which was due to be replaced immediately in February 2020, and asked that it reported.

ACTION: PLANNING OFFICER

Cllr. Stuchbury stated that he had already reported two matters to enforcement including the cutting of hedges at the industrial estate.

858/20 Matters to report

There were no matters to report.

859/20 Chairman's items for information

There were no Chairman's items.

860/20 Date of the next meeting:

Monday 21st December 2020 at 7pm/following the Interim Council meeting

Meeting closed at 9:17pm.

Chair

Date