



BUCKINGHAM TOWN COUNCIL

TOWN COUNCIL OFFICES, BUCKINGHAM CENTRE,
VERNEY CLOSE, BUCKINGHAM. MK18 1JP

Telephone/Fax: (01280) 816 426


Email: Townclerk@buckingham-tc.gov.uk
www.buckingham-tc.gov.uk

Town Clerk: Mr. C. P. Wayman

Tuesday, 03 April 2018

Councillor,

You are summoned to a meeting of the Planning Committee of Buckingham Town Council to be held on **9th April 2018 following the Interim Council meeting** in the Council Chamber, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham.

pp 
C.P. Wayman
Town Clerk

Please note that the meeting will be preceded by a Public Session in accordance with Standing Order 3.f, which will last for a maximum of 15 minutes, and time for examination of the plans by Members.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

Members are asked to receive apologies from Members.

2. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of any personal or prejudicial interest under consideration on this agenda in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 Sections 26-34 & Schedule 4.

3. Minutes

To receive the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Monday 19th March 2018 to be put before the Full Council meeting to be held on Tuesday 8th May 2018.

Copy previously circulated

4. Presentation

To receive a presentation on further amendments to the Royal Latin School's application (17/02939) from Mr. Lester Whitby of TSH Architects (the agent).

5. Action Reports

To receive action reports as per the attached list.

Appendix A

Buckingham



Twinned with Mouvaux, France

Members are reminded to declare any prejudicial interest as soon as it becomes apparent.
All Committee documents can be found on the Buckingham Town Council's website. Alternatively, the Clerk send you a copy of any minutes, reports or other information. To do this, send a request using the contact details set out above.

6. Planning Applications

For Member's information the next scheduled Development Management Committee meetings are 19th April and 10th May 2018, with SDMC meetings on 18th April and 9th May 2018.

To consider planning applications received from AVDC and other applications

1. 18/00977/APP Manor Farm, Bourton Road, MK18 7DS
Retention of farm shop and café
Verey
2. 18/00928/APP [*land adj. to*] Little Oaks, Brackley Road, MK18 1JD
Conversion of detached garage to residential
Sweetman
3. 18/00938/AOP 11 Lenborough Close, MK18 1SE
Outline application for the sub-division of the existing plot for the erection of a dwelling
Aspinall
4. 18/01020/APP Tyrell Close, MK18 1EJ
Erection of single storey rear extension and first floor side above garage extension
Paul
5. 18/01023/COUOR Musicopia Ltd., The Dukes Music, 24 Market Hill, MK18 1JX
Determination as to whether prior approval (Class O) is required in respect of transport and highway impact, contamination risk, flooding and noise for the conversion of B1 offices into a dwelling (C3)
Easton
Members had no objections to the earlier application 18/00095/COUOR, which was disallowed on a technicality, now remedied.
6. 18/01026/AAD Unit 18, Osier Way, MK18 1TG
Installation of replacement illuminated and non-illuminated signs to the exterior of the building
Surgey

AMENDED PLANS

7. 17/04202/APP 15 Bernardine's Way, MK18 1BF
Loft conversion, including the insertion of No 2 dormers and rooflight at the front roof and No 3 rooflights at the rear roof, and single storey rear extension
Vincent

Amendments: 2 dormers are narrower and flat roofed, not gabled, which makes them lower; rear extension is c 3m less deep, but the same width.

Members voted to change their response to Oppose & Attend following the representations from the neighbour (the yellow notice didn't go up until after our meeting, a fortnight after validation).

8. 17/04725/APP 10 Market Square, MK18 1NJ
Erection of four dwellings
Burgess

Amendments: Plots 1 & 2 (the two storey building) have been repositioned further away from No 10 and away from the wall between Nos 9 & 10 leaving a gap of approx. 1m; the bin

store for this building now houses 4 bins. The bins for Plots 3 and 4 were previously shown in their gardens; there is now a common bin store area between plots 1/2 and 3. This means the resident in Plot 4 will have to carry refuse c.25m to the bin and wheel the bin 30m to Market Square for collection (Plot 3 c.18m and 30m). AVDC guideline for taking the bin to the collection point is 30m.

Not for consultation, for information only:

9. 18/001121/INTN 56 Burleigh Piece, MK18 7BB
 Notice of intention to install x1 electronic communication apparatus pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 and the Electronic Communications Code (Conditions and Regulations) 2003 (as amended)
 Harlequin Group

7. Planning Decisions

To receive for information details of planning decisions made by AVDC as per 'Bulletin' and other decisions.

		BTC response	Officer recomm ⁿ
Approved			
17/04078/APP 1-2 Castle Street	Ch/use hotel lounge to coffee shop	Support subj HBO	
17/04326/ALB } Stoneleigh House	Conversion to hotel, alterations	} Support subj. HBO	
17/04861/APP }			
17/04734/APP 6 Rogers Lane	Loft conversion	No objections	
17/04746/APP 1A Hillcrest Rise	Two commercial units	No objections	
17/04784/APP 11 Swallow Close	Single storey side extension	Oppose	
18/00007/APP 5 Castle Street	Ch/use office→residential	No objections	
18/00092/APP 4 Bodenham Close	Replace conservatory with extension	No objections	
18/00169/APP 14 Cotton End	Timber shed, and external flue	No objections	
18/00530/APP Caravell, 18 Top Angel	Premier fence	No objections	
Refused			
17/04611/APP 10 Lincoln	2 storey rear extension	Oppose	
Withdrawn			
18/00113/APP 10 Woodlands Cres.	Extension+ roof conversion	Oppose & attend	
<i>Replaced by 18/00831/APP considered at the 19th March meeting.</i>			
Not Consulted on:			
Approved			
18/00243/ATC } The Old Surgery	Works to trees	} No objections	
18/00370/ATP }			
18/00862/ATC St Bernardine's Ch.	Works to tree	No objections	
Refused			
17/04583/ACL 17 London Road	Studio in rear of garden	Oppose	
18/00095/COUOR 24 Market Hill	Class O approval ch/use B1→C3	No objections	
<i>Replaced by 18/01023/APP above</i>			

8. Development Management Committee

- 8.1 Strategic Development Management (28th March 2018) *Meeting cancelled*
- 8.2 Development Management (29th March 2018) *No Buckingham applications*

9. Enforcement

9.1 To receive the March update *to be circulated by email when received* **Appendix B**

9.2 To report any new breaches

10. Matters to report

Members to report any damaged, superfluous and redundant signage in the town, access issues or any other urgent matter.

11. Application statistics for 2017.

To receive the breakdown of 2017 applications.

Appendix C

12. AVDC quarterly figures

To receive a summary of the figures for October – December 2017

Appendix D

13. S106 Quarterly update

To receive the update (Note that AVDC had nothing to add this quarter)

Appendix E

14. Transport

To receive the supporting paper on the E-W Expressway corridor options (Item 7 on the agenda for the AVDC Cabinet meeting on 10th April 2018) courtesy of Cllr. Whyte.

Appendix F

15. News releases

16. Chairman's items for information

17. Date of the next meeting: Monday 30th April 2018 at 7pm.

To Planning Committee:

Cllr. Ms. J. Bates

Cllr. M. Cole

Cllr. J. Harvey

Cllr. P. Hirons

Cllr. D. Isham

Cllr. A. Mahi

(Chairman)

Town Mayor

(Vice Chairman)

Cllr. Mrs. L. O'Donoghue

Cllr. M. Smith

Cllr. Mrs. C. Strain-Clark

Cllr. R. Stuchbury

Cllr. M. Try

Mrs. C. Cumming (co-opted member)

ACTION LIST

Appendix A

Mins.	Sent	Minute	Form	Rating	Response received	Date of appearance
827/17 846/17	(Full Council) 15/3/18 (Planning) 21/3/18			Min. 19/3/18	News release None agreed	
Subject	AVDC			√ = done		
Ford Meadow parking & lighting					Parish Liaison 13/10/17:- I have caught up with the case officer and they have provided me with more information in regards to this application. They have some concerns with the points you have raised and is going to raise the issue with the University for clarity. The case officer has also made enforcement aware of the situation and will keep them updated on how things unfold. As soon as I have more information I will contact you directly. The university has opened additional car parking spaces at Ford Meadow, (60 spaces), which will help ease the demand on parking space around the campus. Access is via the Ueard, so only open to staff and students. 27/10/17 Enforcement should report shortly	
Quarterly stats	553/17	Query missing 6 appeals & enforcement stats	√	Update requested 31/1/18	Oct-Dec stats now available, analysis to April meeting (agenda 12)	
Cornwalls Meadow new path	611.2	Check consultation/source of money	√	Prompt sent 1/3/18	22/1/18: I am only in the office 2 days this week so will try and get a response to you before we meet on 1 st February. Susan Kitchen, Corporate Planner, Customer Fulfillment	
And Care Home	845.3/17	Query pre-determination	To do	To do	See Agenda 5.3	
RLS application	798/17	Change response to Oppose & attend	√		Presentation to 9 th April meeting, agenda 4	
Contrary decisions	843/17	Write to S Kitchen as minuted				
BCC:						
Secure by Design	186.4/17	Circulate main points for assessing applications against		started		

Subject	Minute	Form	Rating √ = done	Response received
---------	--------	------	--------------------	-------------------

Street/Estate Naming Tingewick Road	852/17	Check suggested names or suppplication in Vale	To do	
Other:				

Agenda layout	854/17	Change general items as minuted	√	
---------------	--------	---------------------------------	---	--

Subject	Minute	Form	Rating √ = done	Response received
---------	--------	------	--------------------	-------------------

Enforcement reports and queries

13 High Street	795.3/15 664.2	New signage & lighting Chase response (done regularly)	√	P Dates: 12/5/17. 13 High Street, Buckingham: we had in the past met with the owner to secure the removal of the signs. Whilst this had not materialised we had been aware that its ownership may change and had hoped that the new owner may be have their own plans and/or may be receptive. However, this has not materialised and so I have asked our consultant enforcement officer Will Holloway to take on the case and we will keep you informed of progress. 26/10/17 I have written to the operator of the premises asking them to confirm a timetable for the removal of the signage. If a timetable is not agreed then the Council will have to consider formal action. I will update you further when I have received a response from the operator. J Wilnot Planning Enforcement Consultant No update 3/1/18
Dominos	313.2/17	Compressor unit not as plans; motorbikes and skips blocking alley Awaiting response from officer on discharge of Condition 4 – Waste disposal Investigate costs & liability	√	17/00169/CON3 Parish Liaison Officer has in hand 15/1/18: Cllr. Hiron reported to meeting that bikes and skips no longer in alley.
Garden encroachment into Maids Moreton Avenue	378/17 717/17	CC to have photos sent to office Office to report breach	Received √	
Cornwalls Meadow path	381/17	Ask why no planning application & consultation	√	Also incorporated in later letter to S.Kitchen (see above 611.2)
New barbers – ex-pet shop	493.2/17	Permission needed for new signage?	√	
Signage	555.2 555.3	Parking sign by Community Centre Larder café, Bourton Road roundabout	√ √	See Application 18/00977 to this meeting
Bourton Meadow containers	743.1	Check 2015 application conditions	√	Containers pre-date 2015 application (on Google streetview August 2015, application received at AVDC in November) and augment a single structure in place since at least 2009. There are no amendments/

Subject	Minute	Form	Rating √ = done	Response received
	845.2/17	Write to County Member as minuted	To do	variations/discharge of conditions associated with the application. Photos attached. (agenda 5.2)
Reasons for case closure	743.1	Clr. Stuchbury to investigate further		
16 Hilltop Avenue	743.2 850.2	Fence encroachment into AVDC land Investigate Bulletin report	√ To do	Referred to AVDC Property & Estates for action Property & Estates have passed to Open Spaces

Appeals were lodged as follows during 2017:

Site	grounds	result
Moreton Road Phase III (S/State call-in) Land East of Buckingham 4-5 Bridge Street, signage Summerhouse Hill West End Farm Care Home	contrary to BNDP non-determination against refusal non-determination against refusal	approval overturned dismissed (2018) dismissed allowed pending

Applications as yet undecided

a) validated in 2015

	Address	nature	validated	BTC response
15/01242/AOP	Land South Of The A421 Tingewick Rd	Allotments & cemetery	17 April	Conditional support

b) validated in 2016

16/00151/AOP	Land off Walnut Drive, Maids Moreton	Up to 170 houses	20 January	Oppose & attend
16/00940/APP	West End Bowls Club, Brackley Road	Demolish clubhouse, erect 1 house	11 March	Support
16/02320/AOP	Land east of Buckingham, Stratford Road **	Up to 170 houses	23 June	Oppose & attend
16/02641/APP	Hamilton Precision site, Tingewick Road	51 residential units	21 July	Oppose & attend
16/3138/APP	Summerhouse Hill **	Replacement of approved 27 dwellings with 38 dwellings	16 September	Oppose & attend
16/03302/APP	Land to rear of 13 High Street	61-bed care home + 14 assisted living flats	12 September	Oppose and attend
16/03784/APP	The Villas, Stratford Road	1 flat above garage	21 October	Oppose & attend

** both still listed as 'undecided' despite Planning Inspector's decision

c) validated 2017 (and in one case, 2018 with a 2017 number)

17/00746/APP	Former Railway Station site	Student accommodation	7 th March	Oppose & attend
17/01157/APP	Park Manor Farm	Ch/use nursery → flats	12 th January	No objections
17/01840/AOP	Silverstone	Change to masterplan	31 st May	No objections
17/01940/APP	Lace Hill	Care Home	23 rd May	Conditional support
17/02112/APP	Lace Hill	Medical centre	2 nd June	No objections
17/02939/APP	Royal Latin School	Pitch and sports building	2 nd August	Conditional support
17/03386/APP	Land at Wharf Hill Terrace	2 new houses	4 th September	Oppose & attend
17/03432/ATP	Land off Chandos Road	Fell 5 trees	5 th Sept.	Oppose
17/03763/APP	5 Bostock Court	Rear extension	27 th Sept.	No objections

17/04202/APP	15 Bernardines Way	Loft conversion & extension	13 th November	Oppose & attend
17/04668/ADP	Tingewick Triangle site	Housing estate	27 th December	Deferred
17/04671/APP	19 Castle Street	5 flats above shop	1 st February 2018	No obj. subj. HBO
17/04725/APP	10 Market Square	4 dwellings	14 th December	No objections
17/04776/APP	Willowby, Bath Lane	Demol. bungalow build house	18 th December	Oppose & attend

Applications by type:

Alterations/renovations	10	{ 7}
Amendment to existing permission	3	{ 3}
ATM	0	{ 2}
Bridlepath	1	{ 0}
Car Parking <i>domestic</i>	1	{ 1}
Care Home	1	{ 2}
Change of use	12	{11}

Shop → café 1; Cafe → gym 1; Retail → gym 1; Day nursery → residential 1; Residential → hotel 4; residential → day nursery 1; Shop → residential 1; Office → takeaway 1; workshop → residential

Conservatory	3	{ 1}
Conversions (garage to residential use)	2	{ 2}
(loft into dwelling space)	4	{ 2}
Continued use as clinic	1	{ 0}
Drainage basin	1	{ 0}
Fence/Wall	5	{ 2}
Garden Building	3	{ 0}
House extension (including HPDE)	26	{41}
Housing	12	{11}

approved: land @ Verdun 4; flats over Dipalee 3 (2 applications); Elm Street workshop (2) (listed under Change of use)

refused: Burleigh Piece 1; The Villas (allowed on appeal) 1

no decision yet: 10 Market Square (5) & new application for 4; Willowby (demolish bungalow, replace with house (0) (2 applications); Wharf Hill Terrace (2); 19 Castle Street (5 flats); Tingewick Triangle 450

Industrial/Employment	5	{ 0}
Major mixed development (Silverstone)	1	{ 0}
Pavement tables	1	{ 0}
Porch/ Canopy	1	{ 4}
Removal of condition/variation of condition	0/2	{0/3}
Security (1 x bollards, 1 x shutters, new barrier)	2	{ 0}
Shed	2	{ 0}
Shopfront	1	{ 1}
Signage	8	{ 8}
Sport (1 x sports hall; 1 x cricket nets)	2	{ 0}
Telecomms	3	{ 0}
University building	1	{ 1}
Windows	3	{ 2}
Works to trees	17	{17}

Responses/decisions:

BTC response 2017	Total 13	AVDC decision					
		approved	refused	Split	With-drawn	Permission not required	No decision yet
Support	12	9					3
(inc. Conditional support, & subj HBO)	(6)	(3)					(3)
No objections	75	61(81.3%)	7(9.3%)		3		4
Oppose	14	9 (64.3%)	4 (28.5%)				1
Oppose & attend	12	4 (33.3%)	5 (41.6%)				3
No comment / Noted*	1	1					
Deferred	1						1
Tree works (ATP) support 1; oppose 4; no objections 5; withdrawn before consultation 1	11	9			1		1 (Waglands Garden)
Tree works (ATC) oppose 1; no objections 4; no comment 1*	6	6					
Other not consulted on/ Not in this parish/	1/1				1		1 (Silverstone)

* BTC application

Previous year's for comparison

BTC response 2016	Total	AVDC decision					
		approved	refused	Split	With-drawn	Permission not required	No decision yet
Support	3	2					1
(inc. Partial support)	1)	1					
No objections	79	70(88.6%)	1(1.2%)		4(5.1%)		4 (5.1%)
Oppose	34	15(44.1%)	4(11.8%)		6(17.6%)		9 (26.5%)
No comment (retrospective applns)	4	2	2				
Deferred	1	1					
Tree works	17	15	1			1	
Other not consulted on/ Not in this parish/	14						
	4						

Last 10 years comparison (discrepant totals are due to noted/withdrawn/not consulted on/no decision yet etc)

Year	Total response to	% AVDC total	Decision	% approved	% refused
2007	171	4.9%	Support 126	85%	2%
			Oppose 37	49%	27%
2008	161	5.4%	Support 105	99%	4%
			Oppose 48	29%	12%
2009	118	4.7%	Support 89	91%	3%
			Oppose 23	87%	13%
2010	113	4.3%	Support 83	92%	5%
			Oppose 23	56%	18%
2011	137	4.8%	Support 93	93%	1%
			Oppose 32	78%	6%
2012	133	4.6%	Support 81	87%	1%
			Oppose 37	60%	11%
2013	158	4.4%	Support 27	81%	4%
			No Objections 78	96%	1%
			Oppose 42	60%	12%
2014	147	3.9%	Support 8	75%	25%
			No Objections 83	94%	2%
			Oppose 33	42%	6%
2015	110 of 147	3.3%	Support 4	75%	0%
			No Objections 71	89%	7%
			Oppose 34	62%	6%
2016	138 of 156	3.4%	Support 3	67%	0%
			No Objections 79	90%	1%
			Oppose 34	44%	12%
2017	134	2.8%	Support 6	75%	0%
			No Objections 75	81%	9%
			Oppose /Oppose & attend 26	50%	35%

Planning Committee 9th April 2018

Agenda 12.

Selected paragraphs from AVDC's Quarterly Review for October – November 2017
(supporting paper for Development Management Committee meeting held on 8th March 2018)

Major applications determined within 13 weeks

	Jan*	Feb*	Mar*	Apr*	May*	Jun*	Jul*	Aug*	Sept*	Oct*	Nov*	Dec*	Totals
Number of Major Applications Decided	7	8	7	10	7	7	6	10	13	8	8	11	102
Number within 13 Weeks (16 weeks) inc. Ext of time*	6	7	6	8	4	5	4	9	11	7	7	8	82
% within 13 Weeks (16 weeks)	86%	88%	86%	80%	57%	71%	67%	90%	85%	88%	88%	73%	80%
Government Target 50%, AVDC target 60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%

*Including extensions of time & PPAs

The quarterly performance achieved are:

81%

Minor applications determined within 8 weeks

	Jan*	Feb*	Mar*	Apr*	May*	Jun*	Jul*	Aug*	Sept*	Oct*	Nov*	Dec*	Totals
Number of Minor Applications Decided	40	53	33	58	49	60	29	46	29	41	49	51	538
Number within 8 Weeks inc. Ext of time*	34	43	29	53	38	44	25	36	20	28	40	24	414
% within 8 Weeks	85%	81%	88%	91%	78%	73%	86%	78%	69%	68%	82%	47%	77%
Government Target	80%	80%	80%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%

*Including extensions of time

Other applications determined within 8 weeks

	Jan*	Feb*	Mar*	Apr*	May*	Jun*	Jul*	Aug*	Sept*	Oct*	Nov*	Dec*	Totals
Number of Other Applications Decided	121	100	138	116	137	139	105	108	104	111	116	107	1402
Number within 8 Weeks inc. Ext of time*	86	71	103	105	125	116	92	90	77	87	94	81	1127
% within 8 Weeks	71%	71%	75%	91%	91%	83%	88%	83%	74%	78%	81%	76%	80%
Government Target	80%	80%	80%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%

For minor and other applications the government previously had no target and so the target of 80% shown was set internally by AVDC. From 1 April 2017 a government target of 65% has been set for minor and other applications.

For the quarter October to December 2017 we achieved

Minors: 65% within the time period against a target of 65%
Others: 78% against a target of 65%

[Members will note that the notion of determination within a set time limit is counteracted by the proviso of "including extensions of time" – some applications have repeated extensions, and every single month in the table has this proviso attached, so the actual number of applications determined within the time limit is unknown]

Appeals against refusal of planning permission

Introduction

This section deals numerically with our performance in relation to appeals against refusal of planning permission. Whilst there is no government performance target a benchmarking measure is that we should seek to achieve success in 65% or more of appeals against planning decisions.

Determined Dismissed	8
Allowed	6
Withdrawn/NPW	3
Split	0
Turned Away	0
Varied	0

Costs Against AVDC

 For AVDC

[Cost figures were not included in the document]

In the quarter between October and December a total of 26 appeals were determined, 17 of which were against refusals of planning permission. Of the 17 appeals against refusals of planning permission which are used for reporting purposes 35% were allowed which equals the Council's target of not more than 35% appeals allowed.

Enforcement

Introduction

This section details statistics relating to Enforcement matters and details the numbers of complaints received, cases closed together with the number of cases which have led to Enforcement action. Enforcement appeals are also dealt with separately and performance can be assessed accordingly.

Cases on hand at beginning of quarter	431	Cases on hand at end of quarter	430
Cases Opened	135	No of Cases closed	136
No. of Enforcement Notices Served	1	No. of Temporary Stop Notices Served	0
No. of Stop Notices Served	0	No. of Breach of Condition Notices Served	0
		No. of Planning Contravention Notices Served	3

Enforcement Appeals

Lodged	PI (Public Inquiry)	0	Determined	Allowed	0
	IH (Hearing)	0		Dismissed	0
	WR (Written responses)	0		W/Drawn	0
	Total	0		Varied	0
				Total	0
Costs	For AVDC	0		Against AVDC	0

Update Report on the Internal Audit for the Planning Service – November 2017

During November 2017, our development management and planning enforcement services were internally audited. An extensive report with findings and recommendations was taken to AVDC's Audit Committee for scrutiny. This special briefing report is provided to members of Development Management Committee for their information and comment.

The report found the planning service to be of medium risk, scoring 11 points on the risk rating system by internal audit at AVDC. For information, high risk areas score between 16-39 points and critical risk areas score over 40 points. Low risk areas score 6 points or less.

A summary of findings is given below:

- There is no local formal monitoring of comments, compliments and complaints and a process needs to be created (Finding 1 – Medium)
- Proactive planning enforcement is not taking place (Finding 2 – Medium)
- A formal Member/Officer engagement session needs to be developed including input to the creation of the new planning system (Finding 3 – Medium)
- Improvements to the oversight of the effectiveness of the Parish Liaison Officer role are needed (Finding 4 – Low)

- Pre application advice costs are not fully substantiated and this needs to be created as part of the upcoming Project Brief already started (Finding 5 – Low).

Proactive planning enforcement was recommended to be undertaken. While this will prove to be challenging with current resource levels, the introduction of the increased planning fees and rollout of the new computer system for built environment is anticipated to create efficiencies that will enable more proactive enforcement to be carried out. Enforcement is a challenging and often emotive area that has high expectations that do not often mirror the reality of available recourse to the local authority. AVDC is working hard to ensure that the enforcement services provided are as proactive as possible within the framework we are allowed to operate and the resources available.

Improved member engagement was also recommended as an action. A member session to demo and discuss the new planning system has been scheduled for 22 February 2018, and immediately after this a general discussion between members and officers on the planning (development management) service will take place. AVAALC parish representatives have also been invited. Further member engagement will be scheduled throughout the year, and member training on planning items has been held previously and is available to members if required.

A further recommendation was improvements to the oversight of the effectiveness of the Parish Liaison Officer role. We are monitoring the inbox as requested, and logging comments from parishes. Although it is early days in the establishment of this new role, the response from parishes to this new service has been overwhelmingly positive, evidenced by the number of compliments that have been received by the service. We will continue to action and monitor suggestions and build on this positive start.

The final recommendation was that pre-application advice costs are not fully substantiated and supporting information for these costs need to be created. In line with the commercial direction of the authority, our discretionary services in customer fulfilment, particularly in planning, building control and trade waste are being systematically reviewed. Under legislation, we are able to charge for discretionary services in this service area, and ultimately to generate income that is utilised in the overall costs of running the planning service. We will look carefully at our costs in the coming months to ensure this happens and a commercial review of these products is already underway.

The full document can be viewed on AVDC's website – Committee agenda for 8th March item #2

Development	Planning application	AVDC/BCC	Sum agreed	Amount spent	Amount committed	Amount remaining	Date payment due	Use by /lose by date	classification	For	Comment as of Mar 2018
CHANDOS ROAD	09/01205	AVDC	£10,299	244	10,055	£0		31/01/2024	SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	£1750 committed to fit out new Scout HQ/Community Centre at Embleton Way. Balance for new cricket nets facility	
TESCO	10/00360	AVDC	£9,147	0	0	£9,147		02/05/2019	POLICING CONTRIBUTION	to be spent by TVP, projects to be advised	
		BCC	£96,000			£96,000				Cycle/footway network	
LACE HILL	09/01035	AVDC	£197,162	3,122	0	£194,040		01/10/2022	FLOOD ALLEVIATION	flood mitigation for properties at 'medium' risk of flooding	
		AVDC	£118,795	100,841	0	£17,954		06/02/2023	EXTRA CAR PARKING AT BUCK ATH	additional parking facilities at Buckingham Athletic FC	
		AVDC	£6,338	3,535	0	£2,803		n/a	CONSULTANCY FEES	to engage consultants for delivery/approval of sports pitches & community hall	
		AVDC	£210,997	0	0	£210,997		26/04/2021	POLICING CONTRIBUTION	to be spent by TVP, projects to be advised	
		AVDC	£100,315	0	0	£100,315		26/04/2026	SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	not yet known	
		BCC	£50,000			£250,000				Footway/Cycleway contribution	Lace Hill (cycleway) – The scheme is proposed to be delivered in two phases. The preliminary design for phase 1 has been subject to a public consultation held from 13 December 2017 to 24 January 2018. Based on consultation response, BCC Cabinet Member for Transportation has approved delivery of Phase 1, via Badgers Way and Bourton Park
		BCC	£95,000			£380,000				Bus/Public Transport subsidy	Funding to be drawn down by BCC Passenger Transport team depending on service requirement
STATION ROAD/STATION TERRACE	14/02685	AVDC	£29,547	0	11,700	£17,847		12/06/2025	SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	£11.7k committed for new cricket nets facility	
MARKET HILL	12/02104	AVDC	£138,863	0	0	£138,863		03/11/2025	SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	not yet known	
		AVDC	£77,358	0	0	£77,358		03/11/2025	AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION	Provision of Affordable Housing within Aylesbury Vale	
TINGEWICK ROAD	11/02116	AVDC	£345,344	0	0	£345,344		09/12/2026	SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	not yet known	
POLICE STATION, MORETON RD	14/03316 &	AVDC	£29,975	0	0	£29,975		12/05/2027	SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	Stratford Fields Play Area improvements	
MORETON ROAD (PHASE II)	13/01325	AVDC	£367,056	0	0	£367,056		n/a	SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	not yet known	
		BCC	£153,120			£153,120				transport contribution	Moreton Road – Scheme included in 2018/19 programme for delivery. TfB to be commissioned to design and deliver footway improvements along Moreton Road, RTP1 bus shelter opposite Balwen and at Market Hill and cycle parking facilities in town centre. Local BCC councillors consulted as part of scheme development.
LENBOROUGH ROAD	16/00145	AVDC	£4,812	0		£4,812		28/09/2027	SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	equipped play facilities at Embleton Way Open Space	
MONIES TO BE PAID LATER IN DEVELOPMENT											
MONIES DUE IF/WHEN DEVELOPMENT COMES FORWARD											
										(SUMS SUBJECT TO INDEXATION)	
MORETON ROAD (PHASE III)	14/02601	AVDC	tbc						SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	BMX facilities in Bourton Park or improvements to Buckingham Union FC	
NORTH OF A421 TINGEWICK RD	15/01218	AVDC	tbc						SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	Verney Road Synthetic Pitch, Buckingham Tennis Club, University Playing Fields Pavilion and/or St Rumbolds Well	
LAND ADJ 73 MORETON ROAD	15/04106	AVDC	tbc						SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	Overn Avenue Play Area	
LAND REAR GRAND JUNCTION PH	16/03302	AVDC	£34,650						SPORTS AND LEISURE CONTRIBUTION	Stratford Fields Play Area	
New information highlighted	AVDC										
	BCC										

Cabinet
10 April 2018

OXFORD-CAMBRIDGE EXPRESSWAY CORRIDOR OPTIONS
Councillor N Blake – Leader of the Council
Councillor Mrs Paternoster – Cabinet Member for Growth Strategy

1 Purpose

- 1.1 To consider the corridor options for the 'missing link' for the Oxford-Milton Keynes-Cambridge Corridor and to agree the key considerations to be included in the authority's written response to Highways England required by 12th April 2018, along with AVDC's written response to the National Infrastructure Commission's Report, 'Partnering for Prosperity: A new deal for the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford Arc'.

2 Recommendations/for decision

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 2.1 | Cabinet is asked to consider the report and agree the principle points summarised from the Members sessions to be input into the authority's written response as set out in paragraph 4.14. |
| 2.2 | To delegate to the Director with responsibility for planning, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Growth Strategy the writing of and submission of the formal written response to Highways England. |
| 2.3 | Cabinet is asked to support AVDC's written response to the National Infrastructure Commission's Report, 'Partnering for Prosperity: A new deal for the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford Arc', along the lines of the document attached as Appendix 3 and delegate to the Director with responsibility for planning, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Growth Strategy the submission of the formal response to Government. |

3 Executive summary

- 3.1 The National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) report 'Partnering for Prosperity', published in November 2017 sees East West Infrastructure as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to unlock land for new settlements and alleviate some of the constraints in the arc in terms of housing affordability as well as congestion and to better link the thriving economies of Oxford and Cambridge. The decision of the 'missing link' of the Expressway corridor (option A, B or C) between M40 and M1 is key. Highways England, who have been commissioned by Department for Transport to deliver the expressway project, are seeking views from stakeholders on the preferred corridor and least preferred corridor. Members seminars have been held to seek views but no overall consensus has been reached on a preferred corridor. This report sets out the key considerations raised during the members seminars which focused on the lack of information available to be able to make a fully informed choice regarding the corridor route at this time and concern that the decision about this important aspect is being made in isolation of decisions for locations and scale of new settlements across the corridor and areas for economic growth. Comments were also made about the absence of evidence from connectivity studies or other detailed analysis. It is recommended that the written response be prepared and submitted on this basis.
- 3.2 The NIC's report also contained several recommendations which officers have drafted responses to. These are both attached in Appendix 3.

4 Supporting information

- 4.1 Oxford – Milton Keynes – Cambridge region has been identified as one of the most significant growth corridors in the country; these three economic areas being some of the fastest growing, innovative and productive in the UK. However, there is currently poor east-west connectivity, resulting in restricted interaction between these economies coupled with challenges including congestion, journey times and housing unaffordability which threaten further economic growth and reduce the attractiveness of the area as a place to live and work. The National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) in its report 'Partnering for Prosperity – a new deal for the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford Arc' (published November 2017), stated that without urgent action, a chronic undersupply of homes could jeopardise growth, limit access to labour and put prosperity at risk.
- 4.2 The NIC report stated that East West Rail (EWR) and the Oxford – Cambridge Expressway provide a once-in-a-generation opportunity to unlock land for new settlements. Estimates prepared for the Commission suggest that meeting the needs of the arc's future population and workforce which is set to increase by between 1.4-1.9 million in the period to 2050 could require 23,000 – 30,000 net new homes per year but taken in aggregate, current local plans make provision for fewer than 16,000 homes per year. Accommodating between 1.4 and 1.9 million people could require between 782,000 and 1,020,000 new homes by 2050 but current development plans, if realised in full, might be expected to deliver only 230,000 new homes.
- 4.3 With the level of growth indicated in the Objectively Assessed Need for areas like Aylesbury Vale shown in the recent Government consultation on this matter, and the increases to housing figures for the areas around the Vale, it is anticipated that the Vale will need to be a key contributor to the overall housing figure that the corridor is expected to achieve. Current calculations show Aylesbury Vale needs to allow for 970 dwellings per annum, but this will need to increase to 1499 dwellings per annum under the new methodology. It should be noted that these figures are for Aylesbury Vale only and do not include any unmet need.
- 4.4 An Expressway between Oxford and Cambridge (M4 and A14/M11) could alleviate some of the housing pressures facing both Oxford and Cambridge, improving connectivity to the central area and unlocking aspirational levels of growth in the corridor.
- 4.5 An Expressway is "an A-road that is as well-designed as a motorway and is able to offer the same standard of journey to users. At a minimum, Expressways will be largely or entirely carriageway standard roads that are safe, well-built and resilient to delays, have junctions that are safe, well built and resilient to delays, have junctions that are largely or entirely grade separated, include modern safety measures and construction standards and technology to manage traffic and provide better information to drivers" (RIS 1, December 2014).
- 4.6 The Expressway involves the conversion of sections of the A34, A421, A428 and A1 but there is a 'missing link' between Oxford and Milton Keynes and following appraisal processes, three corridor options (which include sub options to route around Oxford) have been short listed;
- Option A – via Aylesbury
 - Option B - the East West Rail (EWR) corridor

- Option C - the existing A421 corridor

- 4.7 Stage 0 of the Oxford to Cambridge Project, undertaken by DfT, involved Strategy, shaping and prioritisation and in July 2017, it was passed on to Highways England to initiate Stage 1 of the project. Stage 1 is split into 1a which is identification of the corridor (option A, B or C) to be complete by summer 2018 and 1b which is route selection within the preferred corridor, to be complete by Autumn 2020 following a public consultation to commence in Autumn 2019. The key milestones of the project thereafter comprise of the development phase which will include a Development Consent Order application which will be subject to Examination and a Public Inquiry to enable construction to commence 2025 with a view to the road being open in 2030.
- 4.8 As part of the process to identify the corridor, Jacobs have been appointed by Highways England to carry out stakeholder engagement. A number of stakeholder reference groups have been set up as well as a strategic stakeholder group and members and officers forums in order to gain understanding of the issues and concerns relating to the options. Technical teams have been working in parallel to collate information and evidence on traffic and economic modelling, environment and infrastructure.
- 4.9 Engagement events have set out the strategic aims of the Project:
- o Safe and serviceable network
 - o Supporting economic growth
 - o More free-flowing network
 - o Improved environment
 - o Accessible and integrated
- 4.10 The following objectives for the Ox-Cam scheme have also been set out (updated following the publication of the NIC report):
1. Connectivity – provide an east-west strategic road link between MK and Oxford that delivers enhanced connectivity through faster, safer and more reliable connections across the corridor in the broad arc
 2. Strategic Transformation – support the creation of an integrated corridor between Oxford and Cambridge, reflecting and advancing plans for infrastructure, housing, business investment & development
 3. Economic Growth – unlock economic potential by facilitating strategic growth to the benefit of the UK economy through increased productivity, employment and housing and maximising synergies with potential growth associated with East West Rail
 4. Skills and Accessibility – promote accessibility and wider socio-economic benefits by improving access to job opportunities
 5. Planning for the Future – Reduce the impact of new housing on local roads for communities and contribute to better safety, security and health whilst promoting sustainable transport modes
 6. Environment – To provide a healthy, natural environment by reducing congestion and supporting sustainable travel modes and promoting equality and opportunity
 7. Innovation – apply innovative technology wherever possible to support the sustainable planning, construction and operation of transport measures

4.11 At the end of February 2018, the Project Team took the decision to give key stakeholders the opportunity to provide written feedback to Highways England to help inform the Summer 2018 Corridor decision. To aid in their analysis of the feedback, views were specifically asked to be framed around the following questions and to be submitted before 12th April 2018:

- 1) What is your preferred corridor and why?
- 2) Are there any corridors you do not support, and why?

4.12 HE confirmed that the information on the broad corridors being considered can be found at the Strategic Study Stage 3 Report by DfT dated 28 November 2016. This report recognised the potential for the Expressway to unlock aspirational growth by providing increased road capacity but also delivering strategic housing sites and set out next steps to assess further the economic, environmental, transport impacts and value for money as well as further analysis of the potential interaction with EWR. However, it did include some initial analysis which is summarised in the table below and broadly scored accordingly (1 – best performing and 2 – less well performing). This initial analysis showed option C as the lesser performing option.

	Corridor A – Aylesbury	Corridor B – Line of East West rail	Corridor C - Buckingham
Distance in miles	1 (40 miles)	2 (42-46 miles)	3 (47-51 miles)
Scheme Costs – Base cost (plus uncertainty and project risk)	2 (£3,452 million)	1 (£3,035-£3,366 million)	3 (£3,216 - £3,514 million)
Scheme beneficiaries – all would benefit freight industry, business travellers, commuters, leisure travellers, local communities and wider economy	1 (reduced traffic congestion referencing Thames and Aylesbury)	2 (complement EWR)	3
Estimated journey time M4 Chieveley to M1 (MK) Eastbound(E), Westbound (W) Base line 2015: E 01:39 W 01:35	1 E 00:57 W 00:56	2 E 00:59-01:01 W 00:57-00:59	3 E 01:03-01:05 W 01:02-01:04
Predicted change in workers within 45 mins drive time of key corridor locations – all 3 routes offer significant overlapping of 45 min drive time catchments – potential for stronger relationship	2	1 Specific analysis on this route showing an additional 340,000 people predicted to be brought into 45 min drive time of MK, 123,000 more into Aylesbury catchment	2
Summary of 2041 Socio-economic impacts – direct transport access and travel benefits for total no. of jobs by 2041	1 736,000	2 683,000	2 689,000
Total	8	10	16

4.13 To inform the written response which AVDC intend to submit, two Members seminars have been held (15.03.18 and 22.03.18) to inform Members of the process above and initial analysis carried out and to seek their views. Officers had also mapped the constraints and existing planned growth areas in the Vale for information and provided commentary on the growth context.

4.14 No consensus was reached in these sessions to the questions posed but some key considerations were raised. These principle points are summarised below to be incorporated into the final response:

- The need to be clear on the purpose for the Expressway and what is trying to be achieved in order to answer these questions well
- A proper informed view is not possible to set out based on the evidence currently available or in the proposed timelines
- Corridor decision needs to be planned in an integrated way to ensure that as well as improving the utility of the national road network, it maximises the potential to support and deliver new and aspirational growth whilst preserving the Vale as a great place to live
- Engagement process for the corridor decision is not effective as consultation process is not offered until route selection in 2019
- Concern that project is being carried out in isolation to and in advance of discussions and progress on scale and locations for growth
- Serious concern that the Expressway is being carved up as a discrete Highways project and not joined up with the vision to unlock land for new settlements as championed by the NIC. The Project team, which is headed up by DfT – needs to be integrated with other Government departments – MHCLG and BEIS and treated as a priority as part of the focus on the Corridor as a serious competitor to the Midlands Engine and Northern Powerhouse
- Need to be clear on the corridor choice and interplay with place making and place shaping
- Lack of context to the consultation in terms of the numbers of houses expected to be delivered and the overall scale of development
- Need results of the wider connectivity study currently being prepared by England's Economic Heartlands and information on junctions to understand how the Expressway can link in with existing road network and places and what other infrastructure can be brought forward to truly unlock economic growth and the right connections
- Sequencing of announcements is key - concern that mechanism for capturing land value uplift is not in place prior to the corridor announcement. This is a key opportunity to capture land value uplift to deliver infrastructure and improve connections
- One size fits all engagement process is not appropriate; specific and regular dialogue is needed with Aylesbury Vale as approximately 70% of the missing road length passes through the District, dialogue to include liaison with MPs
- Require more information from Government on the intentions for the area such as the announcements for new settlements or garden communities and to knit these elements together
- Difficult to comment on the corridor without knowing the position on either end eg. Oxford sub options – noting the current issues with A34
- Gigabyte broadband has the potential to substantially reduce the need for physical movements and may influence the need for hard infrastructure

- 4.15 Following the seminars, a number of members put forward their own views on the options presented and individual responses to the questions posed.
- 4.16 The main points raised by those members at the seminars with regard to each option and question are summarised below:

	Reasons for Preferred	Reasons for least preferred
Option A	Scored best in Stage 3 report; delivers dual carriageway bypass for Aylesbury as well as one for Wing (need bypass to SE of Oxford); potential for delivery of new homes at Leighton Buzzard, Aylesbury, Cheddington and Haddenham – all 3 have a mainline station; close to Enterprise Zones and will link these with Science parks in 'brain belt'; potential for HS2 station; land value capture opportunities to develop around this area	Increase in local congestion as will attract more development; insufficient capacity for growth; constrained by current committed development and AONB and Green Belt; little or no benefit to Aylesbury Vale; would also require upgrades of Cheddington and Leighton Buzzard railway stations; environmental constraints AAL etc; would not benefit or easily connect to Buckingham, Bicester or Northern Aylesbury Vale or offer any relief to the A421; concern how to navigate road around Aylesbury owing to development committed and position of Historic Park and Garden
Option B	Sensible to deliver fastest road; delivers significant housing and economic growth potential in Vale in contained areas; opens up potential development land even for a new town and aspirational growth at scale; some containment to growth using EWR rail boundary and creating a genuine corridor offering advantages for road and rail in one corridor where development will then naturally occur; B1 option links to Aylesbury; connects two of Enterprise Zones; potential for HS2 station at the crossing point with HS2 (providing N/S connectivity) and a site for development; less environmental constraints; provide equal local transport benefits for and opportunities for link roads to Buckingham, Winslow, Bicester and Aylesbury relieving pressure on A421;	Scored worse than option A in stage 3 report; not a sustainable location for housing growth and road network is not suitable; adverse environmental impact on rural Vale as development would be on greenfield sites; danger of coalescence with Bicester and MK; should be used to solve existing infrastructure deficit not add to it; concern about competition with EWR and duplicating benefits
Option C		Does not open up much land potential for development; fails to link with or benefit Aylesbury or the two enterprise zones to the south of the Vale ignoring new developments

		in Aylesbury Vale; insufficient space for major new housing or economic growth due to flood plain and other natural features; unviable owing to amount of roundabouts/junctions, disruptive and expensive
--	--	---

- 4.17 Opinion also endorsed for the road to be linked from the M40 at Bicester (new junction) with a new road to Bedford and there was considerable favour with a hybrid option from M40 at Bicester (corridor B) to then link into Aylesbury (corridor A) (option labelled B1 option). North-south connections were also expressed as being important and that the A41 west of Aylesbury needs to be improved as well as extension of the A41 south dual carriageway from Aylesbury to East West rail spine.
- 4.18 No overall consensus can be derived from AVDC Members views on the response to question 1, with corridors A and B being "preferred" but for different reasons, as well as a hybrid option of A and B. The lack of support for option C as a preferred route means this could be put forward as the response to question 2 expanding on the points summarised above.
- 4.19 Bearing in mind the principle points bulleted and the lack of consensus on a preferred corridor, it is recommended that the written response from AVDC to Highways England focuses on the main principle points. The above reasoning from Members can be expanded upon to express the benefits and limitations of options A and B (and the hybrid option) in response to question 1 if Members wish for a view to be submitted with option C being expressed as the least preferred route. BCC have confirmed a preference for option A which remains their position, which they set out in the Call for Evidence submission to the NIC in August 2016. AVDC did not express a view on the corridor at that time.
- 4.20 The key message to deliver in the response from Aylesbury Vale is that investment in infrastructure is welcomed but it is critical that the purpose of the Expressway is properly considered and understood in order to properly inform and influence the corridor choice and that sequencing of announcements makes sense to this purpose. Any of the three corridor choices are feasible but depending on what needs to be achieved, affects the weighting of the benefits and limitations of the options. AVDC consider it is critical that the road delivers more than just a connection between places at the fastest possible time but that it truly unlocks transformational and aspirational growth to maximise this once in a generation opportunity which must not be wasted.
- 4.21 To that end, the Council consider that the Expressway project needs to be delivered as a co-ordinated and integral part of the wider ambitions for the Oxford to Cambridge arc as set out in the NIC report. The correct sequencing of decisions on settlement options, infrastructure, land value capture and new governance arrangements to allow effective interplay between these elements needs to be in place to maximise this opportunity. This also needs to be joined up at Government level to ensure the area achieves its full potential. As such, the Council's response to the Expressway questions will also be framed as part of our overall response to the NIC report.
- 4.22 The Council are willing to partner in discussions and continue and increase dialogue and engagement with Highways England and Government in the decision making processes on the Expressway both at an officer and member level. The importance that this Government scheme has for our area is

unparalleled across the corridor and there is therefore a special case for the Vale to be particularly and closely involved with the planning.

5 Options considered

- 5.1 There is an option not to submit any response to Highways England but the location of the Expressway will have a significant impact on the growth of Aylesbury Vale and therefore, submitting our views is considered essential.

6 Reasons for Recommendation

- 6.1 To set out the Cabinet's view in respect of how to respond to the questions posed by Highways England.

7 Resource implications

- 7.1 None immediately as our work in relation to the expressway is being met from within existing resources.

Contact Officer
Background Documents

Claire Britton 01296 585471
Strategic Study Stage 3 Report
NIC 'Partnering for Prosperity' report

Appendices: AVDC Response to Call for Evidence Aug 2016
Corridor options – officer options
AVDC Response to the National Infrastructure Commission Report
Director Generals' Letter re Cambridge – Milton Keynes – Oxford
corridor next steps letter