

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON MONDAY 28<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2004 at 7.05pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillors J. Barnett  
Mrs P Desorgher  
G P Loftus  
P. Strain-Clark (Chairman)  
R Stuchbury (Mayor)

Also Attending: Cllr. D. Isham

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W.McElligott

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillors: R C Lehmann, H Mordue and Mrs P Stevens.

**4663 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**Cllr. Strain-Clark** declared a personal interest in applications 04/01379/ALB, 04/01556/ACD, 04/01381/ALB, 04/01382/ALB and 04/01392/APP;

**Cllr. Stuchbury** declared an interest as School Governor in application CC/43/04, and

**Cllr. Loftus** as School Governor in CC/48/04.

**4664 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND MATTERS ARISING**

The Minutes of the meetings held on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2004 and 7<sup>th</sup> June 2004, ratified on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2004 were received and accepted.

4664.1 (4657 & 4653.3) Information on the AVDC Code of Conduct

The matter under discussion was covered by clause 10(2): A member may regard himself as not having a prejudicial interest in a matter if that matter relates to –

- (a) another relevant authority of which he is a member
- (b) another public authority in which he holds a position of general control or management
- (c) a body to which he has been appointed or nominated by the authority as its representative.

Although Members agreed that this was an unsatisfactory conclusion for both the Council and residents, no further action could be taken by the Council.

**4665 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

**CC/43/04 (04/01533/ACC)**

**SUPPORT**

Bourton Meadow Combined School

Extend one classroom frontage to courtyard elevation to provide new reception, classroom and associated facilities

*Confirmation had been received that the application was for a new reception and new classroom, not a new reception classroom.*

*Members expressed concern that the extension reduced the safe area for very young children to play in; and that the central flowerbed structure – shown in one drawing only – would restrict movement, in particular emergency evacuation of the classroom.*

**CC/48/04 (04/01689/ACC)**

**SUPPORT**

Buckingham Primary School

Proposed performing arts (dance) studio and infilling courtyard adjacent to playground

*Members felt this was a useful additional facility for the school*

**04/00607/APP**

**OPPOSE**

Land adjacent to 10 Adams Close

Change of use of amenity land to residential garden and enclosure by 1.8m fence

*Members were unhappy at the loss of amenity land and felt that maintenance access to the stream should be retained. Concern was also expressed that the application was retrospective.*

*The following two applications were considered together:*

**04/01379/ALB**

**SUPPORT**

3 Manor Street

Demolition of outbuilding

**04/01556/ACD**

**SUPPORT**

3 Manor Street

Demolition of outbuilding

*Support was given subject to the Historic Buildings Officer's report*

**04/01381/ALB**

**SUPPORT**

3 Manor Street

Replace rear window and door

*Support was given subject to the Historic Buildings Officer's report; Members hoped that the alterations would be in keeping.*

**04/01382/ALB**

**SUPPORT**

3 Manor Street

Conversion of cellar to living accommodation

*Support was given subject to the Historic Buildings Officer's report; Members were in favour of the use of a redundant space.*

**04/01392/APP**

**SUPPORT**

Baileys Solicitors, 18 West Street

Change of use from shop and offices to 2n<sup>o</sup> flats

**04/01411/APP**

5 Sandy Close  
Rear conservatory

**SUPPORT**

**04/01440/AAD**

Tesco Store, London Road  
Erection of 10 double sided directional signs

**SUPPORT**

**04/01441/APP**

81 Fishers Field

Conversion of garage to studio and erection of rear conservatory and first floor balcony

*Members opposed the conversion of the garage: these are terraced townhouses three stories high with the garage as ground floor and the layout of the street is not suitable for the frontage parking caused by the loss of garages. The proposed railing was well forward of the building line and at variance with the style of the street frontages, as was the pitched roof to the entrance. The shape of the proposed studio window was also out of keeping with the existing street scene.*

*It was considered that the high brick wall each side of the 'conservatory' effectively rendered it an extension; Members would have preferred to see a greater proportion of glass involved for less impact on neighbouring properties.*

*It was also felt that the front and rear proposals should have been the subject of separate applications for separate comment and response.*

*Members asked that the Committee schedule a site visit to judge the effect of the proposals for themselves.*

**OPPOSE**

**04/01505/APP**

24 Page Hill Avenue

Single storey rear extension and first floor side extension

*Members were happy to see the application modified with respect to the proximity to the side boundary but felt that turning the extension roof ridge at right angles to the existing and not making it subsidiary made the effect very blocky; a subsidiary ridge would add variety to the street scene.*

**OPPOSE**

**04/01506/APP**

2 Edmonds Close

Two storey and single storey front extension

*Members felt that the forward extension with its roof ridge at right angles to the road was out of keeping with the street scene where all the other roofs were parallel with the road, and that it eliminated the stepped-front interest of the property.*

**OPPOSE**

**04/01544/APP**

Lockmeadow Cottage, Stratford Road

Two storey front extension

*Support was given subject to the Historic Buildings Officer's report and reference to the Vision and Design Statement.*

**SUPPORT**

**04/01611/APP**

7 Boswell Court

Rear single storey extension and pitched roof to front porch

**SUPPORT**

**04/01612/APP**

**SUPPORT**

35 Chandos Road  
Single storey and first floor rear extension

*It was noted that there was no yellow notice posted adjacent to the site. Clerk to check whether one had been posted and reserve the right to amend Members' decision if not.  
[Clerk's note: Planning Officer confirms notice was posted 22/6/04]*

*The following Minor Amended Plans were posted for information only:*

04/01001/APP Burrows Field, Radclive Road Change of use of the land for the siting of sixteen mobile homes etc.

*Additional information supplied – names of the occupants*

04/01318/APP National Westminster Bank, 2 Market Hill

*Name of bank changed from Royal Bank of Scotland, address amended from 1 – 7 Market Hill*

**4666 PLANNING CONTROL**

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

**APPROVED**

04/00323/APP 29 Overn Avenue	2st.side extension,rear conservatory & loft conv. (minor amended plans – no further comment)	Oppose
04/00871/ALB 59 Nelson Street	Relocation of bathroom	Support
04/00954/APP 44 Aris Way	Insertion of dormer windows over garage	Support
04/00956/APP 13 Highlands Road	Single st.rear extn, conv.roof space to living accom.	Support
04/00998/ALB 6 Castle Street	Internal alterations and repairs	Support
04/01009/ATP 4 Bostock Court	Pollard one willow tree	Support
04/01103/APP 14 Mare Leys	Two storey side extension & conservatory to rear (Amended plans	Oppose Support)

**REFUSED**

04/00907/APP 25 Moreton Drive	Part first floor and ground floor extension	Oppose
-------------------------------	---	--------

**WITHDRAWN**

03/03061/APP 18 West Street	Ch. use of ground floor from retail to takeaway food and first floor from office to residential	Oppose
04/00869/APP 8 Middlefield Close	First floor extension	Support

**REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

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

04/00816/APP 9 Fleet Close	First and second floor extension
----------------------------	----------------------------------

**4667 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS**

4667.1 (4660.2) Response to AVDC Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on “Sport and Leisure Facilities” and “Delivering Affordable Housing”

Copies of the Chairman's responses to the questionnaires and some details of the content of the two SPGs had been circulated to Members.

#### 4667.1.1 Affordable Housing

The Chairman had criticised the lack of clarity over the percentages of “affordable” and “low cost” housing, and disagreed with alternative off-site provision as likely to lead to ghetto areas.

Members queried the SPG figure of “minimum 20% and up to 30%” of affordable housing on developments of 25 or more dwellings when the Government guidelines were for 46-49% and noted that a preponderance of larger houses had been built recently in the town and there was a need for a balancing number of smaller, affordable dwellings.

*Cllrs. Strain-Clark & Stuchbury left the meeting briefly to deal with a disturbance outside.*

#### 4667.1.2 Sports & Leisure Facilities

The Chairman had found the SPG short and to the point and with useful tables of facility provision. He also felt that a regular audit and review of provision should be carried out.

Members felt that the differences between Buckingham and Winslow, Wendover and Haddenham should be pointed out: all four had been listed in the table for similar provision. The last two had better transport facilities and were close enough to Aylesbury to share its leisure facilities while Buckingham, and to a certain extent Winslow, were sufficiently isolated as to serve as regional centres and required a higher level of provision. Members also criticised the short time allowed for consultation. A follow-up letter to the questionnaire response would be sent.

**ACTION THE CHAIRMAN/THE CLERK**

#### 4667.2 English Historic Towns Forum’s Focus on the Public Realm

A copy of this publication, which identifies the issues surrounding management of the public realm in historic towns and cities – problems, and examples of good practice - was available in the Office.

#### 4667.3 Press release on PPS 6 (via D.I.S. issue 582)

A copy had been circulated separately to the Committee.

### **4668 CORRESPONDENCE**

#### 4668.1 04/00323/APP: 29 Overn Avenue; AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

Members had opposed the application: “*Members felt that the extension turned a single fronted house into a double fronted house with no appearance of the new build being subsidiary to the existing*”.

Members had made no further comment on minor amendments (1) Details of parking and conservatory, and (2) showing proposed extension roof to be subsidiary to existing, and related alterations.

AVDC: “During the processing of the application the two-storey side extension was amended to incorporate a lower ridgeline and a set back from the rear elevation such that the extension would appear subordinate to the main dwelling. Whilst the development would result in a double fronted house, this was not considered unacceptable and the inclusion of the bay window to the front elevation would match that of the existing dwelling and would help to integrate the extension and to have due regard to the character

and appearance of the existing property. Members were satisfied that the development would have an acceptable impact and as such supported the Officer's recommendation."

4668.2 AVDC: Adoption of Open Space at Treefields Caravan Park; + progress on Heartland and Holloway Spinney areas

AVDC reported that the open space at Treefields had recently been transferred to AVDC, that adoption of the Heartlands was in its final stages; and that adoption of Holloway Spinney, which had been delayed by lack of maintenance and ownership of a small piece of the property, was now proceeding.

Members felt that these pieces of land should be controlled by the Town Council, with any associated commuted sums for their maintenance, for the best future town facilities.

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Desorgher, and **RECOMMENDED** that this Council open negotiations with AVDC with a view to taking over these areas of land.

4668.3 (4660.1) AVDC Design Awards 2004

Bernardines Way had already been judged for the Award two years ago so was ineligible. Members were reminded of the unveiling ceremony at Pateman Close on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2004 at 11am.

4668.4 Enforcement issues: Buckingham Buildbase

Buckingham Buildbase were claiming use of the land along the BP fence for storage of bulk materials in excess of 10 years, and therefore that planning permission was not required. AVDC had asked for evidence for or against this assertion.

The other firms operating in Wharf Yard, BP, and Mrs Smith and Mrs. Robinson had been approached for their views, and these would be passed on to the Enforcement Team.

Cllr. Desorgher stated that she had her car serviced in the Yard and that the stated use had begun after she had moved to the town 9 years ago.

*Cllr. Barnett left the meeting*

4668.5 (4647.1) Brookfield Lane site: BCC Estates Dept response

The Valuation Team Leader, while unable to disclose confidential details of the disposal of the property, gave it as his opinion that developers are generally not prepared to agree a sale condition where the landowner does not control the outcome of the condition. The Chairman noted that this was contrary to the statement made by the developer's representative.

Members asked for information on the proposed re-routing of Dark Alley, with respect to the prevention of crime and the low lighting levels proposed for the development.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

**4669 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS**

A proposal to move the August 9<sup>th</sup> meeting to August 2<sup>nd</sup> - before the meeting of the Full Council - for the convenience of Members was **AGREED** unanimously.

Meeting closed at: 8.45pm

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