

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON MONDAY 30th JANUARY 2006 AT 7.05 PM

PRESENT: Councillors J. Barnett
P. Collins (Mayor)
Mrs. P. Desorgher
H. Lewis (Chairman)
G. Loftus
H. Mordue
P. Strain-Clark
R Stuchbury
Also Attending: Cllr. D. Isham

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W.McElligott

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillor Mrs. P. Stevens.

4886 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest at this point.

4887 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3rd January 2006, to be put before the Council for ratification on 20th February 2006, were accepted. The Chairman confirmed that, after discussion, the response for application 05/02520/APP was **SUPPORT**.

4888 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

05/03042/APP

SUPPORT

The Orchard, Brackley Road

Alterations and extensions to provide additional first floor accommodation. Second storey floor extension

Members noted that two neighbours had written in support of the application, and the response should draw attention to this.

05/03123/APP

25 Nelson Street

Change of use from domestic garage to garage/office accommodation and roof extension to create first floor

Members were advised that the applicant had e-mailed that day to indicate that the application had been withdrawn.

The application was nevertheless discussed with the comments to lie on file if notification of withdrawal was received from AVDC or to be sent to AVDC if not.

*Members **OPPOSED**, feeling the site was inappropriate for office use and that deliveries would adversely impact on neighbours' shared access and parking. Any future change to residential use would be resisted, due to the position of the building in the flood plain.*

[Clerk's note: application is listed as WITHDRAWN 31/1/06]

05/03132/APP

OPPOSE

22 Grenville Road

Two storey side extension and removal of existing garage

Members noted that the proposal more than doubled the existing dwelling, which was situated in a street of small homes, and opposed on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and effect on the street scene.

05/03143/APP

SUPPORT

1 Chandos Close

Two storey and single storey rear extensions

Members felt that the proposed extension was of a suitable size for the site, but that it could be made clearly subsidiary to the existing house.

05/03159/APP

SUPPORT

15 Pitchford Avenue

Demolition of conservatory and erection of two storey side extension

06/00059/APP

SUPPORT

49 Embleton Way

Single storey rear extension

The following two applications had not yet appeared in the Bulletin due to continuing work on the AVDC computer system; however the 'yellow notices' had been posted, with a response date of 6th February.

06/00096/APP

SUPPORT

64 Waine Close

Single storey rear extension and front porch with canopy

06/00100/APP

SUPPORT

8 Wharfside Place

Single storey rear extension and covered walkway

Cllr. Stuchbury declared an interest in the following application as a parent of a pupil at the school

CC/04/06 (06/00150/ACC)

NOTED

Bourton Meadow Combined School

Renewal of temporary planning permission for temporary classroom no 398.

Members noted the application but would prefer to see a permanent building, which would be of greater benefit to the pupils

The following minor amended plans are posted for members' information only:

05/02713/AAD 12 Cornwalls Centre

Amendment shows fascia sign placed below upper windows instead of above, with spotlamps over

4889 PLANNING CONTROL

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

APPROVED

05/02708/APP 11 Holloway Drive	Two storey front extension	Support
05/02713/AAD 12 Cornwalls Centre	Erection of externally illuminated sign	Support
05/02714/APP U.of Buckingham, Chandos Rd.	Replace wooden gates with screen & double door	Support
05/02784/APP Office Block 1, Tingewick Rd.	Erection of loading/unloading docking side bay	Support
05/02947/ATP Land off Hilltop Ave.	Works to trees	Support

NO OBJECTION

05/03142/ACC B.Knowledge Centre, Verney Close Amendments to elevations Partial Support
(CC/60/05)

REFUSED

05/02680/APP Castle House Reinstatement brick wall & timber gate, + fanlight Support

PLANNING APPEAL LODGED

05/01890/APP 40 Highlands Road Single storey rear and side extension
(BTC **SUPPORTED** subject to officer assessment of effect on neighbours and the distance between the new build and boundaries, which could not be judged without access; AVDC **REFUSED**, citing adverse effect on neighbours' amenity)

REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

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

05/03103/ATC 7 Victoria Row Fell Horse Chestnut & Staghorn and crown thin Cherry tree.

4890 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS

4890.1 (4883.2) Report from Cllr. Strain-Clark on and recommended responses to the proposed modifications to the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2004-2016
Members had been circulated with Cllr. Strain-Clark's recommendations with the agenda. Proposed by Cllr. Lewis, seconded by Cllr. Stuchbury, and **AGREED** that these recommendations as circulated be put before the Council for ratification at the Interim Meeting following due to the proximity of the response date.

4890.2 (4883.3) Report from Cllr. Stevens on and recommended response to the Consultation on Planning Policy 25: Flood Risk

In the unexpected absence of Cllr. Stevens, the discussion was based on the information circulated with the agenda.

In general, Members supported Option 2 (to issue PPS25 as revised, subject to consultation responses and to support it with practical guidance).

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Strain-Clark, and **RECOMMENDED** that the response from this Council also emphasises that it does not under any circumstances support building houses on a flood plain.

Members also considered the rejected option (para.29) of making flood risk assessments a statutory requirement.

Proposed by Cllr. Lewis, seconded by Cllr. Barnett, and **RECOMMENDED** that this Council advocate as a statutory prerequisite for any scheme proposed on land subject to flood risk, that a flood risk assessment be carried out by the developer.

Proposed by Cllr. Lewis, seconded by Cllr. Loftus, and **RECOMMENDED** that this Council support Option 2, with the additional comments as above.

4890.3 (4883.4) Report from Cllr. Lewis on and recommended response to the *Planning-gain Supplement: a consultation.*

Cllr. Lewis outlined the changes to the s106 system and Members discussed the Chairman's recommendations circulated with the agenda, in particular the exclusion of home extensions from the new tax levied on the difference between land value pre- and post- development.

Q4.2: Members felt that percentages of house types and sizes prescribed at the planning stage should be maintained for at least 5 years; any extension proposed within that time should be taxed as if a larger new house had been built on that site.

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Strain-Clark, and **AGREED** that the response from this Council suggests that development of extensions to new buildings within 5 years of occupation be considered for planning gain tax liability.

Q5.1: Members were concerned that leisure & cultural facilities and Community Centres were excluded from s106 uses, pointing out that Open Space provision was included and that this often overlapped with leisure facilities.

Q6.1: Members felt that the Parish level would be best able to decide where funding should be used; if there was no suitable project within the parish where development was proposed, then the District or County Councils could put forward suggestions for discussion.

Proposed by Cllr. Barnett, seconded by Cllr. Lewis, and **AGREED** that the Chairman's recommendation be amended to read

“Should allow local Parish, District and County Councils to agree where funding should be used on their own Parish or region”.

Proposed by Cllr. Lewis, seconded by Cllr. Stuchbury, and **RECOMMENDED** that the Chairman's recommendations with the above amendments (as listed in Appendix A) form this Council's response to the Planning-gain consultation.

4891 CORRESPONDENCE

4891.1 05/02483/APP 48 Bourton Road; erection of rear roof extension

Members **SUPPORTED** the original application described as 'Insertion of front skylight and rear roof dormer'.

AVDC subsequently amended the description to 'Insertion of front rooflight and rear roof extension'; Members made no comment on this amendment.

AVDC **REFUSED** the application: "The proposed development comprising the roof extension, would represent a significant alteration to the existing dwelling-house. The extension would dominate the appearance of the rear roof slope and indeed the dwelling as a whole and it would be visible from the rear gardens of the adjacent neighbouring properties and in glimpses from Bourton Road. The development would appear incongruous and out of keeping and, furthermore, the use of white plastic weatherboarding would make the development even more prominent. The development was considered to be unacceptable and the application was subsequently refused."

Members may like to note that the roof extension is referred to as a dormer in the drawings supplied and the colour of the weatherboarding to the sides of the dormer is not specified.

4891.2(4822.1) Street Naming: Land between Brookfield Lane and Chandos Road (copy of letter to developer)

AVDC: "The information provided by all parties has been taken into consideration and I can confirm that this Council has chosen Buckingham Town Council's suggestion of Wagland's Garden. We believe that the Rotherfield name is already in existence and confusion may occur when trying to locate either the sixth form centre or the new dwellings whilst the relevance of the name Wagland would be lost if not remembered for this site."

The Section 18 notice was posted on 3rd January, and allows 21 days for objections to be lodged.

Members asked that a letter be sent to Street Naming thanking the officer for taking the Town Council's comments and views into consideration.

4891.305/00548/CON Jardines Chemist: Alleged unauthorised siting of two air conditioning units

In 2002 the Town Audit noted the air conditioning units on the bakery wall facing the Old Gaol, installed without permission; AVDC wrote in October 2005 that the units had been removed and the file would be closed. We advised AVDC that the units had merely been moved to the rear of the premises facing the Whale.

AVDC Enforcement, January 2006: "I can confirm that a site visit has been undertaken and it was observed that the building to which the air conditioning units were attached was not a listed building. In view of this information, Listed Building consent is not required. Consideration was given to the siting of the units on a building in the Conservation Area. It was decided that the position was the least prominent and that it did not materially affect the appearance of the building, therefore it has been agreed that this file can be closed."

4892 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

(4885) College Farm application

Several more letters of complaint had been copied to the Committee.

Meeting closed at: 8.20pm

CHAIRMAN DATE

APPENDIX A

Recommended response to Planning-gain Supplement: a consultation.

Chapter 2

Q2.1 What further clarifications to the definitions of planning value and current use value would be helpful to provide further certainty to developers?

No further definitions required

Q2.2 How can the self-assessment of PGS valuations and liability be made as easy to comply with as possible?

Current guide is clear

Q2.3 What information on the condition of land at the granting of full planning permission should be made available to the chargeable person?

Full information should be given with estimate of value prior to planning permission and after permission granted

Chapter 3

Q3.1 Should payment of PGS occur at the commencement of development or another point in the development process?

Part payment on commencement and balance on completion.

Q3.2 Should the Development Start Notice be submitted to the local authority or HMRC?

Start Notice should be issued by Local Authority

Q3.3 How should the proposed approach to compliance fit with larger, phased developments?

Assessment should be broken down into the various stages or phases.

Chapter 4

Q4.1 To encourage regeneration, should a lower rate of PGS be applied to brownfield land? What might be the drawbacks?

Lower rates should apply to brown field sites

Q4.2 How should a PGS threshold for small-scale development be set? What factors should be considered?

In general, home improvement and extensions to existing dwellings should be excluded, except that extensions to new buildings within 5 years of first occupation should be considered for planning gain tax liability, to discourage instant enlargement of homes to the detriment of the planned percentages of different sizes and types of housing.

Chapter 5

Q5.1 Does the development-site environment approach proposed here represent an effective and transparent means of reducing the scope of planning obligations?

Planning obligations should not be reduced and if not part of a section 106 agreement should form part of any planning consent. Open space provision may overlap with leisure or cultural uses, so these should not be excluded, nor should Community Halls or Centres.

Q5.2 How should infrastructure no longer funded through planning obligations be provided, including through the use of PGS revenues?

Funded in part by PGS but supported by central government grants

Chapter 6

Q6.1 How should PGS revenues be recycled to the local level for local priorities

The local Parish Council, District and County Councils should agree where funding should be used in their own Parish, primarily, or region, secondarily.

Q6.2 How should PGS revenues be used to fund strategic infrastructure at the regional level?

Q6.3 How can local and regional stakeholders, including business, help determine the strategic infrastructure priorities most necessary to unlock housing development?

Key decisions must be taken by local councils not unelected regional stakeholders.

P38 & 39

Option 1 – Do nothing

Option 2 – Optional Planning Charge based on the impact of the development on local infrastructure

Option 3 – Planning-gain Supplement based on the increase in value of the land between immediately before planning permission is granted and immediately after planning permission is granted.

Option 3 - Recommend Support of the PGS in principle