

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY 2ND MAY 2006 AT 7.25pm
following the Interim Council Meeting and Public Session.

PRESENT: Councillors J. Barnett
P. Collins (Mayor)
Mrs. P. Desorgher
R. Lehmann
G. Loftus
H. Mordue
P. Strain-Clark (Vice-Chairman)
R Stuchbury
Also Attending: Cllr. D. Isham
For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W. McElligott

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillors H. Lewis (Chairman) and Mrs. P. Stevens. In the absence of the Chairman, the meeting was taken by the Vice-Chairman.

4914 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4915 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 18th April 2006 to be put before the Council on ratified on 30th May 2006 were received. There were no matters arising.

4916 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

06/00939/APP

SUPPORT

70 Moorhen Way

Two storey front extension

06/00947/AAD

SUPPORT

Ring Road Garage

Display of illuminated signs, pylon signs and logo boxes

Support was given subject to the pylon not being illuminated, which was felt to be a distraction for drivers so close to the roundabout.

It was also noted that no 'yellow notice' had been posted at the site.

06/00964/APP

SUPPORT

Land to the rear 1 Mitre Street

Change of use of land for residential use and extension to summer house

Members asked that the appearance of the extension be sympathetic to its position adjacent to the oldest house in the town.

06/00982/AAD

SUPPORT

Esso Petrol Filling Station, Buckingham Ring Road

Erection of illuminated sign

06/00984/APP

OPPOSE

Rear of Stratford House, High Street

Erection of garage building with 2 N^o. flats above

Members felt that an additional two dwellings on this site constituted overdevelopment, and were also concerned about the flats overlooking adjacent properties. Disquiet was also expressed about the additional parking area adjacent to the flood plain, and movement in and out of the narrow entrance on to a busy section of road.

The following application had not arrived in time for the meeting:

06/00969/APP

Swan Business Park, Osier Way

Construction of Industrial Estate Road

06/00988/APP

SUPPORT

Project Street Life, rear of 3 West Street

Renewal of permission (04/00857/APP) for use as alcohol free bar for young people

06/00995/APP

OPPOSE

Land off Bridge Street

Erection of 153 homes, 87 square metres of retail, 188 square metre café, 263 square metre gymnasium, car parking and public riverside amenity including footpath link and semi-aquatic area

Members discussed the proposals in some detail and at length, and described the design as imaginative and having taken into account the materials and individual style of Buckingham buildings. The principal points raised were:

1. Though the car park area is in private ownership, it is well used and these cars would still require parking spaces; as no 'spare' places were to be provided within the site, additional pressure would be placed on Cornwall's Meadow car park, already at capacity, or on surrounding streets. Members spoke with feeling of the difficulty of finding a space in Cornwall's Meadow during the day, most days, and disagreed with the survey findings submitted.

2. The proposed use of Cornwall's Meadow car park for overflow parking for a residential development, due to the absence of adequate provision on the site for two-vehicle households, visitors and customers/clients of the businesses, was detrimental to its use by the general public.

3. Concern was expressed at the accuracy of the predicted 40 traffic movements in and out of the site in the morning peak. Whereas the car park took traffic out of the road system, a residential development added vehicles during the morning peak, and it could be expected

that a majority of the flats would be occupied by young working people leading to considerably more than 40 vehicles attempting to emerge into Bridge Street at this time. Vehicles wishing to turn right towards the town centre posed a particular problem, and it might be that a left-turn only rule would need to apply; vehicles waiting to leave the development would impede pedestrians on the footway. The existing congestion at the Bridge Street/Bourton Road/London Road/Chandos Road/Ford Street junction at this time of the morning, especially in term time with the movements of school buses, could only be added to when the sites at Coopers Yard (03/00131/APP: 20 dwellings) and Chandos Road (03/03202/APP: 19 dwellings) became fully occupied. Congestion is exacerbated by the necessarily repeated use of the pedestrian controlled crossing south of the bridge as there was no footway across the river on the same side of the road as the three schools.

*3. Clause BU7 of the AVDLP states: Outside the Primary Shopping Frontages of the Central Shopping Area preference will be given to retail uses. Non-shop uses that complement the diversity of uses in these parts of the town centre may be permitted between retail premises where the attractiveness and interest of the street scene is maintained, **but adjacent non-shop uses will be resisted** [our emphasis]. Members preferred these types of use for such a central and accessible site.*

*Reference was also made to AVDLP paragraphs 6.27(There are two areas, shown on the Proposals Map, which are considered the best sites for new shopping in the Plan period. Both are under-utilised or vacant. The frontage properties, many of which are listed, should be retained but the backland offers opportunities for development that is supportive of and complementary to the town centre.) and 6.28 (In line with the parking policy in the Plan, parking provision will be provided as a maximum figure. **The parking provided should serve the town centre as a whole and not just the development - it should therefore be publicly available for shoppers and other short-term users.**) [our emphasis]. Members felt that the parking space included in the proposal did not meet this requirement.*

4. "Transport Assessment, para. 5.2.4: A significant proportion of the potential residents would be likely to work within the immediate area and would therefore be able to utilise non-motorised transport modes." Without further commercial development in the town centre, there will be no increase in jobs available within walking distance. At the very least, for safety reasons, footpaths/cycleways would have to be provided by other entities to access the industrial areas south of the by-pass.

5. Buckingham is a market town, with limited facilities. The premises laid out in the planning statement would require considerable investment in public transport, particularly evening services, to become feasible. Investment in other infrastructure, such as leisure facilities and sewage treatment may also be required. There are already (see 2, above) 39 additional domestic premises being added to the antiquated sewer system in this immediate area, with the planned development at Moreton Road due to add more pressure on the treatment works.

6. The river level varies widely over the seasons, and Members would appreciate independent confirmation that adequate flow through the pond would be maintained, to prevent stagnation or drying out in periods of low water levels. The pond area could well become a litter-filled eyesore, and a health hazard if stagnant.

7. The inclusion of the suggested new footbridge in the drawings supporting the application when not part of the application, nor a part of a future phase application by this developer, was misleading.

Members asked that the Development Control Committee make a site visit during the morning peak hours on a school day to judge the problems for themselves, including Cornwall's Meadow car park in the visit to visualise the effect of the additional vehicles

displaced by the development. Members also indicated that personal representation of the Town Council's concerns should be made when the application was considered by the Committee.

Proposed by Cllr. Lehmann, seconded by Cllr. Stuchbury, and **AGREED** unanimously, that the Vice-Chairman represent this Council at the DCC meeting when eventually held; and should he be unavailable when the date was set, the Committee would select another member to voice this Council's concerns.

4917 PLANNING CONTROL

The following planning decisions had been received from Aylesbury Vale District Council;

APPROVED

04/03434/APP Stratford House	Demol.existing/erect 4 dwellings + parking+ carport	Oppose
06/00101/APP 42 Moorhen Way	Conv/Extn garage to provide living accommodation	Support
06/00298/APP Land, Avenue Ho.	Erection 2st. detached dwelling	Support
06/00313/APP 30 Lenborough Cl.	Erection of conservatory	Support
06/00333/APP BT Cricket Club	Erection of changing room facility	Support
06/00443/APP 3 Martin Close	Erection of conservatory – retrospective	Support

4918 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS

4918.1 To receive a draft response from the Chairman on the South East Plan Consultation, for ratification at 30th May Council meeting (response date 23rd June)

In the absence of Cllr. Lewis, this matter was deferred to the 5th June meeting, for ratification at the interim Council meeting on June 19th.

4918.2 To consider entries for the AVDC Design Awards 2006 (residential development, including extensions and restorations)

Councillors suggested

1. 12-18 Stratford Road (Application 05/01561/APP)
2. Cemetery Lodge

ACTION THE COMMITTEE CLERK

4919 CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS

There were no Chairman's items.

Meeting closed at: 8.10

CHAIRMAN DATE