

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON MONDAY 19th JUNE 2006 AT 7.55pm following the Interim Council meeting

PRESENT: Councillors Mrs. P. Desorgher
G. Loftus
Mrs. P. Stevens (Chairman)
Mrs. C. Strain-Clark
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 Councillors P. Collins (Mayor), R. Lehmann, H. Lewis and H. Mordue.

4929 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4930 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 5th June 2006 to be ratified on 17th July 2006 were received. There were no matters arising.

4931 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

06/01224/APP **SUPPORT**
11 Westfields
Two storey side extension

06/01232/APP **SUPPORT**
Manor Farm, Bourton Road
Change of use from B1 offices to A2
Members were content to support in this case, but in general would oppose the location of A2 class businesses out of the town centre

06/01316/ALB **SUPPORT**
Sandon House, 20 Moreton Road
Replacement of front bay window
Support was given subject to the requirements of the Historic Buildings Officer. Members noted that no details of the replacement window were supplied.

06/01392/APP Holly House, 2 Salisbury Cottages, Bath Lane Installation of solar water heating collectors either side of gable roof	SUPPORT
06/01422/APP 5 Boswell Court Erection of conservatory	SUPPORT
06/01463/APP 62 Overn Avenue Erection of conservatory	SUPPORT
06/01485/ALB 22 Moreton Road Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of new conservatory	SUPPORT

The following minor amended plans were posted for Members' information only:

06/00984/APP Rear of Stratford House, High Street Erection of garage building with No.2 flats above.

Amendments show deletion of two skylights in front elevation and provision of 2 additional parking places.

4932 PLANNING CONTROL

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

APPROVED

06/00820/APP	32 Clover End	Two storey side extension to form annexe	Oppose
06/00982/AAD	Esso Stn., bypass	Erection of illuminated sign	Support

REFUSED

06/00543/APP	51-53 Badgers Way	Erection of two storey dwelling+integral garaging	Oppose
06/00580/APP	land adj.14 Pitchford Ave.	Ch. use amenity land to residential garden	Oppose
06/00839/APP	24 West St.	Erection of 3 storey building for 3 No. flats	Oppose

SPLIT DECISION

06/00947/AAD	Ring Road Garage	APPROVED Display of illuminated fascia signs & logo boxes	Support
		REFUSED Display of pylon signs	Oppose

WITHDRAWN

06/00964/APP	land rear 1 Mitre St.	Change of use of land for residential use	(Support)
06/00995/APP	land at Bridge Street	Erection 153 homes, shop, gym, café & parking	(Oppose)

4933 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS

4933.1 AV Local Development Framework Consultation

The booklet had been circulated to Members before the meeting.

The Committee decided that a formal Town Council response should be made, although Members could also make individual responses if they wished.

Cllr. P. Strain-Clark and Cllr. Stuchbury would draw up a recommended response to be ratified at the Council meeting on July 17th; the Clerk to check with Forward Plans if a response after the final response date would be accepted.

ACTION CLLRS. P. STRAIN-CLARK & STUCHBURY, COMMITTEE CLERK
Clerk's note, 20/6/06: This would be acceptable provided the response was received by the 21st July 2006.

4933.2 CPRE's Fieldwork June 2006 issue

This publication was available from the office.

4934 CORRESPONDENCE

4934.1 (06/00183/APP 35 Moreton Road. Erection of detached garage with first floor flat) AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

Members had **SUPPORTED** the application.

AVDC **REFUSED**: "The application site is located adjacent to the designated Buckingham Conservation Area and clear views of the site are achieved from within the Conservation Area and the street scene in general. There is also a difference of some 5m in ground levels between the Moreton Road and the location of the proposed building.

Firstly with regard to the proposed design and scale of the development and the impact this would have upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the adjacent conservation area. Although the development was proposed to be set back from the main road frontage (Moreton Road), it was considered that by virtue of its scale and the significant differences in ground levels between the site and the Moreton Road, that the proposed development would compete visually with the original property and dominate views from the Moreton Road and in particular out of the conservation area.

Secondly, turning to the proposed appearance of the development, it was considered that the appearance of the elevation fronting Moreton road had limited fenestration or detailing resulting in a large bulky and intrusive form of development. By virtue of this the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its setting and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the adjacent conservation area.

Finally, consideration was given to the suitability of the level of accommodation proposed within the annex at first-floor level, it was considered that the level of accommodation to be provided could not be regarded as ancillary to the main residential dwelling and would result in a new self-contained unit being introduced. The proposals would therefore be tantamount to the creation of a new dwelling, in a location where a new dwelling would not be permitted."

4934.2 (06/00350/APP 14 Gilbert Scott Road. Single storey side extension and inclusion of open space land within residential curtilage – renewal of planning approval 01/00539/APP) AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

Members had **OPPOSED**: *Members felt strongly that public open space should not be enclosed; they had opposed the original application for this reason and their view had not changed.*

AVDC **APPROVED**: "When reporting the application to committee on the 20th April 2006, the case officer recommended that the application be approved, having regard for policy GP85 of the AVDLP and the planning history of the site.

With regards to the planning history of the site, the site and its surroundings have not changed since the previous consent and it was considered by officers that the current renewal application is still in accordance with the appeal decision and would not detract from the existing site or surroundings. In addition there is still time in which the original permission could be implemented. Although the Local Plan has changed since the appeal decision, the essence of the relevant policies remains the same. Whilst it is accepted that the proposal involved the loss of a small section of the

amenity space to the side of no.14 Gilbert Scott Road, it was concluded that the remaining area would be sufficiently wide to maintain the open setting of the properties on either side of Bradfield Avenue. The proposal would not therefore have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the locality.”

4934.3 (06/00700/APP 44 Meadway: Two storey side extension) AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

Members had **OPPOSED**: *Members felt that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site.*

AVDC **APPROVED**: “The Town Council objection was based on the size of the proposal, which was considered to be an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal was considered to be a modest extension in comparison with the size of the original dwelling, which would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the original dwelling. The extension would be visible in the street scene but would be subservient to the main dwelling with a reduced ridge height and set back and materials to match existing and therefore it was considered that the impact on the street scene would be minimal.”

4934.4 ref. 06/00820/APP (32 Clover End): letter from P. Howell

Mr. Howell had complained that the application had been determined before the final date for Neighbour Response (June 13th) published on the website. He had further information to put before the Planning Officer on June 7th and was told it was too late. The application was determined by the DCC on 1st June.

Members felt that the web site dates should be the ones adhered to, as the ones available to the public; to do otherwise was to deny the public their right to comment. A letter would be sent to AVDC Legal Department, copied to the Head of Planning and Mr. Howell to this effect.

ACTION THE CLERK

4935 PRESS RELEASES

Members agreed there were no matters requiring a press release covered in the meeting. It was felt that the release on the Bridge Street site, which received front page coverage in the *Advertiser* of 16th June 2006, was very effective.

4936 CHAIRMAN’S ITEMS

4936.1 (4927.9) Cecil’s Yard

No objection had been received, so the name was confirmed.

4936.2 Minor amended plans

Attention was drawn to the Minor Amended Plans listed above, which had arrived after the agenda had been sent out.

Meeting closed at: 8.20pm

CHAIRMAN DATE