

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL** held on **THURSDAY 17 JUNE 2021** at 7:00 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Legg (Chair)  
Councillors Baume, McLean, Reilly and Taylor.

**Officers:** E Verdegem, T Barton (Planning Officer), G Davies (Senior Planning Officer), E Gineikiene (Senior Solicitor - Planning) and D Imbimbo (Committee Manager)

**Also Present:** Councillors P Geary, D Hopkins and D Hosking

**DCP01 INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed members of the public and councillors, advising that the meeting was being held both in the Civic Offices and remotely and would be broadcast live on YouTube, further explaining the procedures to be adopted.

**DCP02 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

Mr D Cooke, Mr D Woodhouse, Councillor Taylor (Walton Community Council) and Councillor D Hopkins (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection to application 21/00400/FUL Change of use from a single dwelling (use class C3) to a five bedroom House in Multiple Occupation including widening of parking area and vehicle crossover from street (re-submission of 20/01259/FUL) at 2 Farjeon Court, Old Farm Park, Milton Keynes.

The Applicant declined the right of reply.

Mr B Peters, Councillor P Geary (Ward Councillor) (also representing Olney Town Council), and Councillor D Hosking (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection to Application 21/00301/FUL, Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 no dwellings with associated parking at 11 Beech Avenue, Olney, Milton Keynes

The Applicant's Agent Mr F Hickling (Applicant's Representative) exercised the right of reply.

**DCP03 APPLICATIONS**

**21/00400/FUL CHANGE OF USE FROM A SINGLE DWELLING (USE CLASS C3) TO A FIVE BEDROOM HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION INCLUDING WIDENING OF PARKING AREA AND VEHICLE CROSSOVER FROM STREET (RE-SUBMISSION OF 20/01259/FUL) AT 2 FARJEON COURT, OLD FARM PARK, MILTON KEYNES MR DAVID WRIGHT.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was confirmed that the

recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel Report.

The Panel heard from objectors who reaffirmed the objections as detailed in the Panel report, no new material planning concerns were raised.

During the course of the presentations from objectors a number of non-material matters including allegations in respect of the character of the applicant were made, the Chair, having stopped the speaker making the allegations, reminded the Panel that such matters were not to be considered in determining the application.

The applicant declined the right of reply.

Councillor Legg, seconded by Councillor McLean, proposed that the Officer recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report be agreed.

The Panel heard, in response to a question, that the 'character' of a street was assessed on any changes to the appearance or design of a proposed development and was further informed by the concentration of Houses in Multiple Occupation within a defined area. In this instance no external changes were proposed and the application did not exceed the concentration limit for Houses in Multiple Occupation as set out in Plan:MK.

Members of the Panel sought further clarification in respect of the potential encroachment of the pavement by vehicles parking in the spaces provided on the plot. The Planning Officer explained that it was not possible to determine exactly how much, if any, of a parked vehicle could be on the pavement as it would be dependent on what sort of vehicle an occupant had, however the spaces that were provided were of the size required but the expected circulation space surrounding them was not as wide as required. This however, in the view of Highways Officers, did not present any road safety issues and was therefore not considered a reasonable issue to refuse the application on. It was further noted that similar cases that had been taken to appeal had been upheld.

Discussion was also had in respect of the potential for the number of vehicles owned by occupants to far exceed the required number of parking spaces provided, with the potential to incur 'on street'

parking. This was acknowledged by the planning Officer but the Panel was reminded that the policy standard had been met in terms of the number of spaces provided, and was not a reasonable ground to refuse the application. It was further noted that the Highways Assessment would have taken account of emergency access for fire and ambulance.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried, with Councillors Baume, Legg and Reilly voting in favour and Councillors McLean and Taylor abstaining from the vote.

RESOLVED –

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as detailed within the Panel report.

21/00301/FUL

**DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF 3 NO DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AT 11 BEECH AVENUE, OLNEY, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR CARL BENNETT.**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation, the Panel heard that the Officer recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report.

The Panel heard from objectors who reaffirmed the objections as detailed in the Panel report, it was in particular commented that the development of 3 large dwelling houses would result in parking spaces being situated in positions that were difficult to access and would require significant manoeuvring to use, some of the separation distances would not be as required by the residential design guide, and is described in the report as ‘broadly compliant with separation distances.’ and that generally the proposal was considered to be an over-development of the site and out of character with the street scene and represented a loss of amenity due to overlooking and excess massing.

The Applicant’s agent told the Panel that the application had been submitted with designs to prevent overlooking and had addressed all concerns in respect of ecology and flooding, and that there were no objections from statutory consultees. The Highways tracking measurements indicated that parking spaces were accessible. The provision of 4 bedroom houses whilst not strictly compliant with the mix of housing required by the Olney Neighbourhood Plan, did conform to the requirements of Plan:MK

which was a more recent policy and had a different assessment of housing need.

The Senior Planning Officer acknowledged that the separation distances did not fully match the policy requirements across the whole scheme, however it was commented that the scheme was considered acceptable due to the proposed layout, design and its correlation to the surrounding areas. It was further commented that the distances set in the residential design guide were to ensure that privacy was maintained and related primarily to first floor windows, the proposed development was designed to ensure that no habitable rooms overlooked other properties.

Councillor Legg proposed, seconded by Councillor McLean, that the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report.

Members of the Panel commented that there were comments in the report that there had been no consultation with residents of Beechwood Avenue, the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that this had been looked into and it was established that notification notices had been sent to neighbouring residences and a site notice displayed.

Councillor McLean stated that he shared the concerns raised in respect of over-development and massing of the site. He also recognised the Councils Urban Design Officer only assessed the design as 'Satisfactory' which did not suggest that the layout and design could not be improved to address the concerns held by objectors.

The Senior Planning Officer, in response to a question, confirmed that she felt the proposed development was acceptable in terms of policy as in terms of principle it would provide additional dwellings in accordance with the policy detailed within Plan:MK, it was found to be acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity and there had been no objections from statutory consultees.

The Chair stated that he recognised that there were conflicts with the neighbourhood plan, however the planning hierarchy supported Plan:MK as the more recently adopted document and therefore full weight must be given to the policies therein. The judgement in respect of the overdevelopment comments were something that needed subjective consideration.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in

the Panel report was carried with Councillor Baume, Legg and Reilly voting in favour and Councillors McLean and Taylor voting against.

RESOLVED –

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 8:21 PM