



**Minutes of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL held on THURSDAY 20 APRIL 2017 at 7:00 pm.**

**Present:** Councillor: A Geary (Chair)  
Councillors Alexander, Legg, McLean and Miles

**Officers:** K Lycett (Senior Planning Officer), M Pearce (Planning Officer), S Taylor (Planning Officer), P Keen (Senior Planning Officer), L Gledhill (Planning Officer) D Hird (Planning Officer), A Smith (Senior Planning Officer), A Sacbucker (Senior Planning Officer), N Ahmad (Planning Solicitor) and D Imbimbo (Committee Manager).

**Also Present:** Approximately 50 Members of the Public  
Councillors Dransfield and Webb

**DCP45 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair welcomed Councillors, Officer Colleagues and the Public to the meeting and explained the procedures to be adopted.

**DCP46 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor McLean asked that it be noted that in respect of application 16/02830/FUL, the applicant was known to him in a social capacity but he had not discussed the application with him and would judge it on its merits.

Councillor A Geary asked that it be noted that in respect of application 16/02830/FUL, the applicant was known to him as a colleague within the Church of England Ministry but he had not discussed the application with him and would judge it on its merits.

**DCP47 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

Mrs L Harvey-Bain, Mr S Kirkman (Loughton Residents Association), Cllr P Todd (Loughton and Great Holm Parish Council) and Ward Councillor Dransfield spoke in objection to application 16/01821/FUL Regularisation of alterations to dwelling previously approved under planning permission reference 12/01141/FUL (Part Retrospective) at 6 Weldon Rise, Loughton, Milton Keynes.

That Applicant Mrs S Gerra and Applicant's Agent Mr R Harris exercised the right of reply

Mr J Pittman and Mr M Spencer spoke in objection to application 17/00055/FUL Erection of 3 x dwelling houses including parking and other associated works at Land To The South of 5, Phoebe Lane, Wavendon

The Applicant Mr R Harris and the Applicants Agent Ms H Doyle

exercised the right of reply.

Mrs J Brushwood (Clerk to Lavendon Parish Council) spoke in support of application 16/02277/FUL Development of 7 residential units with associated footway link at Land Opposite Cemetery, Bedford Road, Lavendon.

Mr C Higton, Mr R Bradbury and Ward Councillor Webb (Bletchley East) spoke in objection to application 16/02306/FUL (Extension of time) in respect of the Erection of a 2 bed bungalow to the rear of property at 68 Water Eaton Road, Bletchley, Milton Keynes.

The Applicant Mr Minawar exercised the right of reply.

Councillor Stabler (Great Linford Parish Council) spoke in objection to application 17/00392/FUL Part two-storey, part single storey front extension, replacement of garage door with window and walling at 35 Brownbaker Court, Neath Hill, Milton Keynes

The Applicant had declined the right of reply

Councillor Greenwood (Campbell Park Parish Council) spoke in objection to application 16/03530/FUL Two storey side and single storey front and rear extensions and retaining wall at 196 Oldbrook Boulevard, Oldbrook, Milton Keynes.

The Applicant had declined the right of reply.

## **DCP48**

### **APPLICATIONS**

#### **16/01821/FUL REGULARISATION OF ALTERATIONS TO DWELLING PREVIOUSLY APPROVED UNDER PLANNING PERMISSION REFERENCE 12/01141/FUL (PART RETROSPECTIVE) AT 6 WELDON RISE, LOUGHTON, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR & MRS GERRA**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Senior Planning Officer explained the history of the application and actions undertaken since the matter was deferred in January 2017. The Panel heard that discussion had been had to agree amendments to the plans and that whilst numerous concessions had been made by the applicant there remained an outstanding issue in respect of the gable end that was in close proximity to the boundary with Salisbury House. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that on balance the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions and amendments as detailed in the Panel Report.

It was also noted that an update report had been published which addressed matters raised after

publication of the agenda.

The Committee heard representations from objectors who raised the following concerns;

- The Parish Council had concerns in respect of the impact the development had on the conservation area due to its bulk and positioning relative to the Grade II listed building and grounds and the conservation area as a whole.
- The Loughton Conservation Area Statement having been recently refreshed should be taken account of, and in particular the general principle to preserve the general features of the Conservation Area, one of the main features of which was the spaced out buildings, with green areas between them, the development as built failed to recognise this.
- The property had been constructed in a manner that resulted in it being the equivalent of one storey too high which further impacted on the setting of Salisbury House and its garden which it over-dominates.
- The original permission granted for a basement was on the clear understanding that it would have no visual impact or have any effect on the overall height of the building. The 'as built' form was at least 1.4m taller than it should be.
- The realignment of the foundations to make them parallel with the boundary brings the building 2.5m closer to the boundary than that allowed under the granted permission.
- This resulted in overlooking of the boundary exacerbated by the increased height of the building and an overbearing presence of the building to the setting of Salisbury House and its gardens.
- The amendments proposed largely overcome the overlooking issues but the gable end remains an overbearing feature.
- It was contested that the applicant, being an experienced developer, had made a deliberate choice to build the property as a three storey rather than two storey development, in the wrong position.

The Panel heard that there remained a possibility

that a further deferral would result in agreement being reached between the applicant and objectors on further amendments to the scheme. The Panel sought clarity from the applicant whether there was an option to make amendments to the position of the gable end, however the Panel heard that the applicant had made all the concessions that she believed were reasonable in the circumstances.

The Applicant's Agent and Applicant made the following points;

- Following the deferral of the item by the Development Control Panel in January 2017 two meetings had taken place and a number of amendments were now proposed to be made to the scheme to address concerns raised.
- Some of the changes proposed go beyond what was required to be done to comply with the scheme as approved.
- There remains disagreement in respect of the gable end which the applicant feels no longer presents an overbearing structure taking account of the proposed revisions to the scheme and would have no impact either on the conservation area or the setting of Salisbury House.
- Significant compromises had been made by the applicant.
- There was no objection by raised the Council Conservation Officer
- The land had been bought in 2007 and took 7 years, 5 planning applications and an appeal to get permission granted for the development.
- When the building works were finally started the family faced personal issues which acted as a distraction which meant that the build could not be monitored as much as would have been wished for.
- The mistakes have come about by way of human error
- The build was as permitted but in a slightly rotated position and sitting at a slightly

altered elevation.

- Officers had recommended that the application be approved following work over an extended period.
- The applicant could not agree to the demolition of the Gable on the southern side.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that issues raised by objectors had been referred to and addressed in the Panel report.

Councillor McLean sought clarity from the applicants agent when the applicant had realised that there was a problem with height of the building, the Panel heard that in the early stages of build an enforcement officer had indicated that the plan was being complied with, it was only later that it came to light when windows were fitted that there was an error with the orientation when objections were lodged by neighbours. As part of the mitigation those windows had been removed.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the Officer recommendation be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

Members of the Panel commented that they considered the build outcome to have been a deliberate and flagrant intent to breach the original approved scheme to build what the applicant wanted.

Councillor Alexander in recognition of the request to defer for further negotiation proposed that the determination of the application be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Miles.

Members of the Panel noted that the applicant's agent had indicated that there was no further compromise that would be considered.

On being put to the vote the proposal to defer the determination of the application was lost.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application was lost by an unanimous vote.

The Chair told the Panel that he would call an adjournment to allow advice to be taken to draw a form of wording to reflect the reasons the Panel would refuse the application.

On resuming the meeting Councillor A Geary proposed that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The Building as currently constructed, despite the proposed changes, is so significantly different from the original approved scheme due to its size, scale and bulk and the proximity to the boundary of the neighbouring listed property would lead to a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building and character of the conservation area
2. The building as constructed, despite the proposed changes, would lead to an overbearing impact on the residential amenity of occupants of Salisbury House due to its size scale and bulk and proximity to that property

This was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously,

Councillor A Geary proposed that the Panel call for a report in respect of enforcement action to be presented to the Development Control Committee for consideration, this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously and it was;

RESOLVED –

1. That planning permission be refused as;
  - i. The Building as currently constructed, despite the proposed changes, is so significantly different from the original approved scheme due to its size, scale and bulk and the proximity to the boundary of the neighbouring listed property would lead to a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building and character of the conservation area, and,
  - ii. The building as constructed, despite the proposed changes, would lead to an overbearing impact on the residential amenity of occupants of Salisbury House due to its size scale and bulk and proximity to that property.
2. That a report in respect of enforcement action be prepared and presented to the Development

Control Committee for Consideration.

17/00055/FUL

**ERECTION OF 3 X DWELLING HOUSES INCLUDING PARKING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND TO THE SOUTH OF 5, PHOEBE LANE, WAVENDON FOR MR R. HARRIS**

Councillor Miles left the meeting during consideration of this application to attend to a personal matter.

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was noted that the site was in part outside the envelope of the village and strictly speaking in what was designated open countryside, however the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that on balance the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel Report.

The Committee heard representations from objectors who raised the following concerns;

- The road was extremely narrow, at some points only 3m wide, and had no footpath, any increase in traffic would exacerbate existing congestion and safety issues on a lane that is used for leisure activities including horse riding, cycling and walking as well as vehicles.
- The rural character of the village would be threatened if further developed.
- Three one and a half storey properties all similar in style would be out of character with the other properties which were all different in style and design.
- There were problems with parking and traffic at the junction which again would be exacerbated by increased traffic.
- Local views were heavily in objection to the application.
- The site was better suited to a maximum of 2 properties, and the proposal amounts to an overdevelopment.
- There are errors in the report which does not recognise that the local bus is infrequent and not used, the report refers to provision of business for local shops, despite there being

no shop in the village.

- There will be a loss of the hedge running alongside the lane.

The Applicant confirmed that the proposal sought to enhance the village and fill an area of land without doing any harm to the character of the village. The proposed dwellings were designed to fit in and not be an incongruous feature of the lane, but fit in with the best features of the site.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that it was recognised that the site was in part designated 'open countryside' but as it formed a natural fill in between developments no harm was considered to be caused by the proposed development and was therefore considered to be an appropriate deviation from policy S10 of the saved local plan, as a sustainable development.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

Members of the Panel, in response to a question, heard that the density of the proposed development was low but again this reflected the rural character of the site.

Members of the Panel commented that whilst it was inevitable additional traffic movements would result from the development the number would be unlikely to cause harm or exacerbate any existing problems.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report was carried unanimously, and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

**17/00096/FUL**

**ERECTION OF SINGLE DWELLING, AND ASSOCIATED PARKING AND NEW PARKING FOR NUMBER 45A NORTHAMPTON ROAD (RESUBMISSION OF 16/02094/FUL) AT 45A NORTHAMPTON ROAD, LAVENDON, OLNEY FOR MR R BRAY.**

Councillor Miles returned to the meeting.

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



Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

**16/03323/FUL**

**RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT INCLUDING EIGHT DWELLINGS, ACCESS ROAD, PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT SITE AT, CLICKERS YARD, YARDLEY ROAD FOR BASTION HOMES (HERITAGE) LTD**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Panel heard that two additional conditions were recommended which read;

'1) Prior to the commencement of development, details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and the finished ground levels of the site, in relation to the existing site levels of surrounding property, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: To ensure that construction is carried out at suitable levels, having regard to drainage, access, the appearance of the development and the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with the provisions of saved policies D1 and D2 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011

2). Prior to the commencement of the development details of the proposed boundary treatment of the site (including the type and height of any walls or fences) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the boundaries of the site shall be enclosed in accordance with the approved details before the development is first occupied. The approved fence, hedge or wall shall subsequently be retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality and safeguard the privacy of neighbours'

The Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report together with the additional 2 conditions..

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer

recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

Councillor McLean stated that he was familiar with the site and had some concerns regarding access arrangements but recognised that the advice of the Highways Officer was that the arrangements were adequate.

He further commented that the site was in close proximity to other residential developments and proposed that a condition to restrict working hours be added to read;

'No building or other site works likely to cause nuisance to adjoining occupiers shall be carried out before 8.00 am or after 6pm Mondays to Fridays, nor before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays, or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To limit the detrimental effect on adjoining occupiers by reason of noise and disturbance'. This was seconded by Councillor Alexander.

It was noted that this was a matter controlled by building regulations, however, to ensure that the developer was aware of the requirement to limit working hours an explicit condition should be added.

On being put to the vote the proposal to add the additional condition was carried.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report together with the three additional conditions was carried unanimously and it was;

RESOLVED –

That Planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report together with the following additional conditions;

'1) Prior to the commencement of development, details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and the finished ground levels of the site, in relation to the existing site levels of surrounding property, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: To ensure that construction is carried out at suitable levels, having regard to drainage, access, the appearance of the development and the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with the provisions of saved policies D1 and D2 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011

2). Prior to the commencement of the development details of the proposed boundary treatment of the site (including the type and height of any walls or fences) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the boundaries of the site shall be enclosed in accordance with the approved details before the development is first occupied. The approved fence, hedge or wall shall subsequently be retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality and safeguard the privacy of neighbours'

3). No building or other site works likely to cause nuisance to adjoining occupiers shall be carried out before 8.00 am or after 6pm Mondays to Fridays, nor before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays, or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To limit the detrimental effect on adjoining occupiers by reason of noise and disturbance'

**16/03017/FUL**

**RESTORATION OF GRADE II LISTED BARN TO FORM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING INCORPORATING EXTENSIONS AND OUTBUILDINGS ON PART OF FOOTPRINTS OF FORMER AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS TO PROVIDE ANCILLARY RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION AT THE BARN, THIRLBY LANE, SHENLEY CHURCH END FOR MR AND MRS GRAHAME CURTIS**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Panel heard that late representations had been received that reiterated concerns raised by neighbours during the consultation period, these matters had been addressed in the Panel report and confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

**RESOLVED –**

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

16/03018/LBC

**LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR THE RESTORATION OF GRADE II LISTED BARN TO FORM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING INCORPORATING EXTENSIONS AND OUTBUILDINGS ON PART OF FOOTPRINTS OF FORMER AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS TO PROVIDE ANCILLARY RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION AT THE BARN, THIRLBY LANE, SHENLEY CHURCH END FOR MR AND MRS GRAHAME CURTIS**

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

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report.

16/02277/FUL

**DEVELOPMENT OF 7 RESIDENTIAL UNITS WITH ASSOCIATED FOOTWAY LINK AT LAND OPPOSITE CEMETERY, BEDFORD ROAD, LAVENDON FOR MS NICOLE MURRAY**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Panel heard that the site had a complex planning history and was subject to an extant enforcement notice, these issues had been addressed in the Panel report and published supplementary papers. The Panel heard that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

The Panel heard from the Clerk to the Parish Council that the Parish Council supported the application as it was considered to blend well with the character of the village and despite extending the village curtilage was appropriately positioned and designed to complement its character.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

Councillor McLean told the Panel that he would ordinarily be inclined to refuse an application in

breach of policy S10 of the Local Plan but in this instance it was a complimentary sustainable development on a site that would provide a good gateway to the village.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report together with a S106 agreement.

**16/02830/FUL**

**DEMOLITION OF EXISTING WORKSHOP AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY ANNEXE BUILDING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AREA AND FENCING AT 29 NORTHAMPTON ROAD, LAVENDON, OLNEY FOR MR MARK LAY**

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

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

**16/02306/FUL**

**ERECTION OF 2 BED BUNGALOW TO THE REAR OF PROPERTY AT 68 WATER EATON ROAD, BLETCHLEY, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR N MINAWAR**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was noted that a Site Inspection had been undertaken on Tuesday 18 April 2017 attended by Councillors McLean and A Geary. The Planning Officer confirmed that an update paper had been published setting out detail of some of the planning considerations it was confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel Report.

It was noted that contrary to the position referred to in the report that the Council could now demonstrate that it had a five year housing land

supply and therefore the application was to be considered taking account of policy H7 of the saved local plan.

The Committee heard representations from objectors who raised the following concerns;

- The road was the only route into a development of 198 houses and was already congested due to vehicles being parked by residents of Water Eaton Road who had no off street parking available.
- The proposed development was too large for the plot and would form an overbearing structure for the neighbouring property.
- Previous applications had been refused as the development of the garden was considered to be out of keeping with the character of the area.
- The limited parking provision would necessitate vehicles either backing into or out of the site onto a busy stretch of pavement or the road which has cars parked on it.
- Allowing the application will see a reduction in available 'on street' parking places or will displace the problem of parking and see vehicles parked on the opposite side of the street causing yet more congestion.
- The design bears no similarity to other properties in the area.
- The proximity of the proposed property to existing properties is too close and results in a loss of amenity for neighbours.

The Applicant told the Panel that two car parking spaces were to be provided on site the plans refer to 4 but that was in respect of an earlier application to develop 2 flats on the site. It was acknowledged that occupants of Water Eaton Road used Frensham Drive for parking but the proposal would only see the loss of two on street parking spaces. It was further commented that the design did not provide for rear windows and therefore there was no likelihood on overlooking of number 66 Water Eaton Road.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the Officer

recommendation to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

Councillor McLean having attended the site inspection told the Panel that he had serious concerns about the impact on the parking in Frensham Drive and the risks that entry and egress to the site posed for highway safety. It was further noted that the access arrangements could present a danger to both pedestrians and other car users and would certainly exacerbate existing congestion problems and create a danger to occupants.

It was noted that there were public car parks within a 10 minute walking distance however it was also acknowledged that they could be but were not used at the present time and would be unlikely to ease the potential problems this development would cause.

Councillor A Geary stated that having also attended the site inspection he shared the concerns raised by Councillor.

It was noted that the objections based on the overbearing character of the proposed dwelling was a weak argument as permitted development rights would allow for a structure only 30cm lower.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application was lost.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the application be refused as the Panel believed that there would be a negative impact on highway safety due to the loss of on street parking and the access arrangements and that the final wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to Officers to draw up taking account of the relevant policies, this was seconded by Councillor McLean.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried on the Chair's casting vote, and it was;

**RESOLVED –**

That planning permission be refused as the Panel believed that proposed development would have a negative impact on highway safety due to the loss of on street parking and the access arrangements for the site, and that the final wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to the Head of Development Management, taking account of relevant policies.

**17/00392/FUL**

**PART TWO-STOREY, PART SINGLE STOREY  
FRONT EXTENSION, REPLACEMENT OF**

**GARAGE DOOR WITH WINDOW AND WALLING  
AT 35 BROWNBAKER COURT, NEATH HILL,  
MILTON KEYNES FOR MR JAMES CLARKE**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Planning Officer confirmed that an update report had been published and that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel Report.

The Committee heard representations from the objector who raised the following concerns;

- The proposal would not be in keeping with the street scene and would result in a reduced distance between the dwelling and the highway from the present 5m to 1.5m.
- The proposal to grant the application was inconsistent with other similar applications in Thorneycroft Lane that have been refused.
- The proposed extension would ruin the continuity of the existing frontage of the street.

It was noted that the applicant had declined a right of reply.

The Officer advised the Panel that applications should be considered on their individual merits and not against other applications.

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

The Panel, whilst recognizing the need to consider the application on its own merits, asked for some clarification as to what similarities, if any, there were between Brownbaker Court and Thorneycroft Lane, the Planning Officer told the Panel that she believed that similarity referred to was the linear nature of the frontages to the houses with some having single storey protrusions but that that Thorneycroft was on another estate and layout and design of the street-scene was of a completely different nature. The main difference with the application being considered is that the proposed front extension is located next to adjoining property number 24 Brownbaker Court which has an existing two-storey front protrusion.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application was carried unanimously and it was;



RESOLVED –

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the panel report.

**16/01380/FUL**

**MOVE GARDEN WALL BY 1.9 METRES TOWARDS ELTHORNE WAY AT 80 GREENWICH GARDENS, FOR MR PAUL TOOMEY**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation and confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

**17/00210/FUL**

**PART DEMOLITION, ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSION TO EXISTING PREMISES TO FORM 6 FLATS WITH PROVISION OF 8 CAR PARKING SPACES, BICYCLE PARKING AREA, AMENITY SPACE AND LANDSCAPING AND NEW ACCESS (ONE ADDITIONAL FLAT TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SCHEME 15/01581/FUL AT 32 VICTORIA ROAD, BLETCHLEY, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR ABDUL HAI**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation and confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

**16/03530/FUL**

**TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS AT 196 OLDBROOK BOULEVARD, OLDBROOK, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR M ONGARALINGAM**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Planning Officer confirmed that an update report had been published and that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel Report.

The Committee heard representations from the objector who raised the following concerns;

- The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site.
- The assertion within the Panel report that the proposed development represents a small increase in area is incorrect as the totality of the proposal represents a 50% increase in the living space.
- The Parish Council held concerns that the future intention was to use the property as a house in multiple occupation and requested that a condition requiring that it be for the sole use of one household family residence, if the panel was minded to grant the application.

The Panel was advised that it would not be a reasonable condition to require only one household to occupy the premises, and that should the owner wish to sub divide the property a change of use would be required. It was further commented that once the proposed development was completed it would represent 27% of the size of the plot.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the Officer recommendation to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

It was confirmed that permitted development rights would allow for a development of 6m to the rear, the proposed development was 6.6m.

Councillor McLean proposed that an informative be added advising that a full application would be required should the owners seek to sub-let or divide the property at some future stage. This was seconded by Councillor Alexander.

On being put to the vote the proposal to add the informative was carried unanimously.

On being out to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report together with the additional informative as detailed above was carried

unanimously and it was;

RESOLVED –

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the panel report together with an informative that should the applicant or owner seek to sub-let or divide the property a full planning application seeking permission to do so would be required.

**17/00139/FUL**

**ERECTION OF 2 X 1 BED SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOWS (RESUBMISSION OF 16/01990/FUL) AT LAND TO THE REAR OF THE VICTORIA INN, VICARAGE ROAD, BRADWELL FOR MR BRIAN HAMILTON**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation and confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

**16/03621/FUL**

**EXTENSION AND CHANGE OF USE (USE CLASS A1) OF A REDUNDANT BARN TO FORM A ONE BEDROOM STUDIO (USE CLASS C3) AT REAR OF, 73 HIGH STREET, WOBURN SANDS FOR AP CONSULTING ENGINEERS LTD**

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

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

16/02318/ADV

**ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT FOR THE  
INSTALLATION OF 1 X INTERNALLY  
ILLUMINATED FREE STANDING DIGITAL  
ADVERTISEMENT SCREEN AT SITE ADJACENT  
TO 82, MIDSUMMER PLACE, CENTRAL MILTON  
KEYNES FOR CLEAR CHANNEL UK LTD**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation and confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

That Advertising Consent be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report.

16/02328/ADV

**ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT FOR THE  
INSTALLATION OF 1X FREE STANDING  
ILLUMINATED DIGITAL ADVERTISEMENT UNIT  
AT SITE ADJACENT TO STATION SQUARE,  
ELDER GATE, CENTRAL MILTON KEYNES FOR  
CLEAR CHANNEL UK LTD**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation and confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Legg.

Councillor A Geary advised the Panel that concerns had been asked to draw the Panel's attention to the objections raised by Ms L Inoki as detailed in the Panel report.

The Panel noted that the proposed sign was intended to have one static advert side and one digital and sought clarity as to which way round it would face, i.e. whether the moving picture would face outwards towards the traffic which could prove distracting.

As the information was not available to clarify whether the moving side of the sign board would face the traffic it was requested that Officers negotiate with the applicant to ensure that the moving side was not traffic facing. Councillor McLean proposed that a condition be added requiring that the moving picture side was not traffic facing and should the applicants not agree to this then the authority to refuse the application be delegated to the Head of Development Management, this was seconded by Councillor Miles

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report together with an additional condition as above was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

That Advertising Consent be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report, together with an additional condition to require that the moving side of the sign was not traffic facing. That in the event that the applicant declines to accept the additional condition then the head of Development Management be delegated authority to refuse the application.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10:36PM