

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE** held on **THURSDAY 4 JUNE 2020** at 7.00 pm.

Present: Councillor Brown (Chair)
Councillors Alexander, Baines, Bint, Exon, Lancaster, Legg, McLean, Petchey, Trendall and Wallis

Officers: J Palmer (Head of Planning), S Hine (Development Management Manager), J Lee (Senior Planning Officer), T Barton (Planning Officer), Andrew Turner (Development Plans Manager), E Gineikiene (Senior Solicitor - Planning and Highways) D Imbimbo (Committee Manager)

DCC03 INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME

The Chair welcomed members of the public and councillors to the meeting and explained that the meeting was being held remotely and would be broadcast live on YouTube he further explained the procedures to be adopted.

DCC04 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Bint asked that it be noted that in respect of application 19/02856/FUL for transparency, he would like to clarify that he had been nominated as a board member of MKDP, which was the landowner in the Hindhead Knoll application. However, he considered his appointment "on hold" and had not yet confirmed his acceptance. He had also not attended any meetings or had any discussions of substance in connection with the MKDP. he therefore did not consider that he currently had an association with the MKDP, and consequently, he did not have a prejudicial interest in the item.

DCC05 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS

Mr. R Payne, Mr P Bruen, Mr S Copeland, Parish Councillor M Taylor (Walton Community Council) and Councillor Ferrans (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection to application 19/02856/FUL, Erection of 30 x two-bedroom apartments and associated hard and soft landscaping, car and cycle parking and refuse store at Walnut Tree Reserve Sites A & D, Hindhead Knoll' Walnut Tree' Milton Keynes.

The Applicant Mr P Hardy and the Applicant's Agent Mr P Smith exercised the right of reply.

Town Councillor R Clarke (Newport Pagnell Town Council) spoke in objection to application 19/03443/FUL, Proposed two storey side and single storey rear extensions with associated internal and external works at 66 Pearmain, Newport Pagnell, Milton Keynes.

The Applicant declined the right of reply.

DCC89

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

19/02856/FUL ERECTION OF 30 X TWO-BEDROOM APARTMENTS AND ASSOCIATED HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, CAR AND CYCLE PARKING AND REFUSE STORE AT WALNUT TREE RESERVE SITES A & D, HINDHEAD KNOLL' WALNUT TREE' MILTON KEYNES FOR GRAND UNION HOUSING ASSOCIATION.

The Chair, noting the high level of public representations requesting the item be deferred until the COVID19 restrictions on meetings are eased, told the committee that whilst he sympathized with those who would like to be present in person, it was necessary that the Government guidance be adhered to and meetings continue on line. Together with the Vice Chairs an assurance was given that the level of public interest in the application was fully appreciated by all members of the Committee.

The Senior Planning Officer explained the planning context of the Neighbourhood Plan and PlanMk, the latter having been adopted since the Neighbourhood plan took precedence, it was also not a planning consideration as to how policy was arrived at but PlanMK having been adopted following a full public examination by the Planning Inspector was the policy that must be followed when determining the application. The Senior Planning Officer went on to introduce the application with a presentation.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions set out in the published update report and the completion of a S106 agreement within 28 days of the decision and that the Head of planning be delegated authority to extend the period in exceptional circumstances, if considered reasonable, and that no decision notice be issued until the Secretary of State had considered the request for a call-in and that in the

event that the application was not called in to then issue the decision notice.

The Senior Planning Officer further explained that due to the restrictions on persons gathering the request from the Ward Councillor for a Site Inspection to be held had been replaced by a series of video clips of the site.

The Committee heard from members of the public, a representative of the Parish Council and the Ward Councillor who confirmed their objections to the development, citing the density as being too great for the site and that it did not accord with the policy set out in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council expressed disappointment that there had been procedural errors and that their original representations had neither been published on the Public Access system or referred to in the original Committee report.

Other concerns raised were in respect of;

- The proposal to provide only 2 bedroom apartments when the need was for larger family homes.
- The design is not in keeping with the location.
- The proposed building is too tall and will be overbearing, made worse by its location on the top of a hill.
- The loss of a green space and the trees on the site.

The Applicant's agent told the Committee that a great deal of public consultation had been undertaken and the design amended to reflect many of the comments received, the proposal was providing 36% affordable housing which was greater than the 31% required, there was an excess of parking provision to ensure that the development did not result in any congestion in the area.

A number of non-material planning matters were raised by both the objectors and the applicant, these were identified for the benefit of the Committee.

The Chair noting that the Community Council representations had not been published asked that the Head of Planning seek to establish why this error had occurred.

The Senior Planning Officer apologised for the absence of the Parish Councils comments, however confirmed that they had been fully addressed within the published update report and had not raised any matters not previously referred to in the original Committee report.

Councillor Brown, seconded by Councillor Exon, proposed that the Officer recommendation be agreed.

Members of the Committee reaffirmed the comments from the Chair in respect of appreciating the level of public objection to the scheme, however commented that PlanMk was the policy that was required to be considered in reaching a decision and that the proposal was in keeping with that, Councillor Baines, acknowledging that the proposal did not accord with the Neighbourhood Plan, stated that, as a Parish Councillor, he was aware that there was a need to regularly refresh a Neighbourhood Plan when new policy was introduced to ensure that it retained primacy, this had not been done in this instance. It was commented by Councillor Bint that he did not like the design but he accepted that was a subjective consideration.

Councillor Petchey stated that he believed that the site, being in close proximity to the Community hub, could accommodate the proposed development taking account of its design and height.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application was carried with Councillors Baines,

Brown, Exon, Legg, McLean, Petchey and Wallis voting in favour, Councillors Alexander, Bint and Lancaster voting against and Councillor Trendall abstaining from the vote.

RESOLVED –

That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the published update report and the completion of a S106 agreement within 28 days of the decision and that the Head of planning be delegated authority to extend the period in exceptional circumstances, if considered reasonable, and that no decision notice be issued until the Secretary of State had considered the request for a call-in and that in the event that the application was not called in to then issue the decision notice.

19/03155/FUL

PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS WITH ASSOCIATED INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL WORKS AT 66 PEARMAIN, NEWPORT PAGNELL, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR R BONE.

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Committee heard that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Committee report.

The Committee heard from the representative of the Town Council who stated that the Town Council objected to the proposal for a two storey side extension but not the remainder of the proposal.

The Committee heard that the Town Council was concerned that the proposal represented an over-development of the site and that the side separation to the neighbouring property would be reduced from 7.3m to 4.3m which could result in overshadowing.

The applicant declined the right of reply.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the existing

building covered approximately 15% of the site and the proposal would increase this to approximately 34%, however the plot was relatively large and it was not uncommon for a house to cover 45% of a plot, in respect the risk of overshadowing, this was deemed to be negligible.

Councillor Brown proposed that the Officer recommendation be moved for the purpose of debate, this was seconded by Councillor Exon.

Members of the Committee stated that they did not believe that the proposal represented an overdevelopment of the site and that a 4.3m side separation gap was generous.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Committee report was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED –

That the application be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Committee report.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 21:06 PM