



Minutes of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held on THURSDAY 5 JANUARY 2017 at 7.00 pm.

**Present:** Councillor A Geary (Chair)  
Councillors: Alexander, Bint, Eastman, Exon, Legg, McLean, Miles (Substituting for Councillor P Williams), Morla, Petchey, and C Wilson

**Officers:** D Kirk (Development Management Manager), K Lycett (Senior Planning Officer), A Sacbaker (Senior Planning Officer), J Cheston (Development Plans Team Leader), A Swannell (Highways Engineer), D Blandamer (Urban Designer), N Sainsbury (Head of Urban Design and Landscape Architecture), N Ahmad (Solicitor – Planning) and D Imbimbo (Committee Manager).

**Apologies:** Councillor P Williams, Mr B Leahy (Head of Development Management)

**Also Present:** Councillor Green

**Number of Public Present:** approx. 70

**DCC58 CHAIRMANS WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed Members of The Committee, Officers and Public to the meeting.

**DCC59 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED –

That the minutes of the Meetings of the Development Control Committee held on 14 NOVEMBER 2016 be agreed as an accurate record, and be signed by the Chair as such subject to an amendment at minute DCC46, whereas the reference number 16/00762/OUT on page 2 be amended to read 15/01533/OUTEIS.

**DCC60 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Exon asked that it be noted that in respect of application 16/02105/FUL, he was a member of the Fire Authority and held a pre-determined position on the matter and would be stepping down from the Committee for that Item.

Councillor Legg asked that it be noted that in respect of application 16/03118/MKCOD3, he was a member of West Bletchley Council who had objected to the scheme, however, he had not discussed the application and would judge it on its merits.

Councillor Bint asked that it be noted that in respect of application 16/00533/REM, he worked in close proximity to the site, however, he had not had any contact with applicants or discussed the application and would judge it on its merits.

Councillor A Geary asked that it be noted that in respect of Application 16/02106/OUT, he had engaged in a conversation with the applicant in advance of the submission of the application but had expressed no views and would approach the determination of the application with an open mind.

Councillor A Geary asked that it be noted that in respect of application 16/02871/REM he had objected to the outline application which had been refused, he had subsequently made representations to the planning inspector, however the application having been granted on appeal, the principle of development had been established and he would therefore consider the application on its merits.

Councillor McLean asked that it be noted that in respect of application 16/00533/REM he had objected to the outline application which had been refused, however the application having been granted on appeal, the principle of development had been established and he would therefore consider the application on its merits.

**DCC61 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

Mr Everington, Mr Scarlett, Mr Brockett and Councillor Wheeler (Hanslope Parish Council) spoke in objection to application 16/02106/OUT, Outline application (all matters reserved except access) for residential development of up to 150 dwellings, estate road, open space and associated works at Land Off, Castlethorpe Road, Hanslope

The applicants Agent, Ms S Turnbull exercised the right of reply.

**DCC62 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**16/02106/OUT OUTLINE APPLICATION (ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT ACCESS) FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 150 DWELLINGS, ESTATE ROAD, OPEN SPACE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND OFF, CASTLETHORPE ROAD, HANSLOPE FOR LA TRADING LTD**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the

application with a presentation. The Committee heard that since the publication of the agenda an update report had been published detailing information in respect of the Committee Site Inspection and the S106 contributions. It was further noted, 5 additional public representations had been received, these did not however raise matters not already addressed in the Committee report. The Committee was also told that there were two trees on the site which could be retained and protected by way of condition should the Committee be minded to.

The Senior Highways Engineer told the Committee that in response to comments received from the public he wished to clarify that the access arrangements detailed in the report referred to an area of transition from 30mph to 40mph on the adjacent road, this was an error and the access was in fact further along Castlethorpe Road in the 30mph section.

Objectors to the application raised the following points;

- The roads are not able to accommodate the existing traffic which has seen a year on year increase in volume.
- The number of vehicles recorded as using the road in the traffic assessment is far less than the number recorded on the Community Speed Assessment device.
- The Traffic Assessment is not representative of the actual peak time traffic volumes.
- There are Highway Pedestrian Safety concerns due to the lack of crossing or parking facility in the vicinity of shops in the Gold Street area which is predicted to see a traffic volume increase.
- The land that is proposed to be developed is prime agricultural land and should be retained as such.
- The land does not meet the test for sustainability for the following reasons
  - Air pollution from construction traffic and heavy plant during the construction phase.

- On completion of the build there were likely to be in the region of 300 vehicles associated with the dwelling units adding to the pollution risk.
- Light Pollution, at present Hanslope enjoys low levels of street lighting.
- Wildlife Habitat loss, including that of six species of bats.
- Loss of Historic local amenity in particular footpaths.
- The Village has 'Selected Status' and should be protected from large scale development.
- Local Facilities including shops, Doctor Surgery and schools do not have capacity to accommodate the increase in population.
- The application should be considered in the whole with other similar applications that are proposed.
- The proposals are in contravention of the policies set out in the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Applicants agent told the Committee that despite the concerns expressed by the objectors the Council Highways Officer had not raised any objections to the scheme.

It was further confirmed that the access arrangements would be controlled by condition and would provide a priority junction by way of mitigation for the increased traffic movements.

The agent also told the Committee that it was acknowledged by the planning officers that there being a lack of previously developed land and the need for development, it would be necessary for this to be on agricultural land, it was further confirmed that the land in question was not good quality land.

In respect of wildlife and ecology, the agent confirmed that although further reports would be required, the initial findings are that there would be no detrimental impact on wildlife, furthermore any required mitigation matters would be built into any scheme.

The Applicants agent told the Committee that there would be a social gain from the development of 50 dwellings as affordable housing, i.e. a third of the development would be of affordable housing. It was further confirmed that almost £3m of S106 payments would be made, there would also be jobs created during the construction period.

It was further confirmed that the applicant had nominated some land on the site to go towards parking at the Doctors' Surgery to mitigate the increased need and land had also been provided on the site for either expansion of the school or a complete rebuild or extend the playing fields.

The Agent confirmed that the intention remained to protect and retain the trees on the site but if a condition was deemed necessary this would be acceptable to the applicant.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report together with a S106 agreement.

The Senior Highways Engineer confirmed that the Highways Assessment had been conducted in accordance with accepted practice and guidelines. It was accepted that there would be an increase in the volume of traffic, however, the existing junction would not be at full capacity, the improved junction will further ease any problems and there were proposed traffic calming measures included in the plans.

The Development Plans Team Leader confirmed that the Council was unable to demonstrate that there was a five year supply of housing sites and therefore Government guidance was that there would therefore be a presumption in favour of sustainable development irrespective of contrary policy in Local Plans. Therefore the Selected Status of the village and policies preventing development in open countryside were not considered relevant.

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

The Committee considered in detail the question of sustainability, it was recognised that the site was not ideal but that mitigation was proposed for most

aspects of concern raised. It was further noted that the applicants had made provision to provide land for the doctors surgery and school on site, these were matters that if the application were refused but later allowed on appeal could not be guaranteed. It was further noted that the applicants agent had indicated that it was proposed to provide 33% of affordable housing on the site which exceeded the policy and could likewise not be guaranteed at an appeal. Confirmation was sought that the additional affordable housing would be provided for local people.

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that;

- Officers were satisfied that the requirements to demonstrate sustainability had been met.
- Should a refusal of the application result in being allowed at appeal there would be no means by which the offers made by the applicant could be secured.
- The proposal was to provide 33% of the final total of dwellings delivered as affordable housing.
- It was possible to condition a landscape buffer adjacent to Castlethorpe Road

Councillor C Wilson proposed that should the Committee grant the application an additional condition be added to require that all infrastructure work be completed prior to the development of the dwellings, this was seconded by Councillor Miles and on being put to the vote was carried unanimously.

Councillor Bint proposed that should the Committee grant the application the S106 agreement should include the securing of the level of affordable housing at 33% of the total number of dwellings and that the additional 3% be allocated for local people, this was seconded by Councillor A Geary and on being put to the vote was carried unanimously.

Councillor Bint further proposed that should the Committee grant the application the phasing of the development should be secured through triggers

set out in the S106 agreement, this was seconded by Councillor Petchey and on being put to the vote was carried unanimously.

Councillor Bint further proposed that should the Committee grant the application the existing condition be amended to ensure that any archaeological remains that may be found are reported to the Councils Archaeological Officer and preserved, as far as practicable, in situ, this was seconded by Councillor Petchey and on being put to the vote was carried unanimously.

Councillor Bint further proposed that should the Committee grant the application an additional condition be added to ensure that the two trees on the site are preserved and protected this was seconded by Councillor Morla and on being put to the vote was carried unanimously.

Councillor Bint further proposed that should the Committee grant the application an additional condition be added to ensure that a 10 metre deep landscaping buffer be incorporated on the plans between the development and Castlethorpe Road this was seconded by Councillor Morla and on being put to the vote was carried.

Following a short adjournment the Committee heard from the Development Control Manager that confirmed that the developer had agreed that the additional 3% affordable housing could be allocated for people with a local connection for a set period of time.

Furthermore the Committee heard that the phasing condition would form part of the S106 agreement and the buffer zone had been proposed to be 6m but the developer would propose increasing this to 10metres.

It was agreed by acclamation that the final detail of the conditions be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chairs.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions as set out in the Committee report together with the additional conditions as detailed above and a S106 agreement was carried and it was;

**RESOLVED –**

That outline planning permission be granted

subject to a S106 agreement and the conditions as detailed in the Committee report, together with the additional conditions as detailed above and a S106 agreement.

16/03118/MKCOD3

**DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF 10 X 2 BEDROOM APARTMENTS, AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT 18A ST GEORGES ROAD, BLETCHLEY, MILTON KEYNES FOR MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Committee heard that recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the committee report. It was noted that an update report had been published setting out detail of revised parking arrangements addressing concerns raised by the Parish Council and the Councils Highways Officer.

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

It was noted that the design was out of character with the area but provided a long term solution to for a site with a history of having caused angst in the neighbourhood.

Concern was expressed by Councillor Bint that the design included Juliette Balconies which was something the Committee sought to discourage. The Senior Planning Officer told the Committee that as the amenity space would be limited this was seen as a compromise to provide some amenity for residents.

The Committee sought assurances that the property would remain as affordable housing, it was commented that it was owned and managed by the Council and therefore would be subject to Council housing policy for the foreseeable future.

Councillor McLean proposed that an additional condition be added to restrict building work to standard working hours, Monday to Friday and Saturdays only, this was seconded by Councillor Bint, the Senior Planning Officer recommended that the standard condition 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 in accordance with Policy CS13 of the Milton-Keynes Core Strategy 2013 and Saved Policy D1 (iv) of the Milton-Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011'

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously

On being put to the vote the proposal to approve the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the committee together with the additional condition as above was carried unanimously, and it was;

RESOLVED –

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the committee report together with the additional condition as detailed above.

**16/02105/FUL**

**ERECTION OF BLUE LIGHT HUB EMERGENCY SERVICES FACILITY INCLUDING ACCESS, EMERGENCY EXIT AND LANDSCAPING AT LAND TO NORTH WEST OF, THORNBURY, WEST ASHLAND FOR BUCKINGHAMSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE**

Councillor Exon, having declared a predetermined position, stepped down from the Committee and took no part in the determination of the application

The Senior 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

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

The Committee heard that there were no clear pedestrian links but it was noted that this would be a facility where the public could attend to report matters but would not replace police stations, there were visitor parking facilities for this purpose, the primary function of the site was as an operational

centre.

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

RESOLVED –

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

Councillor Exon returned to the Committee.

**16/02871/REM**

**RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PERMISSION 14/02817/OUT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF 12 X RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS, INCLUDING ASSOCIATED ACCESS, LANDSCAPING AND INFRASTRUCTURE AT LAND BETWEEN 36 AND 38, LONG STREET ROAD, HANSLOPE FOR MULBERRY PROPERTY DEVELOPMENTS**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Committee heard that there was no update on the Committee report and published update reports and that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Committee Report and an informative as detailed in the published update report.

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

Members expressed some concern that the proposal included two points of access onto Long Street which was likely to see further traffic increase due to future proposed developments, but noted that the Highways Officers had raised no objections, and that the application had to be considered individually.

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

RESOLVED –

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

**16/00533/REM**

**RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR ACCESS, APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 13/02130/OUT FOR**

**ERECTION OF 33 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT 1 OSIER WAY, OLNEY, MILTON KEYNES FOR DUNCAN INVESTMENTS**

The Senior 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.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the application be granted, this was seconded by Councillor Exon

The Committee noted that no affordable housing had been required to be provided due to an administrative error at the outline permission stage. Members of the Committee asked that the Chair investigate the detail of the error and seek to have measures put in place to ensure that it could not be repeated, and the outcome and detail of measures that had been put in place to ensure no repeat reported to the Committee.

Councillor McLean told the Committee that he remained concerned about the residential amenity due to the proximity of the sewerage works despite the assurances from Anglian Water.

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

**RESOLVED –**

1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the committee report.
2. That the Chair seeks to establish the events that resulted in the omission of the requirement to provide affordable housing in the S106 agreement and detail of measures put in place to prevent a reoccurrence and that a report be provided to the Committee.

**DCC63 WEIGHT TO BE ATTACHED TO NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS**

The Committee heard that this item had been withdrawn as following the report being written the Secretary of State had made an announcement that meant the matter had to be reviewed.

**RESOLVED –**

That the situation be noted.

**DCC64 EAGLE FARM SOUTH DESIGN CODE**

The Committee considered a report in respect of the revised Eagle Farm, South, Design Codes.

The Committee was provided with an explanation of the key points of the Design Code, it was noted that the application to discharge the condition had been previously refused and the applicant had sought to address the concerns expressed by the Committee with the current application.

The Committee heard from the Urban Designer that the recommendation remained to agree the Design Codes and to discharge the condition.

Councillor Bint expressed concerns that some of the proposed roads within the estates had the characteristics of roads such as Fen Street and Countess Way that had proven problematical due to poor design.

Councillor Bint asked that in the interest of clarity and avoidance of doubt where the design codes refer to 'Grid Road' there is reference made to the 1992 document that calls them 'City Roads'.

It was further commented that there appeared to be no requirement for developers to extend the character of estate design across both sides of key streets.

The Head of Urban Design and Landscape Architecture confirmed that with respect to the requirement to ensure that the character of designs extended across both sides of a street, this was a matter that would be insisted upon at the reserved matters stage. It was further stated that both sides of the Spine Street are included within the same character area.

The Committee also heard that in respect of buildings fronting onto the Grid Roads, this was covered in the text of the document under 'Key Frontages', and makes it clear what is expected referring, as an example, to gable ends facing onto principal roads.

It was further noted that the spine streets had set backs of up to 6 metres thereby allowing for such provision as parking at the front of a property or landscaping. This would enable the creation of a more broken and greener character than that of roads such as Fen Street or Countess Way.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the Officer recommendation be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Legg, and on being put to the vote was carried, and it was;

**RESOLVED –**

That the Design Codes in respect of applications 16/026878/DISCON and 16/02679/DISCON be agreed and the conditions discharged.

**DCC65 GLEBE FARM DESIGN CODE**

The Committee considered a report in respect of the revised Glebe Farm, South, Design Codes.

The Committee was provided with an explanation of the key points of the Design Code, it was noted that the application to discharge the condition had been previously refused and the applicant had sought to address the concerns expressed by the Committee in the current application.

The Committee heard from the Urban Designer that an update report had been published setting out further amendments to the Codes following representations, together with an amendment to the conditions

The Committee heard that the recommendation remained to agree the Design Codes, as amended, and delegate authority to officers to discharge the condition on receipt of the final amended documents.

The Committee noted that the comments passed in respect of the Eagle Farm Design Codes applied equally to this matter.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the amendments to the Design Code as detailed in the published supplementary report be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Legg, on being put to the vote the proposal was carried.

Councillor A Geary proposed that the Officer recommendation be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Legg, and on being put to the vote was carried, and it was;

**RESOLVED –**

That the Design Codes in respect of application 16/02680/DISCON be agreed subject to the amendments as detailed and the authority to discharge the condition be delegated to the Head of Urban Design and Landscape Architecture.

**THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10:25PM**