



Minutes of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL held on THURSDAY 16 FEBRUARY 2017 at 7:00 pm.

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

Officers: C Lycett (Development Management Manager), A Smith (Senior Planning Officer), A Sacbaker (Senior Planning Officer), M Pearce (Planning Officer), J Spurrell (Planning Officer), B McParland (Planning Officer), T Amlak (Planning Officer), J Price - Jones (Planning Solicitor) and D Imbimbo (Committee Manager).

Number of Public Present: 25

Also Present: Councillors Burke, Dransfield, Hosking and Webb

DCP33 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

DCP34 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Alexander asked that it be noted that in respect of Application 3 – 16/03347/FUL, he was a Town Councillor for Newport Pagnell but had not taken any part in discussions in respect of this application.

Councillors Bint and A Geary asked that it be noted that in respect of Application 4 – 16/02944/FUL they were friends and colleagues of the applicant and would therefore step down from the Panel during consideration of this item and would take no part in the determination of the application.

Councillor A Geary asked that it be noted that in respect of Application 8 – 16/02502/FUL he knew the applicant from his connections with the church but not on a personal basis and would therefore remain on the Panel during consideration of the application and judge it on its merits.

DCP35 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS

Mr L Costello (Town Clerk, representing Olney Town Council) and Councillor Hosking (Ward Council) spoke in objection to application 16/03568/OUT Outline permission for erection of up to eight

dwelling with detached garages and home office building, together with provision of new access off Yardley Road and associated works with all matters reserved at Land to NW of 46, Yardley Road, Olney

Mr C Green, (Applicant's Agent), exercised the right of reply.

Councillor Webb (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection to application 16/02696/FUL Erection of 2 detached bungalows at 6 Land to The Rear of 58 To 64, Napier Street, Bletchley

Mr A Knight (Applicant's Agent) exercised the right of reply

Mr Cole (Applicant's Agent), Mr Lavender (Applicant) and Councillor P Geary (Ward Councillor) spoke in support of application 16/02502/FUL Two storey and part single storey front extensions with ground floor side extension (Resubmission of 16/00242/FUL) at 18 Gilpin Way, Olney, Milton Keynes

The applicant being recommended for refusal

Mr M Young and Councillor Dransfield (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection to application 16/02882/FUL Two and a half storey side extension and single storey rear extension, demolition of existing glazed conservatory and replacement with a single storey rear extension, part garage conversion into habitable space, creation of two new windows to ground floor side elevation, and increase in size of two windows to front elevation and one window to rear at 5 Pinks Close, Loughton, Milton Keynes

Mr A Gill (Applicant), exercised the right of reply.

Mr P Fincham and Councillor Burke (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection to application 16/03524/FUL Erection of 1.8 metre boundary wall with brick pillars and timber fence panels to enclose land into rear garden at 18 Wheelers Lane, Bradville, Milton Keynes

Mr Frith, (Applicant's representative), exercised the right of reply

Councillor P Geary spoke in objection to application 16/03169/ADV Advertisement consent for 1 x externally illuminated fascia, 1 x externally illuminated hanging sign and 3 x non-illuminated other signs at 16-17 Market Place, Olney.

The Applicant had declined the right of reply

DCP36

APPLICATIONS

16/03524/FUL ERECTION OF 1.8 METRE BOUNDARY WALL WITH BRICK PILLARS AND TIMBER FENCE PANELS TO ENCLOSE LAND INTO REAR GARDEN AT 18 WHEELERS LANE, BRADVILLE, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR H FRITH

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was noted that a Site Inspection had been undertaken on Monday 13 February which had been attended by Councillor A Geary. It was further noted that an update report has been published which addressed matters raised after publication of the agenda.

The Panel heard that 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 new fence would change the appearance and balance of the street-scene.
- It was accepted that other proposed development on the site would require alternative access arrangements these however did not require the fence which would change the area disproportionately.
- There were alternative less impactful options available, including a lower fence-line, to the applicant if he wished to lessen the effect of the 1.8m wall.
- The officer report has the incorrect distances recorded between the road and the wall
- The road is narrower than in most areas and the impact of the fence is therefore greater in respect of the negative effect on the amenity of residents and is greater than suggested in the report.

The Applicant told the Panel that the intent was to provide for more garden area following the approval of planning permission for an extension.

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

Councillor A Geary told the Panel that whilst having sympathy for the objectors, having attended the Site Inspection he formed the view that whilst there would be a change of scene, there would be little harm caused as a result of the proposed wall and fence being erected, and that in his view there were no sustainable grounds to refuse the application.

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.

TWO AND A HALF STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GLAZED CONSERVATORY AND REPLACEMENT WITH A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, PART GARAGE CONVERSION INTO HABITABLE SPACE, CREATION OF TWO NEW WINDOWS TO GROUND FLOOR SIDE ELEVATION, AND INCREASE IN SIZE OF TWO WINDOWS TO FRONT ELEVATION AND ONE WINDOW TO REAR AT 5 PINKS CLOSE, LOUGHTON, MILTON KEYNES FOR MRS GILL

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was noted that a Site Inspection had been undertaken on Monday 13 February which had been attended by Councillor A Geary. The Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report.

The Panel heard from objectors who reiterated matters raised during the consultation process, including comment that the proposed materials particularly the metal cladding, were not in keeping with the area and that the proposal represented an overdevelopment of the site. The Planning Officer confirmed that these matters had been addressed in the report.

The applicant told the committee that he sought to provide a family home, however was willing to consider alternative materials if the proposal was deemed inappropriate.

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

Members of the Panel heard Milton Keynes Council had no specific policy or guidance by which 'overdevelopment' was defined but rather a subjective judgement.

Councillor A Geary commented that the aerial photographs confirmed that this was a large plot with a large proposed extension but as such was not in his view an overdevelopment.

The Panel recognised that there were concerns in respect of delivery of materials using Common Lane and potential damage to an ancient hedgerow and that the materials proposed were not in keeping with the area.

Councillor Bint proposed that additional conditions be agreed in respect of using alternative materials more in keeping with the neighbourhood and a construction management plan, including protection of the ancient hedgerow and that the wording of the conditions be delegated to the Head of Development Management, this was seconded by Councillor Alexander.

On being put to the vote the motion to add the 2 conditions was carried unanimously.

On being put to the vote the motion to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the panel report together with the additional two conditions was carried unanimously

RESOLVED –

That the application be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the panel report together with the additional two conditions.

Post meeting note:

Additional conditions;

(3) Notwithstanding the submitted materials schedule, prior to commencement of any development above slab level full details of the proposed materials shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development does not detract from the character of the local area in accordance with Saved Policy D2 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011.

(4) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and include provision and details of:

i. The parking of vehicles, of site operatives and visitors

ii. Loading and unloading of plant and materials

iii. The erection and maintenance of security fencing/hoardings and lighting

iv. Construction traffic routing and signage for both Pinks Close and Common Lane

v. Working hours and delivery times

vi. The retention, protection and repair (if required) of the hedge to the north western boundary

Reason: For the safety and convenience of users

of the highway and to protect the amenity of neighbours during the construction process in accordance with the provisions of Saved Policy D1 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011.

16/03568/OUT

OUTLINE PERMISSION FOR ERECTION OF UP TO EIGHT DWELLINGS WITH DETACHED GARAGES AND HOME OFFICE BUILDING, TOGETHER WITH PROVISION OF NEW ACCESS OFF YARDLEY ROAD AND ASSOCIATED WORKS WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED AT LAND TO NW OF 46, YARDLEY ROAD, OLNEY FOR MR J GILL

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

It was confirmed that as indicated in the published additional papers that an amendment to condition 1 was proposed in the following terms;

1. The approved development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings/details:

1412.PL.03 received by the local planning authority 19.12.2016

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in accordance with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Amendment No. 3) (England) Order 2009.

It was noted that planning permission was granted at appeal for a 33 dwellings diagonally to the rear of the site.

In addition, it was noted that the site had a complex planning history and that a previous appeal for dwellings on the site had established the principle of loss of employment land and that a connecting footpath could be secured by way of a Grampian condition. Although this appeal was dismissed on the grounds that it had not been that acceptable living conditions for future occupiers could be secured.

The site had also seen an application refused in 2016, that application was subject to an ongoing appeal, following enquiries with Environmental Health it was considered that the living conditions objection could be overcome by condition and therefore the application before the Panel had been invited by the Council.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report

amended as above.

The Panel heard from objectors who reiterated matters raised during the consultation process, including comment that the proposal was in conflict with both local plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

It was further commented by objectors that the emerging neighbourhood plan had undergone consultation, contrary to what was stated in the officer report. Policy ONP 12 of the plan seeks to protect existing employment sites, as there were no objections to this policy it must be given weight.

The Panel also heard that the neighbouring site had an application for an industrial venture which, if approved, would have implications for the reserved matters consideration on this site. The Objectors reiterated that the site had virtually no links to the town and would be in effect 8 isolated houses, the main road was busy and had a hedgerow running alongside it, this would have to be removed to provide a footpath and thereby remove screening to the industrial site.

Objectors also contested whether there was an ongoing appeal as it was their belief that this was not the case.

The applicant's agent told the Panel that the site had failed to attract interest in employment units that the site was initially intended for, the existing units on the site were beyond economic repair and therefore demolished.

The Panel also heard that when an earlier application had been appealed, whilst the appeal was lost the Inspector had concluded that the site was unlikely to be suitable for employment purposes, and that using the site for residential development would not have a material impact on available employment land. A further application had also been refused to which an appeal had been submitted, this was to be determined by way of an informal hearing.

The applicant's agent also confirmed that he had lodged a formal objection to the neighbourhood plan in respect of the allocation of the site for employment purpose and this matter was still outstanding.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the Neighbourhood plan was currently under consultation and that period ended on 8 March 2017 when it will go for examination as detailed in

the report, he confirmed that an objection had been received to Policy ONP12 as stated, and limited weight could be attached to the policy at this stage.

The Panel was told that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan stated that the site would be safeguarded for employment purposes and any application for non-employment development would be refused, this reflected policy E1 of the saved local plan.

However the Panel was told that paragraph 22 of the NPPF advised that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites for employment purposes where there was no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose.

Members were advised that in any event the lack of a 5 year housing land supply meant that the policies which restricted housing, such as the Policy E1, were rendered out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development as detailed in paragraph 14 of the NPPF was engaged.

The Senior Planning Officer also told the Panel that as the application for industrial use of the neighbouring site had not been determined no significant weight could be given to that consideration.

The Senior Planning Officer further confirmed that that a footpath link to Olney had been raised in the original appeal application but the Inspector had not supported the refusal on these grounds and also that design issues would be addressed under a reserved matters application.

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

Members of the Panel commented that not much weight had been given to the Neighbourhood Plan in the report but the Panel having received the representations from the objectors had now fully considered its content and the status of the plan.

It was further commented that irrespective of how much weight was given to the Neighbourhood Plan, it was acknowledged that the absence of a 5 year housing land supply meant that it would not be possible to refuse the application without demonstrating that there was significant harm to be done by granting permission. The planning Inspector having dismissed issues in respect of

connectivity to the Town, the only remaining concern was that expressed by Environmental Health in earlier applications that related to noise, the Panel had been advised that this matter had been mitigated by conditions to the satisfaction of Environmental Health.

The Panel commented that it appeared that no one was disputing whether there was a prospect of this site being used for employment purposes.

The Panel had serious concerns about the sustainable element of the application but it was noted that the Inspector had essentially negated any argument in this respect.

The Panel asked officers to clarify whether Policy ONP12 was in conformity with the NPPF and that a Neighbourhood Plan guidance note be included with future applications.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that in terms of a reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment purposes, Scorpion Mouldings from the neighbouring site have made representation that they would like to occupy the application site but this needed to be balanced against the findings of the previous appeal inspector in respect of the site.

In addition it was advised that the suggested unsustainable location of the site had previously been argued by officers and this was lost at appeal.

The Senior Planning Officer detailed that in his view Policy ONP12 was not in conformity with paragraph 22 of the NPPF.

It was also confirmed by the Senior Planning Officer that the agent for the applicant has lodged an appeal against the previous application but to date a start date letter had not been received.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report as amended above was carried with one member voting in favour and four abstaining, and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

16/03059/FUL

CONVERSION AND ALTERATION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING TO FORM 4 X 2 BED FLATS AND 1 X 1 BED FLAT BY RECONSTRUCTION OF EXISTING

OUTBUILDING AT THE OLD COCK INN, SILVER END, OLNEY FOR MR BILL SKINNER

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Planning Officer 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.

The Panel heard that paragraph 5.17 of the panel report was incorrect and that the parking provision was compliant. Councillor Bint asked that it be noted that whilst it was comforting to hear that the provision was compliant, he was disturbed that initially the report advocated accepting a non-compliant parking provision and that this was unacceptable.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions 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.

16/03347/FUL

CHANGE OF USE FROM BANK (USE CLASS A2) TO RESTAURANT (USE CLASS A3) AT 53-55 HIGH STREET, NEWPORT PAGNELL FOR MR A AHMED.

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was reported that there was an on the Panel report in that an additional condition to read;

‘Prior to change of use of the premises hereby permitted, details of the extractor flue shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development would not be harmful to the neighbouring amenity.’

The Panel heard that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report together with the additional condition.

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

Members of the Panel held concerns in respect of delivery arrangements due to the busy nature of the road at the front of the premises. There was

also likely to be an impact on the parking in the area.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicants agent had demonstrated that there was adequate parking in the vicinity, this being a town centre location. Likewise the applicant had submitted a delivery schedule which restricted delivery to after 5pm

Councillor Alexander told the Panel that other premises had restricted delivery until after 7pm as the road was busy until that time and therefore proposed that a condition be added to restrict delivery to after 6:30pm, this was seconded by Councillor Bint. Councillor A Geary having moved the motion accepted the amendment.

The Officer confirmed that a delivery management plan would be sought.

The Panel noted that the parking provision was contrary to policy although mitigated by virtue of the town centre location and parking available locally

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

RESOLVED –

That the application be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report as amended above together with the additional condition as detailed above.

16/02944/OUT

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 2 DWELLINGS, OUTBUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED ACCESS WITH ALL MATTERS, EXCEPT ACCESS, RESERVED FOR DETERMINATION AT A LATER DATE AT MALTING FARM, 80 WALTON ROAD, WAVENDON FOR MR AND MRS D HOPKINS

Councillors A Geary and Bint, having disclosed a prejudicial personal interest, stepped down from the Committee and left the room during consideration of this application.

Councillor Legg took the Chair.

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application

subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

Councillor Legg proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed this was seconded by Councillor Alexander

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions 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.

Councillors A Geary and Bint returned to the Committee

16/02696/FUL

ERECTION OF 2 DETACHED BUNGALOWS AT LAND TO THE REAR OF 58 TO 64, NAPIER STREET, BLETCHLEY FOR MR & MRS B HOBBS

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Panel heard that a Site Inspection had been conducted on 13 February which was attended by Councillor A Geary.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

The Panel heard from the Ward Member that he spoke on behalf of residents who objected to the application as the development would be so close to their properties that it would represent an overbearing structure and detract from the amenity of the existing properties. The separation distance from 'bungalow 2' rear to rear would be 11.5m the SDP required 18m.

The applicant's agent confirmed a pre-application had suggested that development would be acceptable hence the application being submitted. The scheme sought to meet all policy requirements as requested by the Council.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed the separation distances were less than required and therefore there was a condition proposed to remove permitted development rights.

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

Councillor A Geary confirmed that having attended the Site Inspection he was not minded to propose that the Officer recommendation be agreed and

thanked Councillor Legg for doing so in order to facilitate a debate. Councillor A Geary told the Panel that in his view the proposed development was unacceptable due to the separation distances between the proposed dwellings and the existing dwellings being too small being in some cases less than 11m and at best 13m, this was not in accordance with the Councils policy and represented an over development of the site. He further stated that he believed the site may be able to accommodate one new dwelling with some rearrangement but recognised that the application had to be considered as presented.

The Senior Planning Officer pointed out that as the dwellings were single Storey the 'Back to Back' separation distances were not applicable, however, it was recognised that the site could be considered as having amenity issues.

Councillor Bint stated that he did not hold the same concerns.

Councillor Legg told the Panel that as a former Ward Councillor he knew the area well and had concerns about the access arrangements due to the tight nature of the road.

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

Councillor A Geary proposed that the application be refused for the following reason;

As a result of the size and siting of plot 2, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the occupiers of 41 and 43 Paddock Way by virtue of an overbearing impact and visual intrusion. The proposed development would therefore fail to accord with Saved Policy D1 (iii) of the Milton-Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011.

This was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to refuse the application for the reason stated was carried and it was;

RESOLVED –

That planning permission be refused as the size and siting of plot 2, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the occupiers of 41 and 43 Paddock Way by virtue of an overbearing impact and visual intrusion. The proposed development would therefore fail to accord with Saved Policy D1 (iii) of the Milton-Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011.

16/03250/FUL

**DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BARN AND
ERECTION OF NEW BUNGALOW SERVED BY
REVISED PARKING LAYOUT
(RETROSPECTIVE) AT THE OLD STABLES,
BAY LANE, RAVENSTONE FOR MR PAUL
WELLER**

Councillor P Geary addressed the Panel and raised concerns in respect of the procedures and the consultation process with the Parish Council. He raised no material planning considerations.

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that there was no update on the Panel report and 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 unanimously and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

16/03355/FUL

**DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDING AND
ERECTION OF NEW BUNGALOW AT
FENNELLA, PARK GARDENS, BLETCHLEY
FOR MR P MATTHEWS.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was no update on the Panel report and 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 unanimously and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

16/02502/FUL

**TWO STOREY AND PART SINGLE STOREY
FRONT EXTENSIONS WITH GROUND FLOOR**

SIDE EXTENSION (RESUBMISSION OF 16/00242/FUL) AT 18 GILPIN WAY, OLNEY, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR AND MRS LAVENDER

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Planning Officer told the Panel that a late representation in objection, which had been detailed in the published update report, had been received, the matters raised therein had been addressed by within the published update report and it was confirmed that the recommendation remained to refuse the application for the reason as detailed in the report.

The Panel heard from the applicant, applicant's agent and Ward Member who raised the following points;

- The application had been revised following an earlier submission that would have been unacceptable due to its proximity to neighbouring properties and represented a scheme that sought to comply with relevant policies as advised by a Planning Officer who was no longer with the Council.
- The application before the Panel had also been amended to address any concerns identified.
- The plot was large and could accommodate the development but due to the configuration of the existing dwelling in respect of front and rear gardens it was necessary to rely on extending to the front.
- The design and materials were such that the street scene would not be adversely affected.
- The scheme was designed to be sympathetic to neighbouring properties and yet provide a family home for the applicant.
- There was no objection to the scheme from either the Parish Council or the Ward Councillors

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

The Panel recognised that there would be a

change to the street scene but that held a view that it would not be of a detrimental nature, it was further noted that the Parish Council and Ward Councillors did not object to the scheme and objections from neighbours had been addressed in the report.

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

Councillor A Geary proposed that the application be granted subject to the following conditions.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent the accumulation of planning permissions; to enable the Local Planning Authority to review the suitability of the development in the light of altered circumstances; and to comply with section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed only of materials of a type and colour which match exactly those of the existing building unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.(M01)

Reason: To ensure that the development does not detract from the appearance of the locality in accordance with Saved Policy D2 of the Milton Keynes Local plan 2001-2011.

3. Prior to commencement, details of the proposed boundary treatment shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include, elevations and confirm the materials and finish of the boundary treatment.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not detract from the appearance of the locality in accordance with Saved Policy D2 of the Milton Keynes Local plan 2001-2011.

4. The hereby permitted extensions shall be used as ancillary accommodation to 18 Gilpin Way, Olney solely for use by members of the household residing at the premises and shall not be let or sub-let, or transferred separately from the main property.

Reason: To ensure the premises are not subdivided without the permission of the Local Planning Authority and to avoid the creation of two distinct dwellings for reasons of parking, access

and residential amenity.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 or any Statutory Instrument revoking or amending or re-enacting that Order, the following provisions of Article 3(1), part I of Schedule 2 of the said Order shall not apply to No.18 Gilpin Way to which this permission relates and planning permission shall be required for the forms of development described in Classes A, B, C D and E of the said order.

Reason: To ensure that development does not take place without prior consent from the Local Planning Authority to ensure the site is not overdeveloped.

This was seconded by Councillor Legg.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed above was carried unanimously and it was;

RESOLVED –

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as detailed above.

16/03468/FUL

TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FIRST FLOOR FRONT EXTENSION OVER EXISTING GARAGE AT 3 FAIRWAYS, TWO MILE ASH, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR AND MRS A SUMMERS

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was no update on the Panel report and 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 unanimously and it was;

RESOLVED –

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

16/03652/FUL

PART SINGLE STOREY, PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, AND SINGLE STOREY LINK TO CONNECT EXISTING STORAGE BUILDING TO DWELLING 35 TATTENHOE LANE,

BLETCHLEY, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR WAYNE TURNER.

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was reported that there was no update on the Panel report and the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

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

It was noted that the determination of the application had been referred to the Panel in accordance with the scheme of delegation as the applicant was an employee of the Council.

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

RESOLVED –

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

16/03169/ADV

ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT FOR 1 X EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED FASCIA, 1 X EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED HANGING SIGN AND 3 X NON-ILLUMINATED OTHER SIGNS AT 16-17 MARKET PLACE, OLNEY, FOR TESCO STORES LIMITED

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the application was retrospective, there was no other update on the Panel report and the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

The Panel heard representations from the Ward Councillor who told the Panel that when the plans had been made known to him he had taken a view that the proposal was acceptable, however the applicant had now erected the signs in advance of the application being determined which had resulted in a clearer demonstration of what was proposed in the application and in situ it was clear that the signs were not in keeping with the area.

The Panel also heard that the High Street in Olney was one of two town centre locations in Milton Keynes that was afforded extra protection, and that the signs were not in keeping with that principle, in

particular the illuminated sign that protrudes, stands out and detracts from the conservation area and historic nature of the town centre.

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

Councillor A Geary reminded the Panel that this was an application that could be split in so far as each sign could be considered in isolation, he confirmed that having seen the signs he concurred with the observations of the objector that the illuminated sign (Sign 5) that stood out from the building line was of such a nature that it completely detracted from the street scene.

It was further commented that Sign 1, which was also illuminated was also out of character but being flat was not as obtrusive and inappropriate as sign 5,

Councillor A Geary told the Panel that a protruding sign that was in keeping with the area and not illuminated might find favour.

Councillor Bint proposed that a condition be applied to Sign 1 to restrict the hours of illumination to the opening or trading hours of then store. This was seconded by Councillor Legg

Councillor Bint asked that each sign be voted on separately.

In respect of sign 1;

The proposal to permit the sign subject to the additional condition to restrict the illumination to the trading hours of the store was carried.

In respect of sign 2;

The proposal to permit the sign was carried

In respect of sign 3;

The proposal to permit the sign was carried

In respect of sign 4;

The proposal to permit the sign was carried

In respect of sign 5;

The proposal to permit the sign was lost.

Councillor A Geary proposed that sign 5 be refused as it was out of character with the area, on being put to the vote the proposal was carried unanimously, and it was;

RESOLVED –

1. That sign 1 be permitted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report together with a condition restricting the illumination to the trading hours of the store
2. That sign 2 be permitted subject to the conditions detailed in the panel report
3. That sign 3 be permitted subject to the conditions detailed in the panel report
4. That sign 4 be permitted subject to the conditions detailed in the panel report
5. That sign 5 be refused as it was out of character with the area.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10:15 PM