

# DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

20 OCTOBER 2016

## COUNCILLOR'S ADDITIONAL PAPERS -

### INDEX OF DOCUMENTS CIRCULATED AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA

1. Speaking Commitment (**Page 2**)
2. Application 02 – 16/00948/FUL
  - i. Submission from Resident (**Page 3**)
3. Application 08 – 16/01431/ADV
  - i. Submission from Central Milton Keynes Town Council (**Pages 4**)



## SPEAKING LIST

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL – 20 OCTOBER 2016

APPLICATION NO.	ADDRESS	REQUESTS TO SPEAK IN OBJECTION	TIME ALLOCATED	RIGHT OF REPLY OR SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR	TIME ALLOCATED
<b>16/01309/FUL</b>	Unit 10, Walker Avenue, Wolverton Mill	Cllr G Learnt  Wolverton and Greenleys Town Council	3 Mins	C Green (Agent)	3 Mins
<b>16/01187/FUL</b>	32B Stratford Road, Wolverton, Milton Keynes	Cllr G Learnt  Wolverton and Greenleys Town Council	3 Mins	A Pegley (Agent)	3 Mins
<b>ITEM 5 TPO PS/540/15/406</b>	41 Stratford Road, Wolverton, Milton Keynes			SPEAKERS NOTIFIED  S Verma  Cllr G Learnt  Wolverton and Greenleys Town Council	4 Mins  4 Mins



**Submission from Mr and Mrs Long**

**Application 02 - 16/00948/FUL**

Dear Sirs

Planning Application 16/00948/FUL

Because of other commitments we are unable to attend to speak to the Development Control Panel meeting on 20th October. We are writing to ask if our comments, below, might instead be read out to the committee.

We live next door to the applicant and have responded earlier as neighbours. We have no issues with the building works in themselves, but do have concerns as to the traffic implications.

As in the published Application, the garage has been converted for habitable use and in fact is now in business use as a studio for massage and related services. Braunston is a narrow and short residential street of 12 houses, from 3 of which active businesses are now operating:

1. The current application
2. A hairdressing business, the subject of an earlier approved application (08/1526/FUL), which has been operated with no issues arising for several years
3. A disco and fairground machinery business at No. 4

All of this is creating a significant amount of traffic and parking in the road, which is also quite frequently obstructed by trucks associated with (3) above. Thus potential danger arises to resident children and OAPs

Attention was drawn to this in earlier correspondence and I appreciate it is not directly relevant to the present Application. The officer's report indicates that these issues can be considered should a 'change of use' application be made: however if there is no such application, then there appears to be no forum other than this Panel for these issues to be considered.

Accordingly, and concerned about further possible conversions for business use in the future, we ask that consideration be given to attaching conditions to the current Application, similar to those agreed when approving No. 2 above. In particular we ask that there be a restriction to one practitioner only operating at any time - the implications for traffic, parking and general disruption to accommodate multiple clients would be severe.

Yours faithfully

GR & Mrs MG Long

**Submission from Central Milton Keynes Town Council**

**Application 08 - 16/01431/ADV**

Dear Andrew

On behalf of CMKTC, having now seen the case officer's report, I wish to advise you that our objection to Application Number 16/01431/ADV is withdrawn. You will appreciate that when a Town or Parish Council comments on an application it does so at a moment in time, when in this case our adviser felt the information provided was incomplete. Also, if that means that in the interests of efficiency, this item does no longer needs to take up the Panel's time and can be dealt with by officers, we are more than content with that.

I would just like to add, reference the DCC recent consideration of speaking arrangements, that it is the practice of CMKTC to always register a representative to speak to explain the nature of any objection from us. However, I am aware that we did not seek to speak in support of our objection to the recent consideration of the application to change the external appearance of Genesis House, 301-349 Midsummer Boulevard, CMK at DCC at its 1st September meeting. I believe it may be that the lack of any objectors at that meeting of DCC was the reference that your officers quoted in justification for greater delegation to themselves. I and other key CMKTC people were fully engaged in preparation for the INTU Inquiry that commenced the following week. Nevertheless, please accept my apologies for mine and the TC oversight.

Regarding Genesis House, I and a colleague met with Adam Smith who explained, whether or not he agreed with us, that he could not sustain an objection on design grounds alone. I could emphasise with that view. Nevertheless, the objective of CMKTC is to seek to raise the bar in terms of the quality of development permitted in CMK and it is only by having the opportunity to address DCC that we might collectively raise that bar. I am grateful to Adam for ensuring that this application and the TC objection were considered by Members.

I know that it is also the objective of MKDP, without which, for example, the ultra high rise development proposed by Sterling Property Ventures will not happen.

Kind regards

Andy

Andrew Thomas

Chair, Planning Committee

CMK Town Council