

ITEM 3(c)

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL** held on **THURSDAY 22 APRIL 2021** at 7:00 pm.

Present: Councillor: Bint (Chair)
Councillors Alexander, Legg (replacing Cllr Brown), McLean and Wallis.

Officers: C Nash (Development Management Manager), P Keen (Team Leader (East) - Development Management), C Ashby (Planning Officer), T Barton (Planning Officer), R Larner (Planning Officer), E Gineikiene (Principal Solicitor) and D Imbimbo (Committee Manager).

DCP25 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

DCP26 APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Councillor Brown who was replaced by Councillor Legg.

DCP27 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Alexander asked that it be noted that in respect of application 21/00130/FUL the site was within his Ward but he had not had any discussion in respect of the matter and approached it with an open mind.

DCP28 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS

Mr S Patrick, Councillor Ayles (Castlethorpe Parish Council) and Councillor A Geary (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection to application 21/00016/FUL Proposed 3m single storey rear extension and garage conversion (resubmission of 20/02875/FUL) at 12 Shepperton Close, Castlethorpe, Milton Keynes.

The Applicant exercised the right of reply by way of a written statement read by the Committee Manager.

Cllr M Whelan (Great Linford Parish Council) spoke in objection to Application 21/00130/FUL, Conversion of a double garage into accommodation for an elderly parent/carer at 5 Cheslyn Gardens, Giffard Park, Milton Keynes

The Applicant Mr B Munro (Applicant's Representative) exercised the right of reply.

DCP29 APPLICATIONS

21/00129/FUL NEW DWELLING INCLUDING NEW ACCESS AND AMENITY SPACE, NEW ACCESS AND DRIVE TO EXISTING DWELLING (RE-SUBMISSION OF 20/02803/FUL)) AT 1 WOLVERTON ROAD,

CASTLETHORPE, MILTON KEYNES MR J MARKHAM.

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel Report and published update papers.

The Panel heard that the objections made by the Parish Council had been withdrawn following amendments to the scheme, this was confirmed by Councillor Ayres of Castlethorpe Parish Council, who was present at the meeting, it was noted that the Parish Council meeting had taken place after publication of the Panel report.

Councillor Bint proposed that the Officer recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report as amended within the published update report be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor McLean.

The members of the Panel commended the applicant for working with the Parish Council to reach an acceptable solution to the concerns originally raised in respect of the application.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report and published update was carried, with all members of the Panel voting in favour.

RESOLVED –

That the application be granted subject to the conditions as detailed within the Panel report and as amended within the published update report.

21/00016/FUL

PROPOSED 3M SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND GARAGE CONVERSION (RESUBMISSION OF 20/02875/FUL) AT 12 SHEPPERTON CLOSE, CASTLETHORPE, MILTON KEYNES FOR MISS ROSE KELLY.

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was confirmed that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel Report. It was noted that additional objections had been received since publication of the agenda and that these had been addressed in the published update papers. It was noted that elements of the proposed development would have been allowed under permitted development rights, however, in this case, they had been previously removed.

The Panel heard from objectors who, in summary, made the following comments relating to planning policy;

- The proposal does not comply with the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan, which amongst other matters, requires pitched roofs.
- The proposed development is out of character with the area and does not fit into the street scene.
- There will be a loss of light to number 14 if the development was approved.
- The view of the properties from the rear will not accord with the rest of the street as it will no longer be uniform.
- There is no requirement for a toilet within the 'gym' if the build is an integral part of the house.
- The proposed use will result in a loss of amenity for neighbours due to the excessive noise created, this was already a problem due to the garage being used to broadcast 'zoom' online classes.
- Shepperton Close was developed in the 1980's in a Georgian style and won awards, the Neighbourhood Plan (policy 3) was drawn up taking account of the unusual setting in a rural village and seeks to preserve the appearance, the proposal would break away from that styling, the Plan does not prevent extensions that are in keeping with the general style of the street.
- PlanMK policy D3 requires that an extension does not detract from the design and character of a building and surrounding area, the proposal would be in breach of that policy.
- The retention of the 'false' garage door goes some way to preserving the style, but the flat roof is out of character, as is the whole proposal for the treatment of the windows and doors which are not in the Georgian style.
- The rear of the property would be fully visible

from the street as people enter the village.

- The proposal will create a habitable room with only a single brick wall separating from the neighbouring property allowing sound to travel easily between the properties.
- Previous applications in the street that have not been in keeping with the street scene have been approved after modification to fit in.

The Panel heard a written submission from the applicant in response to the objections.

In response to a question from Councillor Alexander the Planning Officer confirmed that noise and sound nuisance was a matter for Environmental Health rather than a Planning matter. It was commented that there was no proposal for a change of use and the property will remain residential and therefore there was no planning provision for requiring additional sound insulation. The use of the 'studio' for the purpose of broadcasting a 'zoom' online class was considered to be similar to any 'working from Home' activity and did not require a change of use.

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

Members of the Panel expressed concern that the proposed extension did not incorporate a degree of noise protection for neighbours, however it was recognised that the failure to comply with policy 3 of the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan and policy D3 of PlanMK in respect of the character and street scene was clearly reason to allow the application.

On being put to the vote the motion to grant the application was lost with all members of the Panel voting against.

Councillor McLean, seconded by Councillor Legg, proposed that the application be refused as it was contrary to Policy 3 of the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan and Policy D3 of PlanMK.

On being put to the vote the proposal to refuse the application as it failed to comply with policy 3 of the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan and policy D3 of PlanMK in respect of the character and street scene was carried with all members of the Panel voting in favour.

21/00130/FUL

CONVERSION OF A DOUBLE GARAGE INTO ACCOMMODATION FOR AN ELDERLY PARENT/CARER AT H5 CHESLYN GARDENS, GIFFARD PARK, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR & MRS BATES.

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

The Panel heard representations from the Parish Council in objection on the basis that the proposal would conflict with Policy D1 of PlanMk in terms of design and the continuity of the street scene. The Parish Council also believed that the proposals were contrary to policy D5 of PlanMK in terms of amenity and the failure to protect a shared drive.

It was further stated that the design and specification did not appear to facilitate habitation by an elderly disabled person, there being standard doors and a lack of other adaptations, this leads the Parish Council to believe that the development is not for use as stated for an elderly relative.

It was also commented that policy required that an annex should function as an integrated part of the main dwelling. In this case the annex is detached from the main dwelling, it is of concern that the annex could be used as a separate dwelling.

The Applicant told the Panel that the design was in keeping with the street scene, parking concerns were unfounded as there was provision within the plan and the property was situated at the end of a cul-de-sac it was not intended that the elderly person occupied the annex, but rather the carer for the elderly person, the elderly person would remain in the main house. The applicants were unable to be present full time and a carer was required, there was no spare bedroom for the carer to stay in.

The Planning Officer told the Panel that the issues raised had been addressed in the update papers, it was commented that the policy did not require an annex to be physically integrated with the main dwelling but dependent on the host building, there were conditions proposed to ensure that the annex was not used as a separate dwelling.

In response to a question the Planning Officer confirmed that Policy D6 required annexes to provide

accommodation for dependent relatives not their carers, however there was accompanying policy text that suggested that an annex could be used in a case of this nature for the carer, as a result of the needs of a dependent.

Councillor Bint proposed, seconded by Councillor McLean, that the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report.

Members of the Panel recognised that the policy was unclear and open to interpretation, there was however nothing to suggest that the intent of use was for anything other than that stated. It was noted that it was not considered appropriate to apply a personal permission in this instance.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report was carried with all members of the Panel voting in favour.

RESOLVED –

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

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 8:31 PM