

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL** held on **THURSDAY 21 OCTOBER 2021** at 7:00 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Legg (Chair)  
Councillors Exon, Lancaster (replacing Councillor Bowyer) and McLean.

**Officers:** P Keen (Team Leader (East) - Development Management), E Gineikiene (Senior Solicitor - Planning and Highways) and P Brown (Head of Democratic Services).

**ALSO PRESENT:** 3 members of the public.

**DCP18 APOLOGIES**

Councillors Bowyer and Priestley

**DCP19 INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed members of the public and councillors, advising that the meeting was being held both in the Civic Offices and remotely and would be broadcast live on YouTube, further explaining the procedures to be adopted.

**DCP20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None were made.

**DCP21 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

Cllr M Whelan (Great Linford Parish Council) spoke in objection to application 21/00504/FUL, Installation of 5 condensers (retrospective) - Resubmission of 20/02399/FUL at 160 Ramsons Avenue, Conniburrow, Milton Keynes.

The applicant's agent Mr B Sirah exercised the right of reply.

**DCP22 APPLICATIONS**

**21/00504/FUL INSTALLATION OF 5 CONDENSERS (RETROSPECTIVE) - RESUBMISSION OF 20/02399/FUL AT 160 RAMSONS AVENUE, CONNIBURROW, MILTON KEYNES FOR MR ANEES BADURUDEEN.**

The Team Leader introduced the application with a presentation. The Panel heard that there was no update on the Panel report and that the recommendation remained to grant the application

The Panel heard from Councillor Whelan speaking on behalf of Great Linford Parish Council who stated that the proposed development was out of character of the area,

was too large for a residential street and would therefore have an adverse impact on the street scene and neighbourhood.

The applicant's agent told the Panel that when the Condensers were installed the applicant had been advised that they were required to be of the size and type installed to ensure that the meat stored on the premises was kept at the required temperature, they were required to be on the outside of the property and that there was no suitable alternative.

Councillor McLean commented that the objector was referring to paragraphs in the report that did not appear in that published with the agenda, following some a short adjournment to conduct enquiries it was established that the objector had been referring to a previous report and not that being considered by the Panel.

Councillor McLean expressed concern in respect of the application being to place items on land that was not in the control of the applicant. The applicant's agent repeated that the condensers were the smallest available that would achieve the required level of temperature required without making excessive noise. It was further established that the applicant had not sought advice from the Highways Officers prior to installing the units. The applicant's agent told the Panel that the footpath was approximately 8 feet away from where the units had been installed and did not present an obstruction.

The Council's Solicitor advised the Panel that the installation of the units on the Highway was not a bar to making an application for permission, and that Highways matters of that nature were not considerations for the Panel.

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

Councillor Lancaster expressed further concern in respect of the development having been carried out on the Public Highway and asked that Officers refer the matter to Highways to investigate.

Councillor Exon however acknowledged that ownership of the land was not a consideration in whether to grant or refuse the application. Members of the Panel further stated that they did not accept that there was a loss of

amenity by virtue of the development.

Councillor McLean shared the concerns expressed by Councillor Lancaster but accepted that the surrounding fencing made the appearance better and had reduced the impact of noise.

Councillor Legg recognised that there were no planning considerations that would support refusing the application.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried with Councillors Exon and Legg, voting in favour of the proposal and Councillors Lancaster and McLean abstaining from the vote.

RESOLVED –

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

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 7:33 PM