

## ITEM 3(b)

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL** held on **THURSDAY 22 OCTOBER 2020** at 7:00 pm.

**Present:** Councillor: Brown (Chair)  
Councillors Bint, Exon, Lancaster and Wallis.

**Officers:** P Keen (Team Leader (East) - Development Management), C Chan (Planning Officer), T Barton (Planning Officer), C Gaunt (Employed Barrister, Interim Principal Lawyer (Planning)) and D Imbimbo (Committee Manager).

**Also Present:** Councillor Crooks

### **DCP05 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

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

### **DCP06 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None were made.

### **DCP07 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

Town Councillor Winsor (Newport Pagnell Town Council) spoke in objection to application 20/01628/FUL First Floor Extension to No.25 over No.25A with associated works to turn 25A from a ground floor flat into a 2 bedroom dwelling (separate from No.25) at 25 Little Linford Lane, Newport Pagnell.

The Applicant, Mr M Cole, exercised the right of reply.

Councillor Crooks, (Ward Councillor), and the Applicant's Agent, Ms H Lowe, spoke in support of application 20/01333/FUL Alterations to dwelling: front extension with attic accommodation connecting to associated rooms and 2 storey front porch; replacement roof; single-storey side/rear extension; side extension with projecting rear canopy and attic room joined to remodelled outbuilding including front and side extensions to the latter to form west wing of dwelling incorporating triple garage with attic accommodation and associated rooms above; reconfiguration of driveway and installation of sliding access gate; associated landscaping at Fox Covert, 1 Linford Lane, Willen, the application having been recommended for refusal.

Parish Councillor Stabler (Great Linford Parish Council) spoke in objection to application 20/01751/FUL Erection of a double garage constructed in wood to include a small carport at the front at 83 Tower Drive, Neath Hill, Milton Keynes.

The Applicant, Ms. A Whelan, exercised the right of reply.

Town Councillor Winsor (Newport Pagnell Town Council) spoke in objection to application 20/01979/FUL Single storey detached building

to rear of property for use as summer house at 51 Lagonda Close, Newport Pagnell.

The Applicant, Dr. F Jenner, exercised the right of reply.

**DCP08**

**APPLICATIONS**

**20/01628/FUL FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO NO.25 OVER NO.25A WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS TO TURN 25A FROM A GROUND FLOOR FLAT INTO A 2 BEDROOM DWELLING (SEPARATE FROM NO.25) AT 25 LITTLE LINFORD LANE, NEWPORT PAGNELL FOR MR MICHAEL COLE.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Panel heard from the representative of the Town Council who, in summary, raised the following concerns;

- The dwelling on the site has already been sub-divided into two dwelling although the work on the part now known as 25a has not yet been completed.
- Other properties of a similar design in the area are not sub-divided.
- There is inadequate car parking on the site as it already exists.
- The entry to the drive has poor visibility.
- The new massing of the building will be excessive.

The Applicant told the Panel that the property was occupied by his father, the property was approved as two units one being a flat. The application sought to provide two smaller houses which would allow for his father to live in a property suitable for his needs.

The Panel heard from the Planning Officer that the site was already divided into a three bed dwelling and a separate 1 bed flat, the proposal sought to create 2 x 2 bed houses, there would be no increase in the number of bedrooms on the site. Parking had been assessed by the Council Highways Officers as adequate in the circumstances. The Panel heard that there was a revised recommendation detailed in the published update paper, in so far as condition 4, relating to the requirement to provide an electric vehicle charging point be removed, as it was not considered reasonable as there was no new dwelling proposed on the site.

The recommendation therefore remained to grant the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report but with the removal of Condition 4 as detailed therein.

Councillor Brown, seconded by Councillor Bint, proposed that the Officer recommendation be agreed.

Councillor Bint stated that he recognised that the principle of the sub-division had been established when the previous application had been granted.

Councillor Bint further commented that he recognised that the parking space shortfall remained problematic, however he recognised that problem already existed and therefore the Panel could not expect the new application to provide a remedy.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried with all Members of the Panel voting in favour.

RESOLVED –

That the application be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report with the removal of condition 4.

**20/01333/FUL**

**ALTERATIONS TO DWELLING: FRONT EXTENSION WITH ATTIC ACCOMMODATION CONNECTING TO ASSOCIATED ROOMS AND 2 STOREY FRONT PORCH; REPLACEMENT ROOF; SINGLE-STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION; SIDE EXTENSION WITH PROJECTING REAR CANOPY AND ATTIC ROOM JOINED TO REMODELLED OUTBUILDING INCLUDING FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSIONS TO THE LATTER TO FORM WEST WING OF DWELLING INCORPORATING TRIPLE GARAGE WITH ATTIC ACCOMMODATION AND ASSOCIATED ROOMS ABOVE; RECONFIGURATION OF DRIVEWAY AND INSTALLATION OF SLIDING ACCESS GATE; ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AT FOX COVERT, 1 LINFORD LANE, WILLEN FOR KAMALJIT REEHAL.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. It was confirmed that the recommendation remained to refuse the application for the reasons stated in the Panel report.

The Panel heard from the Ward Councillor and Applicant's Agent who, in summary, made the following points;

- The applicants feel that the recommendation to refuse is unjustified taking account of the proposals to a house set on a substantial plot.
- The proposals represent a similar amount of site coverage to surrounding properties and contrary to the statement in the report that the proposal would harm the pattern of development in the area, would in fact be similar.
- The proposed development would not be out of Character or conflict with the surrounding properties.
- The development is set behind considerable vegetation and would not impact on the streetscene.
- The view from the street would be further reduced should the gate, that officers have not objected to, be installed.
- The proposed extension to the left has been moved 2m further from the boundary at the request of the planning officers and has significantly lower eaves than those originally proposed.
- None of the proposed windows could cause a problem with overlooking.
- The property as it exists suffers from overbearing structures at both 42 Portland Drive and 2 Linford lane, using the space between the properties for the development will not cause any harm to neighbouring properties.
- The neighbours at 42 Portland Drive and 2 Linford lane, and the Parish Council do not object to the application, neither have a number of other neighbours in the vicinity.
- All the revisions to the application that have been requested have been made.
- The objections by the Willen residents' group may have been unduly influenced by activity on a neighbouring site.

The Planning Officer told the Panel that there had been revisions to the scheme as the landscaping scheme that had originally been submitted would not have fitted the site with the proposed development due to some of the land being subject to disputed ownership.

Councillor Brown proposed that the Officer recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons stated in the Panel report be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Exon.

Councillor Bint stated that he did not believe that account should be taken of the premises that did not object as many people simply do not engage with the planning process and no conclusions should be drawn from that.

Members of the Panel commented that the points raised by the applicant's agent and Ward Councillor had been addressed in the Panel report and that whilst the decision was finely balanced the conclusions drawn by the Planning Officer were correct.

Councillor Exon stated that, recognising that the height of the building was less than a standard 2 storeys building and that on balance he found the application acceptable.

On being put to the vote the proposal to refuse the application for the reasons as detailed in the Panel report was carried with Councillors Bint, Brown, Lancaster and Wallis voting in favour and Councillor Exon voting against.

**RESOLVED –**

That the application be refused as;

1. The proposal, by reason of its forward projection and the unbroken height and scale of the southern projecting extension (west wing) taking into account its close proximity to western boundary would create a disproportionately deep extension to the dwelling, out of keeping with the character, appearance and pattern of development within the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D1, D2 and D3 of the Plan:MK (2019) and points a) and e) of Design Policy 1 of the Campbell Park Neighbourhood Plan.
2. The proposal, by reason of its forward projection, unbroken height and scale of the southern projecting extension (west wing)

taking into account its close proximity to western boundary with no's 2 Linford Lane and 42 Portland Drive, would result in a highly dominating and overbearing development that would create an unsatisfactory level of visual amenity for the private rear gardens of both neighbouring properties and from the closest rear windows of 42 Portland Drive. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy D5 of the Plan:MK.

**20/01751/FUL**

**ERECTION OF A DOUBLE GARAGE CONSTRUCTED IN WOOD TO INCLUDE A SMALL CARPORT AT THE FRONT AT 83 TOWER DRIVE, NEATH HILL, MILTON KEYNES FOR MS ANGELA WHELAN.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation. The Panel heard that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel Report. The Panel was told that the application was for an amendment to a previously approved application, seeking a smaller size using a different material.

The Panel viewed a video of the site and surrounding area. Members of the Panel were reminded that due to the restrictions in respect of the COVID19 pandemic the video was used to replace a site inspection.

The Panel heard from the representative of the Parish Council, who, in summary, raised the following concerns:

- The proposed materials are not in keeping with the materials of the existing building and are out of character with the area.
- The first application for a garage was refused following objections from the Parish Council as the materials proposed to be used were not in keeping with the area, a subsequent application, which was approved, proposed materials that were in keeping. That approved application included a condition requiring materials to match the existing dwelling, that permission lapsed in 2020.
- The Parish Council does not object to the principle of the development but requests that it be done using materials which are sympathetic to the existing building and the

area in contravention of Policy D2 paragraphs 1, 2 and 4. And the Great Linford Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan policy s1 paragraphs a and b.

The applicant told the Panel that the proposed materials sought to satisfy the Council's aspirations under policy SC1 of the Council Plan for environmentally sustainable development. The proposed building could be removed without causing harm. The building is not visible from the street and there are no objections from neighbours.

The Planning Officer told the Panel that Great Linford Neighbourhood Plan Policy S1 refers to new homes and small infill sites, this proposal was neither.

The Planning Officer confirmed that no formal notice had been received to state that the work had started on the previous application before its expiry date. It was further confirmed that it was not relevant to the application to be considered.

Councillor Brown proposed that the application be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report, this was seconded by Councillor Bint.

Councillor Exon stated that he recognised that the principle of development had been established, he could see no planning reason to refuse it.

Councillor Bint stated that he believed it to be a finely balanced decision as to whether the proposed material was appropriate, however because the site was shielded by the landscape and vegetation it could be something some would support.

On being put to the vote the motion to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Panel report was carried with Councillors Brown, Exon and Lancaster voting for the proposal and Councillors Bint and Wallis abstaining from the vote.

RESOLVED –

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

**20/01979/FUL**

**SINGLE STOREY DETACHED BUILDING TO REAR OF PROPERTY FOR USE AS SUMMER HOUSE AT 51 LAGONDA CLOSE, NEWPORT PAGNELL FOR DR. F JENNER**

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

The Panel heard from the representative of the Town Council who, in summary, raised the following concerns;

- The structure being constructed of brick could be used all year round and therefore to call it a summerhouse was not appropriate.
- The Town Council believes that the proposed structure is too large.
- The materials should be wood and glazing.

The applicant confirmed that the intention was to use the structure as a sheltered outdoor space all year round, the existing wooden construction, due to its location in a shaded area required regular maintenance and was prone to rotting.

The proposed materials are in keeping with the dwelling and those in the surrounding area, the size and scale and positioning was such that it could not be converted into living space.

Councillor Brown proposed, seconded by Councillor Exon, that the application be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel report.

Members of the Panel commented that proposed structure seems reasonable in the location and in appearance it was similar to the garages at the rear of the property.

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

**RESOLVED –**

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

**THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 8:43 PM**