

Minutes of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL held on THURSDAY 25 APRIL 2019 at 7:00 pm.

Present: Councillor: McLean (Chair)
Councillors Alexander, Baines and Miles
Officers: E Verdegem (Senior Planning Officer), C Ashby (Planning Officer), L Peacock (Planning Officer), V Watts (Planning Lawyer) and T Milner (Committee Manager).

Number of Public Present: 13

Apologies: Councillor Williams

DCP38 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

DCP39 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None were made.

DCP40 REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS

Ms J Jackson, Ms M Sherwood and Councillor P Geary (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection to application 19/00386/FUL Demolition of existing garage, dining room and bedroom above; erection of a two-storey side and rear extension; erection of a single-storey rear extension; erection of separate annexe including single garage to the side at 15 West Street, Olney.

The Applicant Mr L Wood exercised the right of reply.

Mr K Moore spoke in objection to application 19/00307/FUL Change of use from dwelling house (C3) to house in multiple occupation (C4) at 5 Lundy Walk, Newton Leys, Milton Keynes.

The Applicant declined the right of reply.

19/00386/FUL DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE, DINING ROOM AND BEDROOM ABOVE; ERECTION OF A TWO-STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION; ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION; ERECTION OF SEPARATE ANNEXE INCLUDING SINGLE GARAGE TO THE SIDE AT 15 WEST STREET, OLNEY FOR MR AND MRS WOOD.

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

It was noted that Councillor Hosking had registered to speak at the meeting but due to unforeseen circumstances was unable to be present; he had however submitted a written representation which the Chair read on his behalf.

The Panel heard from objectors who raised the following planning concerns;

- The proposed development would triple the size of the building and represented an over-development of the site.
- The proposed development would be overbearing on neighbouring properties and not in keeping with the street scene.
- The removal and replacement of the hedge will result in an unsafe exit arrangement for vehicles and will be a risk to security.
- The proposed development site is a semi-detached property and whilst previous extensions have resulted in two properties that do not match the proposals will significantly alter the exterior due to the size of the proposed extension.
- Whilst not situated in the conservation area, the development will impact on it.

The applicant told the Panel that the applicant had sought pre-planning advice and had drawn up

plans in accordance with that, overall the proposal was completely in keeping with policy, in particular it should be noted that the plot was extremely large and that whilst the proposed extension was itself large scale it did not have any detrimental impact on either the development property or the neighbouring properties, this was further supported by the recent acquisition of a strip of land adjacent to the property. The proposed development took up less than 15% of the entire plot. Likewise there is no uniformity of buildings in West Street. It was further commented that the separation distances between properties was large and therefore the development would not be overbearing. The applicant also stated that should the neighbours have concerns about the hedgerow that was proposed as a buffer he would be willing not to include it.

Councillor McLean, seconded by Councillor Baines, proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed.

The Panel recognised that the plot was extremely large and that there was unlikely to be any detrimental impact on neighbours or the street scene, it was also noted that the occupants of the adjoining semi-detached property had not objected to the scheme. It was further noted that the proposals were in keeping with the NPPF.

It was noted that the objectors would prefer the hedgerow not to be planted and that the applicant was agreeable to this and therefore the inclusion of condition 3 was unnecessary. It was proposed by Councillor Baines seconded by Councillor McLean that condition 3 be removed, on being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Panel Report with condition 3 removed was carried.

RESOLVED –

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

19/00307/FUL CHANGE OF USE FROM DWELLING HOUSE (C3) TO HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (C4) AT 5 LUNDY WALK, NEWTON LEYS, MILTON KEYNES FOR Mr LEON HILL

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

The Panel heard from the objector who stated that he held concerns that the proposal would lead to significant parking congestion as there was inadequate parking provision, this was already a problem in the street and a concern shared by all residents in the street.

It was also commented that the property benefitted from only one parking space and the second that was originally available had been converted to living space.

Councillor McLean, seconded by Councillor Miles, proposed that the officer recommendation be agreed.

Members of the Panel recognised that the street was narrow and congested with parked vehicles. It was also noted that the premises did not meet the parking standards

On being put to the vote the recommendation to refuse the application as the proposed development fails to provide a sufficient number of on-plot independently accessible parking spaces for a 5-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation within Parking Zone B, as outlined within both the Houses in Multiple Occupation 2012 (SPD) and the Milton Keynes Parking Standards 2016 (SPD). As such, the proposed change of use would result in additional on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety for all users, convenience and amenity of local residents. The proposed scheme is contrary to Policy CT10 of Plan:MK, the Houses in Multiple Occupation 2012 (SPD) and the Milton Keynes Parking Standards 2016 (SPD).was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED –

That the application be refused for the reason stated above.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 7:55 PM



CHAIR'S INITIALS