

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting - 10 October 2018

Present: R Bagge (Chairman)
D Anthony, M Bezzant, T Egleton, B Gibbs, P Hogan, M Lewis,
Dr W Matthews and D Smith

Apologies for absence: J Jordan

16. MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 15 August 2018 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Hogan declared a Personal Interest under the Council's Code of Conduct on Application 17/01191/FUL as he was a Member of Beaconsfield Town Council who have made representations about this application. He had not attended any meetings when this application was discussed by the Town Council nor expressed a view on the application and has not pre-determined the application.

Cllr Dr Matthews declared a Personal Interest under the Council's Code of Conduct on Application PL/18/2189/FA as she was the Chairman of Iver Parish Council and a Member of Richings Park Residents Association who have made representations about this application. She had not attended any meetings when this application was discussed by the Town Council or Richings Park Residents Association nor expressed a view on the application and has not pre-determined the application.

18. APPLICATIONS AND PLANS

Key to the following decisions:

ADV - Consent to Display Adverts; ARM - Approval of Reserved Matters; CI - Certificate of Lawfulness Issued; CON - Conservation Area Consent; D - Deferred; D (INF) - Deferred for Further Information; D (SV) - Deferred for Site Visits; D (PO) - Deferred for Planning Obligation; D (NEG) - Deferred for Negotiations; FCG - Consent for Tree Work; PCR TPO Part Consent/Part Refusal; LBC - Listed Building Consent; OP - Outline Planning Permission; P - Application Permitted; R - Refused or Rejected; R (AO) - Refused against Officer recommendation; RC - Removal of Condition; TC - Temporary Consent; TP - Temporary Permission; ULBC - Unconditional Listed Building Consent; UP - Unconditional Permission; VG - Variation Granted; W - Application Withdrawn.

Planning Committee - 10 October 2018

(A) COMMITTEE DECISION REQUIRED FOLLOWING A SITE VISIT AND/OR PUBLIC SPEAKING:

		Decision
Plan Number:	17/01191/FUL	D (INF)
Applicant:	Mr Brendan Joy	
Proposal:	Redevelopment of site to provide detached building comprising 5 apartments, incorporating basement car parking, creation of vehicular access, access ramp, refuse store and landscaping works at 70 Ledborough Lane Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire HP9 2DG	
<p>Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A site visit was undertaken by Members. 2. There was no public speaking on this application 3. The Planning Officer informed Members that when this application was originally submitted, over a year ago, it was considered that it fell within the development type of a 'minor other' application. Since the application was submitted, the Council had reviewed the national criteria for development types and now considered that this application fell within the definition of what constituted a major application for the purposes of consultation and advertisement. Officers confirmed that the application could not be determined by Members until the consultation period had ended. 4. The Planning Officer also advised Members of a minor revision to condition 13 which should say "District" rather than "County" Planning Authority. 5. Two further letters of objection had been received on 9 October 2018. 6. The Planning Officer confirmed that the ridge height was comparable to other houses in the street. 7. Clarification was sought by Members on the artificial vegetation screen. <p>Cllr D Anthony proposed that whilst he was happy for the decision to be deferred until after the consultation period had ended, due to the number of objections the application should be referred back to Planning Committee for determination rather than the decision being delegated to officers as recommended. This proposal was seconded by Cllr Lewis and agreed unanimously at a vote. It was accordingly</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be deferred until the end of the consultation period and be brought back to the next Planning Committee for consideration.</p>		
		Decision
Plan Number:	17/01853/FUL	P
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Pomeranke	
Proposal:	Redevelopment of site to provide 8 detached dwellings with integral garages at Cut Heath House, Parsonage Lane, Farnham Common, Buckinghamshire SL2 3PA	
<p>Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A site visit was undertaken by Members 2. Mr Peter Lomax spoke on behalf of the objectors. 3. Mr Robert Clarke spoke on behalf of the applicant. 4. The Planning Officer advised Members that the application had been referred back to the Planning Committee because it was considered that the original May Committee report did not clearly highlight that the proposal would result in the loss of a tree from the site, which was covered by a Tree Preservation Order. As such Members were not clearly made aware of all the material planning considerations relevant to the application. It was also considered that notwithstanding the updated NPPF there had 		

Planning Committee - 10 October 2018

been no changes in material planning circumstances or policy since the May Committee meeting when Members were satisfied that the Scheme was acceptable subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 planning obligation.

5. The Planning Officer referred to the application plans which had not been changed and he also displayed the Tree Protection Plan submitted with the application which showed the removal of the protected Oak Tree.
6. The Planning Officer confirmed that as all other matters remained the same it was considered that the only issue that needed to be assessed by Members was the proposed loss of the protected Oak Tree.

Cllr P Hogan proposed that the application be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development to approve subject to the satisfactory prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation Agreement relating to affordable housing. That if the Section 106 agreement cannot be completed, the application be refused for such reasons as considered appropriate This proposal was seconded by Cllr D Anthony and agreed at a vote. It was accordingly

RESOLVED:

That the application be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development to approve subject to the satisfactory prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation Agreement relating to affordable housing. If the Section 106 agreement cannot be completed, the application be refused for such reasons as considered appropriate.

		Decision
Plan Number:	PL/18/2189/FA	R
Applicant:	Mr Aggarwal	
Proposal:	Extension to existing driveway to provide additional parking incorporating landscaping. Front gates and railings at 57 Wellesley Avenue, Iver, Buckinghamshire SL0 9BP.	

Notes:

1. A site visit was undertaken by Members.
2. Mr Ajay Koshal and Mike Kightley spoke on behalf of the objectors.
3. A further objection was received on 9 October 2018.

Cllr Dr W Matthews proposed refusal of the application for reasons of the effect on public amenity that it would not be consistent with the overall character and open design of the area and it would have an adverse impact on the public realm. This proposal was seconded by Cllr T Egleton and agreed at a vote.

RESOLVED that the application be refused for reasons of the effect on public amenity, inconsistency with the overall character and open design of the area and adverse impact on the public realm.

(B) COMMITTEE DECISION REQUIRED WITHOUT A SITE VISIT OR PUBLIC SPEAKING

None

(C) COMMITTEE OBSERVATION REQUIRED ON APPLICATIONS TO OTHER AUTHORITIES

None

(D) APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

The Committee received for information a list of the applications dealt with under delegated authority by the Head of Planning and Economic Development.

19. DELEGATED ARRANGEMENTS ON PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

The Committee received a report which recommended changes to the delegation arrangements on Planning Enforcement matters to take account of the recent approval of the Local Enforcement Plan. Members of the Planning and Economic Development PAG had been consulted and had supported the recommended changes. The report would also be considered by the Cabinet before a recommendation was made to Full Council. The Appendix set out in tracked changes the recommended changes to the Scheme of Delegation. Chiltern District Council Planning Committee had also been supportive of the recommended changes.

Following discussion Members were also in agreement with the recommended changes. However, they emphasised that the Planning Committee and Local Members should be updated regularly on enforcement issues and use of the delegations. Members welcomed the delegated decision making which were based on national best practice and would ensure that officers could respond to enforcement issues in an effective and timely manner.

The Officer recommendation that the revised delegations as set out in the Appendix to the report be agreed and recommended to Full Council for approval was put to the Committee by the Chairman and agreed at a vote.

RESOLVED that the revised delegations as set out in the Appendix to the report be agreed and:-

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that the revised delegations as set out in the Appendix to the report be approved.

20. PLANNING APPEALS AND SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING MATTERS

The Committee received for information a progress report which set out the up-to-date position relating to Planning Public Inquiries, Hearings and Court Dates.

RESOLVED that the report be noted

The meeting terminated at 5.25 pm