



# South Buckinghamshire Area Planning Committee minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the South Buckinghamshire Area Planning Committee held on Tuesday 9 June 2020 in Via Microsoft Teams, commencing at 6.30pm and concluding at 8.50 pm.

## Members present

D Anthony, M Bradford, S Chhokar, T Egleton, B Gibbs, P Griffin, G Hollis, M Lewis, Dr W Matthews and R Reed

## Others in attendance

Cllr P Kelly

## Agenda Item

### 1 Election of Chairman

It was proposed by Councillor S Chhokar that Councillor T Egleton be elected Chairman of the South Area Planning Committee for the ensuing year. This proposal was seconded by Councillor G Hollis and agreed at a vote.

**RESOLVED: That Councillor T Egleton be elected Chairman of the South Area Planning Committee for the municipal year 2020-21.**

### 2 Appointment of Vice-Chairman

It was proposed by Councillor T Egleton that Councillor W Matthews be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the South Area Planning Committee for the ensuing year. This proposal was seconded by Councillor B Gibbs and agreed at a vote.

**RESOLVED: That Councillor Dr W Matthews be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the South Area Planning Committee for the municipal year 2020-21.**

### 3 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

### 4 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

**5 Virtual Meeting Procedural Rules**

The Committee discussed the virtual meeting procedural rules attached to the Agenda that would apply to virtual meetings whilst physical meetings were unable to take place.

**RESOLVED: That the Virtual Meeting Procedural Rules be noted.**

**6 PL/19/2119/FA - Thames House, Bells Hill, Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire, SL2 4EH**

Proposal: Demolition of the existing car showroom and the erection of a three storey mixed use building comprising a car showroom at ground level, and 12x 1-bed flats on the first and second floors. Retention of existing workshop to the rear with 2 MOT bays. Provision of car parking spaces, cycle storage area, and bin store.

Notes:

- The Case Officer stated that regarding all three applications and the proposed conditions, where details and schemes needed to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority these needed to be approved in writing and thereafter implemented, references to the District Planning Authority should be the Local Planning Authority and Applicants had agreed to the pre commencement conditions where proposed.
- A further two letters of objection had been received since the publication of the agenda. It was confirmed that these letters had not raised any additional material planning considerations.
- Speaking as an objector: Ms Emly Mitchell
- Speaking for the applicant, the agent: Mr Rob Clarke

**It was proposed by Councillor M Bradford, seconded by Councillor Dr W Matthews and RESOLVED:**

**That the application be delegated to the Director of Planning, Growth and Sustainability to approve subject the conditions included in the Officer's report with an additional condition requiring that at least 10% of the energy used on the site should come from renewable sources, and the satisfactory prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation Agreement relating to affordable housing and mitigation of Burnham Beeches SAC. If the Section 106 Agreement cannot be completed, the application be refused for such reasons as considered appropriate.**

**7 PL/20/0135/FA - 15 Cambridge Avenue, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8HP**

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side extension and rear infill extensions. Loft conversion including rear roof extension and raising of the ridge, addition of front and rear dormers and 6 rooflights. Front porch, formation of 3 parking spaces and vehicular access.

Notes:

- The Case Officer stated that a further letter of objection, a letter of support and a letter from the applicant had all been received since the publication of the Agenda. These letters had not raised any additional material planning

considerations.

- The Tree Officer had raised no objections to the proposal.
- An additional condition was proposed to ensure that the landscaping scheme would be implemented.
- Speaking as a Buckinghamshire Ward Councillor: Councillor Paul Kelly
- Speaking as an objector: Mr Peter Redpath
- Speaking as the applicants: Mr Tajinder Dhaliwal and Mr Manmohan Singh Dhaliwal

**It was proposed by Councillor S Chhokar, seconded by Councillor G Hollis and RESOLVED:**

**That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informative included in the Officer's report, with additional conditions requiring that the driveway be constructed of a permeable material to ensure sustainable drainage, and requiring that the landscaping scheme be implemented.**

**8 Deferred Application - PL/19/3143/FA - Focus School Stoke Poges Campus, School Lane, Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire, SL2 4QA**

Proposal: Erection of a multi-purpose space and ancillary rooms, removal of existing modular classrooms, creation of a new footpath link with Khalsa Academy, creation of temporary construction access on School Lane and related landscaping, SUDS and other drainage works and associated works on 6 no. TPO trees.

Notes:

- One further letter of objection had been received since the publication of the Agenda, but it did not raise any additional material planning considerations.
- An addendum report presented to the Committee when this application was previously considered relating to CIL liability had not been appended to the Agenda for this meeting. The Case Officer advised that the proposed development would be liable for CIL.
- The Case Officer recommended that the wording of Condition 11 be amended to ensure that the development could only be used for its intended purposes and an additional condition to ensure the removal of the existing portacabins on site.
- There was no public speaking on this application.

*Note: Councillor M Lewis left the meeting at 7.43pm.*

**It was proposed by Councillor M Bradford, seconded by Councillor G Hollis and RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused for the following reasons:**

- **The proposal would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.**
- **The development would result in additional harm to the Green Belt through loss of openness.**

- **The very special circumstances set out in the report did not outweigh the harm which would be caused to the Green Belt. The size of the proposed hall was not fit for purpose and the need for the development had not been justified.**