

Town Planning & Environmental Management Committee - 3 June 2020

Planning Applications - Delegated Decisions

These decisions will not be made through the normal committee meeting process but instead are delegated to the Deputy Clerk. Members of the public are invited to submit their comments by email to deputyclerk@newport-pagnell.org.uk by 12pm on Wednesday 3 June.

Item 1 Planning Applications

Meeting Date	Planning Appl'n	Details	Address	Grounds for objection	Decision on 03/06/20	Member chosen to speak at DCC
03/06/2020	20/01006/ADV	Advertisement consent for one internally illuminated fascia sign and one internally illuminated menu board (retrospective)	28 St John Street	None	No objection	
03/06/2020	20/01167/TPO	Removal of Oak (subsidence claim - 2 Auden Close)	3 Auden Close	None	No objection	
03/06/2020	20/00754/FUL	Proposed detached two bedroomed dwelling (resubmission of 19/02249/FUL) (Minor red line amendment to previous application)	21 St Margarets Close	(1) The proposed infill development is out of keeping with the surrounding properties in St Margarets Close and will have an adverse effect on the streetscene. The development is therefore contrary to Policy NP4 of the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan (windfall sites). (2) There is no guaranteed access to the new development. The proposed property although in St Margaret's Close will front on to Seven Drive. The only access to the property is via vehicle access gates, which are on the access driveway of Harben House, not directly on to the highway	To object to the application based on these grounds	Cllr Winsor
03/06/2020	20/01226/FUL	Single storey rear extension	82 Carroll Close	None	No objection	
03/06/2020	20/01227/FUL	Garage conversion and external alterations to garage including new window openings and replacement of roof	102 Westbury Lane	None	No objection	

1.1 Comments from members of the public

The Committee noted a comment from a member of the public regarding **20/01167/TPO** asking for the Town Council's support in objecting to this application and supporting the retention of the tree which, he said, contributed to the 'outstanding rural nature of the town'.

1.2 Additional comments

20/01006/ADV As with the previous application for Listed Building Consent, **Cllr Clarke** objected to this application suggesting that the application should be for three signs not two. He added that the signage on the front of the

listed building is excessive and out of keeping with a listed building and that the fixings could damage the facade of the building. The name of the restaurant is already very visible from the high level sign protruding from the building without these additional signs over the doorway. The Menu sign could be located inside the building and not on the outside fascia.

Cllr Lombardo also objected on the same grounds, agreeing that the external signs were not in keeping with a listed building. He added that the applicants needed to be challenged on certain works they appeared to be carrying out retrospectively.

20/01167/TPO **Cllr Day** commented that he could see that the house may need the works, but the tree will be significant for bird life and the ecosystem. He added that, if the tree is to go, just as NPTC have committed to replacing trees that it has removed as owner of parks and play areas, something significant in terms of replanting is needed.

20/01226/FUL **Cllr Clarke** objected to this application. He pointed out that the applicant had previously applied to construct a detached room, incorporated into being part of the semi detached garage. This was refused due to the impact on loss of parking space (19/03076/FUL). This new application appears to relate to the construction of a 4m extension to the main building, although the Site Plan still shows only the previous proposed development, stating "proposed out building" and does not show the new proposed 4m extension attached to the main building. He suggested this is updated, as the details are inaccurate for this proposal. The "Proposed Plans & Elevations" do show the proposed attached 4m extension, but do not provide any detail of how this sits on the site, or details of the existing semi detached garage. On the "site plan", this shows the red line perimeter for the site. However part of the red line area is part of the public vehicle and pedestrian access within the courtyard, giving other residents access to the other properties and garages, so Cllr Clarke suspected that this red line drawing is not accurate and makes the footprint of the site larger than it actually is. If this is the case he said, the addition of the proposed 4m x 6.44m extension would be considered an overdevelopment of the site. However this revised application appears to have removed the issue of loss of parking on this site, for which the previous application was refused.

20/01227/FUL Cllr Sidebottom declared a personal interest in that the applicant was known to her.

Item 2 Planning Decisions

The Committee received and noted the Deputy Clerk's updated schedule of planning decisions comparing TPPEM's representations against MKC decisions