



**Central Milton Keynes Town Council
 Planning Meeting held on 27th May 2015
 At the Town Council office, Margaret Powell House,
 413 Midsummer Boulevard, Central Milton Keynes**

Present: Andrew Thomas (Chair)
 Ken Baker
 Linda Inoki
 Rebecca Kurth
 Jon Muncaster (Planning Advisor)
 Paul Cranfield (Clerk)
 Thomas Walker (Assistant Clerk)

	Notes	Actions
1	Apologies & Declarations of Interest No new declarations of interest were noted.	
2	Minutes The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 29 April 2015, as previously circulated, were agreed and signed as a true record.	
3	List of Planning applications for the last 28 days The paper, as previously circulated, was noted. The Planning Advisor provided an outline of his enquiries on the 'minor' applications featured, which are not subject to individual scrutiny by the entire Planning Committee. A paper outlining his opinion on each application was noted. The following responses to the applications were agreed upon:- 15/00930/FUL No comment It was noted that the Permitted Development Order pertaining to changes of use to residential is time limited. It was agreed that this would be discussed with Anna Rose. 15/00986/FUL Object- Whilst being supportive of the work to be undertaken on converting the property for disabled use, there are clear issues with the design which need addressing before the design is fit for purpose. 15/00964/FUL Support 15/01053/FUL No comment 15/01127/MKCOD3 Object. The proposal is unsightly and affords a negative contribution to the environment and could cause reputational damage. 15/01128/MKCOD3 Object. The proposal obscures the open views down the boulevard and creates a lack of visibility which could be dangerous to car	

	drivers not having line of sight of pedestrians crossing using the porte cochere.	
4	<p>Application 15/00607/FUL- Kingsbridge House The paper, as previously circulated, was noted.</p> <p>The changes to the exterior façade were noted.</p> <p>The Planning Committee agreed to object to the application on the basis that the proposal to remove the colonnade would be in contravention of Section G7 of the Business Neighbourhood Plan, which requires existing colonnades to be retained wherever practicable.</p>	
5	<p>Application 15/01059/FUL- West of 201, Avebury House The paper, as previously available, was noted.</p> <p>The application was supported.</p>	
6	<p>Application 15/00827/FUL- North Second Street The paper, as previously circulated, was noted.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed at the lack of a colonnade on the building. The Planning Committee declined to decide upon a response and requested that the applicant be asked if they had considered to providing a colonnade on the frontage of the building.</p>	PC
7	<p>Application 15/01074/OUT- Intu The papers, as previously available, were noted.</p> <p>A lengthy discussion ensued in respect of the most effective way in which the response to this application could be developed. The Planning Committee determined that it wished to object to the application, but noted that the terms of such objection would need to be carefully considered due to the complexity of the issues present.</p> <p>It was noted that there were three types of response:- ---on planning grounds ---on transport grounds ---following legal advice related to the combined s106 and walkway agreement.</p> <p>In each of these regards it was felt appropriate to seek to engage professional assistance in constructing arguments.</p> <p>It was noted that the Town Council is party to any Stopping Up order, and this would be required if the walkway was narrowed, but it was felt that establishing that to do so would not be in the public interest could be challenging. <i>Paul, not sure what you are trying to say/emphasise. If unsure you could simply omit it and just leave the factual statement.</i></p> <p>It was agreed to seek legal advice on the viability of the walkway agreement and whether there might be grounds for a public enquiry if the agreement is varied/disregarded. The Clerk to request a recommendation from Dominic Lawson in this regard.</p> <p>It was also noted that, within the Business Neighbourhood Plan, Policy <i>CMKAP G3</i> precludes the removal of public space, which will be the case in Midsummer Place, unless the development is exceptional, as outlined in Policy <i>CMKAP G11</i>, which is not felt to be the case.</p> <p>A proposal was made that other parish councils in the proximity be</p>	PC

	<p>approached to provide support to any argument made for decline of the application.</p> <p>It was agreed to proceed with a request to Dominic Lawson to consider the application, but that Motion should only be asked to provide an initial assessment of the transport plan.</p> <p>It was further noted that commissioning opinion in respect of all three aspects of the application will cost and that the Planning Committee does not have a budget. The four Town Council members present agreed to request support for a budget of £5,000 from reserves to pursue these actions, but also agreed that a request be placed before the Town Council that the sum of £15,000 in total could be allocated from reserves to support actions the Planning Committee might deem necessary to interrogate applications, providing flexibility without the need to revert to the Town Council prior to action being taken. The Clerk to bring forward to the next Town Council meeting.</p>	PC
8	<p>Verbal Update on Campbell Park/Newlands Development The Planning Advisor provided an update on the discussions at a meeting he attended on behalf of the Town Council where two contrasting schemes for the marina scheme were considered.</p>	
	<p>The meeting closed at 8.05 pm</p> <p>Date of next formal meeting proposed as Wednesday 24 June 2015 at 6pm</p>	