



**Central Milton Keynes Town Council
Planning Meeting held on 23rd November 2016
At the Town Council office, Margaret Powell House,
413 Midsummer Boulevard, Central Milton Keynes**

Present: Andrew Thomas (Chair)
Linda Inoki
Rebecca Kurth
Paul Cranfield (Clerk)
Thomas Walker (Assistant Clerk)

Apologies: Jon Muncaster (Planning Advisor)

Members of the Public: One, between items 4 and 8

| | Notes | Actions |
|---|---|----------------|
| 1 | Apologies The Planning Advisor extended his apologies for the meeting. | |
| 2 | Declarations of Interest No additional declarations of interest were advised. | |
| 3 | Minutes The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 26 th October 2016, as previously circulated, were agreed and signed as a true record. . | |
| 4 | Minor Planning Applications The paper, as previously circulated, was noted. A member of the public arrived at this juncture and was invited to speak, but declined to do so. In accordance with the procedure agreed for addressing minor applications whose statutory consultation conclusion falls before the formal planning committee meeting the following response, considered by the Chair, was ratified:- 16/03009/FUL Amends to window configuration- Campbell Park Pavilion Support | |

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| 5 | <p>Scheme of Delegation The paper, as previously circulated, was noted.</p> <p>The Planning Committee considered the 'Consultation on Proposed Amendments to the Scheme of Delegation and Constitution' and resolved to support the following recommendations to be sent to Milton Keynes Council by 30 December:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minor planning applications, where the planning officer agrees with an objection or condition request from a P&TC, do not need to go to DCP. 2. In cases where the planning officer disagrees, he should discuss with the P&TC which then has the right to escalate to DCP providing it agrees to provide a speaker so the escalation would not be automatic. 3. The consultation period for P&TCs should be extended to 28 days as it is for Ward Cllrs and, providing it does not compromise decision timescales, the planning officer should agree requested extensions. This would also apply to major applications. 4. The MKC IT system should automatically inform Clerks (and Ward Cllrs) of a new validated application in their Parish on the first day of the consultation period. 5. The MKC IT system should automatically inform Clerks (and Ward Cllrs) of the date at which DCP will consider an application to which the P&TC has objected or requested conditions as in (2) above. 6. P&TCs should make their objections or request for conditions on the basis of Planning Policies and Planning Guidance. 7. A training programme should be developed between MKC Planning and MKALC to provide planning skills to P&TCs and <u>advisory</u> targets for trained councillors could be agreed. 8. No change should be made to speaking rights. <p>Additionally, it was agreed that the Chair, under delegated Chair's Action powers, complete the online survey with additional comments supplemental to the above points.</p> | AT/TW |
| 6 | <p>16/02370/FUL Re-cladding of Airkix The paper, as previously circulated, was noted.</p> <p>It was noted that pursuant to email correspondence with the Planning Officer and further consideration by the Planning Advisor it would not be possible to sustain an objection on design grounds, but that a communication to the Planning Officer had reflected the Town Council's view on the choice of materials for the re-cladding.</p> | |
| 7 | <p>16/03038/FUL 809/811, Silbury Boulevard The paper, as previously circulated, was noted.</p> <p>The Assistant Clerk noted that he had drawn comparisons between the previous scheme for the site and that currently before the committee,</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|----------|
| | <p>specifically relating to concerns registered with the previous application.</p> <p>The Clerk advised that communications had been received from DLA which had been sent to the Planning Officer with relation to the proposal. The communication did not ask that the TC consider the content and hence it was agreed that these communications would not be referred to when ascertaining the Planning Committee's view on the new application.</p> <p>The Assistant Clerk advised that the focus of the development had changed to enable the provision of affordable rental housing throughout the scheme. It was uncertain at this stage whether this would be deemed to satisfy the affordable housing requirement of MKCouncil, but this was acknowledged as one of the areas yet to be determined. The Chair reported that the Council's Planning Obligations Officers had advised him that he would be consulting the TC in due course, once this and the position on other obligations had been clarified.</p> <p>It was noted that there was a small reduction to the number of units now proposed, and that the removal of the 'community space' to be replaced by a smaller 'residents' lounge' has enabled an increase in car parking provision from 71% to 86% of maximum. A discussion followed regarding parking, and, by a majority, the Planning Committee agreed that the current allocation was sufficient for the development, given the periphery parking already available.</p> <p>It was agreed that the response to the application with the information currently available would be as follows. The Town Council:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • notes the increase in parking allocation within the new application. • welcomes the revised proposals to include a bin store. • welcomes the proposal to extend the porte cochere. • requests details on the pallet of materials proposed for the elevations before commenting on this aspect of the application. • would request more information on S106 and other planning obligations, together with confirmation that the proposal meets the affordable housing requirements. • Notes the strong concerns articulated by local residents and businesses with reference to the loss of sunlight in respect of adjacent properties be noted. <p>The member of the public left the meeting at this juncture.</p> | |
| 8 | <p>16/03068/FUL Site north of Morrisons Supermarket The paper, as previously circulated, was noted.</p> <p>It was agreed that this application should be supported, being in compliance with the Neighbourhood Plan, and that the note to the Planning Officer should incorporate the principal policy references in the Plan</p> | AT/PC/TW |
| 9 | <p>30 applications for free standing internally illuminated digital signs The paper, as tabled at the meeting, was noted.</p> <p>The Chair and Clerk reported on the recent and most satisfactory meeting with the Planning Officer and applicant, where most locations for the new signs were visited and the siting and orientation discussed and agreed.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Planning Committee would not object to any of the proposed locations, but that assurances were sought that all 44 existing, larger units, will be removed and the paving made good, as promised by the applicant.</p> | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | |
| 10 | <p>The meeting closed at 7.40 pm</p> <p>Councillor Kurth noted that she would not be available for the next meeting, which would be inquorate unless an additional councillor agrees to join the committee at the next full Town Council meeting.</p> <p>Date of next formal meeting proposed as Wednesday 21 December 2016 at 6pm</p> | |

Chair's Signature.....

Date.....