

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs Jill Knowles

Minutes of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held at the Community Centre, Eskdale Road,
Stoke Mandeville on Thursday 24th August 2017 at 10.30 am

PRESENT: Cllrs: J Hunt (Chair), S Atkinson, A Clark, B Ezra, K Gomm, S Pluckwell.

ITEMS P17/91 to P17/95 only: Mr Joe Houston, Parks & Green Infrastructure Officer, Aylesbury Vale District Council
(AVDC)

MINUTES taken by Cllr Atkinson, in the absence of the Clerk.

P17/91	APOLOGIES AND ABSENCE Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Rogers.	
P17/92	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS There were no declarations of interest made. The Clerk will ask all Parish Councillors to update their Register of Interests.	Clerk
P17/93	MINUTES The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 th July 2017 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.	
P17/94	OPEN FORUM FOR PARISHIONERS No members of the public were present.	
P17/95	SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS Mr Houston gave a presentation on his role in connection with assessment and allocation of contributions under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), commonly known as s106 agreements, followed by a question and answer session with members of the Planning Committee. It was noted that of the seven sites to receive s.106 monies projects for all except one had been submitted. That for 125 dwellings in Lower Road still had to be agreed. J Houston said that the stated aims for this to be used for leisure facilities for the Hawkslade /Stoke Leys area was unacceptable as no land or facility had been identified. Therefore, he suggested that this s.106 could be used for the provision of additional space at the Community Centre as had been discussed. This was a tangible project to submit to the developers. Other schemes could be funded from within the overall sum within the already agreed criteria. No more than five development sites could contribute to any one project. He said that although schemes had to be approved by the developers at the initial planning stage there were	JH

	<p>advantages in taking time to decide and to plan facilities required. The immediate need was for allocated schemes to be submitted to developers for approval. This process now started prior to planning permission being granted. He also stated that there was a need to take into account any similar facilities being provided in neighbouring areas so that there was no duplication. Joint schemes with neighbouring parishes could also be submitted. The Chairman of the Committee suggested that possibly the Council should bring in play and leisure planning expertise to assist.</p> <p>A note of the presentation and discussion attached as Appendix 1.</p> <p>Mr Houston requested a speedy response to his request for a revised project for the allocation of s106 proceeds for the 1125 dwelling development on Lower Road (16/04608/AOP) in the sum of £365k.</p>	
<p>P17/96</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS CONSIDERED</p> <p><u>Ongoing Applications</u></p> <p>a) 17/01221/ADP – Land at Lower Road</p> <p>The Chairman noted that over sixty new documents had been included in the application on AVDC planning website since the 2nd August. Consideration was given to revised plans for Materials, Boundary Treatment and Parking. No further comments were made.</p> <p>b) 16/02673/APP – Land to rear of 17-55 Eskdale Road and 47-63 Station Road</p> <p>The Chairman reported on the AVDC Strategic Development Management Committee on 20th July 2017, when the decision on the application was deferred and delegated to Officers for approval, subject to conditions which included overcoming of concerns regarding the footpath link to Station Road.</p>	

	<p>The Chairman further reported on a meeting which had been requested by the developers to reconsider the pedestrian access over the embankment to Station Road, which had taken place on 9th August and had included Cllrs Ezra, Atkinson and Hunt, a Highways representative and the Case Officer . A number of alternative options had been discussed and had been referred to the Planning Committee for consideration. The Committee had reaffirmed its earlier opinion that to have a designate crossing over the railway embankment emerging on to the narrow footpath along the A.4010 on the bridge at Station Road would be an unsafe development. In considering the revised Options submitted by AVDC it was agreed that the only Option which could be considered was to resurface a length of the shared driveway [to where the pedestrian access emerged from the development] and agree rights of access for future occupiers of the development using the pedestrian link. This option would not include the ramp access or crossing point on Station Road on the incline of the bridge. The Chairman would advise AVDC accordingly.</p> <p>c) 16/04608/AOP – Outline application for 125 dwellings – Lower Road There being no further matters to report, no comments were made about this application.</p> <p><u>New Applications</u></p> <p>d) 17/02950/APP - Erection of 1.8m high close board fence to enclose side garden - 6 Wycombe Close, Stoke Mandeville The Committee considered the application and raised NO OBJECTIONS.</p>	<p>JH</p>
--	--	-----------

	<p>e) 17/02868/AOP - Application in outline with access to be considered and all other matters to be reserved for the creation of 5 dwellings - Land rear of 34 - 58 Eskdale Road, Stoke Mandeville This application was considered and it was agreed to OPPOSE the application as the scale and design of the proposed dwellings was considered to be over-development of the site and out of keeping with the characteristics of nearby properties. The access was adjacent to that of the playing field and could be a danger to pedestrians and drivers using both sites.</p> <p>f) 17/03046/APP – Single storey rear extension - 63 Dalesford Road The Committee considered the application and raised NO OBJECTIONS.</p> <p>g) 17/03075/HS2PS – Development authorised by High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017 - Street record Wendover Footpath 4A Wendover The Committee deferred the application to the Parish Council in order to obtain a wider view.</p> <p>h) 17/02535/ATP – Walnut tree to rear of garden overhanging 9 and 10 Arnold Close and 115 Wendover Road - 113 Wendover Road, Stoke Mandeville The Committee considered the application and raised NO OBJECTIONS.</p> <p>i) 17/02106/ACL – Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed erection of single storey side extension - 23 Brudenell Drive, Stoke Mandeville The Committee considered the application and raised NO OBJECTIONS.</p>	
--	---	--

P17/97	<p>VALE OF AYLESBURY LOCAL PLAN</p> <p>An invitation from Cllr Carole Paternoster (AVDC Cabinet Member for Growth Strategy) for 2 representatives from the Parish Council to attend the Parishes Seminar on the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan at 6.30pm on 4 October 2017 was considered. It was agreed that Cllrs Hunt and Atkinson would attend, and that AVDC would be notified accordingly.</p>	Clerk
P17/98	<p>AVALC</p> <p>The Committee considered a request from the Aylesbury Vale Association of Local Councils (AVALC) seeking information on the Council's experiences in dealing with planning applications. It was agreed that the only issue of concern had been that in connection with the development of land in Lower Road. Aylesbury Town Council had been identified as the resident parish and work had continued along this line leading to confusion to all concerned. The matter had been satisfactorily resolved by involving the local District Councillor.</p>	Clerk
P17/99	<p>DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> <p>Application decisions by AVDC were noted as follows ; -</p> <p>17/01932/APP – 47 Risborough Road, Stoke Mandeville – Demolition of existing garage with erection of a new timber garage. APPROVED</p>	

	<p>17/01786/APP – Land adjoining 5 Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville – Erection of dwelling. APPROVED</p> <p>17/01506/APP – Stoke House, Risborough Road, Stoke Mandeville – Demolition of and replacing existing barn with new steel framed building. APPROVED</p> <p>17/01989/ACL – 17 Castlefields, Stoke Mandeville – Conversion of loft into additional living accommodation, including one flat roof dormer window to rear elevation. CERTIFICATE ISSUED</p>	
P17/100	<p>ANY OTHER MATTERS (FOR INFORMATION) There were no other matters reported.</p>	
P17/101	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING Thursday 14th September 2017 at 10.30 am.</p>	

Signed _____ Date 14th September 2017

Discussion with Mr J Houston, Senior Parks Officer, AVDC;

- The time limit for S106 funds to be spent is 10 years from the receipt of funds by the District Council from developers (or 10 years from the last payment if payments are phased). This means that Parish Councils do not need to rush to spend the funds so raised, but can take the time to “get it right”.
- As a rule of thumb, developments of less than 70 dwellings will require payment by the developer before commencement on site. For larger developments, the payment arrangements, including any phasing of payments, is subject to negotiation.
- Where the proposed development is still subject to Planning Authority approval, the s106 allocations may be amended (see Supplementary Planning Guidance for Sports & Leisure).
- Interpretation of what constitutes Sports & Leisure usage is a matter for the Planning Authority, but Parish Councils can buy land with the funds to achieve a suitable objective. However, Cllr Hunt pointed out that lack of available land to buy was one of the challenges facing the Parish Council.
- Proposed allocations by Parish Councils must be specific as to what is intended, but allocations may be on an “and/or” basis.

There followed discussion on the following matters:-

- 1) The need for a new burial ground in Stoke Mandeville – this much needed facility is outside the scope of a leisure facility, so cannot be funded by s106 contributions, notwithstanding the increased demand that will follow large scale development across the Parish.
- 2) Appointment of a Leisure Consultant – Cllr Hunt referred to the possibility of appointing a specialist Leisure Consultant to research options for the Parish Council. It was felt this could widen the range of alternatives considered, and the cost could potentially be recovered from the s106 contributions, provided the consultant’s mandate was specific and part of the agreement with the developer(s).
- 3) BCC Sports & Social Club – the recent decision (and subsequent calling in of the decision for review) by Bucks County Council to close the Sports & Social Club on Lower Road was discussed, particularly in the light of it (a) being a well-used and strategically well placed green space leisure facility for the surrounding area, including the new developments in the immediate area, and (b) having been registered as an Asset of Community Value by the Parish Council.
- 4) The importance of debating and developing a strategy for leisure that covers the Parish and the surrounding area, including the AVDC plans for the Garden Town – larger leisure facilities in particular, or those that would serve a wider population than immediate residents, should be debated with adjacent parishes/authorities, and not developed piecemeal. In such cases, a master plan across a parish cluster might be appropriate.

At the end of the discussion, Mr Houston was thanked for his time and his input.

SA

31 August 2017