

no part in the consideration of this item.

DCC104 REPRESENTATIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Councillor P Wharton,(MKC), Councillor R Gifford (SSTC) and Mr G Benjamin spoke in objection to application 11/00143/FUL The partial demolition of the existing buildings at Cofferridge Close and the construction of a new food store with the reconfiguration of the car parking (amended description, amended plans and amended supporting information) at Properties at, Cofferridge Close, Stony Stratford for CB Richard Ellis Investors

The applicants agents, Ms K Morris and Mr. C Patmore exercised the right of reply.

Mr. K Payne, Mr. S Loud, Councillor McDonald (MKC) and Councillor Bint (MKC) spoke in favour of application 13/00024/ful (recommended for refusal) removal of play area to be replaced with landscaping and the creation of a wet pond at former play area, Far Holme, Middleton

Mr S Malka spoke in objection to application 12/01967/FUL Change of use from internet cafe (use class A1) to hot food take-away (use class A5) at, 330 Conniburrow Boulevard, Conniburrow, Milton Keynes for Mr Fiaz Malik

The applicants agent, Mr. Sirah exercised the right of reply.

DCC105 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

11/00143/FUL THE PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BUILDINGS AT COFFERRIDGE CLOSE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW FOOD STORE WITH THE RECONFIGURATION OF THE CAR PARKING (AMENDED DESCRIPTION, AMENDED PLANS AND AMENDED SUPPORTING INFORMATION) AT PROPERTIES AT, COFFERRIDGE CLOSE, STONY STRATFORD FOR CB RICHARD ELLIS INVESTORS

The Officer reported that since preparing her report and Officer Update a further two letters of objection had been received, these had been circulated to members and published, they did not raise any new points. She reported that a Site Inspection had been held on 11 March attended by 3 Members of the committee.

The Officer reported that her recommendation remained to refuse the application for the reasons stated in the report..

Members heard representations that the proposals would have a negative impact on traffic flow in the

area, and that the loss of car parking spaces would have a severe detrimental impact on the area. The Committee also heard that there was a serious concern held by local traders that development of a large supermarket in such close proximity to the High Street would have a serious negative economic effect on local businesses and cause significant harm to the viability and vitality of Stony Stratford town centre and that the failure to provide for resilience to economic change was contrary to paragraph 23 of the NPPF and saved Local Plan Policy R1 (2).

Members heard that the replacement of the various units that had provided a wide variety of local services including a dentist by one supermarket was contrary to paragraph 70 of the NPPF in that it failed to plan for community facilities and services.

The Committee heard counter representations that a full transport assessment had been conducted and had identified no concerns with the proposals, and that a delivery management plan would allay any fears held by residents about the impact of large vehicles delivering to the store. The committee also heard that the NPPF made no requirement on an assessment of the impact of or the need for a development in terms of the local economy.

Councillor White proposed that the Officers recommendation be approved. This was seconded by Councillor McLean.

Members recognised that whilst there was no need to assess the impact or need of a development on the local economy there remained a need to make provision for the protection of local economies..

Members considered the need for an additional reason for refusal in respect of the impact on parking and local road systems. Members heard that the Senior Highway Engineer had conducted research and did not recommend any objections on that basis.

Councillor A Geary proposed an additional reason for refusal due to the loss of parking spaces in the Town Centre; this was seconded by Councillor White. On being put to the vote the motion was declared lost.

The proposal to refuse the application on the grounds stated in the Officer report was put to the

vote and was carried unanimously and it was;

RESOLVED -

That the application be refused as;

1. The size, scale, form and design of the development and extent of the area of hard standing to accommodate an over provision parking to serve the development and lack of opportunities to retain an existing area of public open space within the site; the loss and re-provision of less trees than are already contained with the site; the lack of opportunities for on site biodiversity and detrimental impact on the residential amenities of 7-23 Silver Street would all constitute an over development of the site. The application would be contrary to policies D2, D2a, D1 (iii and iv), NE3, L2 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011.

2. The demolition of a large section of the existing building and proposed scheme would cause harm to Cofferridge Close as a heritage asset in its own right. The proposed development would cause harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, Stony Stratford Conservation Area and the listed buildings, 7-23 Silver Street. The development would be contrary to policies HE5 and HE6 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011, Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy and paragraphs 134 and 135 of National Planning Policy Framework

3. The development would result in the loss of an important community facility (NHS dental practice) for which no alternative provision has been made within Stony Stratford Town Centre. The development would be contrary to policy C2 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011.

13/00024/FUL

REMOVAL OF PLAY AREA TO BE REPLACED WITH LANDSCAPING AND THE CREATION OF A WET POND AT FORMER PLAY AREA, FAR HOLME, MIDDLETON FOR CREST NICHOLSON

The Officer reported that her recommendation remained that the application be refused for the reasons set out at the end of the report. It was noted that a Site Inspection had taken place on 11 March 2013 attended by 3 Members.