

Tsinonis, Rosemary

From: uniformpublicaccess@milton-keynes.gov.uk
Sent: 30 January 2010 21:27
To: DC Business Support Reports Inbox
Subject: PublicAccess for Planning - Application Comments (10/00018/FUL)

PublicAccess for Planning - Application Comments (10/00018/FUL)

"Dr I R Collinge" has used the PublicAccess for Planning website to submit their comments on a Planning Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 30/01/2010 21:27:20 from IP [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Application Number:
10/00018/FUL

Address:
Land To Right of Village Hall
Church Road
Sherington

Proposal:
Erection of a single storey building for use as a new village store and cafe with new vehicular access

Case Officer:
Richard Sakyi

Customer Details

Name:
Dr I R Collinge

Address:
8 Gun Lane
Sherington
Newport Pagnell

Postcode:
MK16 9PE

Email:
[REDACTED]

Phone Number:
[REDACTED]

Comments

Submission Type:
Customer objects to the Planning Application.

Comments:
I wish to register my objection to this application.

Most of the comments I wished to make have already been made by Mr Roger Hardy of 14 Church Road. Therefore I will not repeat them here, but simply endorse all his comments, with one exception. I do not agree that the Water Lane commercial area is a

suitable alternative location, because Water Lane is even more unsuitable than Church Road with respect to access.

I would like to make the following additional points:

1. The application to use Public Open Space is contrary to previous Village Plans. For example, that of 1982 labels the proposed site of the shop as 'Areas it is important to keep open' and the view from Church Road (which will be lost) is labelled 'Important Vista'. The 1982 Plan does acknowledge the potential need for commercial premises and envisages these will be met by the conversion of an existing building. Where this is the case, the Plan states the Council will look favourably on the application provided it does not have a significant adverse affect on the amenity of others. This Application does not meet these conditions: it does not use an existing building and it involves an unacceptable loss of public amenity. Whilst it might be argued that 1982 is a long time ago, the provisions of this Village Plan are still very relevant today. Indeed, one major change in society, the introduction of the Internet, has led to an enormous growth in online shopping with home delivery of groceries, which reduces the demand for the more traditional shop.

2. The Front/Rear Elevations show 4 trees at the corners of the building. In each case the building is behind the tree and it is clearly the intention to imply that the impact of the building will be softened by this landscaping. This is not consistent with the Block Plan, which does not show trees in these locations. All the trees are located away from the building at the two ends. In fact, it is clear from the Block Plan that there is not enough space in front or behind the front/rear of the building to accommodate these four trees. The Front/Rear Elevations provided by the Applicant therefore give a false and misleading impression.

3. Access problems. Other objectors have commented that there is a risk that delivery vehicles and customers will park on Church Road instead of using the car park. This risk is not theoretical but very real. I live in Gun Lane opposite the White Hart. Like Church Road, Gun Lane is narrow and, like the proposed shop, the White Hart has a car park of roughly similar size. I can confirm that most delivery vehicles do indeed park in the road whilst making deliveries and some customers prefer to park on the road, as it is easier, rather than use the car park, even if there are plenty of free spaces.

4. Church Road only has a pedestrian footpath along one side. There is none on the side opposite the proposed shop, so pedestrians accessing those properties must walk in the road. The increased traffic and maneouvring vehicles around the shop poses an increased hazard.

For all these reasons, I would urge the Council to reject this Planning Application

PublicAccess for Planning. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.