

PLANNING COMMITTEE **2nd August 2011**

THE FOLLOWING ALTERATIONS AND AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN
RECEIVED SINCE THE PLANNING OFFICER'S REPORT WAS
PRESENTED TO MEMBERS

AGENDA ITEM 5

P/09785/008 – McArdle House, McArdle Way, Colnbrook, Slough

Comments have been received from the Environment Agency who raise no objections to the planning application and provided further advice with regards to flooding issues and works close to the river.

Comments have been received from the Council's Transport Engineer's who raise no objections to the planning application subject to a survey of the number of vehicles travelling to and from the site allowing the Local Planning Authority and the developer to agree to an annual number of trips that would not be exceeded so as to control the impact of the development on the declared Air Quality Management Area and conditions with regards to parking layout and cycle parking provision.

For the sake of clarity recommendation in section 13.1 of the report should read as follows:

Having considered the policy background and comments from consultees it is considered that this application should be refused and enforcement action taken against all the unlawful uses currently on the site to ensure that the original permission is being complied with.

NO CHANGE IN RECOMMENDATION OF REFUSE AND ENFORCE.

AGENDA ITEM 6

P/09979/001 – Mill House, Mathisen Way, Mill Book Way, Poyle, Slough

The Transport & Highway Engineers have submitted revised comments as set out below:

This is a development to demolish an existing B1 office measuring 2683sqm and 136 parking spaces and replacing it with a warehouse measuring 3425sqm of storage and distribution space with ancillary office space and staff facilities. 29 car parking spaces will be provided and 5 HGV bays for the loading and unloading of vehicles.

Car Parking

The applicant is proposing to provide 29 car parking spaces at the equivalent ratio of 1 space per 118sqm. The Slough Local Plan minimum parking standards are set out as 1 space per 200sqm and therefore the number of proposed spaces is in accordance with the parking standards. I note from the application that 100 employees are proposed, however in subsequent discussions with the applicant it has been confirmed that they expect to employ approximately 60 people. As this site is operating on a shift basis there should be sufficient car parking provided.

There is comment in both the planning statement and transport statement that the reduction of car parking will be beneficial to the site, however it is important to bare in mind that the Poyle Trading Estate does suffer from widespread parking on footways by both cars and HGVs and there is generally a shortage of parking on the Estate. On my site visit I noted that cars and HGVs were overspilling onto the roads around the site, therefore I shall be seeking further information from the applicant to ensure that sufficient car parking is to be provided.

Response: The no of car parking spaces provided complies with the Council's approved guidelines

HGV Parking

Five HGV bays are to be provided, which is slightly below the HGV parking standards set out in the Slough Local Plan, which requires 1 space per 500sqm for the first 2000sqm and then 1 space per 1000sqm for each 1000sqm thereafter. However the developer has submitted revised plans showing that a 6th bay can be achieved and therefore this is acceptable.

I am concerned that with a development of this size that HGVs may end up queuing in the roads leading to development or parking up waiting for a space on the highway. In the immediate vicinity to the site the footways on Mathisen Way have been severely damaged by HGVs and other vehicles parking on the footway, and all the pavement flagstones are broken. Therefore noting the number of HGV bays which would indicate a high number of HGV movements to and from the site and the possibility that there will be times when HGVs need to wait on the adjoining highway for a bay to become available then I would request that a S106 contribution to implement physical measures on the footways along Mathisen Way to prevent vehicles driving up onto the footway. The applicant has agreed to make a £15,000 contribution and this is considered acceptable. The contribution will be used to widen the footways on Mathisen Way and implement bollards to prevent vehicles parking on the footways. A narrower carriageway will also discourage vehicle parking and overall this should help maintain the walk route between the local bus stops and the site for pedestrians.

The transport statement refers to the bus stops as providing an alternative mode of transport of the site and therefore reinforces the need to ensure that the footways are protected from overspill HGV and vehicle parking.

The contribution will help prevent some of the footway parking problems that are occurring on Mathisen Way, which will help to discourage HGVs parking on this part of the Poyle Trading Estate during the night time, which in the past has caused disturbance to local residents.

Response: A S106 Unilateral Undertaking obligating the developer to pay the said contribution has been executed

Traffic Generation

The transport statement shows that the site will lead to a reduction in vehicle movements by a total of 250 arrivals and departures per day. This assessment is a simplification of the traffic reduction as the site will be generating an increase in HGVs which are equivalent of 2.5 passenger car units (pcu), whereas a car is equivalent of 1 pcu. Nevertheless I am of the view that this site will lead to a reduction of vehicular traffic to the site than would be occurring if the site was fully operational as an office. The developer's consultant has confirmed that the site will handle a total of 56 HGVs two way trips per weekday and 32 two way trips per weekend day.

Day	Time	HGV Arrivals	HGV Departures	Total HGV trips
Mon to Fri	06.00-18.00	20	20	40
Mon to Fri	18.00-06.00	8	8	16
Sat + Sun	06.00-18.00	12	12	24
Sat + Sun	18.00-06.00	4	4	8

Site Access

Revised visibility splay drawings have been submitted by the applicant demonstrating that a splay of 2.4m by 30m can be achieved.

Response: An appropriate condition has already been incorporated

Site Access Gate

A sliding site access gate is shown on the plans, but I understand that negotiations have already taken place such that the applicant has agreed that the gates will remain open during the site is operational to prevent vehicles obstructing the site access and waiting for the gates to be opened. This agreement will need to be secured by condition.

Response: It is proposed to amend the wording of condition 11 as set out below:

11 Non Standard 9, Vehicle Entrance Gates

*No development shall occupied until the proposed vehicular entrance gates onto Millbrook Way have been installed in the position shown on drawing no. 1481 – TP – 01 as hereby approved and in accordance with such further details that shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority **and the gates as installed which shall be sliding gates, shall remain open at all times while the site is in use.***

REASON To enable service vehicles to draw off the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport (2001), Core Policy 7 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006-2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008.

Cycle Parking

A cycle parking store is shown on the plans. This store is existing, although probably not being used for storing cycles. It measures 2.0 x 4.5m and it would therefore appear to be too small to provide adequate cycle storage in the way that it is laid out as bicycles measure 1.8m in length. However it is feasible to provide cycle parking on 45 degree angle and therefore so long as reasonable layout can be achieved I am willing to accept it.

Response: An appropriate condition has already been incorporated

Servicing and Deliveries

An important concern of local residents is the disruption caused by night time deliveries. The works to prevent footway parking will go some way towards helping that on Mathisen Way, but from within the site noise will still be generated. The Department for Transport, The Freight Transport Association (FTA) and the Noise Abatement Society has recently been involved in a Quiet Deliveries Demonstration Scheme (QDDS); the focus of this scheme is related to retail deliveries, however there are some conclusions that would appear to be relevant to this application and a Night Time Deliveries toolkit has been developed by the FTA. The QDDS report states that "Noise monitoring and evaluation has demonstrated that the main source of peak noise at out-of-hours delivery sites is that generated by the delivery vehicle manoeuvring on-site, with the engine idling, over-revving and tyre scrub." However it also advises that "behavioural issues involving drivers and depot staff do lead to reductions in loading/unloading noise, albeit to a limited extent." The QDDS involved retailers developing a Memorandum of Understanding between them and other partners outlining measures to be introduced and implemented. Therefore I recommend that a condition is added to this application that requires a Servicing and Deliveries Management Plan to be prepared that takes heed of the guidance within the FTA Toolkit and QDDS report and any other best practice guidance from the Noise Abatement Society.

Response: the following additional condition is proposed:

Prior to the occupation of the development as hereby approved a servicing and deliveries management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan as approved shall be implemented fully in accordance with the recommendations made at all times to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

For the avoidance of doubt when preparing the Servicing and Deliveries Management Plan regard shall be paid to the guidance given within the freight Transport Association Toolkit and Quiet deliveries Demonstration Scheme and any other best practice guidance from the Noise Abatement Society.

REASON: To minimise disturbance for existing residential occupiers in accordance with PPG 24

Recommendation

Now that the applicant has agreed to enter in S106 agreement to fund works to prevent vehicles parking on the footway and subject to the following conditions I would not raise a highway objection to this application.

ADD in condition on visibility splay

ADD in cycle parking condition

ADD in condition on Sliding Gate could be incorporated within the condition below

Add Servicing and Deliveries Management Plan condition

Response: These matters have all been addressed as set out above

The applicant has asked that Committee be advised that although the proposals require the removal of trees adjacent to the Poyle Channel, enhancements will be undertaken to the bank in line with the Environment Agency requirements, opening up views of the Channel from public vantage points.

The applicant has further advised that:

The submitted ground floor plans show a staff locker room and canteen area. Any drivers who will be on site for longer than a drop-off / pick-up (unlikely in KWE's case), or who need to use the toilet will be able to use this facility. The antisocial problems experienced by the neighbour will not therefore occur as a result of this scheme.

Response: The comments are noted, however, to ensure that such provision is retained the following additional condition is proposed:

The applicant shall submit to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval further details relating to the provision of a drivers rest room and the details as approved shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development as hereby approved.

REASON: To avoid potential anti social behaviour in accordance with Core Policy 12 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006 – 2026) Development Plan Document December 2008 and Policy EN5 of the Adopted Local plan for Slough 2004.

. KWE might have an occasional/ad hoc visit from a refrigerated vehicle, so we can not say that it will never happen. However, this in itself does not mean that such deliveries will cause a nuisance and in the unlikely event that there were to be a problem then there is existing environmental protection legislation in place to deal with it. On this basis I do not think that it is necessary for limitations on deliveries to be imposed.

A further letter of objection has been received from the occupier of 9 Poplar Close, a copy of which is attached to this Amendment Sheet.

The letter mainly comprises a number of responses to points raised either in the Officer's first report in reply to the objector's first letter or responses to that letter by the applicant.

- *How can knocking down a perfectly good modern office block be considered as being a sustainable action??? It isn't.*

Further Response

In a letter dated 9th June 2011, sent to all Members of the Planning Committee, the applicant's agent advised that the existing building on site has been unoccupied for 3 years. This is despite the building having been refurbished and extensively marketed. The applicant's agent has further advised that there are two other similar sized office buildings at the southern end of Riverside Park that have remained empty for over 5 years, giving a clear indication that Riverside Area is a redundant location for office buildings.

- *With reference to the first officer response as set out on page 37 of the initial report, the objector states that:*

The first item responding to my letter is referring to the building itself and chooses to ignore the lorry movements and the fact that these cause low frequency vibration. It also ignores the fact that the Lorries and their movements will cause disturbance when I'm in my garden. My property includes my garden and I don't expect to have to stay indoors because it suits someone's planning application.

Further Response

Concerns about noise and disturbance were covered in the officer's response given on pages 39 and 40 of the initial report and although he objector does not accept the results of the noise assessment, it was referred to the Council's Neighbourhood Protection Section who have not to date objected to its findings.

- *With reference to the applicant's response to the objector's first letter, regarding noise and vibration, and the various ways that such anti social behaviour can result in noise disturbance, the objector has further commented*

Much of the anti-social behaviour I suffer is not deliberate but occurs as a result of ill advised planning permissions granted for inappropriate premises in close proximity to residential homes. Probably therefore not subject to enforcement even if the resources existed.

Why should we all try to deal with/mitigate the symptoms of unwise planning approvals when we can remove the cause by just not placing such facilities close to people's houses.

Further Response

When determining planning applications it is necessary to consider all material matters relating to such applications, in order for a decision to be taken. These matters have been considered by officers in coming to a recommendation.

With reference to the applicant's response to the objector's first letter regarding the view taken by the applicant's noise consultant was that

- *The most critical time for potential disturbance was night time.*

I do not consider it is for the applicant to decide limited critical times for disturbance. Disturbance can happen at any time of day, I shouldn't have to expect any disturbance from profit motivated companies but unfortunately some already exists. This residential road existed before Cargo companies started to invade Colnbrook.

In any event the applicant makes a very evasive comment in that "we understand that reversing beepers will not be used at night." which is not worth the paper it is written on.

Further Response

Given that aircraft do not normally fly during the night time, it is not an unreasonable assumption that noise disturbance could be worse during that period. With respect to the use of reversing beepers, conditions are proposed restricting both the use of reversing beepers and external tannoy systems outside the hours of 7.00 am and 22.00 pm

With reference to the applicant's response objector's first letter regarding the view taken by the applicant's noise consultant

- *to eliminate particular peaks in the 10% disregarded period, the objector has further commented:*

As I have already stated that the peak noises cannot be disregarded. The peaks are not constant but clearly they were the highest level on the particular day the readings were taken. But, probably not the highest peaks I suffer living here all the time as I do. If another warehouse is built and lorry movements increase the frequency of noise peaks will increase therefore the disturbance increases.

Further Response

The applicant's noise consultant previously responded to this point as follows: *I think the point made here is wrong. In general, the higher the existing noise, the less the impact of new noise. Therefore, I deliberately removed aircraft noise during the day, and passing vehicles at night, to give a worst case.*

With reference to the applicant's response objector's first letter regarding the view taken by the applicant's noise consultant

- *Not to add the 5 dB penalty, the objector has further commented*

But they in their self appointed wisdom decided not to in order to make the results look better.

Further Response

The applicant's noise consultant previously responded to this point as follows: *Whether or not to add the 5 dB penalty in BS4142 is always contentious. However, the principle of the BS4124 method is that the penalty should be added if the new noise will have particular characteristics that will make it stand out from the existing noise environment. That is clearly not the case here. As I said in the report, planning inspectors have agreed with this view. However, even if the 5 dB was added, the noise would not be of even marginal significance when rated using BS4142.*

With reference to the response by the Council's Neighbourhood Protection Team to the objector's first letter which raised concerns about the anti social behaviour of some of the lorry drivers, as set out on page 40 of the initial report, the objector has further commented:

I have every respect for the Neighbourhood Team but what appears to them on their occasional visits is not the same as living next door to the problem. The situation is improved but the current disturbance is a problem and another warehouse will only make it worse.

Further Response

Whilst it is acknowledged that effective enforcement can at times be limited through a lack of recourses, the measures achieved in respect of Kidde Graviner does demonstrate that enforcement action can achieve the desired results.

With reference to the Officer response to the objector's first letter which raised concerns about the nature of the traffic and not just the levels of traffic which would be serving the development

The response does not factorise lorry/van movements for car movements as it should in its calculations.

Council policies should be urgently amended taking account of the views of the people that they serve. I've lived here for nearly 35 years. When this part of Colnbrook moved from Spelthorne into Slough the community were promised they would be well served. We didn't expect to be sacrificed for the benefit of the rest of Slough and Heathrow Airport.

Again more calls to treat the symptoms not the cause.

Further Response

As previously stated, whilst it is acknowledged that the nature of the traffic may change from the previous use, the overall levels of traffic will drop. As current planning policy stands, Class B8 warehousing is a use which is considered to be appropriate to the Poyle Business Area and as such the application is being determined in accordance with approved planning policies.

With respect to the objector's suggested mitigation these are set out below:

- *Hours of operation 8.00 am till 5.00 pm Monday to Fridays only.*

Response: Given that other surrounding warehouses operate unrestricted hours, it would be unreasonable in planning terms to impose such a condition in respect of the proposed development. It would not reflect the modern day requirements of such an industry and would be unacceptable to the occupier. If such a condition were to be imposed it is likely to be appealed by the applicant.

- *Extensive tree planting to improve attenuation of noise.*

Response: The opportunities for tree planting are limited given the space requirements for the intended end user. It should also be noted that an ecological corridor has been maintained adjacent to the Poyle Channel along the southern end of the site in accordance with the requirements of the Environment Agency.

- *Significant upgrade of the acoustic fence between the neighbouring properties of 9 and 10 Poplar Close.*

Response: There is no evidence to suggest that the existing acoustic fence is not effective. Its replacement is not included within the recommendations of the submitted noise report.

- *Width restriction at the top of Poyle Road to physically prevent the flow of Lorries through the residential areas.*
- *A no commercial vehicle except for local access restriction notice in the same location.*

Response: The applicant helping to fund measures to restrict parking in Matheson Way. It would be unreasonable to expect the applicant to fund any further measures which would be designed to offset existing issues relating to commercial vehicle access to the wider Poyle Industrial Estate.

Members are advised that a letter has been received from the intended occupier KWE Kintetsu World Wide Express (UK) Ltd. It will be noted from the attached letter that KWE already occupy a site in Newlands Dive on the Poyle Industrial Estate, but are looking for larger premises to expand their business. It should also be noted from their letter that they employ a number of residents who live in Slough.

Given that the S106 Unilateral Undertaking has been executed the recommendation is **changed** to:

DELEGATE TO THE HEAD OF PLANNING POLICY AND PROJECTS FOR FINALISING CONDITIONS AND FINAL DETERMINATION.

9 Polar Close
Colnbrook
Slough
SL3 0PQ

30th August 2011

Your Ref: P/09979/001

Planning Dept
Slough Borough Council
Town Hall
Bath Road
Slough
SL1 3UQ

Dear Sirs

Demolition of Existing Office Building and
Erection of a Class B8 Warehouse.....

Mill House, Mathisen Way, Mill Brook Way, Poyle, Berks, SL3 0AA

Further to my objection letter of 1st April 2007 I now comment on the applicant's responses and the officer's report.
(My comments in red)

I note that none of the applicant's responses counter the points I have made. They contain lots of words but no substance.

1.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

1.2 Having considered the relevant Policies below, the development is not considered to have an adverse affect on the sustainability and the environment for the reasons set out.

How can knocking down a perfectly good modern office block be considered as being a sustainable action??? It isn't.

Response: It is agreed that from the front boundary of the curtilage of 9 Poplar Close and the northern boundary of the site is 19 metres. However, 9/9a Poplar Close is set back from its front boundary by between approximately 11 – 14 metres and the flank wall of the proposed warehouse building will be set Back from the northern boundary by about 3 – 4 metres, giving an overall Separation of approximately 33 metres

The first item responding to my letter is referring to the building itself and chooses to ignore the lorry movements and the fact that these cause low frequency vibration. It also ignores the fact that the Lorries and their movements will cause disturbance when I'm in my garden. My property includes my garden and I don't expect to have to stay indoors because it suits someone's planning application.

The next response

In response to issues of noise and vibration, the applicant has responded:
Many activities, which would normally not cause a nuisance, can be performed In such a way as to cause a nuisance if a person is set on behaving antisocially. However, if noise is such as to cause a nuisance and it can be Demonstrated that this is due to deliberate anti-social behaviour, then the Local Authority has a duty to use legislation to investigate and abate the nuisance.

Much of the anti-social behaviour I suffer is not deliberate but occurs as a result of ill advised planning permissions granted for inappropriate premises in close proximity to residential homes. Probably therefore not subject to enforcement even if the resources existed.

Why should we all try to deal with/mitigate the symptoms of unwise planning approvals when we can remove the cause by just not placing such facilities close to people's houses.

The applicant has responded: "We took the view that the most critical time for Potential disturbance was night time, and we understand that reversing Beepers will not be used at night. If reversing beepers are used in the day, then They may be audible, but, given the low level of noise predicted from the lorry Movements on site, compared with the relatively high ambient noise during the day, noise will not be rated as being of even marginal significance....."

I do not consider it is for the applicant to decide limited critical times for disturbance.

Disturbance can happen at any time of day, I shouldn't have to expect any disturbance from profit motivated companies but unfortunately some already exists. This residential road existed before Cargo companies started to invade Colnbrook.

In any event the applicant makes a very evasive comment in that "we understand that reversing beepers will not be used at night." which is not worth the paper it is written on.

The next response

Referring to the Noise Assessment document background noise levels are measured eliminating particular peaks in the 10% disregarded period.....

As I have already stated that the peak noises cannot be disregarded. The peaks are not constant but clearly they were the highest level on the particular day the readings were taken. But, probably not the highest peaks I suffer living here all the time as I do.

If another warehouse is built and lorry movements increase the frequency of noise peaks will increase therefore the disturbance increases.

The applicant has responded: "Whether or not to add the 5 dB penalty in BS4142 is always contentious.

But they in their self appointed wisdom decided not to in order to make the results look better.

Response: Neighbourhood Protection advise that that the problems appear to have been solved after the management at Kidde Graviner installed bollards at the site entrance.

I have every respect for the Neighbourhood Team but what appears to them on their occasional visits is not the same as living next door to the problem. The situation is improved but the current disturbance is a problem and another warehouse will only make it worse.

Response: It is acknowledged that the nature of the traffic using the proposed warehouse will be different to that which served the former office building. The accompanying transport statement indicates that: "Comparison of the anticipated traffic flows shows that there will be a significant reduction of around 60 vehicles per hour two-way in the morning peak hour and of around

80 vehicles per hour two-way in the evening peak hour. In terms of daily two-way traffic movement there is anticipated to be a reduction of around 250 movements per day. This reduction in traffic will have a benefit on the surrounding highway network both in terms of capacity and safety.

The growth in warehousing and distribution within the Poyle and Colnbrook areas reflects its location close to Heathrow Airport. The siting and location of such uses within the eastern part of the Borough is in line with the Council's approved planning policies.

Enforcement of highway regulations are not a matter for consideration as part of the planning application.

The response does not factorise lorry/van movements for car movements as it should in its calculations.

Council policies should be urgently amended taking account of the views of the people that they serve. I've lived here for nearly 35 years. When this part of Colnbrook moved from Spelthorne into Slough the community were promised they would be well served. We didn't expect to be sacrificed for the benefit of the rest of Slough and Heathrow Airport.

Again more calls to treat the symptoms not the cause.

If there is any possibility of anything like this application being approved, then extensive restrictions and mitigation measures should be included.

Hours of operation 8.00 am till 5.00 pm Monday to Fridays only.

Extensive tree planting to improve attenuation of noise.

Significant upgrade of the acoustic fence between the neighbouring properties of 9 and 10 Poplar Close.

Width restriction at the top of Poyle Road to physically prevent the flow of Lorries through the residential areas.

A no commercial vehicle except for local access restriction notice in the same location.

Please ensure my views are fully expressed to the Planning Committee.

Yours Sincerely

Peter Hood



29th July 2011

Mr Chris Smyth
Planning Department
Slough Borough Council
Town Hall
Bath Road
Slough
Berkshire
SL1 3UQ

Dear Mr Smyth,

Re. Planning Application P/09979/001, Mill House, Mathisen Way, Poyle, SL3 0AA

Please can you accept this letter as confirmation of our involvement in and full support for the above application.

We are the UK subsidiary of the Kintetsu Corporation, Japan which employs over 50,000 persons worldwide. Our business was incorporated in 1985 and we have been based in Poyle for 25 years. We employ 70 persons at our Heathrow premises and a further 50 persons at our 7 other UK branches.

The growth of our business is constrained at our existing premises due to the size, nature and layout of the building. Consequently we took steps to procure new premises in 2010, which led to the proposed development at Mill House and the application before you.

It is imperative that the business of our core branch is sustainable for the long term hence our investment into the Mill House development is the largest investment our business has made to date. Furthermore the success of our business is contingent upon location, which is why we chose to remain in Poyle for at least the next 25 years.

Heathrow is a principal location for our global business hence no expense has been spared in the specification of the development. We have specified intelligent LED lighting, a highly

efficient heating system which utilises destratification fans to retain as much heat as possible and automation systems that save energy whilst increasing our efficiency. We have also taken steps to ensure that the Developer complies with the full requirements of the Environment and Highway Agencies. We feel that the proposed development will be a property to be proud of amongst our 270 locations worldwide.

We have absolute confidence that new jobs will be created on the site of a building which has been unlettable, unoccupied and susceptible to deterioration, should the development be permitted.

Our employees have given their full support for the development particularly those that are residents of Slough. We hope that we are able to continue to invest into Slough's economy and look forward to a prosperous future for all concerned.

Yours sincerely,


Yasuhiko Hatano.
Managing Director
For and on behalf of Kintetsu World Express (UK) Limited

AGENDA ITEM 9

P/15086/000 – 9-12, Kingfisher Court, Farnham Road, Slough,

Traffic and Road Safety/Highways Development

Comments have been received from Traffic and Road Safety/Highways Development. No objections to the application have been raised.

With regard to traffic movements, the TRICS trip generation database has been used to derive the potential trip generation of the site. This shows that the proposed land use is predicted to result in a reduction in trips when compared to the existing land use.

With regard to parking provision, the residential units will have a provision of 1.5 spaces per flat, which is considered to be consistent with the standards in the Slough Local Plan, which requires between 1.25 spaces for 1 bed flat and 1.75 spaces for a 2 bed flat in a residential area.

With regard to the parking provision associated with the business units, relevant standards do not require parking for a development in a business area. This site is located on the boundary between residential and business and therefore the proposed level of parking is considered to be acceptable. It is noted that the site also benefits from being located close to the Farnham Road local shopping centre and within walking distance of the Slough Trading Estate. The applicant is reducing the number of vehicle spaces for the business use from 96 to 94 to accommodate some cycle parking. It is considered that the provision of 94 spaces would be in excess of 35 spaces that would be required under the minimum parking standards.

With regard to servicing, it is noted that the service road has been identified for bin collection. Confirmation has been requested as to how the site will be serviced in the form of swept path tracks; however it is noted that the service road is currently utilised for this purpose and this is therefore not considered to be reasonable or necessary. A refuse strategy for the site is however requested, and a condition has been recommended requiring the submission of details.

With regard to the proposed highway works, the applicant is advised that they will need to apply to Slough Borough Council for the satisfactory implementation of the works identified in the highways schedule. Alternatively the applicant will need to enter into a Minor Highway Works Agreement with Slough Borough Council for the satisfactory implementation of the highways schedule. It is proposed to attach an informative to this effect.

Neighbour Notification

Further correspondence has been received from the occupier of Unit 2, Kingfisher Court reiterating their concerns with respect to the proposed parking and access arrangements. A suggestion has been made for direct access to the top car park to be provided and the provision of 4 no. spaces to be laid out in a gated/segregated car park leaving 12 no. spaces for the proposed flats (equating to 1 no. car parking space per flat). It is claimed that access to the downstairs car park for residents would be highly problematic for the businesses. It is felt that there would be security issues and a definite conflict of interest i.e. residents mixing with business users. This is not considered to be acceptable.

Response: It is proposed to provide parking for use by occupiers of the proposed flats at ground floor level only. A condition has been recommended requiring the submission of a comprehensive parking plan for the site which will ensure that there is satisfactory parking provision with details of pedestrian linkages. Relevant parking standards have been assessed in section 11 of the Committee report, and comments from Highways are provided in the above section.

In response to the concerns raised in connection with this aspect of the proposal, the applicant's agent has advised that the landlord has the rights allocate parking anywhere on the site under the terms of the leases, and it is therefore submitted that that these objections are not a planning matter.

Conditions

For the purposes of clarity, it is necessary to clarify the numbering of the list of recommended conditions. Conditions 1 to 4 (inclusive) remain as set out and numbered in the officer report, however conditions 5 to 16 should be numbered as follows:

5. No windows, other than those hereby approved, shall be formed in the west elevation of the development without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON To minimise any loss of privacy to occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy H15 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

6. No development shall commence on site until a detailed landscaping and tree planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme should include the trees and shrubs to be retained and/or removed and the type, density, position and planting heights of new trees and shrubs.

The approved scheme shall be carried out no later than the first planting season following completion of the development. Within a five year period following the implementation of the scheme, if any of the new or retained trees or shrubs should die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, then they shall be replaced in the next planting season with another of the same species and size as agreed in the landscaping tree planting scheme by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and accordance with Policy EN3 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

7. No development shall take place until a landscape management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This management plan shall set out the long term objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedule for the landscape areas other than the privately owned domestic gardens, shown on the approved landscape plan, and should include time scale for the implementation and be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON To ensure the long term retention of landscaping within the development to meet the objectives of Policy EN3 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

8. No development shall commence on site until details of the proposed boundary treatment including position, external appearance, height and materials have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Before the development hereby permitted is occupied, a suitable means of his boundary treatment shall be implemented on site prior to the first occupation of the development and retained at all time on the future.

REASON In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and accordance with Policy EN3 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

9. The development shall not commence until details of a lighting scheme (to include the location, nature and levels of illumination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development and maintained in accordance with the details approved.

REASON To ensure that a satisfactory lighting scheme is implemented as part of the development in the interests of residential and visual amenity and to comply with the provisions of Policy EN1 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

10. No development shall commence until details of the proposed bin store (to include siting, design and external materials) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved stores shall be completed prior to first occupation of the development and retained at all

times in the future for this purpose.

REASON In the interests of visual amenity of the site in accordance with Policy EN1 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

11. No development shall be begun until details of the cycle parking provision (including location, housing and cycle stand details) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with these details prior to the occupation of the development and shall be retained at all times in the future for this purpose.

REASON To ensure that there is adequate cycle parking available at the site in accordance with Policy T8 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004, and to meet the objectives of the Slough Integrated Transport Strategy.

12. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of as to the design and appearance of the proposed rear balconies, which shall include the provision of privacy screens to the sides of the proposed balconies, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. Once approved, such details shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the flats hereby approved and retained in that form thereafter.

REASON In the interests of design and safeguarding the amenities of future occupiers and neighbouring residents in accordance with Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008.

13. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of noise insulation measures shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The insulation measures shall be in accordance with the recommendations of the submitted 'Preliminary - Sound Insulation Testing' (15/03/2011) carried out by Alpha Acoustics, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, such details shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the flats hereby approved and retained in that form thereafter.

REASON In the interests of safeguarding the amenities of future occupiers and neighbouring residents in accordance with Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008.

14. A minimum of 18 no. car parking spaces for use by future occupiers of the flats hereby approved shall be laid out and provided prior to the first occupation of the flats hereby approved, and retained at all times in the future for the parking of motor vehicles. The car parking spaces shall not be assigned to individual occupiers or flats, and shall only be used for communal car parking.

REASON To ensure that adequate on-site parking provision is available to serve the development and to protect the amenities of the area in accordance with Policy T2 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

15. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a ground floor and basement car parking plan showing the spaces to be assigned to the respective uses on the site along with pedestrian linkages and details of the management of the car parking spaces shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, such details shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the flats hereby approved and the car parks shall be laid out and managed fully in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON To ensure that adequate on-site parking provision is available to serve the occupiers of the site and to protect the amenities of the area in accordance with Policy T2 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

16. The Development hereby approved shall incorporate measures to minimise the risk of crime and to meet the specific security needs of the application site and the development. Any security measures to be implemented in compliance with this condition shall seek to achieve the 'Secured by Design' accreditation awarded by Thames Valley Police.

REASON In pursuance of the Council's duty under section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to consider crime and disorder implications in exercising its planning functions; to promote the well being of the area in pursuance of the Council's powers under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000, and to reflect the guidance contained in PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'.

An additional condition is also recommended with respect to the submission of a refuse strategy, as follows:

17. No development shall commence until details for the arrangements for the storing of refuse or waste at the site have been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The storing of refuse or waste shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

REASON In the interests of ensure that satisfactory refuse arrangements are in place in conjunction with the development in the interests of the amenity of occupiers in accordance with Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008.

Additional informatives as suggested by Highways are also recommended, and this section now reads and is numbered as follows:

1. The applicant will need to apply to the Council's Local Land Charges on 01753 875039 or email to 0350SN&N@slough.gov.uk for street naming and/or numbering of the unit/s.
2. The development must be so designed and constructed to ensure that surface water from the development does not drain onto the highway or into the highway drainage system.
3. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to obstruct the public highway by the erection of scaffolding, hoarding, skip or any other device or apparatus for which a licence must be sought from the Highway Authority.
4. The applicant must apply to the Highway Authority for the implementation of the works in the existing highway. The council at the expense of the applicant will carry out the required works. Alternatively prior to commencing works the applicant will need to enter into a Minor Highway Works Agreement with Slough Borough Council for the implementation of the works in the highway works schedule. The applicant should be made aware that commuted sums will be payable under this agreement for any requirements that burden the highway authority with additional future maintenance costs.
5. Any works/events carried out either by, or at least at the behest of, the developer, whether they are located on, or affecting a prospectively maintainable highway, as defined under Section 87 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, or on or affecting the public highway, shall be co-coordinated under the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic Management Act 2004 and licensed accordingly by the Street/Highway Authority in order to secure the expeditious movement of traffic by minimising disruption to users of the highway network in Slough. Also Developers need to inform undertakers of their proposed works, to jointly identify any affected apparatus, and to agree diversion or protection measures and corresponding payment. Any such works or events commissioned by the developer and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to site, shall be co-coordinated by them in liaison with Slough Borough Council Street Works Section (telephone 01753 875666). This must take place at least one month in advance of the commencement of the works and must be in line with the noticing requirements of the NRSWA 1991 and the TMA 2004. The developer must particularly ensure that statutory undertaker connections/supplies to the site are co-coordinated to take place wherever possible at the same time and using the same Traffic Management measures.

6. This decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Local Plan for Slough 2004 and the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, as set out below, (to Supplementary Planning Guidance) and to all relevant material considerations.

Policies H10, H11, H14, EN1, EN3, EN5, T2 and T8 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 and Core Policies 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 12 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008.

This informative is only intended as a summary of the reasons for the grant of planning permission. For further detail on the decision please see the application report by contacting the Development Control Section on 01753 477340.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION