

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE** **4<sup>th</sup> September 2013**

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

## **AGENDA ITEM: 6**

### **P/00149/017: Northgate House, 1a, Stoke Road, Slough, SL2 5AH**

#### **Comments from Highways and Transport Advisors**

The following comments have been received from the Council's Highways and Transport Advisor:

##### **Trip Generation**

The consultant has derived trip rates for the development from the TRICS database for B1 office development. The trip rates derived by the consultant for vehicle movements to the existing site are in my opinion on the high side and this is because the locations that the consultant has selected include edge of town centre, suburban area and edge of town sites. This site is in the town centre and therefore it is the location which is a critical factor rather than the size of the office. I have derived trip rates from TRICS and have determined that the vehicle trip rate is circa 50% of what is proposed by the consultant.

The trip rates for the proposed use as C3 residential have also derived from the TRICS database. I have checked these rates and whilst I would generally prefer not to use sites in London there is a dearth of similar sites. My results are similar to that of the consultant.

In comparison between the two uses, based on my calculations, the office will generate a similar level of trips to the residential in the morning but a greater number of trips in evening peak hour. Throughout the day by my calculations the trip rates for vehicles for the existing office would be 4.700 arrivals per 100m<sup>2</sup> and 4.644 departures per 100m<sup>2</sup> with generating a total of number of 114 vehicles. Using the consultant's trip rates for the residential use the development would generate 124 vehicle trips. However the trip rates do not take account of the provision of parking, so I think it is reasonable to conclude that there will be no increase in vehicle trips resulting from the development.

##### **Access**

The vehicular access to the site is to be from Bristol Way as existing. The width of the dropped crossing is to be reduced in size to 4.8m, which is acceptable and consistent with MfS to allow 2 vehicles to pass. A visibility splay of 2.4m x 25m is to be provided to the north, which is consistent with the MfS guidance for a 20mph road and which is appropriate for Bristol Way. 2.4m x 19m can be achieved to the south which is the maximum that can be achieved due to the alignment of the road. The visibility splays are shown in Milestone Transport Planning Drawing 070/01 Rev. A.

The developer proposes to remove the existing access barrier to the site and agrees to cut back existing vegetation and realign the fence line to achieve the visibility splay.

Pedestrian access to the site will be made from a stepped access from William Street and there will also be a ramp in this location. Two further pedestrian accesses will be provided from the ground floor car park. I am not quite clear if the existing steps from William Street will remain to the ground floor car park – please clarify.

##### **Parking**

16 car parking spaces are proposed, in which the developer proposes to allocate 2 spaces to each of the 2 bedroom flats and nil spaces for the remainder flats. Under the Slough Local Plan Parking Standards developments there is no requirement for sites within the town centre to provide parking for residential uses and therefore the provision of parking for this site is considered acceptable. The applicant has agreed to a S106 obligation that residents will be ineligible to apply for a parking permit in existing and future residents parking schemes and this is welcomed. The developer has

suggested this applies to just the residents of the studio and one bed flats, however it is my view that this will need to cover all residents otherwise it will be very difficult to enforce.

2 of the 16 spaces are proposed to have the capability to be used as a electric car charging bays, which in principle is a good idea as there is a growing number of locations (albeit from a small base) in Slough where electric vehicles can be charged. The transport consultant has provided an additional drawing (070/TK03 Rev. B) to show that space no. 16 can be accessed, although it is extremely tight and may have result in it being underused. Taking into account my comments on the cycle parking below I would suggest that this space is deleted as it would provide additional space within the cycle store to achieve a better layout, which in my opinion is too cramped.

### **Car Club**

As part of the Travel Plan the developer is proposing to fund a car club space and all purchase and operating costs associated with the provision of a car on-street by residents of the development to use. The space is to be provided on the public highway on Stoke Gardens by re-designating a 5m length of the existing 1 hour limited waiting bay. In principle this is acceptable and welcomed, however the detail of how this car club is to operate needs to be fully set out in the S106 agreement. As this proposal would mean the first car club in Slough then the developer will need to fund the cost of the traffic regulation order to create a car club bay, but also ensure that a car club vehicle is provided. From my own discussions with car club operators, there has not been a lot of interest to date to install car club vehicles in Slough. Therefore a full specification of what is to be provided will need to be included within the S106 agreement for this to materialize.

Neither the TA nor the TS state the minimum period that the car club will be in place, but I would suggest that this is a period of 3 years from first occupation and that all occupiers within the development will be provided with free membership to the car club for a minimum period of three years. This will provide a suitable length of time for the car club to establish itself.

### **Public Transport Vouchers**

The developer has also made provision for £300 travel vouchers to be provided for one of occupier of each flat to be spent on public transport or cycles/cycle equipment and is welcomed. The process of distribution of the vouchers will need to be fully specified in the S106 agreement to ensure that this scheme delivers what is proposed.

### **Servicing**

The refuse and recycling arrangements are considered acceptable.

### **Cycle Parking**

A cycle store is proposed at Ground Floor Level accessed from the car park. A secure access is also provided from within the building which is good practice. The cycle store has been designed to contain 60 double tier cycle racks holding 120 bikes, but insufficient floor to ceiling height has been provided so scheme does not work. The system requires a minimum of 2.6m, but only 2.3m is available. So as currently designed the scheme does not work. The transport consultant has advised that a change can be made to the design of the building to lower the floor of the cycle store such that a height of 2.6m can be achieved. This needs to be shown on amended plans and re-submitted and should also be secured by planning condition, as once construction has started this will be very difficult to resolve at a later date.

Fundamentally I am not keen on the design of the cycle storage, large stores of this size for residential use are not appropriate in my opinion as they do not provide adequate security for users. The key question is will residents feel that their £500 mountain bikes will be safe in a store, where their bike and accessories is on full view to all other residents of the development. There is a high risk that people will shun the store and keep bikes in their flats or on their balconies. Women, the

petite and older people do find it harder to pull down and push up racks to the second tier. In my professional opinion these racks are better suited to places of employment or at railway stations.

The two tier racks require ongoing maintenance because they have been known to develop faults as they have moving parts and this maintenance responsibility will need to be incorporated within the management plan for the building and the travel plan. In terms of the installation, the Josta design is the original version of this two tier rack, however there are cheaper versions on the market which are less good, as they are harder to manoeuvre and more difficult to secure bikes too. If you are minded to approve the application using two tier racks, then I would be grateful if within S106 obligations specify the Josta brand to be used and implemented to the layout specifications as recommended in the Cycle-Works leaflet with a spacing of 450mm between racks.

In summary, I am not very happy with the proposed cycle parking solution especially as it is less satisfactory than proposed in the pre-application drawings where individual lockers were shown for some of the residents. I would be interested to understand why such a large plant room is required and whether available space could be used for some secure lockers or storage cupboards to improve the quality of what is being offered.

### **Road Safety Analysis**

In the TA, a review of highway safety has been undertaken in which it reports that four of the eleven accidents in the vicinity of the Stoke Road/Stoke Gardens junction have involved pedestrians. One pedestrian was also hit whilst crossing the Stoke Gardens arm of the junction, where currently this arm does not have any signal controlled crossing. The developer has agreed to fund an upgrade of the Stoke Road/Stoke Gardens/William Street junction to include toucan crossings on all arms which is welcomed. This improvement help mitigate the increase in pedestrian movement to and from the site.

### **Travel Plan**

The travel plan needs some refinement before it can be considered acceptable and I would expect this to be done prior to the signing of the S106 agreement. The following changes need to be made:

- A site layout plan for ground floor and first floors should be included within the travel plan to illustrate access points;
- Estimated number of residents should be included – this is referred to in the Planning Statement as 168 people;
- The nature of the targets is welcomed in principle; however the correct baseline information as well as parking capacity must be taken into account here.
- The 'travel voucher scheme' is welcomed, however clarification must be provided how these vouchers will be issued to residents – and this must be secured as a S106 obligation;
- The Car Club is strongly welcomed in principle, but greater details about who will fund the vehicle on-street need to be provided;
- The 'travel information pack' measure is welcomed – this should be extended to include future revisions and distributions of the pack in future – e.g. at 3 and 5 years from occupation, to all residents.
- Information must be provided about car park management at the site;
- TRICS SAM surveys (see <http://www.trics.org/sam/> ) must be undertaken at the site, funded and commissioned by the developer, at 1, 3 and 5 years, and this must be committed to in the travel plan;
- Additional monitoring must be carried out by the TPC and noted in the annual report – e.g. cycle / car parking counts, number of information packs distributed etc.
- The TPC will be responsible for commissioning the independent TRICS SAM surveys; and
- Interim contact details must be given for the site, for SBC to follow up when monitoring the travel plan.

It is recommended that the above amendments are sought prior to a decision being made on this application.

### **Recommendation**

I am still not particularly happy with the proposed cycle storage and I would be grateful if you incorporate the changes that I have suggested and delete the parking space 16 to make the cycle store larger and ensure that it is constructed to the recommended dimensions by Cycle Works using the Josta design.

Subject to securing the S106 package, the planning conditions and making changes to the travel plan as part of the completion of the S106 agreement I would not raise a highway objection.

### **S106 Transport and Highways Schedule**

#### **Highways Schedule**

- Enter in S278 agreement to undertake the works to the highway;
- Upgrade Stoke Gardens/Stoke Road junction to provide toucan crossings on each arm. The works include widening of the crossing studs, provision of tactile paving and push button controls to comply the latest highway standards and all necessary refurbishment works to achieve this outcome, a new signal controller and all traffic management costs;
- Implement tactile paving on junction of Stoke Gardens/Grays Road/Bristol Way as per Milestone Transport Planning drawing No. 070/01 Rev. A;
- Alterations to the site access from Bristol Way;
- Dedication of land to be maintained by the local highway authority at the public expense around the boundary of the site on Stoke Gardens / Bristol Way to ensure that a 2m wide footway is provided around the site. The dedication of land to cover the vehicle visibility splay on Bristol Way as necessary;

#### **Transport Schedule**

- All occupiers ineligible to apply for residents parking permit in existing or future local residents parking schemes;
- Travel Plan monitoring contribution £6k;
- Travel Plan;
- Travel Plan welcome information packs;
- Travel vouchers to the value of £300 for each flat – the S106 should specify how these vouchers are to be distributed either by the developer or by the Council;
- Travel Plan monitoring surveys to be TRICS SAM compliant and all survey costs to be funded by the developer;
- Full costs of introducing a Car Club vehicle onto the streets of Slough for a minimum period of 3 years;
- Residents to be provided with free car club memberships for a period of 3 years;
- Contribution of £4.5k to making changes to existing traffic regulation order and implementation of signing and lining to provide the bay on-street; and
- Josta design to be used for the two tier racks.

The issues that have been outlined can be dealt with prior to the final determination of the application and discussions are ongoing with the applicant to provide appropriate cycle storage.

#### **Mix of Housing**

The Applicants have supplied the following information with regards to the mix of the proposed housing:

The site has been designed to meet the identified needs in the Slough market and in a wider regional context.

As such the mix of units allows for the capital values of many of the units to be at a level where stamp duty maybe mitigated and encourage those renting currently onto the first rung of home ownership. We have consulted local residential agents in Slough who clearly identified a need for housing for individuals and couples looking to take their first steps onto the property ladder without the means to pay large deposits for 2 bedroom units and then be forced to share. As such the mix reflects this with a predominance of smaller Studio Suites and 1 bedroom units.

The building is designed to be deliverable whilst providing stylish homes commutable to London for young singles and couples reflecting its proximity to the station and Town Centre. As such the location and scheme does not lend itself to larger 3+ bedroom units. The architects smart design turns a compact living space into a desirable home, and the quality of the exterior and interior design, finishes and fittings will not be compromised by cost. Given the sustainable location and extensive provision of cycle parking, the building should appeal to the intermediate income singles and couples not catered for by the predominant two bedroomed developments and affordable housing schemes in the area that they are not eligible for.

Officers consider the mix to be acceptable in light of the above information.

### **Contributions**

The applicants have now provided a viability report which has been assessed by the Council's valuation officers. This demonstrates that while agreement is reached with regards to a payment of £292,666 has been agreed with regards to transport, travel, education and recreation amenity discussions with regards to a contribution for off site affordable housing are ongoing. The viability report shows that onsite affordable housing would not be viable and the applicant's re willing to make a contribution for off site affordable contributions.

In light of this it is considered that the best course of action is for Members to review the scheme in light of the principle of development, design and appearance, impact on neighbours and future occupiers and transport / parking and matters with regards to contributions will be reported to Members at a future committee meeting where a decision on the application will be taken.

**CHANGE IN RECCOMENDATION – That the application be considered by Members at the meeting but that a final decision be deferred to a future Committee to consider the results of further negotiations on affordable housing contributions.**

**AGENDA ITEM: 7**

P/00437/085: Langley Business Centre, 11-49, Station Road, Slough, Berkshire, SL3 8DS

As a result of the applicant agreeing an extension of time for determining the planning application there is a **CHANGE TO THE RECOMMENDATION** That the application be deferred to a future Committee to allow for consideration of outstanding consultation responses.

## **AGENDA ITEM: 9**

### **P/04551/013: Elvian House, Nixey Close, Slough, SL1 1ND**

#### **Amended Plans**

Amended plans have been received with regards to the terrace of dwellings so that the arch has been removed and the entrance area to the car parking area has been redesigned to provide some additional relieve to the properties at the rear and removal of some of the second floor windows to remove the issues of overlooking. The amendment also sees the change of all of these dwellings to three bedroom houses. The amended description should now read as follows:

**ERECTION OF AN ADDITIONAL FLOOR ON THE SOUTH WESTERN ELEVATION, FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION ABOVE THE EXISTING BILLIARD ROOM, INFILLING OF THE BASEMENT AND CONVERSION OF THE BUILDING INTO RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION COMPRISING 29NO. X 1 BED, 7NO. X 2 BED, 9NO. X STUDIO AND 2NO. X 3 BED FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING REFUSE AREAS AND AMENITY SPACE AS WELL AS A SEPARATE TERRACE OF 4NO. THREE BEDROOM, THREE STOREY DWELLINGS WITH ROOMS IN ROOF SPACE COMPRISING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING.**

#### **Comments from Conservation Advisor**

The following comments have been received from the Council's Conservation Advisor:

This revised scheme follows a site meeting on 21st May 2013 following my concerns at the proposals for, in particular, the internal changes to Upton Towers. This revealed the interior has entirely gone and only the brick outer shell survived radical surgery for office use. We also discussed the possibility of an extra storey to the 1980s office wing. I had concerns initially but decided that an added storey, if well designed, would actually carry more conviction for the residential conversion. The office additions end abruptly and, frankly, rather dully. So in my view the addition actually enhances the building and I have no CA objection or concern at potential domination of Upton Towers itself in these proposals.

While broadly in accordance with what was discussed I am not convinced that the rooms in the roof are practical. The roof appears to be pitched at 30 degrees but the plans seem to be drawn as if this was a full storey with bathrooms and staircases in the lowest parts of the eaves. I note on the elevation drawing it refers to an internal height of 2.3m but that can only be at the very apex of the ridge. I suggest you seek a section drawing to demonstrate that the applicant can achieve what he shows. In any case there seem rather a lot of roof lights. I suspect this roof area will need a redesign.

For both elements of the scheme I suggest a condition requiring approval of external materials samples prior to work starting, reason: to ensure materials are sympathetic to the designated heritage asset of the conservation area and the Local List building.

These further issues with regards to the roof of the building has been passed to the applicants who will make any amendments where required.

#### **Comments from Highways and Transport Advisors**

The following comments have been received from the Council's Highways and Transport Advisor:

#### **Trip Generation**

The consultant has derived trip rates from the TRICS database for the existing and proposed developments and these are considered to be acceptable. The trip assessment shows that the existing development will generate 279 vehicle trips per day and the proposed development 159 trips per day. Therefore the proposed development will lead to a decrease in vehicle movements on the local highway network.

### **Access**

Access to the development is to be taken from Nixey Close via an existing access. The access road leading to the development passes an existing office building (Winterton House). It is intended that the access road will be provided as a shared surface with a width of 4.8m wide which is acceptable and allows a for a refuse vehicle to pass a car. The provision of a shared surface is in principle acceptable, but Manual for Street Guidance is clear that the “it is important that shared surfaces include an alternative means for visually impaired people to navigate by”. As currently designed this has not been taken into account and therefore I should suggest that the developer may wish to consider demarcating a footway measuring 1.8m on the west side of the access road (using a different coloured pavior) which would also encourage pedestrian movement along this side, which would tie in with the footway that is proposed in front of the houses. Also the developer may wish to consider some minor traffic calming features on the access road as it is relatively straight using a change in materials (e.g. cobbles) to discourage vehicles being driven at speed.

Manual for Streets does recommend that shared streets are constructed from paviments rather than asphalt as this helps emphasise the difference from conventional streets and helps to reduce traffic speeds. Therefore as a planning condition I will require the construction materials of the access road to be submitted for agreement.

### **Refuse/Recycling**

The consultant and architect has made an error in the design of the refuse and recycling facilities. They have assumed that a 25m distance between the refuse store and the refuse vehicle, this is not correct. The maximum refuse collection distance for 1100 litre Eurobins is 10 metres as detailed in BS5906:2005. This is also stated on page 20 of the Slough BC Developers Guide Part 4 - <http://static.slough.gov.uk/downloads/developers-guide-part-4.pdf>. Therefore the two proposed refuse/recycling stores are unacceptable and will need to be relocated. Revised plans will need to be submitted prior to determination.

The stores would also appear to exceed the 30m walk distance from each apartment.

### **Car Parking**

A total of 65 car parking spaces are being provided which is on the basis of 1 space per flat + 7 visitor spaces and 2 spaces per house plus 3 visitor spaces. This is an under provision of spaces compared to the Slough Local Plan Parking Standards which requires 1.25 spaces per unit per 1 bedroom flat, 1.75 spaces per 2/3 bedroom flats, 2 spaces per 3 bedroom house and 3 spaces for 4+ bedroom houses. Therefore compared to the Parking Standards there is an under provision of 8 number spaces. At the pre-application discussions I agreed that I would be willing to accept a small shortfall of parking on the grounds that the site was located very close to the town centre and also if high quality cycle parking was provided and if the pedestrian/cycle permeability of the development was maximized. I will address these issues in the sections below but I do not believe as so far proposed these conditions have been met and some further alterations are required.

Furthermore as there is a shortfall of parking the developer will need to agree a S106 obligation that all future residents will be ineligible to apply for a car parking permit in any existing or future residents parking scheme in the surrounding streets.

### **Cycle Parking**

The cycle parking that has been proposed is substandard and does not comply with the guidance set out in Developers Guide Part 3. The stores are unacceptable for the following reasons:

- the dimensions do not work;
- there are no doors on the stores;
- the entrances are not being over looked by natural surveillance from the flats,

The stores need to be accessed off communal areas of the main building, so high levels of security are maintained. As large communal stores as proposed are easy prey for burglars and once they have been targeted once residents lose confidence in their security and either stop owning a bicycle or store it within flats. I would prefer to see individual stores being provided for each flat as this allows occupiers to use the stores for other things e.g. prams, mobility chairs and more than one bicycle per flat.

Rear and side pedestrian gates can be provided for the three of the four houses and garden sheds provided within the garden of each house to provide a cycle parking solution; this alteration should be made.

### **Permeability**

In the pre-application discussions I made it clear that I wanted to see whether a ped/cycle link could link the site to the east. I note on google earth that there is vehicular right of way between the Chiltern Place development site and this site. The reason I would like to see a link is so that a future pedestrian route for residents can be provided as a short cut to link to Yew Tree Road to access St Mary's Primary School. A link such as this would reduce the walk distance by 300m and such dissuade some people from driving to the site. I would still like to encourage the developer to investigate whether a private right of way for pedestrians with a secure gate can be provided between the two sites allowing access to Upton Road.

### **Drainage**

The site is believed to be currently drained by infiltration. The intensification of use of the site may affect the current surface water drainage arrangements for the site. The applicant should clearly show the existing drainage arrangements and any alterations necessary to accommodate the new buildings. The design standards for surface water drainage have significantly changed since the original development and the applicant should demonstrate that the drainage system is capable of containing within the site a 1:100yr + 20% event with no surface flooding below a 30yr event.

The intensification and change of the use of the site is likely to significantly increase the foul sewage discharge and Thames Water should be consulted regarding this. The addition of housing is likely to change the current status of the foul drainage within the site to public sewer and this should be taken into consideration in the drainage design.

### **Recommendation**

As currently proposed I would raise a highway on two grounds:

The layout as submitted is unacceptable in terms of the location of refuse stores, in terms of the carry distance from apartments and the drag distance of eurobins to the refuse vehicle, and as such would result in an unsatisfactory form of development. The development is contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.

The development fails to provide secure cycle parking in accordance with adopted Slough Borough Council standards and if permitted is likely to be reliant on the use of the private car contrary to the aims of central government policy and Policies T1 and T8 of the Local Plan for Slough.

If the refuse issues and cycle store issues are resolved and together with providing further evidence about a whether a right of way is in existence or could be achieved, then I would be willing to withdraw my highway objection subject to the Section 106 obligations and planning conditions.

The issues that have been outlined can be dealt with prior to the final determination of the application and discussions are ongoing with the applicant to provide appropriate cycle and bin storage as well as details of drainage.

### **Comments from Tree Management Officer**

The following comments have been received from the Council's Tree Management Officer:

The proposal will have limited implications on the trees in and adjacent to the site. The proposal will retain most of the trees within the site but will require the removal of 3no. trees. It is the intension to install some new hard surfacing within the RPA of some of the retained trees and the processes of demolition and construction in them selves can be hazardous to trees.

The application is supported by a tree survey and reports, the principles of minimising the possible impact on the trees are given and using these it is evident that it should be possible to undertake the proposal and not harm the retained trees. The three trees to be removed can be adequately replaced by new planting.

To insure the principles of the report are adhered to in practice during construction it will be advisable to require by condition, a arboricultural method statement which does not include the elements of the submitted report that do not relate to actual implementation of the development. The AMS should be limited to the site specific detail necessary to actually construct the proposal and it should also give details of, who is the assigned arboriculturalist, detail of any proposed incursion in to the RPA for services or drainage needs (SuDS etc) or state incursions will not be needed. Also of particular concern on this site is the installation of no dig surfacing under the Horse chestnut T2 and the level of the root plate.

These further issues with regards to the arboricultural method statement has been passed to the applicants who will make any amendments where required.

### **Additional comments from neighbouring properties.**

An additional letter has been received from the owners of Winterton House which adjoins the application site raising the following issues:

- The proximity of the end house of the new terrace to the boundary of Winterton House.

RESPONSE: This issue is covered in the officers report

- The increase in traffic.

RESPONSE: This issue is covered in the officers report and the details above

- The risk of harm to the trees.

RESPONSE: This issue is covered in the officers report and the details above

- The effect that the development will have on the tenants quiet enjoyment of their property before and after the development.

RESPONSE: Issues with regards to noise should not have a detrimental impact upon Winterton House and any noise nuisance is a matter for environmental health legislation.

### **Contributions**

The applicants have now provided a viability report that states that:

“The following report shows that the above mentioned project will yield a profit of -£5,458,692.00 (-38.88%). Total sales figures are estimated at £8,581,104.00 whilst expenditure including the site, construction costs, professional fees and finance are expected to total £14,039,976.00.”

While additional work is being undertaken with regards to viability it seems as if the scheme will be unviable and is being used as an exit strategy from the site by the applicants who can not find another viable use for it. Therefore this will have a direct impact upon what, if any, contributions will be paid to the Council.

In light of this it is considered that the best course of action is for Members to review the scheme in light of the principle of development, design and appearance, impact on neighbours and future occupiers and transport / parking and matters with regards to contributions will be reported to Members at a future committee meeting where a decision on the application will be taken.

**CHANGE IN RECCOMENDATION – That the application be considered by Members at the meeting but that a final decision be deferred to a future Committee to consider the results of further negotiations on viability, affordable housing contributions cycle parking, refuse and drainage.**

## **AGENDA ITEM 10**

### **P/14515/005: 234 Bath Road**

1. The Committee Report outlines the main changes that have been made to the external elevations. The changes obviously affected the internal lay-out of the office building and the other drawings reflect these changes.
2. The following condition deals with the approved drawings:
  - Drawing PL 010 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Site Plan); Dated: 20/08/2013 Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 099 Rev 03 (Proposed Condition: Basement Floor Plan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 100 Rev 04 (Proposed Condition: Ground Floor Plan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 101 Rev 03 (Proposed Condition: First Floor Plan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 102 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Second Floor Plan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 103 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Third Floor Plan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 104 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Fourth Floor Plan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 105 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Roof Plan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 011 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Site Plan within LRCC Masterplan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 109 Rev 01 (Proposed Condition: Basement Floor Plan within LRCC Masterplan); Dated: 24/07/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 110 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Ground Floor Plan within LRCC Masterplan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 111 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: First Floor Plan within LRCC Masterplan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 112 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Second Floor Plan within LRCC Masterplan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 113 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Third Floor Plan within LRCC Masterplan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 114 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Fourth Floor Plan within LRCC Masterplan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 115 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Roof Plan within LRCC Masterplan); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 200 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Sections); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 300 Rev 03 (Proposed Condition: Elevations); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 301 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Elevations); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 302 Rev 03 (Proposed Condition: Elevations); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 701 Rev 04 (Proposed Condition: Cladding Detail 01); Dated: 20/08/2013; Received: 20/08/2013
  - Drawing PL 702 Rev 02 (Proposed Condition: Cladding Detail 02); Dated: 23/07/2013; Received: 20/08/2013

- Drawing ASA-364-DR-005 Rev F (Landscape Layout within LRCC2 Masterplan); Dated: 20/12/2012; Received: 20/08/2013
- Drawing ASA-364-DR-006 (Landscape Layout: Existing Road Layout); Dated: 20/12/2012; Received: 20/08/2013
- Drawing 17563/478/004 Rev. E; Dated: 02/08/2013; Received: 07/08/2013

**NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

## **AGENDA ITEM 11**

### **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2012/13**

The figure for the number of affordable houses completed was reported in the committee report was incorrect. 53 affordable houses were completed in 2012/13. Of which 39 were social rent and 14 shared ownership.

### **NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION**

## **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ITEM**

### **Note informing Planning Committee members of the latest position regarding the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Planning Application 13/01667 for proposed minerals extraction, production of concrete batching, infill of inert waste and restoration and the outstanding request from RBWM for a Slough BC response under the Spheres of Mutual Interest agreement(SMI/561)**

#### **Land at Riding Court Farm**

In July 2013, Slough BC was consulted under the Spheres of Mutual Interest arrangements for this above-mentioned major development scheme received by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. This scheme is complex and abuts Slough District boundary with traffic implications for Slough highway network and other planning implications.

Although this site is Preferred Minerals Site in the Approved 2001 Berkshire Replacement Minerals Local Plan, the current application is for a larger site incorporating some land within the listed Historic Park of Ditton Park. The Preferred Minerals site is part of the total land-bank (for Berkshire) required to meet previous commitments agreed by Central Government. It is part of the Metropolitan Green Belt although minerals extraction is acceptable as a temporary activity within this designation.

It was intended to report this application to Committee in due course but on 4th September, RBWM planning informed Slough BC that it had been unable to secure a Planning Performance Agreement with the applicant and so may refuse the application under delegated powers on the basis of outstanding planning concerns.

It is important that Slough expresses its concerns to RBWM, even if the application is being refused, in order to make sure that all issues are covered. As a result Officers will use delegated powers to make a written response covering the following issues:

1. Extension of the mineral extraction area onto land which is part of the heritage asset known as Ditton Park.
2. Absence of a S106 agreement dealing with traffic routing where capable of being jointly agreed by RBWM and SBC .taking in account matters highway capacity and design, traffic noise and disturbance, Provision of traffic mitigation measures where appropriate.
3. Satisfactory safeguards in place to ensure continued enjoyment of the recreational facilities in neighbouring Upton Court Park and existing and future residential areas regarding noise, dust and odour in the event of this development taking place.
4. Provision of new north-south public footpath linking existing routes and associated long term maintenance.
5. Overcoming objections being raised by Environment Agency
6. Provision of all necessary measures to prevent mud on roads and any other effects from the operations including bird-strike.
7. Proper safeguards to achieve the full restoration of the site in accordance with good practice before the expiry of any temporary permission

If there is a change in proposed timescale for dealing with the planning application a report will be submitted to this Committee for consideration.

The application itself will be determined by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.