

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th April 2014

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

P/00850/012 - 1, Whittle Parkway, Slough, SL1 6DQ**Neighbour Notification**

Further representations have been received, both objecting and in support of the proposed development.

The following objections have been received:

Occupier of 5 Lowestoft Drive – Object for the following reasons in summary:

- This will cause the residents of Lowestoft Drive a considerable deal of aggravation and disruption during the morning rush hour with people dropping their children at school and also the weekends. As you are well aware the traffic congestion within the Burnham Gate estate will escalate, especially on Fridays, the car parks do not have private parking for owners/tenants signage, therefore, the users of the intended Mosque/ school/ gym potential could park in Burnham Gate car parks or even outside resident's houses;
- Weddings will be performed at 1 Whittle Parkway once again causing traffic congestion not only from the A4 Bath Road, but our estate will be inundated with vehicles that will be leaving late at night during the weekends disturbing our sleeps.

Occupier of 7 Lowestoft Drive – Object for the following reasons in summary:

- Enough issues already compounded by the Council allowing the Mini Garage to be opened on the old Racal site, and its refusal to impose double yellow lines on Walpole Road;
- Nuisance parking is already an issue and there are serious road safety issues now, the verges are ruined by vehicle transporters who have nowhere to turn and end reversing unguided into Walpole Road this in itself is a serious health and safety concern Whittle Parkway is already badly congestion with vehicles from the Fiat Garage and additional traffic entering and exiting whittle Parkway will only compound the dangers of the junction with the Bath Road and St Andrews Way/Access to Burnham Gate which is a notorious traffic black spot as well as cause further Nuisance Parking on the estate and cause general inconvenience to local residence.

Occupier of 43 Lowestoft Drive – Object for the following reasons in summary:

- This mosque will have a huge negative impact on residents, local businesses and traffic in the area
- business could lose their lets on the buildings and lose their livelihoods should planning for this mosque go ahead;
- Traffic - the proposed mosque will cause serious traffic problems in the surrounding area as mosques attract not dozens but hundreds of attendees;
- Congestion - There will be major congestion at the junction on the Bath Road at the lights at the end of Whittle Parkway. Drivers will have problems getting out of that road onto the A4 especially when turning right. It will also cause congestion to many of the nearby roads, especially the estate of Walpole Road and Lowestoft Drive;
- Danger to Public - There is a potential for increases in collisions due to high concentrated volumes of traffic. Small children play outside in the summer;
- Parking - as Walpole Road and Lowestoft Drive and many roads in the surrounding area do not have any yellow lines, there will be a problem with visitors parking in quiet local roads, obstructing and causing disruption to residents getting into their driveways and parking near their houses and flats;
- Access - as Whittle Parkway is not a large road and lorries use this road to service Fiat, there will be a major issue with access down this road that also leads to Progress Business Centre. Also the

proposed car park does not hold nearly enough spaces for those who would like to attend as there will be potentially hundreds of visitors;

- Obstruction to Emergency Services - with the increased parking and obstruction in the roads, this will cause a serious threat for emergency services to attend an emergency and could pose a danger to life;
- Affect on small businesses - Local businesses in Progress Business Centre could be under threat;
- Noise Pollution - the possibility of all day prayers, or music and weddings until late at night will have a detrimental affect on the local community and their peace and quiet;
- Quality of life - many of the residents in the estate immediately next to Whittle Parkway have purchased properties here due to the secluded and quiet feel of the area. Quality of life will be affected for the worse.

Owner of 43 Lowestoft Drive (occupier of Willows) – Object for the following reasons in summary:

- Main objection relates to the traffic and parking problems that are almost certain to be created in Burnham Gate, which will make it a less pleasant place to live.
- The problem with Whittle Parkway is that there is not much parking and the building itself does not have enough capacity for car parking. Parking on the A4 is not allowed and so Burnham Gate and the approaches is where the overflow will go. A lot of the residents (and their visitors) cars are packed in the roads but none of these spaces are reserved, so we will be faced with people coming home, when the Mosque is full, and not being able to park near their home to unload shopping, children (including babies), etc.
- Residents only parking is not practical because there has to be space for visitors, tradesmen etc.

Owner of 49 Lowestoft Drive – Object for the following reasons in summary:

- There are current parking and access problems to the estate. Having a public building being used as a mosque, school, gym and hosting weddings will cause more traffic problems - especially with regard to parking. The access to Whittle Parkway is limited now and this will cause 'overflow' parking and traffic onto Burnham Gate;
- The noise levels and people traffic will significantly increase.

Occupier of 64 Walpole Road – Object for the following reasons in summary:

- On Burnham Gate Estate there are no parking restrictions and traffic congestion will escalate. Mini & Fleetwood are parking along the road, causing havoc;
- Informed that Weddings are to take place at this intended establishment, this will cause further traffic congestion and disruption to residents late at night, guests will be leaving at all hours and disturbing people in the properties directly behind 1 Whittle Parkway.

No address provided – Object for the following reasons in summary:

- Strongly object to the planning application. Concerns expressed regarding damage that lorries are causing to the grass area on the A4 entrance to Burnham Gate.

Response to issues raised: Matters relating to impact on neighbour amenity and impact on the local highway network are discussed in the officers report. The concerns regarding the use of the site as a wedding venue are noted and it is considered that such a use could potentially have adverse impacts. It is therefore recommended that the Section 106 agreement includes an obligation preventing the use of the site for these purposes to address this.

It has been suggested that businesses may relocate from the surrounding commercial units if this application were approved. It is considered that ensuring the proposed use can be satisfactorily accommodated given nearby uses is an important consideration and mitigation has been identified

to seek to address the adverse impacts which could arise as a result of overspill parking and access concerns.

Whilst some concerns have been raised regarding a perceived lack of consultation, notification letters regarding the application were sent to owners/occupiers of properties and premises who adjoin the application site. The addresses are listed in the officer report. The Local Planning Authority would not display a site notice for this type of application as it is not defined as major development. Consultation requirements for this application have been met as prescribed by the Development Management Procedure Order.

The following letters of support have been received: At the time of writing, 232 emails of support have been received. The content of these emails is similar and they convey strong support for this much needed community project for the local Muslim population and state that the project will unite a cross section of the community and help to improve the moral and spiritual wellbeing of the young and the old. Some letters urge that the application be approved without delay.

Additional comments in support of the proposal contained within the emails of support received are as follows:

Occupier of 125 Burnham Lane:

A smaller building is currently used which is inadequate and there is no comparable facility on the west side of Slough.

Occupier of 70 Canterbury Avenue:

A school is very much needed in Slough.

Occupier of 2 Simpson close, Maidenhead:

Have been attending Friday prayers at the Madni mosque on Bath Road and can say that they are very professional and well organised which has already brought a lot of benefit to the local community.

Of the 232 emails of support received containing address details, it appears that 126 have been sent by Slough residents. The remainder of the letters of support have either no address provided, or have been sent by individuals residing outside of the Borough in locations including: Birmingham, Bradford, Brentford, Bromley, East Ham, Harlington, Hayes, Ilford, Iver, Leeds, Luton, Maidenhead, Reading, Rotherham, Southall, Stanmore, Sutton, Taplow, Welwyn, Windsor, Woking. It appears that a few of the letters of support received may be duplications

In addition, a petition in support of the proposal has been received. The petition states the following:

We the undersigned would like to convey our strong support for this much needed community project for the local population of Slough. We believe this project will benefit the community and help improve the spiritual wellbeing of the young and old as well as provide education for our growing community.

The petition in support of the proposal appears to have been signed by 1,740 individuals. Address details have been provided. Whilst the majority of addresses provided would seem to be for where individuals reside, it appears that a small number of addresses for places of work may have also been provided. Furthermore, the legibility of some handwriting is unfortunately not entirely clear.

However, an analysis of the addresses provided indicates that the majority of individuals who have signed the petition live in Slough. It appears that around 86% of people have provided a Slough address.

Given the late receipt of this petition, it is understood that a copy will be available for Inspection at the Committee meeting.

Transport, Parking and Highway Safety

The applicant has been advised that the landowner will need to be a signatory to a Section 106 Agreement and that their consent will need to be secured – discussions and negotiation will have to take place in connection with this.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

In addition to the matters set out in the officer report, it is recommended that the Section 106 agreement includes an obligation defining the permitted use and preventing the use of the site for wedding venue or banqueting.

With regard to the limit on the number of persons, if this limit is exceeded, the Section 106 Agreement shall include a clause that the use should cease.
Consideration will be given to the need for other relevant obligations as considered necessary.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

P/02114/021 - Slough & Eton C Of E School, Ragstone Road, Slough, SL1 2PU

Neighbour Notification

A further objection has been received. This objection is made on the following grounds:

Occupier of 22 Ragstone Road (on behalf of Ragstone Road residents) – Object for the following reasons in summary:

- The development will lead to negative impact on amenity space as gardens are north facing – the development will not conform to laws regarding overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy, impact on local traffic and road situations;
- It is being constructed too close to the gardens thus it will cause a loss of privacy in their only amenity space, the bedroom and living rooms will be vulnerable. These gardens rely on light and with the double storey it will inevitably cause the new development to overshadow thus taking away the right to maximum sunshine during the day;
- Affected residents collectively are against the idea of allowing the school to continually expand by erecting another major two storey pitched roof building;
- Looking at the volume and frequency of planning applications made over the past years, it is alarming the amount of transformation this whole school has gone through in a decade;
- Enormous amount of traffic is generated onto Ragstone Road due to the Power League club, Windsor Road McDonalds, 70 Ragstone Road Mosque facility, Quakers House and the Masonic Lodge not to mention local traffic.

Potential Impact on Neighbouring Properties

The applicant has submitted additional information in support of their application to address concerns relating to this issue.

The additional information includes a response to the objections raised, a daylight and shadow study and amended plans showing the windows in the northern elevation at first floor level amended to high level windows – the previously proposed windows at eye level have been omitted and are to be replaced with rendered panels.

The applicant has also advised that they are willing to relocate the building approximately 1-1.2 metres to the south.

The assessment of this additional information is as follows:

Response to objections

The applicant's response to the objections received sets out the following:

1. Overlooking

We have amended the north elevation of the proposed scheme. All the rooms on the first floor will no longer have windows at mid-height/ eye level and are replaced with render panels. We have retained some high level opening lights to provide natural ventilation. However, as these rooms operate under supervision we believe that there would be no risk of direct overlooking. In order to provide natural light and support ventilation to laboratory F01 we have introduced 4 rooflights. Please refer to the following attached amended drawings:

- L1110F – Proposed First Floor Plan
- L1220C – Proposed Roof Plan

- L1200F – Proposed Elevations

Please also refer to the tree survey submitted with the planning application and attached drawing L1402. This illustrates that there are a number of trees along the boundary line which provides screening throughout the year, particularly from spring through to autumn.

2. Daylight/ Shadow Study

Existing and Proposed Development Study

We have carried out a daylight/ shadow study based on the building arrangement only. This has been undertaken during the following periods:

- Spring Equinox – 20th March
- Summer Solstice – 21st June
- Autumn Equinox – 23rd September
- Winter Solstice – 21st December

Drawings L1400 and L1401 illustrates the daylight/ shadow study with the proposed development. This highlights that during the vast majority of the year the impact of the development is minimal. However, the following periods require further analysis:

- 1800 20th March
- 1800 23rd September
- 21st December

We carried out a further study of the existing buildings during these periods, to see what the difference was between the existing and new proposals. Please see drawing L1450.

From this study we note the following:

1800 20th March and 1800 23rd March

The shadows cast during this period remain largely unchanged by the existing and new developments. There is no further loss of light as a result of the proposed development during this time.

21st December

During midday of the winter solstice there is a further shadow cast as a result of the development. This is indicated on drawing L1451 reference 5. The periods of sunrise and sunset remain largely unchanged. There would be a small loss of light as the shadows would be cast sooner in the day during this time of the year. Please also note that the normal weather conditions during this time of year would be generally overcast.

Impact of Existing Trees

There are currently a number of trees planted continuously along the site boundary. Please refer to the tree survey submitted with the planning application; and specifically to page 21 (tree survey schedule) and page 23 (drawing TPP-CC/1156 AR2095). This shows that there a number of trees between 13m and 16m high along that boundary line and the shadow cast by them in mid-summer. We believe that the shadows cast by these trees have a much greater impact than the proposed development, particularly when they have a full set of leaves (spring through to autumn). Please refer to drawing L1452. Please also not all the trees do not become completely bear during the winter.

21st December

Although the trees will not have many leaves during the winter period we feel that the density and heights of them will continue to cast a notable shadow. We believe that this does reduce the perceived impact of the proposed development during this period of the year. As mentioned above

the normal weather conditions this time of year would be generally overcast. Furthermore the density, height and spread of the trees will provide a screen throughout the year.

3. Planning Policy Statement

The statement that this 'Current proposal is a step too far' is subjective. We feel that the proposed design is suitable for the site and is in line with planning policy and respects the amenities of the adjoining of adjoining occupiers. We refer to the pre-application advice issued and note the following to which we are in keeping with:

- Core Policy 5 of the Core Strategy for better education and training opportunities in order to improve skills
- Policy EN1 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough and Core Policy 8. It is in keeping with existing building on site with minimal impact on the street scene
- Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy that the development respects the amenities of adjoining occupiers. We believe that we have considered the issues relating to overlooking, over-dominance and overbearing relationship at planning stage following receipt of the pre-application advice. This has been addressed further based on the objections raised above. We have also provided additional information to support the application
- Core Policy 7 of the Core Strategy in relation to transport matters, the development would have no impact on pupil numbers and therefore on the existing transport infrastructure

4. Screening/ Planting proposal

There is currently no further planting proposed on the site. However, the school confirms that they would be happy to work with the occupier at number 10 Ragstone Road to specify a suitable planting design that improves the screening whilst not have an adverse impact (limited height and spread) to address this concern.

Daylight and shadow study

The daylight/shadow study has been undertaken during the periods listed above. It appears that the proposed building is likely to have its greatest potential impact during the winter months. The difference between the shadow cast between the existing and proposed development at 12:00 on December 21st is shown shaded in green on the study of the proposed building. The study shows that the proposed building would result in additional overshadowing to the gardens of 2-12 Ragstone Road during this time.

The shadow study of the existing and proposed building at 15:30 on December 21st shows that shadows are currently cast and would continue to be cast to the north east, towards the rear of neighbouring properties. What does not appear to be clear from this analysis is how the duration of overshadowing is affected and whether other properties to the north and east, that are not currently overshadowed would be overshadowed following the erection of the proposed building.

It is considered that it would be beneficial for further analysis to be undertaken in relation to this area. The applicant has indicated that they would be prepared to re-site the building to the south and it is considered that analysis of the potential impact of an amended siting would be beneficial to inform the assessment of potential impact on neighbouring properties.

Amended plans

The amended plans received show the windows in the northern elevation at first floor level amended to high level windows – the previously proposed windows at eye level have been omitted and are to be replaced with rendered panels. It is considered that this amendment is sufficient to address concerns regarding overlooking and no objections are raised on overlooking grounds.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION