

PLANNING COMMITTEE

7TH May 2014

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

P/00440/008 - Slough Estates Plc, 234, Bath Road, Slough, SL1 4EE

Consultation:

Transport/Highway Safety:

It has been commented that the applicant should be given another opportunity to reflect on the need for a cycle ramp to the building.

It has been commented that this is a key site where commitment to sustainable travel is needed as part of the wider LRCC2 development and expecting cyclists to carry bikes downstairs into a restricted area with doors, one of which opens outwards is unsatisfactory and will lead to damage to bicycles. Wheeled ramps do not work well on steep staircases as proposed. They form a trip hazard to pedestrians and inconvenient in terms of people using the hand rail.

It has also been commented that just because one is provided in Winnersh it does not mean that this a good way of getting cyclists down into the car park far from it. For a largely new building (with brand new occupiers) this is not acceptable, especially given the commitments to providing a high quality facility at pre-app.

The applicant has been asked as to whether changes could be made to address these concerns.

It is considered that any issues regarding the Travel Plan could be resolved.

Thames Water:

No objections have been raised and conditions and informatives are recommended. It has been noted that there are easements and way leaves running to the east of the proposed development. These are Thames Water Assets and assurance will be sought that these will not be affected by the proposed development.

Landscaping:

Amendments have been undertaken to the proposed landscaping scheme and a revised plan has been received. It is considered that the proposed amendments are acceptable and compliant with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy and Policy EN3 of The Adopted Local Plan.

Sustainability:

Further information has been received regarding sustainability matters. The applicant has provided details as to how they consider the proposal would comply with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy in respect of sustainable design and construction principles. With respect to the generation of electricity from renewables; 10% of the building's energy (for new build area of 4,770m² only) is to be met by using onsite renewables. It is submitted that the limiting factor to installation will be the ability of the roof to safely bear the load of a proposed array. Further

details have also been provided with respect to minimising energy consumption, recycling waste, and incorporating sustainable design and construction.

Having regard to Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy, it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable on balance. Whilst the Developers Guide states that major developments must include renewable or low carbon energy equivalent to 10% of the developments carbon emissions, the applicant is proposing to provide 10% of the building's energy for the new build area only. Whilst it could be argued that the 10% should relate to the total floorspace of the building, the scheme involves the retention of existing fabric. The development is described as being for part-refurbishment and construction and the existing floors of the western building are to be retained. Given that the proposal would provide other sustainability benefits as well as achieving BREEAM rating of 'Very Good', as required, it is not considered that it would be reasonable to raise an objection to the proposal on sustainability grounds having regard to the requirements of Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy. The wording of Condition 13 is to be amended accordingly.

Parking and Highway Safety:

Further/revised details have been received regarding transport and highway matters. The response received includes the following:

- A revised drawing has been provided showing a reduction in the width of the junction bell-mouth and overrun area;
- The basement car park aisle widths are to remain as existing;
- A drawing has been provided which illustrates an alternative basement access arrangement;
- A revised drawing has been provided showing additional disabled parking spaces and a re-configuration of the basement area to accommodate new columns that are required for the new building;
- Access to the basement car park will be controlled via the existing sliding gates;
- A revised drawing has been provided which demonstrates that the parking spaces on the access ramp do not obstruct cars entering the basement car park;
- A 'cycle channel' will be provided;
- A revised and updated Travel Plan has been provided;
- Sheffield style cycle stands are to be provided at the east end of the landscape break out area located under a covered, pagoda-type structure.

The Council's Transport consultant has assessed this information and further comments have been received, as summarised above.

The main concern remains with the access arrangements to the cycle store. Whilst the applicant is proposing to provide a cycle channel, this is not considered acceptable. The arrangement of doors is also not considered satisfactory. It has been commented that the applicant should be given another opportunity to reflect on the need for a cycle ramp to the building.

Conditions:

The applicant has commented on the recommended conditions. It has been requested that certain conditions are either omitted or reworded and consideration has been given to these comments, as follows:

7th May 2014

Slough Borough Council Planning Committee Amendments

Condition number 2 setting out the approved plans has been updated to include the revised plans received;
Conditions 8 and 9 are considered reasonable and necessary. Any proposed alterations, extensions or changes of use would be assessed against development plan policies;
Condition 12 relating to cycles is to remain as a pre-commencement condition. Given the above comments from the Council's Transport consultant regarding the need for a commitment to sustainable travel at this key site, it is considered that this is an appropriate trigger for these details to be provided (the access issues discussed above will be considered prior to formal determination);
Condition 13 relating to sustainability is reworded to make it clear that the 10% requirement relates to the new build area;
Condition 15 relating to refuse is amended to require details to be submitted prior to occupation;
Condition number 27 regarding piling has been updated in light of comments received from Thames Water. This condition is considered reasonable and necessary;
Conditions 28 and 29 are considered reasonable and necessary.

Further Information:

The applicant has submitted the attached "Summary Design Note" in support of the application.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Planning Application Ref: P/00440/008

SUMMARY DESIGN NOTE ON THE REFURBISHMENT AND EXPANSION OF 234 BATH ROAD, SLOUGH.

1. SEGRO welcome the Officer's recommendation, which reflects the outcome of detailed pre-application discussions and meetings with Planning and Highways Officers, as well as a public consultation exercise.
2. SEGRO have marketed the larger approved scheme for the site for a period of 3 years without success. This consent remains alive. SEGRO have explored alternative options that are more responsive to the current market conditions, meet the needs of future occupiers and will form an important gateway to the Slough Trading Estate.
3. The design approach has involved the re-use of the existing floor plates of the western building with some modifications where as the eastern building will be demolished as it is unsuitable and does not meet modern office requirements.
4. The key factors influencing the layout of the building include the shape of the site and fact that it is a corner plot, the reuse of the general access locations, the location of the mains sewer running along the western side of Leigh Road, the building line on Bath Road (the proposed building will not extend beyond the existing building line) and provision of amenity space. Scale was also an important consideration in the design response, together with the site's relationship to the opposite side of Leigh Road. In our view there is no need for the two sides of Leigh Road to 'mimic' each other, but rather the opportunity to create two statement buildings, which add to this prominent gateway location. 230 Bath Road is different in shape and this will influence the design response to this site. The two buildings can be complementary to each other.
5. The design response is in our view a significant improvement on the first scheme presented to you at the pre-application stage, in December last year. The site layout is designed to maximise the prominent gateway location of the site and is responsive to the geometry of Leigh Road with an angled return to Leigh Road including a triple height glazed pedestrian entrance and canopy feature. We have located the entrance on the south east elevation to make it visible to visitors from Bath Road and Leigh Road. It is an inviting entrance, drawing on existing examples along Bath Road. It also provides an opportunity for making a grand architectural statement towards the junction and would enhance the gateway to the Training Estate.
6. The scale of the building can be appreciated when looking at the model and CGI's provided.
7. In our view the design is predicated on a strong rationale underpinned by a good understanding of the site's constraints and opportunities, and an appreciation of the character

7th May 2014

Slough Borough Council Planning Committee Amendments

of the surrounding townscape, and need to deliver a high quality, prominent gateway building. This is further explained in the submitted Design and Access Statement.

8. In conclusion, the proposals seek to transform and modernise the two existing buildings of disparate design under a unified enclosure. This is a sustainable response to the reuse of this site. The new building has been designed to be highly efficient and sufficiently flexible to accommodate the needs of future occupiers and will form an important gateway to the Slough Trading Estate. Subject to planning permission being given, SEGRO would look to start on site as soon as practicable and construct the office space speculatively, in the knowledge that this building better responds to the market.

P/06348/008 - Lion House: Depot & No. 10, Petersfield Avenue, Slough, Berks, SL2 5DN

A new petition, objecting to the proposal, has been received. It is from the Residents Association of Petersfield Avenue and has 51 signatures from residents of Petersfield Ave and Benson Close. It includes many names from the existing 2011 petition. A new letter from the Association raises the following matters :

The previous application was approved by accident/deception.

It was strongly opposed by residents – it had been rejected twice and at a public enquiry.

Only 3 people received notification of the application being resubmitted.

When the application was passed no residents were notified and, as a result, no one from the Association attended the Planning Committee.

The application should be denied because of huge opposition and over development of the area (referring to recent developments nearby).

A full impact assessment should be carried out.

Does the proposal meet the public inquiry Inspectors recommendations ?.

Local people will have to put up with areas social problems.

In response the existing permitted scheme is different to the 2 schemes previously refused. It is smaller and addresses the concerns raised by the public inquiry Inspector. Council records show that neighbours in the area were notified of the application for the permitted scheme and the associated 2011 extension of time application. When the permitted scheme was approved in principle (23rd September 2008) minutes record that an objector(s) spoke at the Committee meeting. (Point to note : when the current (extension of time) application was first presented to Planning Committee in Dec 2011 no discussion took place and a decision was deferred. One objector had registered to speak). The Officers report addresses issues of the impact of the proposal. The 2008 Committee report addressed issues raised by the Inspector in particular the height of the building in relation to the proximity of existing homes and design issues regarding the frontage.

One objector has sent in a second letter raising similar issues as those reported in the Neighbour Notification section.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

P/15673/002 - 3 The Grove & 258-268, High Street, Slough, SL1 1JU

Amended plans have been received from the Applicant's agent showing the lay out of the proposed refuse and cycle storage which have also been provided to the Council's Highways and Transport Consultant. These have been submitted for confirmation in order to overcome the issues previously raised by the Engineers or to identify if further amendments are required, which can be dealt with under the matters to be delegated to Development Management Lead Officer to resolve.

The amended plans also show an amendment to the 2nd and 3rd floors, showing increased bedroom sizes so that they comply with the Councils guidelines for flat conversions.

The amended plans show revised fenestration on the north facing elevation to improve levels of natural light to habitable rooms and a daylight / sunlight report is being commissioned to establish if the appropriate level of sunlight and daylight are going to be provided to these rooms. This is another issue that can be resolved under the responsibilities delegated to the Development Management Lead Officer.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION: Delegate to the Development Management Lead Officer for consideration of any substantive objections, resolution of outstanding issues relating daylight and sunlight, cycle parking and bin storage, possible S106 Agreement, finalising condition

P/14306/002 - Disused Railway Line, Old Bath Road, Colnbrook, Slough, Berks

The following comments have been received from the Environment Agency:

“In the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), we object to this application and recommend refusal of planning permission until a satisfactory FRA has been submitted.

The application lies within Flood Zone 1 (FZ1) defined by the Technical Guide to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as having a low probability of flooding. However, paragraph 103, footnote 20 of the NPPF requires applications for sites over 1 hectare in FZ1 to be accompanied by an FRA. An FRA is vital if the local planning authority is to make informed planning decisions. In the absence of an FRA, the flood risks resulting from the proposed development are unknown. The absence of an FRA is therefore sufficient reason in itself for a refusal of planning permission. The FRA should;

- demonstrate that the storage volume required to attenuate surface water run-off from the critical 1 in 100 chance in any year storm event, with an appropriate allowance for climate change, can be provided on site.
- demonstrate that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) will be used on site to provide storage for surface water generated on site, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103, that requires development to give priority to the use of SuDS.
- demonstrate that the peak discharge rate for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 chance in any year critical storm event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change, will not exceed that of the existing site. This may increase the flood risk on site and in surrounding areas.

We note that no assessment has been made of the impacts of the proposals on the biodiversity and ecological status of the site. The development site includes a bridge which crosses the Poyle Channel as shown on the site plan drawing (ref P498 number 06 dated 12-012-13). The plan states that the existing bridge will be repaired and we recommend that the applicant submits a working method statement to ensure that there will be no deterioration to the status of the watercourse in line with paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Thames Land Drainage Byelaws 1981, the prior consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the Poyle Channel, designated a ‘main river’. This includes proposals which may include storage within 8 metres, bridge repairs and the provision of hardstanding.”

RESPONSE : In light of the above information it is recommended that the following reason is included in any refusal :

A holding objection is raised on the grounds that the applicant has failed to provide a flood risk assessment including details of ecological conservation and flood defence consent contrary to Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006-2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008.

The following comments have been received from Colnbrook With Poyle Parish Council:

7th May 2014

Slough Borough Council Planning Committee Amendments

“The Parish Council wishes to object to this application as it will have a detrimental effect to nearby houses and is contrary to LDF and your policy EN1. It also puts the possible future use of the railway line in jeopardy”

RESPONSE : These issues are considered in the Officers Report.

It is noted that there is an error in paragraph 12.1 of the Officers Report which should read :

On the basis of the information provided it is considered that the proposals would have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring amenity and highway safety and the application should be refused.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION.