

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th February 2016

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

Montrose House, 155-161 Farnham Road

The Applicant has agreed to all the draft conditions within the Supplementary Report.

The Local Planning Authority is still awaiting for full drainage details which the Agent has commissioned the work for. These will be assessed by the Council's Drainage Officer and will need to be acceptable prior to issuing planning permission, a condition relating to compliance with the drainage works maybe required.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the application is delegated to the Planning Manager for approval, subject to acceptable sustainable drainage, completion of Section 106 Agreement and finalising of conditions.

R/O Westminster House, 31 – 37 Windsor Road

Following a late consultation with Historic England comments have been received which although not opposed to the principle of development have raised significant concerns about the design appearance and quality of the building being proposed. With the agreement of the applicant officers are withdrawing this application from the Agenda, to allow the applicant time to redesign the scheme. It is proposed to resubmit this application to the next Meeting of Planning Committee on 31st March 2016.

Withdrawn from Agenda

P/06350/001 Gurney House, Upton Road

The revised drawings received are acceptable and include a full width footway, alteration of spacing of crossovers onto Upton Rd and obscure glazing for upper floor windows on the flank next to 91 Upton Road.

Regarding the garden rooms the applicant does not wish to reduce their size. The proposed restriction on their future use will go in a Section 106 agreement rather than a condition and the precise wording will be dependent upon discussions with Legal. However there is no intention to restrict the rooms from being used for members of an extended family including so called granny annexe – this could include cooking facilities being put in the rooms.

Two items to add to the Sec 106 list in para 9.1 are:

Garden rooms to be used only for domestic purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the main dwelling and not be used as separate self-contained residential accommodation or for any industrial, commercial or business use. (but for clarity there is no intention of preventing a room being used, in part, as a home office nor for extended family) Restriction on selling or leasing or renting out a garden room separately from the main house. The Council as current land owner will also put a similar covenant of the disposal of the land.

Changes to Conditions:

Condition 2 drawings numbers to be updated - 16B street scene, 02D layout, 05B elevation plot 1.

Condition 19 to be deleted (replaced by 106 obligation)

New Condition to prevent any access being put in the boundary with the Park.

The delegation to Planning Manager to also cover consideration of any further objections received as a result of a late notice of application in a local paper.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Delegate a decision to the Planning Manager for approval subject to completion of a satisfactory Section 106 planning obligation or equivalent thereof, minor amendment of conditions and consideration of any further observations received.

Freestone Yard, Park Street

Thames Valley Police Consultation

“To ensure that these opportunities are not missed, request that the following (or a similarly worded) condition be placed upon any approval for this outline application;

No development shall commence until details of the measures to be incorporated into the development to demonstrate how ‘Secured by Design (SBD)’ accreditation will be achieved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and shall not be occupied or used until the Council has acknowledged in writing that it has received written confirmation of SBD accreditation.

I feel that attachment of this condition would help the development to meet the requirements of:

- The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (Part 7, Sect 58; Requiring good Design and Part 8, Sect 69; Promoting Healthy Communities) where it is stated that development should create ‘*Safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion*’.
- DCLG’s Planning Practice Guidance in relation to design, where it states ‘*Although design is only part of the planning process it can affect a range of economic, social and environmental objectives... Planning policies and decisions should seek to ensure the physical environment supports these objectives. The following issues should be considered: ...safe, connected and efficient streets, ... crime prevention, ...security measures, ...access and inclusion, ...cohesive & vibrant neighbourhoods.*’ It also states that ‘*Planning should promote appropriate security measures. Taking proportionate security measures should be a central consideration to the planning and delivery of new developments...*’
- Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006 - 2026) Development Plan Document states: All development will:
 - a) Be of a high quality design that is practical, attractive, safe, accessible and adaptable;
 - c) Provide appropriate public space, amenity space and landscaping as an integral part of the design;
 - d) Be in accordance with the Spatial Strategy in terms of its height, scale, massing and architectural style.

Opportunities to design out crime and/or the fear of crime and to promote community safety are present within the proposed layout (see my observations below). Assuming outline approval is given, and to assist the authority and the applicants in providing as safe a development as possible, and to aid the latter in ultimately achieving SBD accreditation, I make the following observations:

- Parking courts are problematic in terms of crime prevention design. They make vehicles vulnerable to criminal activity and they often attract anti social behaviour (ASB). These areas should be made as secure as possible.
- From the illustrative plans provided it would appear that some ground floor windows will not be provided with any set back or private space (between allocated parking and the private dwelling's building line). Defensible space helps distinguish between private and public space and provides additional security, as it makes accessibility to ground floor windows and harder. Residents may be inclined to keep curtains/blinds permanently closed in order to prevent strangers (who are legitimately using the parking facility) from looking into their private rooms, this in turn, presents inactive ground floor frontages and restricts surveillance onto the public realm. Reduced active frontage, lack of surveillance could create an environment that attracts crime, increases the fear of crime, ASB and vulnerability of residents. Defensible space should be provided and be at least 2m in depth to create a sense of ownership.
- In addition it appears that the development will be dissected by gates. This may prevent unauthorised access to one section of the development however the front section will not benefit from this protection, I would ask that additional information is provided regarding these gates and what they will be intend for?
- The landscaping scheme should ensure that natural surveillance across the development and to/from dwellings is not compromised. This should be addressed before reserved matters approval and SBD guidance on landscaping should be followed in general.
- Again, I note the applicants for inclusion of providing a safe and secure environment (will be) achieved by the layout and design of the scheme: and (the scheme) will be of a high quality, providing modern new homes. However, there is no firm commitment to the lay out and physical security standards will be adopted within the proposals. I suggest that they provide this commitment within any reserved matters application documentation by stating that they aim to achieve SBD accreditation for the development. The requested condition would ensure that this is the case regardless."

The Agent has agreed to the Secured by Design Accreditation condition.

BEAMS Conservation Consultation

The locations in Colnbrook are well known due to other cases nearby and associated site visits.

Documents consulted:

- Colnbrook Conservation Area Appraisal, Slough Council, July 1997.

Local Plan policies:

- EN13 Conservation Areas
- EN16 Setting of Listed Buildings
- EN19 Protection of Archaeological Sites.
- EN20 Archaeological Remains

Slough Core Strategy Development Plan Document (December 2008)

- Core Policy 9 (Natural and Built Environment).

Also: Applicant's Draft Heritage Statement, December 2015.

The site is in the Eastern half of Colnbrook i.e. beyond the bridge when passing through the village from Slough and it lies on the North side of Park Street.

It is situated behind the row of Listed Buildings that face on to Park Street on a former industrial back-plot and close to the banks of the Colnbrook.

The two storey properties in Park Street have much character with their sloping tiles roofs and dormer windows and the carriage arches that survive from the former coaching days that were historically, socially and architecturally important for the significance of Colnbrook in the past.

COMMENTS

A back-land development is feasible in this setting and would serve to consolidate the residential character of Colnbrook in a way that is potentially positive and could be welcomed. The generation of traffic together with the awkward tight turn into a rather busy road as it runs through the centre of the settlement are matters of concern and parking within the proposed development would need to be managed in a way that is not detrimental to the overall visual setting.

DESIGN

In view of the historic role of the buildings adjacent it is recommended that an overall 'courtyard' layout is established so as to resemble former stable and service yards.

It is vital also that the new buildings remain subservient in scale and in overall character to the Listed Buildings adjacent but that they share some design characteristics with these neighbouring buildings.

Materials for cladding, fenestration and roofing should also be selected to fit in well with the established character of the Conservation Area.

SUMMARY

Given the constraints as set out in the documents (see above) a suitable scheme could receive serious consideration for approval subject to Conditions. It is important also that the archaeological work specified should be carried out prior to the beginning of any ground-works ahead of construction.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the application be delegated to the Planning Manager for approval, following consideration of outstanding consultations, finalising of conditions and Section 106 Agreement.

Tree Preservation Order No.4 of 2015 – Land adjacent 10 Layburn Crescent

The Notice period for objections ended on 3rd December 2015. A late objection has been received 12th February 2016 from the new owners of the site objecting to the tree at position **T2**.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

Consultation on South Bucks and Chiltern Local Plan

Agenda Item 12 sets out this Council's proposed response to the consultation on the South Bucks and Chiltern Local Plan. The report therefore focuses upon the specific questions that are contained in the consultation document.

We have been asked a number of questions about the report by South Bucks and Chiltern District Councils and so the purpose of this note is to provide further context as to how Slough's response to the Consultation on their Joint Local Plan fits into Slough's overall approach to the future planning of the wider geographical area.

The context for the preparation of all of the plans in the area is that the level of housing need is much higher than it has been in the past. Failure to meet needs arising in South Bucks and Chiltern or in Windsor and Maidenhead areas will put additional pressure on Slough. Failure to provide sufficient affordable housing would be a particular problem for Slough.

It is considered that the starting point for Local Plans is that new housing should, where possible, be provided where the need arises. Since the need for housing in South Bucks and Chiltern is much higher than past building rates it is clear that the new Joint Plan needs to consider a range of new strategies which could deliver the required housing. The consultation document has identified a number of spatial strategies involving the extension of a whole range of settlements to provide the new housing. There does not appear to be an appraisal of which of these options would be the most sustainable. As a general rule, however, it is considered that expanding the largest settlements would tend to be the most sustainable option. It is also considered that development should take place around the most accessible locations.

This is why the Committee report recommends that South Bucks and Chiltern Councils should be requested to develop a comprehensive strategic planning option which would consist of a major expansion of Slough combined with selective growth around Taplow and Iver stations. This option is being proposed on the basis that it is the best way of meeting the housing need arising in South Bucks and Chiltern.

Although we have not yet been able to come to a definitive position it is apparent that Slough will not be able to meet all of its housing needs within the Borough because there is not enough available land. Due to physical constraints, the only way in which it can expand is northwards into South Bucks. As a result it is considered that the new Joint Plan should consider whether there is the capacity for the proposed "garden suburb" to take some of Slough's housing needs as well as those for South Bucks and Chiltern.

If the Joint Plan produces a strategy which provides for South Bucks and Chiltern's housing needs without having a northern expansion of Slough it is considered that this option should still be considered to meet Slough's needs.

This option is being promoted on the basis that it is the only way that Slough can physically be expanded and it would effectively involve building in Slough's "backyard".

As explained in the Committee report South Bucks and Chiltern have made representations that Slough should first try to accommodate any of its unmet development within the Berkshire-wide

housing market area rather than South Bucks. They have sought to justify this on the grounds as a result of preparing a Joint Plan, they have moved South Bucks into the Buckinghamshire Housing Market Area for pragmatic plan making reasons. This does not, however, change the actual geography of the functional housing market and so cannot be used as a reason not to consider the northern expansion of Slough.

If a northern expansion of Slough does not take place we will have to look for other options within the Housing Market Area of South Bucks and Windsor and Maidenhead. If this is not possible we will then have to see whether other adjoining areas can accommodate Slough's unmet housing need.

As a result there will be an on-going need to continue to discuss these important planning matters in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that this note be added to the response to the South Bucks and Chiltern Local Plan consultation.