

PLANNING COMMITTEE

7TH September 2016

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

In order to overcome complex land ownership issues, an amended red line plan will need to be submitted as there are parcels of land at the proposed rear service road, which are outside the ownership of the applicant. The agent is currently in negotiations with these land owners, however if the land ownership issues cannot be resolved, the application will be refused for the reasons given below.

Consultations

Highways

Discussions and negotiations are still ongoing in relation to highways requirements, the following comments below have been received from the Highways Officer regarding the amended plans submitted, these matters below will need to be resolved:

- *Vehicle and pedestrian visibility splays*
- *Car parking spaces allocated for the retail units;*
- *The servicing approach – if the car park is only for Residential Use then there will need to be a separate service corridor between the lift core to the retail units and the service road. Otherwise the gates will be permanently open when deliveries are being made and the security will be non-existent.*

If the above issues cannot be satisfactorily addressed, the application should be refused:

1. *The proposed access is at a point where vehicle and pedestrian visibility is substandard and would lead to danger and inconvenience to people using it and to highway users in general. The development is contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.*
2. *The proposed development does not provide adequate servicing arrangements for the retail units, this would lead to a conflict and unsafe environment within the car park area which would have a detrimental impact in conjunction with the residential development proposed and is therefore contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.*

Drainage

The following condition is recommended:

"Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been complete. The discharge rates will need to be limited to 5 l/s d".

Land Contamination

The Agent has confirmed to accept the 4 conditions recommended by the Council's Land Contamination Officer.

Thames Valley Police – Agent's response to comments:

"As regards the Thames Valley Police Report, we confirm that the applicants are willing to accept that a condition be imposed on this application to ensure that the car park be secured and access controlled through the inclusion of self closing electronic gates or shutters. The new revised LGF plan shows

electric gates (to LPS1175 SR2 or equivalent), to ensure security. It is agreed that these measures must incorporate an access control system that allows the driver to operate the system without leaving the vehicle, and that audio link between gates and retail units should be provided to allow for goods delivery and refuse collection access.

As regards the Private Residential Underground Car Park , this incorporates the communal entrance doors for the ‘Stoke Road’ residential core. It is confirmed that these areas are for residents only and this core will have access control in the form of a fob. The layout and design of this facility will also incorporate the safer parking principle of surveillance, lighting and management processes and procedures.

Communal Access control: The new revised LGF plan shows that the ‘Stoke Road’ core in the lower ground car park, has now been provided with an access control door. Robust Access control will be implemented that allows residents to communicate with their visitors without having to open their front door. We confirm that our clients are willing to accept that a condition be imposed on this application to ensure that all Communal entrance door access control systems will include electronic remote release with audio and visual intercom link to each apartment, capable of recording and capturing images of individuals using the door entry panel. Details to be provided prior to first occupation.

Cycle store: The new revised LGF plan shows the quality of the cycle rack provision is of superior quality, with 20 individual stores, measuring 1m in width x 2m in height x2m in length . Furthermore, the new revised LGF plan shows electric gates. The cycle storage facilities will be accessible ONLY by residents, and by the staff of the retail units. We confirm that our clients are willing to accept that a condition be imposed on this application to secure all cycle storage facilities through the inclusion self closing secure doorsets compliant with the physical requirements of PAS24:2012 with electronic remote release locking systems, preventing unauthorised access to cycle stored within .

Postal deliveries: It is agreed that the preferred management of mail delivery is either via external wall amounted letterboxes or via ‘through the wall mail deliveries. The location of mail boxes will be adjacent to the front and rear residential entrances, on the external wall.’

Neighbourhood Protection – Agent’s response to comments:

“We confirm that the applicants are willing to accept a condition as follows :

Noise

The development shall not begin until a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from external noise has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Any works, that form part of the scheme approved by the Local Planning Authority, shall be completed before any permitted dwelling is occupied, unless an alternative period is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the amenities of the future residents is not adversely affected by noise.

Hours of operation

As regards the hours of operation of the units, the applicants would accept the recommendation that hours of operation mirror those to similar premises in the area so as not to increase the noise levels in the area. Please note that existing operation hours at the site are 6am to 9pm on all days.

Refuse storage and collection

I am advised that there was a typing error on the original LGF plan drawing. This has now been corrected and the revised drawing shows that there is a clear distinction between the storage of residential and commercial waste. The applicants are willing to accept a condition requiring the developer to provide details of the refuse storage (including putrescible materials) and access of vehicle collection within the curtilage of the site.”

Objection

Additional objections have been received from the Agent of the Lady Haig site:

"Having looked at the recommendation for the planning application 72-74 Stoke Road, Slough ref P/00943/008, I was surprised to see that despite the SBC Highway Dept. recommending refusal on several grounds, many of which are contrary to the SBC Core Strategy, the above application has been recommended for approval subject to a 106 Agreement. You are aware that we feel that this scheme will have a negative effect on our clients' own scheme at Lady Haig in design terms. The objections from Highways are:

- *The inadequate width of the Service Road,*
- *Substandard vehicle and pedestrian visibility,*
- *Lack of parking (15 useable spaces only) and no parking for the commercial which do not meet the Core Strategy standards.*

The application is recommended for approval subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement which as submitted would need the signature of my clients given they are included within the application red line.

Since writing the above (not previously sent) we have spoken this morning and I understand that the 'redline' on the application scheme has been amended and a plan re-submitted to you only this morning. In addition various alterations and re-submissions have been made to the scheme within the last few days regarding the Highways although I understand that the scheme is still does not meet the parking requirements and has no commercial parking at all.

Unfortunately I am unable, having just tried again, to see these re-submissions on the SBC planning website and given the circumstances, the lack of time for re-consultation and the last minute changes I would ask that this application is at the very least deferred until the next meeting to give us the opportunity to consider these amendments properly.

The 15m separation distance is too small. I am not convinced by the precedent argument; particularly with such large block where there are no existing buildings and you cannot argue improvements over the existing.

Also we recommend strongly that the wall between the sites is reduced to 2m not 7.8m at that height it's going to ruin the amenity area at the rear of our building it will be unusable for the purpose it was designed and the wall will also have a negative impact of the aspect of our flats in terms of overshadowing and loss of outlook.

Are they going to be allowed to provide less parking per unit than we were required to provide on our scheme?"

The applicant's agent has responded to objection as follows:

Construction adjacent to Lady Haig site:

"We would point out the proposed building would not be constructed along the shared boundary. It would be built inside the boundary. It is neither possible nor necessary to move the building 300mm. There would be no oversailing of the boundary by the proposed scheme. No guttering is proposed, and rainwater would descend within the curtilage of the application site. Construction stage issues in the vicinity of the boundary would be addressed through a Party Wall Agreement."

The Agent will also confirm the height of the boundary wall.

THERE IS A CHANGE TO THE RECOMMENDATION:

Delegate the planning application to the Planning Manager for approval, subject to resolution of outstanding transport/highway, air quality matters, minor design changes, resolve land ownership issues (amended red line plan), finalising conditions, satisfactory completion of a S106 Agreement and final determination. If the agent is unable to satisfactorily resolve landownership issues and transport/highway matters, the application should be refused on the following grounds:

1. The development fails to provide adequate access to the site and this would compromise the scheme as a whole, whereby there would be no of access to the site, no provision of car parking spaces, no servicing of the retail and residential units. The development is contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.
2. The proposed access is at a point where vehicle and pedestrian visibility is substandard and would lead to danger and inconvenience to people using it and to highway users in general. The development is contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.
3. The proposed development does not provided adequate servicing arrangements for the retails units, this would to a conflict and unsafe environment within the car park area which would have a detrimental impact in conjunction with the residential development proposed and is therefore contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.