

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**7<sup>th</sup> December 2016**

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

**Wexham Park Hospital**

Amended Plans:

An amended plan has been submitted to improve the junction roundabout. The works would be secured by South Bucks District Council / Bucks County Council through a S278 Agreement. The scheme includes the following measures:

- Reduction of speed limit from 40mph to 30mph to the roundabout;
- Complete redesign of kerblines at the roundabout, including the central island, in order to significantly increase deflection on all arms;
- Improving all pedestrian / cycle crossing facilities through the roundabout junction;

The drawing is currently under review by the Highways Officer.

An amended landscaping plan has also been received; this now includes the provision of cycle provision for visitors and realignment of the pedestrian route and access into the hospital site.

The cycle condition will be amended from pre-commencement condition to compliance with the drawing issued.

Drainage:

Surface water details have been submitted, these have been issued the Council's Drainage Officer and the Environment Agency to review.

Environmental Protection:

*"I have looked over the reports & they are quite informative. According to the results, the applicants will need to ensure that the recommendations of the report are followed to ensure that noise during the construction noise and operational noise is below the identified noise limits.*

*In relation to the working hours during the construction phase, I am assuming that they are the normal daytime hours. Can you confirm, please? If they are not, we may have to ask for restrictions for any noisy works planned after hours."*

Wexham Parish Council:

The following comments have been received:

*"Full details were not made available at the time but it was felt that this would be beneficial to the community and therefore the Council should recommend approval."*

**THERE IS A CHANGE TO THE RECOMMENDATION:**

Delegate the planning application to the Planning Manager for approval, subject to finalising of conditions and final determination. This recommendation is subject to a referral to the Secretary of State as the proposed development falls within designated Green Belt.

**P/02823/003: Eton College**

Correction

The site was originally identified as being (or part being) common land by Natural England. This has since been rectified by Natural England who confirmed that no part of the proposed site is common land:

*“It is come to our attention that our previous response to this application referred to the wrong area of land. We would therefore like to withdraw that response and submit a new response which can be seen below. Apologies for any inconvenience caused”.*

*Natural England has no comments to make on this application.*

*Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.*

*Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.*

*The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.*

*We recommend referring to our SSSI Impact Risk Zones (available on Magic and as a downloadable dataset) prior to consultation with Natural England. Further guidance on when to consult Natural England on planning and development proposals is available on gov.uk at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice>*

*(Natural England, 06/12/2016).*

As such, Informative 8 should be omitted.

Highways

The vehicular access is located on the Slough Road, which falls within the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. The Council's Highway Authority have been unsuccessful in trying contact the Highway Authority for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to agree to the works recommended by the Council's Highways Officer. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead have been consulted regarding this application and have raised no objection or requirements. Based on this, it would be unreasonable for the Council to continue to pursue the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, and therefore, the application is recommended for approval with no changes to the vehicular access.

## Drainage

Consultation Response from Lead Flood Authority:

- The application can be approved with conditions

Condition:

No development shall take place until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacements national standards and details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The following additional information should be provided to clear the above condition:

- Cross and long sections through SuDS should be provided
- Construction and its traffic will cause site compaction which might affect infiltration potential during construction and increase flood risk. This should be considered  
Clarify whether discharge is to watercourse or existing pipe network
- Provide site report proving the site is not contaminated and the groundwater depths
- There is no comment or consideration of the drainage ditch to the north of the site, other than being used for exceedance flows

## Flooding

The proposed development is:

- Located within flood zone 2.  
Classified as “water compatible” by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Practice Guide (<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/flood-zone-and-flood-risk-tables/table-2-flood-risk-vulnerability-classification/>).

In accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103 a site specific flood risk assessment has been submitted with the planning application. Given the nature and location of the proposed development the sequential test has been satisfied because it would be impractical to direct the development elsewhere.

The applicant has chosen to mitigate the risk of flooding to the property by setting floor levels 300mm above the known or modelled 1 in 100 annual probability river flood (1%) plus 20% for climate change in any year.

In terms of fluvial flood risk the application is considered acceptable on the condition that the Eton College Management Plan, demonstrating the evacuation procedures for the site, is submitted for approval by Slough Borough Council. Whilst the application is acceptable it would be prudent to include flood proofing and resilience techniques as specified by ‘improving the flood performance of new buildings’ CLG (2007).

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/7730/flood\\_performance.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7730/flood_performance.pdf)

## **ONE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED CONDITION.**

No development shall take place until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacements national standards and details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The following additional information should be provided to clear the above condition:

- Cross and long sections through SuDS should be provided
- Construction and its traffic will cause site compaction which might affect infiltration potential during construction and increase flood risk. This should be considered Clarify whether discharge is to watercourse or existing pipe network
- Provide site report proving the site is not contaminated and the groundwater depths
- There is no comment or consideration of the drainage ditch to the north of the site, other than being used for exceedance flows

REASON: To prevent the risk of flooding.

## **Agenda Item 10**

### **Response to Windsor & Maidenhead Draft Borough Local Plan 2013-2032 (Regulation 18) Consultation**

It can now be confirmed that the consultation on the Draft Plan began as anticipated on 2<sup>nd</sup> December. This means that the comments and recommendations now refer to the consultation document rather than the version of the plan that went to the Overview and Scrutiny in November. This should be reflected in the change to recommendation set out below.

Paragraph 5.13 of the report welcomes Windsor and Maidenhead's decision to meet its housing needs in full. Paragraph 5.18 welcomes the inclusion of the additional housing sites in the plan which are being released from the Green Belt. Paragraph 5.17 formally requests that the site south of Austin Way should be proposed for housing as part of the Slough Issues and Options Option J (Southern Expansion of Slough)

Our Issues and Options document also has an Option K which is to build in other areas outside of Slough. As a result it is considered that the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead should be formally requested to consider whether any additional housing could be provided in the Borough, particularly in locations with good public transport links to Slough, in order to meet unmet needs within the Housing Market Area.

#### **THERE IS A CHANGE TO THE RECOMMENDATION:**

The recommendation should be changed to state that:

- a) The proposed representations on the Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation set out in this report and the amendments sheet be submitted to the Council.

**Response to South Bucks & Chiltern Green Belt Preferred Options Consultation**

Since the report was written there has been some on-going correspondence with Chiltern & South Bucks Councils and there has been a decision about how the Duty to Cooperate should be carried out which could be of relevance.

Correspondence with Chiltern & South Bucks Councils

The main concern from Chiltern & South Bucks was:

*I am surprised that the report says “failure to properly consider” your Councils previous representations, particularly given the e-mail I recently sent to yourselves (attached for the Planning Committee). The report in my view does not take into account the attached nor does it set out clearly why your Council may consider there to be a failure.*

Although the various documents produced by Chiltern and South Bucks Councils may refer to the northern expansion or consider parcels within it against Green Belt criteria, none of this constitutes a proper consideration of this important cross boundary issue.

They have acknowledged that the Documents which summarised all of the consultation responses did not provide a detailed response to Slough’s lengthy and detail representations. None of these documents have been considered by the Chiltern and South Bucks Joint Committee.

The clear failure in the preparation of the Chiltern & South Bucks Local Plan is that they have made important decisions without first considering our proposal that there should be a northern expansion of Slough.

This should have been considered before deciding to request that Aylesbury Vale Local Plan should accommodate 5,800 dwellings that cannot be accommodated in the districts.

It should also have been considered before deciding which Green Belt Preferred Options should be the subject of public consultation.

It will be difficult to give proper consideration of the proposed northern expansion of Slough at a later date. Delaying any consideration of northern expansion until the end of the plan making process will make it. This means that by the time Chiltern & South Bucks Councils Waiting to consider. As a result it is clear that the Councils have failed to properly consider this Council’s previous representations prior to taking important decisions about the plan making process.

As a result of the correspondence there is correction that needs to be made to the Committee report. Paragraph 5.5 should state that the site close to Taplow Station is for office use only and not residential.

Duty to Cooperate

The Inspector who has been appointed to consider the St Albans Local Plan has found that they have not met the Duty Cooperate. He stated in his letter:

“It must be emphasised that this does not mean that St Albans City and District should be expected to accommodate additional growth – that is not necessarily the case. What it does mean is that the Council should give detailed and rigorous consideration to strategic cross-boundary matters and

priorities and draw robust conclusions with regards to whether or not any of those priorities could be delivered in a sustainable way within the District, bearing in mind the environmental and other constraints that exist.”

This has implications for the Chiltern and South Bucks Plan. As explained in the report we have made representations that they should consider an urban expansion of Slough in the form of a new ‘Garden Suburb’ which will help to meet the housing needs in the area.

This is exactly the sort of strategic cross boundary matter that the Duty to Cooperate mechanism was intended to help to address.

As things stand it would appear that Chiltern and South Bucks would fail the Duty to Cooperate as interpreted by the Inspector at St Albans.

As a result it is recommended that they should take the following steps which could be agreed through a Memorandum of Understanding between the Councils.

- DC/SBDC should diligently consider SBC’s request to consider that there should be a northern expansion of Slough in the form of a “garden suburb” to meet housing needs in the area which cannot be met in Slough Borough because of a lack of physical capacity.
- This should include jointly carrying out the necessary Master Planning work to produce the most sustainable location, distribution and layout for the “garden suburb”.
- SBC and CDC/SBDC should give detailed and rigorous consideration to whether or not the northern expansion of Slough could be delivered in a sustainable way taking into account all of the environmental, technical, physical and other constraints that may exist. This should be the subject of public consultation.
- Chiltern and South Bucks Councils would then determine whether the proposed northern expansion of Slough would cause significant harm to the principles and policies of the NPPF.
- If Chiltern and South Bucks District Councils conclude that housing needs, including Slough’s un met needs, cannot be met within the northern expansion of Slough, because to do so would cause significant harm to the Green belt, (or for any other reason), CDC/SBC would ask the Planning Inspectorate to test this conclusion as part of the examination for the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan.
- If for any reason the issue cannot be resolved by the Inspector, the Councils agree that there should be an immediate partial review of the Local Plan just to consider the northern expansion of Slough.

#### **THERE IS A CHANGE TO THE RECOMMENDATION:**

An additional recommendation e) should be added which states that this Council:

- e) Requests that Chiltern and South Bucks Councils enter into a Memorandum of Understanding agreeing the steps that are needed to properly consider the proposed northern expansion of Slough.