

Planning Committee – Meeting held on Wednesday, 2nd August, 2017.

Present:- Councillors Dar (Chair), M Holledge (Vice-Chair), Ajaib, Bains, Chaudhry, Plenty, Smith (from 6.46pm) and Swindlehurst

Also present under Rule 30:- Councillor Strutton

Apologies for Absence:- Councillor Rasib

PART I

33. Declarations of Interest

Application S/00257/005 – Former Absolute Ten Pin Building, Salt Hill Park, Slough - All Members present declared that they had submitted a request for a dispensation for a potential Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that the Council was the Trustee of The Salt Hill Playing Fields which owned a small part of the application site. Members were advised that the Monitoring Officer had granted dispensations in these circumstances, however, some Members had not received confirmation prior to the commencement of the meeting. Councillor Plenty declared that as he had not personally been informed that he had been granted a dispensation he would withdraw from the meeting during consideration of this item.

34. Guidance on Predetermination/Predisposition

Members confirmed that they had read and understood the guidance on predetermination and predisposition.

35. Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 5th July 2017

Resolved- That the minutes of the last meeting, held on the 5th July 2017, be approved as a correct record.

36. Human Rights Act Statement

The Human Rights Act Statement was noted.

37. Planning Application

(Cllr Smith joined the meeting at 6.46pm)

Details were tabled in the amendment sheet of alterations and amendments received since the agenda was circulated. The Committee adjourned at the commencement of the meeting to read the amendment sheet.

No oral representations were made to the Committee by Applicants or Agents under the Public Participation Scheme.

Planning Committee - 02.08.17

S/00257/005- Former Absolute Ten Pin Building, Salt Hill Park, Slough-
Councillor Strutton addressed the Committee under rule 30.

Resolved – That the decisions be taken in respect of the planning applications as set out in the minutes below, subject to the information, including conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Projects and the amendments sheet tabled at the meeting and subject to any further amendments and conditions agreed by the Committee.

38. S/00257/005- Former Absolute Ten Pin Building, Salt Hill Park, Bath Road, Slough, SL1 3SR

(Councillor Plenty left the meeting)

Application	Decision
Enlargement and alterations to existing car park, widening of access road, and alterations to junction with Bath Road. Over cladding of existing roof, replacement and additional doors, replacement external plant, new louvres, ducts and flues.	Delegated to the Planning Manager for approval subject to measures to prevent glare from the over-cladding, the changes set out in planning officer's highways and parking section, consideration of any substantive objections from members of the public, consideration of any requirements from the Authority; Thames Water; Environmental Quality; Contaminated Land Officer; and finalising conditions.

(Councillor Plenty rejoined the meeting)

39. P/08040/020- Alexandra Plaza, 33, Chalvey Road West, Slough, SL1 2NJ

Application	Decision
Addition of third storey and change of use of the first and second floors to provide a total of 32 residential flats (23no. 1bed; 4no. 2 bed; 5no. 3 bed.) Green roofs partly to be used as an amenity space with privacy screening above second and the proposed third floor. Demolition of 4 Alexandra Road to facilitate realigned vehicular access. Extension to the southeast end of the building to accommodate new pedestrian access and stairwell to all levels. (Revised application following withdrawal of P/ 08040/018)	Delegated to the Planning Manager for approval, subject to any changes by the highways authority, and consultee responses from Thames Water, Crime Prevention Design Advisor, Environmental Protection (NET), finalising conditions and satisfactory completion of a Section 106 agreement to provide the following;- financial contribution for affordable housing.

40. Response to Central & Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper

The Committee was presented with a report from the Planning Policy Lead Officer which outlined Slough's response to Central & Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper. Bracknell Forest Council, Reading Borough Council, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and Wokingham Borough Council were working together to produce a Joint Minerals and Waste Plan 2017-2038. The Council had decided not to be an active working partner with the Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan because it was not considered to be a priority.

The Officer summarised the key strategic issues for Slough and reviewed the points made in response to the consultations detailed in paragraphs 5.10 to 5.18 of the report which Members were asked to endorse. Members discussed a number of issues including the potential impact of a 3rd runway at Heathrow in waste provision, the Colnbrook Logistics Centre and the local implications of gravel extraction sites near to Slough. At the conclusion of the discussion the response was endorsed.

Resolved- That the response to the Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out in paragraphs 5.11 to 5.18 of the report be endorsed.

41. Response to Windsor & Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013-2032 (Regulation 19) Submission Version

The Planning Policy Lead Officer presented the Committee with a report outlining the proposed response to Windsor & Maidenhead Borough's Local Plan 2013-2032 (Regulation 19) Submission Version. The Plan was currently out for consultation for 8 weeks ending on the 26th August 2017 and the proposed response of Slough Borough Council was summarised. It was highlighted that concerns were previously raised about the way in which the plan had been produced and the failure to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Slough had previously raised concerns that the RBWM plan did not meet their Objectively Assessed Housing Need, however, this had now been addressed and the plan proposed meeting the need for 14,240 homes. It did not provide any contribution to meeting Slough's unmet need and there were two small sites for potential southern expansion that the Council would request be bought forward.

The Officer advised that within the Local Plan that insufficient consideration had been made to the provision of affordable housing and that under Policy H03 that there was no mention of housing for rent, that inability or unwillingness to provide housing would have a detrimental impact on Slough; and highly unaffordable homes for purchase. The report also highlighted Slough's formal request for the site south of Austen Way, Langley to be utilised as a housing development in the borough plan to help meet

Planning Committee - 02.08.17

housing needs in the area, however this had been rejected and there were plans for further discussion regarding the caveats to this proposal. The implications of the gaps within the plan would result in Slough's highly saturated private rented sector (PRS) being placed under higher demand as the Royal Borough's residents who were affected by homelessness or were unable to afford homes will inevitably look for housing in the neighbouring boroughs. It was noted that RBWM had agreed commitments on affordable housing and it appeared there would lead to a supplementary Planning Document rather than be included in the Local Plan itself, which the Committee considered unsatisfactory.

Members highlighted their concerns in relation to the proposed Local Plan and the lack of affordable housing rent provision by the Royal Borough which would in turn place excessive demand pressures on neighbouring boroughs. Members did not feel that it was either equitable nor reasonable for Slough to provide affordable housing options for neighbouring boroughs who were failing to meet the need of their existing residents. Members discussed that there had already been issues with neighbouring boroughs placing families into temporary accommodation within the authority, and those who did not have a duty to be housed would then seek affordable private rentals within Slough as they were effectively priced out of the Royal Borough and surrounding areas. Members felt strongly against the idea of certain boroughs adhering to national policy and guidance and how some authorities were able to avoid delivering on housing priorities for their residents.

Several Members strongly expressed the views that the Royal Borough's long standing failure to provide affordable homes for rent was unacceptable and had serious impacts on neighbouring boroughs. It was agreed that the response should make this point in the strongest possible terms by not meeting the Duty to Co-operate. Members also discussed the increased congestion and traffic associated with housing growth.

At the conclusion of the discussions, the Committee recognised the progress in the Royal Borough meeting their own housing needs but that strong representations should be made on affordable housing.

- Resolved-**
- (a) That the proposed representations on the Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Regulation 19) Submission Version set out in paragraphs 5.20, 5.24 and 5.43 of the report be submitted to the Council.
 - (b) That the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead be invited to agree a bilateral Memorandum of Understanding as a way of seeking to resolve outstanding issues with the Submission version of the Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan.

Planning Committee - 02.08.17

42. Annual Monitoring Report 2016/17

The Planning Policy Lead Officer presented the Committee with a report outlining the proposed response to Windsor & Maidenhead Borough's Local Plan 2013-2032 (Regulation 19) Submission Version. The Plan was currently out for consultation for 8 weeks ending on the 26th August 2017 and the proposed response of Slough Borough Council was summarised. It was highlighted that concerns were previously raised about the way in which the plan had been produced and the failure to comply with the Duty to Co-operate. Slough had previously raised concerns that the RBWM plan did not meet their Objectively Assessed Housing Need, however, this had now been addressed and the plan proposed meeting the need for 14,240 homes. It did not provide any contribution to meeting Slough's unmet need and there were two small sites for potential southern expansion that the Council would request be bought forward.

The Officer advised that within the Local Plan that no considerations had been made to the provision of affordable housing and that under Policy H03 that there was no mention of housing for rent, that inability or unwillingness to provide housing would have a detrimental impact on Slough; and highly unaffordable homes for purchase. The report also highlighted Slough's formal request for the site south of Austen Way, Langley to be utilised as a housing development in the borough plan to help meet housing needs in the area, however this had been rejected and there were plans for further discussion regarding the caveats to this proposal. The implications of the gaps within the plan would result in Slough's highly saturated private rented sector (PRS) being placed under higher demand as the Royal Borough's residents who were affected by homelessness or were unable to afford homes will inevitably look for housing in the neighbouring boroughs. It was noted that RBWM had agreed commitments on affordable housing and it appeared there would lead to a supplementary Planning Document rather than be included in the Local Plan itself, which the Committee considered unsatisfactory.

Members highlighted their concerns in relation to the proposed Local Plan and the lack of affordable housing rent provision by the Royal Borough which would in turn place excessive demand pressures on neighbouring boroughs. Members did not feel that it was either equitable nor reasonable for Slough to provide affordable housing options for neighbouring boroughs who were failing to meet the need of their existing residents. Members discussed that there had already been issues with neighbouring boroughs placing families into temporary accommodation within the authority, and those who did not have a duty to be housed would then seek affordable private rentals within Slough as they were effectively priced out of the Royal Borough and surrounding areas. Members felt strongly against the idea of certain boroughs adhering to national policy and guidance and how some authorities were able to avoid delivering on housing priorities for their residents.

Several Members strongly expressed the views that the Royal Borough's long standing failure to provide affordable homes for rent was unacceptable and had serious impacts on neighbouring boroughs. It was agreed that the

Planning Committee - 02.08.17

response should make this point in the strongest possible terms by not meeting the Duty to Co-operate. Members also discussed the increased congestion and traffic associated with housing growth.

At the conclusion of the discussions, the Committee recognised the progress in the Royal Borough meeting their own housing needs but that strong representations should be made on affordable housing.

Resolved- (a) That the proposed representations on the Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Regulation 19) Submission Version set out in paragraphs 5.20, 5.24 and 5.43 of the report be submitted to the Council.

(b) That the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead be invited to agree a bilateral Memorandum of Understanding as a way of seeking to resolve outstanding issues with the Submission version of the Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan.

43. Planning Appeal Decisions

Resolved- That the details of the recent Planning Appeal Decisions be noted.

44. Members Attendance Record

Resolved- That the Member's attendance record be noted.

45. Date of Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Wednesday 6th September 2017.

Chair

(Note: The Meeting opened at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.44 pm)