

PLANNING COMMITTEE
1st November 2017

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

Agenda Item 6

P/00731/032 26 – 40 Stoke Road

Corrected site boundary re agenda front sheet is within the presentation.



12 units will be designed to disabled person/ wheelchair standard.

Para 2.2 - steps down to 3 storey should read the east end steps down to 5 and 4 storeys.

Para 2.10 the ground floor brick will be a very dark grey rather than dark red. The applicant has been asked to consider a paler grey or dark red.

Revised elevation drawings acceptable. Top storey cladding has been refined so that the terracotta panels line up with window openings. Construction of fins to be clarified in case there is an opportunity to have an opening in them next to balconies/windows for residential amenity. Revised layout drawings acceptable.

Affordable Housing package has been agreed at 15 social rent units; but no additional financial contribution for affordable housing because of viability. However there will be a cap on the sale value of the affordable units i.e. the developer cannot sell the affordable housing to a housing association or the Council at a value above that used in negotiations over the Section 106 package. This has been accepted by the Council's Asset Management valuer and Housing team.

Regarding light a revised study has been submitted; it concludes the proposal is acceptable in terms of light reaching habitable rooms subject to particularly type of glazing for 28 flats. This can be secured by condition. In terms of daylight distribution in rooms those 28 flats would be below standard. The format of the light study is different to the previous one (for the approved scheme) such that direct comparison of results is difficult and the sunlight has not been studied. However the new report says there will be an improvement pointing out that some of the features that limited light in the approved scheme have been changed such as size of fins, loss of louvres and north elevation terrace. The latest comments received today are still being studied but at present there is nothing to suggest the scheme is unacceptable. The

previous was approved in the knowledge that some homes would receive less than the recommended levels of light. It is expected that the same will be so of the new scheme as the key elements of the building affecting light have not changed much. It is however likely that fewer flats in the new scheme will be below standard because of different arrangement of architectural features.

Re para 10.6 the outstanding matters to be addressed are light study queries, ground floor brick colour; fin design, completion of Sec 106,

Revised drawings list re condition 2 :

Site Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-001 Rev I
Basement Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-002 Rev H
Ground Floor Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-003 Rev J
First Floor Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-004 Rev G
Second Floor Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-005 Rev G
Third Floor Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-006 Rev D
Fourth Floor Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-007 Rev D
Fifth Floor Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-008 Rev B
Sixth Floor Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-009 Rev B
Roof Plan GAA-17-001-PL01-010 no revision
Building A West Elevation GAA-17-001-PL01-020 Rev B
Building A North Elevation GAA-17-001-PL01-021 Rev C
Building A East Elevation GAA-17-001-PL01-022 Rev D
Building A South Elevation GAA-17-001-PL01-023 Rev D
Building A Courtyard Elevations GAA-17-001-PL01-024 Rev C
Building B-East & North Elevations GAA-17-001-PL01-025 no revision
Building B-West & South Elevations GAA-17-001-PL01-026 Rev A
Site Section AA GAA-17-001-PL01-030 Rev A
Site Section BB GAA-17-001-PL01-031 Rev C
Stoke Road Street Scene GAA-17-001-PL01-032 Rev A

Agenda Item 7

P/16611/004 40 Liverpool Road

Corrections:

- Paragraph 3.2 states the original Premier Inn Hotel application was determined at Planning Committee on 5th August 2017 when in fact it went to Planning Committee on 3rd August 2016.
- Paragraph 17.1 SUDs maintenance to be dealt with via a condition and therefore a Section 106 Agreement is not required.
- BREEAM to be omitted as a car park cannot have a BREEAM standard. BREEAM is being provided for the hotel.
- The redline site as shown on the front of committee report is not correct as it includes the application site from Premier Inn Hotel application which is not part of this application. the redline site should be taken from the submitted drawings.

The proposed layout has changed to:

- 219 car parking spaces over 3 no. levels
- 93 to be allocated to the Premier Inn Hotel (73 spaces at ground floor and 20 spaces at first floor)
- 72 spaces at first floor (20 to be allocated to the Premier Inn Hotel and 52 spaces to serve the wider trading estate on tariff basis)
- 74 spaces at second floor to serve the wider trading estate on tariff basis
- 12 electric vehicle charging bays (4 on each level)
- 7 disabled parking bays (at first floor)
- Access and egress taken from Bedford Road
- CCTV Cameras connected to the existing Business Watch network

Consultation Responses Received:

Planning Policy:

No objection -_Planning Policy have now confirmed there is no objection to the provision of 222 spaces in this application as it will not exceed the Car Parking Cap allowance for the loss of on-street spaces. The current net figure in the Cap is being discussed at present so can be added when agreed.

Background

Paragraphs 8.2 to 8.4 of the committee report refer to the Car Parking Cap operated across the STE area by SEGRO. This implements Core Policy 5 'no overall increase' (in operational car parking spaces, see CS para. 7.95 for more information).

The method to deliver this was established as part of the S106 agreement accompanying the renewed SPZ (adopted Nov 2014). That agreed a method of monitoring net spaces available, an allowance of up to 450 spaces for those lost as part of the Council's Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) program, and an agreement to record this annually as part of the 'Umbrella' Travel Plan also designed and operated by SEGRO as part of the SPZ.

The CPZ is being delivered by Transport and Highways and includes implementing double yellow lines across the Estate so the S106 gives an allowance of up to 450 spaces to mitigate for the impacts on businesses in the estate from the loss of on street spaces. The number of spaces the CPZ removes from the estate is being discussed at present but is likely this will exceed 450. As the S106 450 exceeds the 222 in this application there is no objection. This is because effectively this means the spaces lost due to the CPZ are being relocated to the car park.

Further information Received:

- Existing surrounding road levels added to proposed elevations
- Additional glazed stairwell proposed to the Liverpool Road elevation
- Images of the a built-out carpark showing the materials proposed

(To be shown on presentation slides)

Assessment: The proposed additional glazed stairway and proposed materials within the images are acceptable. However, the submitted images include a steel frame that is not included on the proposed plans. Planning Officers have requested revised plans to show the steel frame, but these have not yet been submitted. A condition should be included to require samples of the material to be submitted.

Park Mark

- Park Mark has been requested to be dealt with by a condition

Assessment:

Having discussed the proposal with the Council's parking team, Planning Officers are now satisfied this can be secured by condition

CHANGE IN RECOMMENDATION

Having considered the relevant policies set out below, the representations received from consultees and all other relevant material considerations, it is recommended that the application be delegated to the Planning Manager for approval, following consideration of outstanding consultations, resolution of sustainable drainage matters, changes to the submitted plans to show the steel frame, finalising of conditions, and any other minor changes.

Agenda Item 8

P/01508/042 Aspire 2 Site, Corner of Church Street and Herschel Street, Slough

Since the the main report was written amended plans have been submitted by applicant which alter the ground floor arrangement and the corresponding elevations. In addition, comments have been received from various consultees.

Taking the issues in turn:

Mix of housing

As a result of the amended ground floor plan, this has slightly altered the mix of residential units. However, the mix is still considered to be acceptable.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

An updated landscaping plan has been submitted which shows no increase in the space around the edges of the building but identifies potential locations for trees. Rowan trees are shown around the west and south side of Block A. Cherry Plum Trees are shown on both the north and east side of the sites.

The Rowan trees would not be a sustainable form of planting because they are located too close to windows of some of the apartments. This would be likely to lead to residents requesting these be removed because of the overshadowing impacts, leaf and debris fall. In addition, the Cherry Plum trees would be too small a species which would not be sufficient to provide the visual townscape link to the backdrop of the mature trees and to provide trees of an appropriate size to soften the impact of the scale and mass of the proposed buildings.

Impact upon heritage assets

In the original comments from the Heritage Adviser (BEAMS Ltd), they commented that the development would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the designated heritage asset and that the benefit to the town could be weighed against the less than substantial harm. However, the Heritage Adviser then completed the comments with the statement: "...the proposal is considered to preserve the special interest of the Grade II* listed St. Mary's Church. Recommend approval".

Where harm is identified, it cannot be the case that the proposal would also preserve the heritage asset. The Heritage Adviser therefore, on request, provided a clarification note which stated that the development by virtue of its scale, bulk / mass would cause some harm to the setting of St. Mary's Church, particularly in views north along Church Street and from within parts of the churchyard. The Adviser commented that the harm would not be substantial but quoted paragraph 134 of the NPPF which states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use'.

The Heritage Adviser stated that “Some harm to the setting of St Mary’s Church has been recognised and it is appropriate for BEAMS to object to the proposals on this basis. However, it is for the Council, as decision maker, to weigh the less than substantial harm against the public benefits of the proposal (as per NPPF, paragraph 134).”

In light of this clarification, reason for refusal 2 still stands.

The impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and future occupiers of the development

Paragraph 12.2 of the main report refers to the sunlight and daylight report that was submitted by the applicant in respect of the original scheme. The report has been reviewed by a consultant appointed by the LPA and they advise that before accepting the proposed building design that the LPA request the following information:

- Clarification as to whether the shading impact of the surrounding site was factored in the calculation of the daylight performance of Block A and Block B.
- Justification as to why many spaces are achieving >6% Average Daylight Factor – what effort has been made to minimise excessive heat gain and loss in these spaces.
- Justification as to why some of the Living, Dining and Kitchen spaces are achieving <1% Average Daylight Factor – what effort has been made to lessen the possible ‘gloomliness’ of these areas.
- Justification as to why nearly 50% of spaces in block A are below Building Research Establishment (BRE) criteria – what effort has been made to lessen the possible ‘gloomliness’ of these areas (such as good ADE scores).

It should also be noted that since the sunlight and daylight report was written amended plans in respect of the ground floor arrangement have been submitted. No updated report on sunlight and daylight has been submitted which take into account this change. In light of the advice from the consultant, it is recommended that a holding reason for refusal is included on the grounds that insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposals would result in a good standard of amenity as required by the NPPF.

The consultant has also requested that information be submitted in respect of how the development will impact on the surrounding site. While the applicant has not made such an assessment based on BRE criteria, Officers have made an assessment on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers at paragraphs 12.7 to 12.10 of the main report and concluded that the development complies with both national and local planning policies.

Safe and accessible environment

Since the main report was written, amended plans have been submitted. The following changes have been made which were raised as concerns in the main report:

- The overhang to the vehicular entrance to Block B has been altered by moving the gates to be in line with the elevation of the building.
- The access route to the west of Block A has been replaced with soft landscaping. The bin stores have been re-sited to the east facing side of this Block.
- The gates between Blocks A and B have been sited further north.

- The excessive permeability to the south east part of Block B has been reduced with fewer entrances into this building.

The scheme has not been amended to give some defensible space at the north east corner of Block B (see paragraph 14.5 of the main report). The Thames Valley Police (TVP) Crime Prevention Design Adviser still has concerns that there is a lack of active frontage and defensible space for this part of Block B, however this consultee states “On balance I now feel the original objection from myself on behalf of TVP...can be withdrawn”. This is as a result of the amendments to the scheme and because conditions (had planning permission been granted) could be used to provide details as such access control systems.

It is unfortunate that the north east corner has not been amended, however, a new window has been inserted at ground floor level into the lobby area which will increase the amount of surveillance onto this wall of the building and the space in front of the building. It is therefore recommended that reason for refusal number 1 be amended to remove the part that states “Lastly there are elements of the scheme that would result in potential criminal activity and anti-social behaviour”.

The impact on highway safety and convenience

The applicant has provided a plan which shows that the vehicular access off Church Street will not affect the amount of on-street parking.

Surface water drainage

The Lead Local Flood Authority raise no objection to the proposals; in the various storm events surface water will enter two storage tanks beneath the car park via permeable paving. The water will then discharge from the tanks into the existing sewer beneath Church Street.

Affordable Housing and Infrastructure Requirements

Since the main report was written, the consultant appointed to review the viability of the development is still yet to conclude on whether the development could support a policy compliant level of affordable housing and infrastructure requirements. The reason for refusal has been updated as a word was omitted.

In terms of the infrastructure contributions that may be sought, the following has been requested in respect of education and public open space.

Education - £613,480 towards the Westgate School expansion.

Public Open Space - £178,500 towards various parks within the locality.

Contaminated land

Given historic uses of the site, the Senior Scientific Officer requested that there be a full assessment in respect of contamination. Had the application been recommended for approval, this would have been dealt with by condition.

Clarification

PART C: RECOMMENDATION - This heading was omitted from the report on page 72 above paragraph 9.5.

But as per this Amendment Report it is recommended that the application still be refused planning permission for the reasons set out below. (Reasons 1 and 3 have been amended and reason 4 is new)

Reason for Refusal 1 - Amended

The proposed development by reason of the siting, height, scale and mass of the buildings would result in a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area. In addition, there would be limited opportunities for meaningful landscaping and as such the development would not assimilate well into its surroundings. The development would be poor design that would fail to comply with Policies EN1 and EN3 of the Slough Local Plan (March 2004) and Policy 8 of the Core Strategy (2008) and paragraphs 56, 58, 60, 61 and 64 of The National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Reason for Refusal 2 – No change

The proposal by reasons of its siting, height, scale and mass would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the setting of the Grade II* listed St. Mary's Church. This harm would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. The development is contrary to Policy 9 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

Reason for Refusal 3 - Amended (additional word in underscore text)

It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development could not provide the appropriate level of affordable housing and financial contributions towards infrastructure. The development is contrary to Policies 4 and 10 of the Core Strategy and the Developer's Guide.

Reason for Refusal 4 - New

It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposal would result in a good level of amenity for future occupiers of the development. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 17 (Core Principle bullet point 4) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).