

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**5<sup>th</sup> September 2018**

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

**1. PART A: BACKGROUND****- Update to neighbour responses**

Since the Officer's Report was completed, 5 further letters of objection have been received (3 identical from 3 adjoining properties).

The concerns raised within the additional objection letters can be summarised as follows:

<b>Additional Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
Impact on community from the loss of the vets, other shops and businesses within the existing shopping parade and loss of employment.	An assessment of the impact upon the provision of shops and services is provided at section 13.0 of the main report.
Proposed development significantly taller than any surrounding development	An assessment of the design and impact upon character and appearance of the area is made at section 10.0 of the main report.
Traffic generation and parking provision	An assessment of the impact upon traffic is dealt with in the Highways comments published on this amendment sheet below.
Potential for anti-social behaviour within the basement car park.	An assessment of the potential for anti-social behaviour is made at section 15.0 of the main report.
Pressure on infrastructure	An assessment of the impact upon infrastructure is made at section 19.0 of the main report.

**- Update to consultee comments**

No comments had been received from the local Highway Authority at the time of writing the report but are now provided in full below. While comments have not been received from the Crime Prevention Design Adviser the matters relating to potential crime and anti-social behaviour have been addressed in the main report. No comments have been received from the Environmental Quality and Protection Teams, however, it is not considered that there would not be any issues of principle relating to the environmental matters relevant to the outline application; had the application been acceptable such details would have been addressed at the reserved matters stage and/or by condition.

**Transport & Highways comments**

This outline planning application proposes the demolition of existing retail and residential buildings to allow for the construction of a five storey building with mixed retail and residential use. The development proposes an increase in residential units from 14 to 119 (an increase of 105 units) as well as a net increase of the supermarket element by 139m<sup>2</sup> but a reduction of 142m<sup>2</sup> of other retail uses.

The indicative plans show the supermarket is proposed to be served by 74 parking spaces whilst the smaller units A,B & D will have 26 parking spaces dedicated to them. A further 35 parking spaces are proposed for residential visitor parking but none dedicated to the residential premises themselves. The site is currently served by a shared use car park for the existing residential dwellings and retail elements of the site which can accommodate approx. 78 vehicles.

The plans indicate that the new building includes underground car parking for visitors and the retail section however there is no parking proposed directly for the residents. There is also a ground floor service yard proposed for the retail.

It should be noted that there is a school directly opposite the site and therefore this area is very busy with vehicular, cycle and foot traffic during peak hours.

**The following comments are primarily based on the submitted transport statement;**

- **PIA Data (Section 3.1)** – Matrix should purchase (accident) data for the last 5 years from SBC rather than rely on free data from Crashmap which has questionable accuracy.
- **Table 4.2 (Comparison of Existing and Proposed Residential Accommodation)** – The last two columns in this table are missing information on proposed breakdown of residential units (1 bed, 2 bed, etc) and therefore prevent us from making an accurate assessment .
- **Deliveries and Servicing (Section 4.7)** – This information advises that deliveries would be managed on site and limits the number of HGV's to 1 per day. As such we would require a deliveries & servicing management plan to give further detail of this. I would advise this is conditioned.
- **Residential Parking Provision (Section 4.17)** – No parking for residents appears to be acceptable given that the Elmshott Lane/Bath Road Neighbourhood Centre is designated as a 'shopping centre' site within the Local Plan proposals map, however given the location and surrounding land uses '100% car free' seems a little unrealistic especially given that there is a substantial increase in residential units from 14 existing to 119 proposed. Notwithstanding this I have the following comments:
  - There doesn't appear to be any consideration given to disabled parking for residents.
  - 35 'visitor spaces' are proposed. How would residents/shoppers be prevented from using the visitor bays. There is no detail on how parking spaces would be controlled and ultimately the layout of the car park doesn't lend itself well to the intended uses.
  - Despite complying with SPD parking standards, the local factors and circumstances must be taken into consideration and in this instance there is a vast intensification for the area which is likely to be harmful to the highway and road safety. The close proximity of the indicated number of residential units to the school without parking, risks parking on the highway network where there is little available capacity and road users already competing for parking during peak periods.
  - This is insufficient information on the mix of the residential phase, larger flats with an 2+ bedrooms which are preferable would generate a greater parking demand leading to further risk of harm.
- **Residential Cycle Parking (Section 4.2.2)** – Secure spaces are proposed in the basement (1 per residential unit) on the indicative plans however it is not clear from the plan provided how these would be accessed – if access is proposed via the car park access ramp, this would raise safety concerns (cars interacting with cycles). Details of the cycle storage are vague but the cycle parking does not appear to be very secure considering it is located within a public car park. I would expect the storage to be within a more secure area with restricted access, furthermore we would need further details on the design of the cycle stands, Sheffield stands are not suitable. Cycle storage needs to be high quality and include a good mix of individual cycle lockers to encourage and maximize the use of them. From the information

given we cannot see any viable alternative arrangements and none have been demonstrated therefore we deemed the layout shown as unacceptable.

- **Retail Visitor Cycle Parking (Section 4.2.3)** – This is referred to in the text of the TS but it is not clear where this would be provided. Retail visitor parking should be at-grade, close to main entrances to retail units (to maximise visibility and usage), rather than hidden in basement or at rear of building. Retail visitor parking should not be mixed with residential parking as the latter will need to be overlooked and secured via some form of controlled access. Retail cycle parking must be provided on land within the control of the applicant and not on the highway. There does not appear to be adequate provision for this in the given proposal.
- **Car Park Design (plan in appendices):**
  - There is major concern over the poor design of the car park due to lack of circulation given that the main usage of the car park is for retail customers (high turnover, busy in peak periods);
  - The current design of aisles will inevitably result in long reversing manoeuvres and/or awkward three-point-turns when car park is busy (customers searching for spaces), leading to safety and congestion issues within car park;
  - The safety issues are greatly exacerbated when interaction with pedestrians and cyclists in car park is taken into consideration;
  - A detailed plan fully marked-up with dimensions (including aisle widths, ramp widths/ gradients, parking bay dimensions) would be required to comment in detail on the layout however the current design of the car park has many concerns which have not been taken into consideration;
  - We require Tracking/swept path drawings of the car park in all key locations and parking spaces car park (using a large car).
  - Only one trolley bay is provided in a corner of the car park by the retail entrance. The location of this is poorly located and not very accessible meaning customers would need to walk around the car park unnecessarily to return trolleys to the bays.
  - It is not clear how parking bays are allocated between the visitor residential spaces and the retail spaces.
  - The support pillars for the building are indicated by dots on the plan. The pillars must be shown to scale and the remaining space on either side clearly shown as a dimension on the drawings as I suspect it will mean some of the bays are inaccessible/unusable.
  - The basement car park must be designed in accordance with The Institution of Structural Engineers publication “Design Recommendations for Multi-storey and Underground Car Parks 2011- 4th Edition. There is no evidence to suggest this is the case and the car park does not appear to be designed according to this publication.
  - Overall the indicative parking layout is doesn't work and is unable to achieve an appropriate layout and the required level of parking given the level of development indicated within this proposal.

### **General Transport & Highways Comments**

- **Access**
  - The main vehicular access is proposed via a new access on Elmshott Lane, through a new undercroft section through the ground & 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the building which I confirm appears to be acceptable.
  - The access for until D utilises an existing access through an undercroft on ground floor which is at sufficient height for a standard roof transit van or similar but does

- not appear to be able to accommodate a high roofed van, Luton box van or 7.5t vehicle which is the minimum it should be able to accommodate to allow for effective servicing.
- As such we are not convinced how the access will operate and could potentially lead to vehicles servicing the unit from the highway which given the location would be deemed as unacceptable.
- **Refuse Collection & Storage**
    - I assume that refuse collection from Units A-C will be via the service yard which I confirm is acceptable providing that it can accommodate a refuse vehicle of 3.8m in height which I assume will be the case as the main access is designed to accommodate HGV's.
    - The refuse collection strategy for Unit D is unclear. The service area is not designed to accommodate refuse vehicles so it is assumed waste for the individual unit is from the roadside which is acceptable but the bins must be stored in a dedicated bin store away from the public highway, preferably to the rear of the unit.
    - A detailed servicing and refuse strategy would be required in order to provide information on these operations and to detail if/how they impact on the highway. As such given the lack of this information we are unable to accurately assess the application.
  - **Servicing and Refuse Vehicle Access** – Vehicle tracking shows very tight manoeuvring for a 16.5m articulated lorry to turn around in the service yard/loading bay. Furthermore there appears to be intervisibility issues between vehicles exiting the service yard and exiting the car park ramp at the same time which increases the risk of collisions. We would expect that following is provided:
    - Tracking of HGV into loading ramp shown adjacent to main loading bay
    - Tracking of LGV/7.5t box van using separate loading bay to south serving Retail Unit D
    - Intervisibility shown between vehicles exiting the service yard and the car park ramp, it should be noted that this is through an undercroft section of the car park therefore will have a reduction of natural daylight therefore it is critical that intervisibility is ensured.
    - A system of vehicle priority has not been shown to reduce the risk of conflict, this can be made up of road markings and physical signage.
    - The positioning of the loading bays for Units A & B seems to be in a location where their operation may interfere with that of other vehicles using the service yard. The operation of these loading bays and how loading/unloading will affect other vehicle movements in the service yard should be detailed/demonstrated.
    - There is insufficient information on the operation of the service yard to fully determine whether or not it can operate safely and as such we do not believe that it can support the level of development indicated based on the information given.
  - **Travel Plan** – The scale of this development requires some form of travel plan for the residential element of it and a travel plan monitoring fee would mostly likely be applicable however a travel plan hasn't been included as of yet.
  - **Trip Generation**– In terms of trip generation, Matrix have undertaken a comparison of the vehicular trip generation of the existing retail provision with the proposed using TRICS and there appears to be a minimal increase in trips. Multi-modal trips (walk, cycle, bus) haven't been considered in any detail (e.g. impact on existing bus services in terms of additional patronage from proposed development) therefore we

cannot accurately assess the impact or if any transport contributions would be required. There is most likely going to be increased harm to the highway network from this proposal given the level of development which has not been considered, the multi-modal impact must be assessed to gain an accurate picture of the harm/impact and how it can be mitigated.

- **Car Club** – There is a lack of demonstration to show how a car club (2 bays) would be feasible in this location.
  - The proposed car club is sited on the public highway on Elmshott Lane however there appears to be no consultation with SBC on their car club policy and whether or not this location would be suitable to the wider public.
  - It is doubtful that the critical mass required for a car club can be achieved in this location, evidence to support this has not been provided.

### **Highway Authority Recommendation**

The proposal is currently missing a great deal of key information and despite being an outline proposal does not give us enough to accurately assess the application to hand. A number of queries have been identified which require further clarification and furthermore we have serious concerns on the layout of the car park and general operation of it therefore the Highway Authority is recommending this application for refusal.

### **Reasons for refusal**

1. The layout as submitted is unacceptable and as such would result in an unsatisfactory form of development as it has not demonstrated that the proposal can effectively meet car/cycle parking and servicing requirements or achieve an acceptable layout in terms of public and highway safety. The level of development proposed would likely lead to displaced parking on the highway and an unacceptable risk of serious harm on the local highway network through the additional traffic movements generated especially in such close proximity to the Primary School. The development is therefore contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.
2. The proposed means of access to the underground car park and adjacent service yard is inadequate by reasons of its alignment/positioning/operation to serve the proposed development with safety and convenience. The development is contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.
3. The development fails to provide secure cycle parking in accordance with adopted Slough Borough Council standards and if permitted is unlikely to encourage cycling as a viable means of transport for residents. The development is therefore contrary to Slough Borough Council Local Plan Policies T1 and T8.
4. The proposed development is premature until such time that the applicant has demonstrated that the application, if approved, will not be detrimental to the safe operation of the adjacent and wider highway network. The development is contrary to Slough Borough Council's Core Strategy 2006-2026 Core Policy 7.
5. The development fails to provide car parking in accordance with adopted Slough Borough Council standards and if permitted is likely to lead to additional on street car parking or to the obstruction of the access to the detriment of highway safety and convenience. The development is contrary to Slough Borough Council Local Plan Policy T2.

## 2. PART B: PLANNING APPRAISAL

The applicant has advised that the report is incorrect at paragraph 11.14 that the rear boundaries of properties at 23, 25 and 27 Patricia Close have no trees or shrubs between them and the application site. Officers confirm that this may be incorrect in terms of number 27 but not number 23 or 25. Officers will clarify at the meeting.

## 3. PART C: RECOMMENDATION

Having considered the relevant policies, and comments that have been received from consultees and neighbouring occupiers, and all other relevant material considerations in the main report and the Amendment Sheet, it is recommended the application be delegated to the Planning Manager for refusal following the close of the consultation period subject to there being no new substantive planning issues that have not already been considered and/or that would be material to the determination of the application, for the reasons (updated reason 1 to cover the highways impact) set out below.

1. The proposal is considered to be overdevelopment of the site. This predominantly residential-led development would be of an unacceptably high density outside of the town centre and not in keeping with character of the local area. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the development proposed would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area due to its scale, mass and prominent location. It is also considered that there would be a harmful impact on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers as a result of the scale of the proposals and this is demonstrated by the illustrative plans. The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring residents including those on Patricia Close (numbers 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 59, 61, 63 and 65) and in Chalcott Mews due to the potential for overlooking and an overbearing development resulting from the scale and mass of the building. The proposal would result in overlooking between the proposed residential units and would result in a loss of amenity to future occupiers. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the development would not have a harmful impact on future living conditions of occupiers of the apartments. The layout as submitted is unacceptable and as such would result in an unsatisfactory form of development as it has not demonstrated that the proposal can effectively meet car/cycle parking and servicing requirements or achieve an acceptable layout in terms of public and highway safety. The level of development proposed would likely lead to displaced parking on the highway and an unacceptable risk of serious harm on the local highway network through the additional traffic movements generated especially in such close proximity to the Primary School. The proposed development would not comply with Policies EN1, H14, T1, T2 and T8 of the Local Plan for Slough March 2004, Core Policies 1, 4, 7 and 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document and the requirements of the NPPF 2018.
2. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction the Local Planning Authority that the proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on surface water drainage which could lead to flooding. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document and the requirements of the NPPF 2018.

3. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development could not provide the appropriate level and type 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.



#### 4. Further representations

1.1 Since the Officer's Report was completed, 7 further letters of objection have been received (3 being from one party). A further petition has also been received with 39 signatures.

1.2 The concerns raised within the additional objection letters can be summarised as follows:

Additional Comment	Officer Response
Dwellings have been moved further back (north) resulting in the dwellings being immediately outside the back gate of 114 Cheviot Road – resulting in overlooking and loss of light to this property.	An assessment of the impact upon neighbouring amenity can be found in section 10.0 of the main report.
Loss of light to 118 Cheviot Road from proposed dwellings and trees – request a sunlight and daylight assessment.	An assessment of the impact upon neighbouring amenity can be found in section 10.0 of the main report. It is not considered necessary for a specific daylight/sunlight report to be carried out as an assessment of light has been carried out by Planning Officers. There would not be any significant loss of light or overshadowing to neighbouring properties.
Overlooking of 118 and 122 Cheviot Road.	An assessment of the impact upon neighbouring amenity can be found in section 10.0 of the main report.
Concern that there will be more noise generated from people living in the property day and night.	This is covered in paragraphs 10.9 and 10.10 of the main report.
Proposal in breach of the Human Rights Act Protocol 1 Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment which includes the home and other land.	This is covered in paragraphs 10.9 and 10.10 of the main report.
<p>Concern raised with the validity of the submitted transport survey:</p> <p>Date from parking survey not a true reflection of the use of the car park and garages due to severe weather conditions (snow) where some vehicles could not be used (for example motorbikes) – a fresh survey now would have different results.</p> <p>Data extracted from video footage has been incorrectly documented – garages have been labelled 1-8 and report states ‘1 person entered garage and left on motorcycle, garage number 7’. The garage labelled 7 does not have a motorcycle or bicycle, only a car – numbers 8 and 1 have motorcycles and these are shown to be only used once combined. As such conclusion must be incorrect.</p>	The submitted parking survey was assessed by the Local Highway Authority who are satisfied with the information in the survey and concluded that 8 replacement parking spaces would mitigate the loss of the existing garages and parking area (see section 13.0 of the main report).

The provision of 8 parking spaces for existing residents not enough. There is existing parking on verges, pavements and roads and 8 spaces will not be adequate.	An assessment of the parking provision on site is made at part 13.0 of the main report (13.7-13.9).
Design and Access statement advises that 50% of garages in Slough are not used. Garages on this site are used regularly for parking vehicles not storage. If tenants had been contacted applicant would know the garages are used for vehicles.	Paragraphs 13.7-13.8 of the main report cover this. A transport survey was undertaken and the results accepted by the Local Highway Authority.
Emergency access for the flats from the fire service and ambulance will be compromised/restricted due to lack of space/access required due to double parking if spaces are taken away, putting lives at risk. Bin lorries also struggle to access site.	Paragraphs 13.7-13.8 of the main report cover this. A transport survey was undertaken and the results accepted by the local Highway Authority, identifying that the current situation would not be exacerbated by this proposal due to the proposed 8 communal spaces mitigating the loss.
Occupier of 2 Grampian Way uses one of the garages to store car and mobility scooter – garage used infrequently due to disability. Garage units are a convenient distance from 2 Grampian Way to provide access to disability scooter – loss of garage would be a massive inconvenience and security and safety issue for disability scooter.	This is covered at paragraph 10.12 of the main report.
Current tenant of a garage works shifts and garage close by offers safe place to park and access home. The loss of the existing garage and the re-location to another location will make them feel unsafe.	This is covered at paragraph 10.12 of the main report.
Garage used daily by 118 Cheviot Road and massive inconvenience and security and safety concern if garage removed – loss will increase insurance costs.	This is not a material planning consideration.
In the evenings and weekends the road becomes crowded. Removing 8 garages and 10 car parking spaces that are used and are not currently sufficient will cause more parking issues.	An assessment of the parking provision on site is made at section 13.0 of the main report.
Concern more dwellings on an already overcrowded estate is not healthy for existing residents, causing unnecessary stress and worries, having a detrimental impact on people's wellbeing.	An assessment of the parking provision on site is made at section 13.0 of the main report. It is not considered that there would be a negative impact upon existing parking on site and consequently on neighbours wellbeing.
Existing access to estate by one access point dominated by doctors surgery and mosque which exacerbate parking problems. Concern construction vehicles needing to access the site will result in a big cause for concern.	Proposed condition 7 as set out in the main report requires the submission of a construction traffic management plan.
Two properties on Cheviot Road have garages in gardens that are accessed through the car park – this access would be lost as a result of	This is covered at paragraph 13.10 of the main report.

the proposal.	
Slow worms, hedgehogs, feral cats and red kites on the site.	An assessment of ecology is found in Section 16.0 of the main report.
Next to car park is grass area used by children and dog walkers – made a lot smaller by this proposal.	This is covered at Section 15.0 of the main report. There would be a resultant increase in the level of green space alongside improvements through the provision of play equipment.
As a garage tenant no contact received from the Council regarding the removal of the garage and any relocation.  Asset management team have not consulted or assisted any existing tenants of the garages.	This is not a material planning consideration.
On amended plan documents, letters only sent to flats 72-99 from Stride Treglown Ltd but the Council have written to everyone – Stride Treglown Ltd should have written to everyone.	The letters referred to are in connection with the completion of Certificate B relating to serving of notice on those persons with a leasehold interest in the drying area being improved as part of this application. There is no legal requirement for the applicant to consult neighbouring properties.
If approved will contact Rights of Light surveyors.	This is not a material planning consideration. An assessment of the impact on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers is in Section 11 of the main report.
CCTV cameras are still on site from parking survey.	This is not a material planning consideration.

## 2. Update to Consultation Update

2.1 Contaminated Land Officer – No comments have been received from the Officer, however, conditions 16 to 19 require submission of technical reports relating to investigation of contamination and the requirement for remediation should this be necessary.

## 3. PART C: RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Having considered the relevant policies set out below, and comments from consultees and neighbouring occupiers, and all other relevant material considerations it is recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions in the main report and the additional condition in PART D: CONDITIONS below.

## 4. PART D: CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

4.1 Condition 24 – The houses to be affordable and retained in perpetuity (detailed wording to be drafted by Planning Officers).

4.2 Condition 25 – Maintenance/Management plan and responsibilities for the ‘drying area’ (detailed wording to be drafted by Planning Officers).

**1. Update to Consultation Responses**

- 1.1 No comments have been received from Thames Water, Neighbourhood Protection, or the Crime Prevention Design Advisor. Planning Officer are satisfied that drainage, noise and disturbance during the construction phase, and crime prevention through Secured by Design are be addressed by the recommended conditions.

**2. Update to impact on the character and appearance of the area – top floor**

- 2.1 Paragraph 10.7 states that it is unclear if the top floor elevations would have a flush surface as indicated on plans, or incorporate fins and deep returns as indicated in the Design and Access Statement. Revised plans have been submitted that reflect the design proposed within the Design and Access Statement. This is the preferable option as this offers more interesting features and better appearance compared what was shown on the originally submitted plans. The revised design will be presented during the Planning Committee meeting.

**3. Update to Highways and Parking**

- 3.1 Paragraph 10.7 refers to issues relating the proposed vertical cycle racks. Revised plans have been submitted that propose horizontal racks positioned within a larger store. The proposed racks do not appear to be the Sheffield type racks as required by the Council's Guidance, however, this can be addressed by condition to require this type of cycle rack system.
- 3.2 The Highway Authority has raised concern over the refuse storage for the existing commercial units in terms of their co-location proposed residential refuse store. As there is sufficient space on site to achieve this, these details can be secured by condition.

**4. PART C: RECOMMENDATION (Changed)**

- 4.1 Having considered the relevant policies set out below, and comments that have been received from consultees and neighbouring occupiers, and all other relevant material considerations it is recommended the application be delegated to the Planning Manager for approval subject to the conditions in the main report and the Amendment Sheet; finalising conditions, and any other minor changes.

**5. PART D: CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES (Additional conditions)**

- 5.1 Change to Condition 12 (Refuse and Recycling):

No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied shall until details of residential and commercial refuse and recycling provision (which must be separated) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved residential and commercial refuse and recycling provision shall be provided in accordance with these details prior to the occupation of the development and shall be retained at all times in the future for this purpose.

REASON To ensure that there is adequate cycle parking available at the site in accordance with Core Policy 7 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 – 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008 and Policy T8 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

5.2 Condition 13 to read:

No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied shall until details of the cycle parking racks have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with these details prior to the occupation of the development and shall be retained at all times in the future for this purpose.

REASON To ensure that there is adequate cycle parking available at the site in accordance with Core Policy 7 of The Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 – 2026, Development Plan Document, December 2008 and Policy T8 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

**1. Update to Affordable Housing contributions.**

1.1 Following further interrogation of the of the submitted viability assessment, the developer has agreed to increase the Affordable Housing contributions from £150,000 to £254,589. The schedule set out in Paragraph 6.1 should therefore be updated to the following:

- Affordable Housing - £254,589;
- Education - £6,634;
- Recreation - £250 per unit = £15,000 for 60 units;
- Traffic Regulation Order - £3,000;
- Transport - Realtime Passenger Information Screens for 2 nearest bus stops - £15,000
- Transport - Car Club Contribution - £30,000;
- Transport - Increased Trips / Movements - £36,777;
- Air Quality - £10,000
- Preclusion on parking permits

**2. Update to Sustainable Drainage**

2.1 The Addendum Report to Planning Committee states a drainage strategy has been submitted and can be secured by condition. However, the Environment Agency has asked to be consulted due to the proposed infiltration method of drainage being proposed within heavily contaminated site. In accordance with the Ministerial Statement (HCWS161), the Local Planning Authority need to be satisfied the site will be satisfactorily drained in accordance with SUDS requirements and if applicable Thames Water's agreed discharge rate before planning permission is granted.

2.2 As such, a condition is required requiring a drainage strategy to be approved in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority.

**3. PART C: RECOMMENDATION (Changed)**

3.1 Delegate to Planning Manager for 1) approval subject to: the submission of an acceptable drainage strategy following consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 planning obligation securing financial contributions as specified in paragraph 1.1, a review mechanism relating to infrastructure and affordable housing, and a preclusion on future residents obtaining parking permits, and conditions listed in the main report and below, and any finalising of them. Or, 2) refusal should a satisfactory S106 Agreement not be completed by 1st March 2019.

**4. PART D: CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES (Additional conditions)**

4.1 Remove the existing drainage condition (condition 15) and replace with a compliance condition once the drainage strategy has been approved, similar to as follows:

Condition:

The surface water control measures shall be carried out in accordance with the following details:-

[To be confirmed on approval from Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority].

The surface water control measures shall be retained thereafter and the drainage system shall be managed and maintained for the lifetime of the development in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No other drainage or infiltration into the ground at 426-430 Bath Road, Slough SL1 6BB is permitted other than with the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON To ensure that surface water discharge from the site is satisfactory and shall not prejudice the existing sewerage systems in accordance with Policy 8 of the adopted Core Strategy 2006 - 2026.

1. Regarding para 5.4 and what National Grid have said the source of this information is in a letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> August 2018 which is attached.

**nationalgrid**

National Grid House  
Warwick Technology Park  
Gallows Hill  
Warwick  
CV34 9DA

Howard Albertini  
Slough Borough Council  
St Martins Place  
51 Bath Road  
Slough  
Berks  
SL1 3UF

Laura McDermott  
Laura.McDermott@nationalgrid.com  
07929 369533

[www.nationalgrid.com](http://www.nationalgrid.com)

Date 20/08/18

Your Reference: H/00003/001

Dear Howard

**Re: Former Slough Gasworks and Gas Holder Site, Uxbridge Road, Slough  
Hazardous Substance Consent (H/00003/002) (HSE HID C15 No, H1784)**

Many thanks for your query which has been passed to me.

I can confirm that the gas holder at Slough is not currently in operational use.

Gas holder demolition at this site is estimated in the next 2 - 5 years. As you may be aware there are some constraints associated with the demolition of the gas holder which we are currently working through with various stakeholders before gas holder demolition can commence.

It is the approach of National Grid Property to request Hazardous Substance Consent revocation upon completion of demolition.

We are currently reviewing the potential for redevelopment of the site.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any more queries.

Yours sincerely



Laura McDermott  
Real Estate Development Manager

National Grid is a trading name for:  
National Grid Property Ltd  
Registered Office: 1-3 Strand, London WC2N 5EH  
Registered in England and Wales, No 2531489