

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**27<sup>th</sup> May 2020**

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

**1.0 Additional Representations**

- 1.1 The following queries were raised by Councillors subsequent to the publication of the Committee Agenda.

Cllr Minhas: Affordable housing has been agreed at 10%, can this be increased? Transport & Highways - It is stated that it is not clear where delivery vans will park or removable vans, will this be made clearer when the officer introduces this report?

*(Officer Response: In regards to the query about affordable housing for 426-430 Bath Rd development, I intend to draw attention to the provisions during the presentation and will provide some further context here. The officer report covers the issue also in a reasonable level of detail of which I will not repeat in this message but I would refer you specifically to paragraphs 8.4 to 8.11 for some background. In terms of the query about drop offs and loading, I will present an illustrative plan this evening which will identify the parking and access provisions. This plan is illustrative as the layout is a matter to be reserved and this will form part of a detailed submission in the future. I trust this interim response is useful and I will elaborate further upon your queries this evening during the presentation).*

**2.0 Recommendation:**

- 2.1 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:

A) For approval subject to:-

- 1) the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 to secure the provision of 10% affordable housing (on site provision) and financial contributions towards Transport, Air Quality, Education and Leisure/Open Spaces and the provision of Travel Plan as set out in this report, and
- 2) finalising conditions; and any other minor changes, or

B) Refuse the application if the completion of the Section 106 Agreement is not finalised by 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020 unless a longer period is agreed by the Planning Manager in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

**1.0 Revised Recommendation**

- 1.1 Delete 'OR' after second bullet point (ii). Then insert new bullet points (i) and (ii) as follows:

(i) A revised plan is submitted by the applicant detailing the omission of the proposed vehicular lay-by on Brunel Way.

(ii) Appropriate planning conditions and/or obligations are secured as necessary following the submission of further transport modelling and safety auditing of the amended highways provisions.

## 2.0 Corrections to Report

Para 2.8. Delete bullet point listing Statement of Community Involvement by Forty Shillings. This was not submitted with this application.

## 3.0 Additional Representations

3.1 Additional representations have been submitted by the Borough's Transport and Highways Officer. These are summarised as follows:

- The LINSIG Modelling [submitted in respect of the Transport Assessment to take into account the changes to the bus station access road and right turn from Stoke Rd and modifications to the bus lanes] cannot be relied upon at this stage.
- The latest version of the LINSIG modelling is currently being reviewed and SBC Highways Officers will comment further on this in a separate technical note however it must be noted that the results of this analysis may have an impact on the design of the junction/access, the highway works and how the site will operate.
- The final design of the junction and access road must be secured via condition and included as a condition of any recommendation, following the submission of further transport modelling by the applicant that needs to be verified by SBC Highways Team.
- No objection is raised to the proposals in principle, but the above transport modelling and junction solutions need to be secured, prior to (conditional) planning permission being granted. Highways Officers currently advise that a severe impact on the local highway cannot be ruled out if an acceptable scheme for the above junction/access road is not secured.

*(Officer Comments: The Recommendation has been amended to reflect the specific requirement to review updated transport modelling and safety auditing and the outcome of this modelling in order to determine appropriate planning conditions or/and obligations to address the modelling/auditing results)*

3.2 The following queries were raised by Councillors subsequent to the publication of the Committee Agenda.

Cllr Mann: I have sought to find some of the reports listed as submitted as part of the application [Agenda Item 6: P/04888/022] on our own planning portal but cannot locate some of these - in particular the SCI that was submitted as part of the application. Can someone please advise?

*(Officer Response: I have checked the application cover letter which confirms that the Statement of Community Involvement was not included as part of this application. This is an error in the officer report and will be clarified in the committee addendum. The SCI that was carried out was in connection with the previous development/application that was withdrawn in November 2019. The current application was submitted in December and therefore a further SCI was not put forward by the applicant. The Planning Application was subject to a significant public consultation exercise in January 2020 and no objections from the public have been received.)*

Cllr Plenty: Para. 6.6. The concept of a soft public realm is interesting. Can it be expanded upon? What is the issue with West Himalayan Birch? What are the advantages of the alternatives? The gardening concept is an interesting one. Can it be expanded upon? What trees are on any

preferred list? We should have one. Bee friendly trees (it is not just shrubs that can be bee friendly) would be good, but any choice should have an ecological benefit, ie encourage other wildlife, insects, birds etc rather than just be an easy curiosity.

*(Officer Response: The importance of high quality soft public realm is technically known as green infrastructure and this has been extensively researched by Universities and government departments. Securing and maintaining a high quality landscape for this town centre development is very important to the scheme. In summary trees and soft areas provide key benefits such as; reduced stress levels in humans, increase in shopping time, increase in property value by up to 20%, reduced traffic speeds, reduced surface water flooding, improved air quality, habitat for nature plus many more.*

*In terms of your inquiry about use of Himalayan birch, there are no major objections to this. It is tree species with many commendable characteristics which means it has been planted extensively in urban areas. Best practice for landscape is to have a diversity in species so that there is greater resilience to climate change and emerging pest and diseases. The applicant has revised the landscape scheme following initial dialogue with officers and further revised details have been submitted to ensure the health and viability of the trees within the raised planters.*

*The provision of a gardening club is something that officers consider could be set out in the Landscape Management Scheme condition, although it is noted this may be difficult to enforce. The condition is designed to ensure the landscaped areas (including roof terraces which are private) can be maintained and managed in perpetuity and would likely fall under the control of a Management Company for the building. The terrace areas outside of the café/restaurants will be open to the public but in private ownership and any landscaping and street furniture here will need to be subject to the landscape management scheme).*

#### **4.0 Modifications & Clarifications to Assessment**

Revise Para 15.9 to read as follows:

It is recommended the provision of the Brunel Way Lay by is omitted from the plans.

Delete sentence (in para 15.9): A condition is recommended which omits this provision from the plans.

Amend Bullet point (ii) para 15.14 to read as follows (new insertion in bold text):

£150,000 Sustainable Transport Contribution towards the electrification **AND/OR** infrastructure of the Bus Station to support Electric Buses (prior to commencement) **or sustainable infrastructure projects to support buses that produces low emissions (such as hybrid buses).**

#### **4.0 Recommendation**

##### **4.1 Revised as above:**

A. Having considered the relevant policies of the Development Plan set out below, the representations received from consultees and the community along with all relevant material considerations, it is recommended the application be delegated to the Planning Manager for:

A. Approval subject to:

- (i) A revised plan is submitted by the applicant detailing the omission of the proposed vehicular lay-by on Brunel Way.
- (ii) Appropriate planning conditions and/or obligations are secured as necessary following the submission of further transport modelling and safety auditing of the amended highways provisions.
- (iii) the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure financial contributions towards sustainable transport improvements including electrical vehicle infrastructure in the town centre, public realm and landscaping enhancements and provision of Travel Plan and Section 278 highways/access works;
- (iv) finalising conditions and any other minor changes;

OR

- B. Refuse the application if the completion of the Section 106 Agreement is not finalised by 31 September 2020, unless a longer period is agreed by the Planning Manager in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.