

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28th July 2021

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

National Planning Policy Framework – July 2021 Update

1. Following the publication of the Agenda for this evening's committee, the Government have published an updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework dated July 2021. This updated version responds to the Government's Building Better Building Beautiful Commission 'Living with Beauty' report, with much of the updates reflecting recent Government pronouncements which seeks to improve the quality of design in new buildings, environment and the public realm.
2. The overarching amendment to the NPPF is to ensure that good design is front and centre for the decision maker when undertaking the planning balance.
3. Please note, some references to paragraphs within the Officer's Committee Report as well as any reference to the earlier version of the NPPF are now out of date. It must be taken as read that the references are still valid, however paragraph numbers may have slightly changed. If there is any revision to the specific wording of the NPPF which is relevant to the officers report, each officer will either highlight this within this amendment sheet or bring your attention to the change during their presentation.
4. To assist Members and Officers, below is a short update of the key changes included within the revised NPPF July 2021 relevant to decision making are outlined below, however a further Member briefing note will be circulated in due course which will include greater detail as well as setting out those updates regarding plan making and design codes:
 - a) The main change contained within the revised NPPF, as noted above, relates to design and the overarching objective that requires planning to be for "well-designed, beautiful and safe places". Development that is not well designed should be refused and this test is set out in para 134 of the revised NPPF. Weight should be given to local or national design guidance and development should reflect those documents. Greater positive weight should also be attributed to schemes which include planting and retention of trees within development sites.
 - b) In relation to environmental considerations, the NPPF requires that infrastructure provision, climates change and environmental requirements are key to sustainable development and development should manage residual flood risk through improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding.
 - c) Regarding sustainable transport, paragraph 104(d) has been amended to reflect the Building Better Building Beautiful commission's recommendations to encourage walking and cycling, this includes making sure that large scale developments have the infrastructure and facilities required with a genuine choice of transport modes available.

Item 5 – P/0114/008 Garages Rear of 1 Alexandra Road, Slough. SL1 2NQ

- 1.1. Following comments from the Highways Officer, additional highways information was received on Friday 23 July 2021. The additional information includes a revised site layout plan Ref: PL-01 Rev C which shows a revision to the parking layout and confirms the width of the access at 3.1 metres along with the removal of previously proposed bi-fold gates and written confirmation that the development will be fitted with sprinkler systems for fire safety purposes.
- 1.2. The Following comments are received from Highways:

Vehicular Access

Vehicular access to the site is proposed via a narrow driveway which measures 3.1m wide and would be accessed from the hammerhead at the northern end of Alexandra Road. The existing access is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass each other, although currently provides vehicular access to the rear of properties on Chalvey Road. The length of the access places the flats approximately 45m from the public highway

It is important to consider access to the site for fire engines where a narrow access is provided. The Manual for Streets advises within paragraph 6.73 that the association of Chief Fire Officers advises that if an authority or developer wishes to reduce the running carriageway to below 3.7m, they should consult the local Fire Safety Officer.

The applicant has consulted the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service (RBFRS). RBFRS have commented that each flat will be located 45m from the adopted highway and that there is no room for a turning circle for a fire tender to access the proposed development.

RBFRS have confirmed that they will accept sprinklers as a compensatory feature for the lack of access to the premises for fire engines and that an enhanced fire detection system should be installed in all risk rooms within each flat. The RBFRS have advised have a fire detection and alarm system, minimum Grade D2 Category LD3 standard, in accordance with the relevant recommendations of BS 5839-6 and have advised that a sprinkler system to comply with BS 9251:2014 or EN12845

In relation to access for fire engines, the Manual for Streets states the following in paragraph 6.73: *'Residential sprinkler systems are highly regarded by the FRS and their presence allows a longer response time to be used. A site layout which has been rejected on the grounds of accessibility for fire appliances may become acceptable if it's buildings are equipped with these systems'*.

SBC Highways and Transport have no objection to the proposed development based on emergency access given the response by the Royal Berkshire Fire Service who have confirmed that a sprinkler system will be accepted as compensation for fire engine access.

Access by Sustainable Travel Modes

The site is situated 1.5km (19 minutes walk) from Slough Railway Station and 1100m (14 minutes walk) from the western entrance to Slough High Street. SBC Highways and Transport consider the site relatively accessible by sustainable travel modes.

Parking

Three parking spaces are proposed for the development at a ratio of 1 parking space per dwelling. The Slough Borough Council Parking Standards require the provision of 1 parking space + 0.5 communal spaces for the 1 bedroom dwelling and 2 parking spaces per dwelling where all spaces are assigned. Therefore a total of 5 parking spaces would be required by the Slough Parking Standards.

SBC Highways and Transport consider the proposed 3 parking spaces acceptable and that they will satisfy the desire to own a car at the proposed development.

EV Parking

The applicant has confirmed that Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP) will be provided in accordance with the Slough Low Emissions Strategy (2018 – 2025). The Slough Low Emissions Strategy requires the provision of 1 EVCP per dwelling where parking spaces are allocated to each dwelling.

SBC Highways and Transport recommend that EV Chargers are secured by planning condition.

Cycle Parking

The proposed site plan (Drawing No. PL-01-Rev-C) does not display cycle parking. SBC Highways and Transport require the applicant to provide 1 secure, covered cycle space per dwelling. The SBC Developers Guide – Part 3: Highways and Transport provides the cycle parking standards for new development and requires that on residential developments, an individual secure store for each dwelling is required.

Servicing and Refuse Collection

SBC Highways and Transport requested the provision of details of servicing and refuse collection arrangements for the site. The location of the proposed bin stores would appear to exceed the recommended maximum carry distances. A maximum drag distance for residents of 30m from dwelling to bin collection point is specified by the Slough Borough Council Guidance: Refuse and Recycling Storage for New Dwellings (November 2018). The guidance recommends a maximum drag distance of 15m from dwelling to bin collection point.

Summary and Conclusions

I confirm that I have no objection to this application from a transport and highway perspective. Please include the following condition(s)/informative(s) as part of any consent that you may issue.

Conditions

Vehicular Access

No part of the development shall be occupied until the new means of access has been sited and laid out in accordance with the approval plans and constructed in accordance with Slough Borough Council's Adopted Vehicle Crossover Policy.

REASON: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development.

Layout

The scheme for parking and manoeuvring indicated on the submitted plans shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

REASON: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway.

Electric Charging Points

Prior to the first occupation of each unit, the residential car parking provision for the unit shall be provided, to include a 1 electric vehicle charge point per dwelling – and a total of 3 electric vehicle charging points. The residential electric vehicle charging points must have a ‘Type 2’ socket and be rated to at least 3.6kW 16amp 0 7kW 30amp single phase, in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure vehicle parking is provided and encourage up-take of electric vehicle use, in accordance with Policy T2 of the Adopted Local Plan (2004), Policies 7 and 8 of the Core Strategy 2008, the guidance contained in the Council’s Developer’s Guide Part 3 (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Cycle Parking

No development shall be begun until details of the cycle parking provision (including location, housing and cycle stand details) 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 Policy T8 of The Local Plan for Slough 2004, and to meet the objectives of the Slough Integrated Transport Strategy

Bin Storage

No part of the development shall be occupied commence until bin storage has been provided in accordance with the standards set out in the Slough Developers Guide.

REASON: To ensure that adequate refuse storage is provided to serve the development

1.3 No objections are noted. Of the requested conditions from highways, the following is considered:

1.4 The vehicle access condition can be included in the recommendation.

1.5 The requested layout condition is covered in proposed Condition 8 of the report.

1.6 The condition relating to electric charging points is covered in proposed Condition 13 of the report but it is recommended to replace this with the proposed condition above.

1.7 The condition relating to Bike Stores appears to overlook the location of proposed cycle parking as shown on the scheme. Proposed Condition 9 addresses cycle parking and is considered appropriate.

1.8 The condition relating to Bin Storage is addressed in proposed Conditions 9 and 12 of the report.

1.9 Therefore the recommendation remains as set out in the report but with an additional condition for access provision and the replacement wording of Condition 13.

Item 6 – P/06651/103 Units 2C, 3A, 3B, Slough Retail Park, Twinches Lane,

1. Update:

1.3. The National Planning Policy Framework was updated to its 2021 version on 20th July 2021, which was after the publication of the Planning Committee Report. The following are updates to the Committee Report to reflect the relevant changes in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, and to include minor corrections:

Committee Report Paragraph	Planning Officer Comment / Correction
7.0	<p>The revised version of the National Planning policy Framework was published on 19th February 2019 has been superseded by a new version of the Framework published on 20 July 2021”</p> <p>The relevant Local Development Plan Policies in relation to determining this application are largely considered to be in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 2021....”</p>
7.2	<p>Given the above, the proposed changes are considered to engage the following planning policies:</p> <p><u>National Planning Policy Framework 2019</u>2021:</p>
8.4	Clarification: Grandmother = P/06651/086; Mother = P/06651/075
9.2	This application seeks to vary conditions to permit the sale of food and drink within unit 3A for consumption of off the premises.
9.6	<p>Core Policy 6 of the Core Strategy and Local Plan Policy S4 also states...”</p> <p>“The National Planning Policy Framework has since been published (current version published on 20 July 2021)...”</p>
9.7	<p>“Para 86 87 of the 2021 Framework...”</p> <p>“Paragraph 040 011 of the NPPG set the context for applying the sequential test:</p> <p>“It is for the applicant to demonstrate compliance with the sequential test (and failure to undertake a sequential assessment could in itself constitute a reason for refusing permission). Wherever possible, the local planning authority should is expected to support the applicant in undertaking the sequential test, including sharing any relevant information. The application of the test should will need to be proportionate and appropriate for the given proposal. Where appropriate, the potential suitability of alternative sites should will need</p>

	to be discussed between the developer and local planning authority at the earliest opportunity.”
9.9.	The application has been submitted pursuant to a household survey undertaken by a NEMS market research on behalf of the applicant. This has identified that 54% of the residents survey respondents of in the Cippenham area carry out carry out most of their main food shopping in the out of centre Asda at Telford Drive, while 15% of Cippenham residents survey respondents use the Town Centre Tesco in Brunel Way, and 7% use the edge of Town Centre Sainsbury’s in Uxbridge Road (7%)
9.13; 9.14; 9.19	In respect of the area of the search area for the sequentially preferable location (within the sequential test), it should be noted by way of clarification that the Town Centre is not included as a sequentially preferable location because the sequential test appropriately relates to the Centres within the identified catchment area of the proposed store. The Town Centre is not within this identified catchment.
9.14	Insert “ sales area ” after limited to 1,100 square meters
9.16	“...any alternative sites are suitable and viable available ”
9.18	Add – “ Core Strategy paragraph 7.89 confirms retailing is an employment use for the purposes of Core Policy 5. ”
9.19	“Based on the above, the application has demonstrated the proposed store could not be located within the designated shopping centres local to the site as identified within the defined catchment area of the store, in accordance with NPPF Para 86 87” Final sentence Para 87 of the NPPG
10.1	Paragraph 130(f) of The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 requires planning decisions to ensure developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. encourages new developments should provide a high quality of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings
10.2	“to allow a food store to be accommodated in ” Proposed Hours: 08.00 to 22.00 Monday to Saturday including bank/public holidays and outside the hours of 10.00 to 18.00 on Sundays.
11.1	“The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 2021. ”

12.1	“...Proposals should not result in unacceptable levels of air pollution. This is reflected in Paragraph 181 186 in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021....”
12.3	3 rd bullet “Please see paragraphs 11.2 11.12 – 11.13 for the reason....”
13.2	“Paragraph 80 81 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021....”
15.2	“...Manual for Stress Streets guidance....”
16.1	“The Application has been evaluated against the Development Plan and the NPPF 2021
16.2	<p>The report identifies that in using a cautious approach to interpret the meaning of major retail development, in the context of Core Policy 6, the proposals are not fully compliant with the text in the policy by not considering Slough Town Centre in the sequential test and by virtue of the proposals being within an out of town centre location which included a restriction on the type of retail given the need to safeguard Slough Town Centre. However, when considering the following:</p> <p>The report identifies that in using a cautious approach to interpret the meaning of new major retail development in the context of Core Policy 6, the proposals are not fully compliant with the text in the policy which states that new major retail development will be located in the shopping area of Slough Town Centre. However, when considering the following:</p> <p>“The proposal is considered to be in broad compliance with the Local Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 2021....”</p>
Condition 13	<p>In the event that there are power supply issues in relation to providing rapid charges charging bays,</p> <p>REASON “...National Planning Policy Framework 2019 2021”</p>
Condition 17	REASON “...National Planning Policy Framework 2019 2021”
Condition 18	REASON “...National Planning Policy Framework 2019 2021”

2. Recommendation:

No change in the recommendation to Approve.

Item 7 – P/03138/014 – 10, The Grove, Slough, SL1 1QP

1. Update

All references to National Planning Policy Framework 2019 or NPPF 2019 to read as 'National Planning Policy Framework 2021'.

2. Section 16.0 (Paragraphs 16.1 and 16.2) to read as follows:

- 16.1 Under Core Policy 4, all sites of 15 or more dwellings (gross) will be required to provide between 30% and 40% of the dwellings as social rented along with other forms of affordable housing. However, the updated National Planning Policy Framework (2021) sets a threshold where at least 10% of the new dwellings within major developments should be provided as affordable.
- 16.2 In this case, as a combined application, a total of 16 dwellings are proposed which would ordinarily trigger the need to provide affordable housing based on the above thresholds. However, given that 8 units within the development already benefit from prior approval for residential conversion, affordable housing cannot be sought on these units. Instead, the requirement will only be triggered where the net increase in dwellings would exceed 15 or the development is a major. As the proposed development is proposing a total of 16 dwellings, the net increase of 8 is the only factor which triggers this development to be a 'major'; it should be noted that the consideration here is for the 8 additional units which alone would not constitute a 'major'. Therefore, the proposed development falls below both the NPPF and core policy thresholds. Consequently, it does not trigger the need for affordable housing.

Item 8 – P/01158/033 - 19-25, Lansdowne Avenue, Slough.

Consultation update:

1.1 Consultation responses have been received from Natural England and Berkshire Archaeology, and the Council's Highways officer has provided revised comments on the amended layout and housing mix.

1.2 Berkshire Archaeology:

The site lies within a local landscape where there has been little opportunity to assess the area for archaeological potential, but ahead of development in 2019 significant medieval and prehistoric archaeology was discovered at the former Horlicks factory site, as little as 200m north of the proposed development area.

The proposed development will significantly impact the whole site, including the rear gardens of the existing structures which have not been previously impacted by development.

Therefore, the application site falls within an area of archaeological significance and archaeological remains may be damaged by ground disturbance for the proposed development. It is therefore recommended that the following condition is applied should permission be granted in order to mitigate the impacts of development. This is in accordance with Paragraph 199 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should '*require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible*'.

Condition:

A) No development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

B) The Development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).

The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written

Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason:

The site lies in an area of archaeological potential, particularly for, but not limited to, Prehistoric and Medieval remains. The potential impacts of the development can be mitigated through a programme of archaeological work. This is in accordance with national and local plan policy.

In view of the nature and scale of the development and the low likelihood of the potential archaeology, should it exist, meriting preservation in situ, field evaluation through trial trenching would represent an appropriate initial phase of work in order to determine the archaeological potential and levels of previous truncation and the need for any further phases of work.

Berkshire Archaeology would be pleased to discuss the approach with the applicant, or their archaeological consultant should permission be granted. If the applicant can demonstrate previous widespread impact on below ground deposits which specifically affects the archaeological potential, then this advice can be reviewed.

1.3 Natural England:

Objection - further information required to determine impacts on designated sites - development within 5.6 kilometres of Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

Between 500 metres to 5.6km from Burnham Beeches SAC, a Habitats Regulations Assessment is required to determine Likely Significant Effect. Mitigation measures will be necessary to rule out adverse effects on integrity.

Natural England requires further information in order to determine the significance of these impacts and the scope for mitigation. Our advice is outlined below.

Please re-consult Natural England once this information has been obtained.

When there is sufficient scientific uncertainty about the likely effects of the planning application under consideration, the precautionary principle is applied to fully protect the qualifying features of the European Site designated under the Habitats Directive.

Due to new evidence on the impacts of recreational and urban growth at Burnham Beeches SAC carried out by Footprint Ecology in 2019, Natural England recognises that new housing within 5.6km of the internationally designated Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) can be expected to result in an increase in recreation pressure.

The 5.6km zone proposed within the evidence base carried out by Footprint Ecology represents the core area around the SAC where increases in the number of residential properties will require Habitats Regulations Assessment. Mitigation measures will be necessary to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC from the cumulative impacts of development.

Impacts to the SAC as a result of increasing recreation pressure are varied and have long been a concern. These impacts, which have the potential to adversely affect its interest features, include:

- Contamination (e.g. dog fouling, litter, spread of plant pathogens);
- Increased fire risk;
- Trampling/wear (e.g. loss of vegetation, soil compaction, erosion, damage to trees from climbing);
- Harvesting (e.g. fungi, wood);
- Difficulties in managing the site (e.g. maintaining the grazing regime);
- Disturbance (e.g. affecting the distribution of livestock and deer).

In light of the new evidence relating to the recreation impact zone of influence, planning authorities must apply the requirements of Regulation 61 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, to housing development within 5.6km of the SAC boundary. The authority must decide whether a particular proposal, alone or in combination with other plans or projects, would be likely to have a significant effect on the SAC.

In March 2020 Buckinghamshire Council (formally Chiltern and South Bucks Councils) produced the now adopted Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Burnham Beeches. The SPD requires net dwellings within 5.6km of Burnham Beeches to make financial contributions towards the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring strategy (SAMM).

Development in accordance with the Adopted Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy SPD would not be likely to have a significant effect on the SAC because they will provide, or make an appropriate contribution to, acceptable avoidance and mitigation measures. The planning authority can grant planning permission to such developments in accordance with the Regulations.

A mitigation strategy or equivalent will be required for Slough to avoid adverse impacts at the SAC. We advise the strategy should build upon the plans for creation and enhancement of habitats and facilities at Upton Court Park, providing an alternative open space of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) quality that will draw visitors reducing the recreational impact upon the Beeches.

However, development proposals which are not in accordance with the above would be likely to have a significant effect on the SAC, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. In accordance with Regulation 61, before granting planning permission for such a proposal, the planning authority must undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications of the development on the SAC, in light of the site's conservation objectives. The conservation objectives are to maintain and, where not in favourable condition, to restore, the Atlantic acidophilous beech forest habitat.

Consequently, it is Natural England's view that the planning authority will not be able to ascertain that this proposed development as it is currently submitted would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC. In combination with other plans and projects, the development would be likely to contribute to a deterioration of the quality of the habitat by reason of increased access to the site including access for general recreation and dog-walking. There being alternative solutions to the proposal and there being no

imperative reasons of overriding public interest to allow the proposal, despite a negative assessment, the proposal will not pass the tests of Regulation 62.

Please note that if your authority is minded to grant planning permission contrary to the advice in this letter, you are required under Section 281 (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to notify Natural England of the permission, the terms on which it is proposed to grant it and how, if at all, your authority has taken account of Natural England's advice. You must also allow a further period of 21 days before the operation can commence.

1.4 **SBC Highways officer:**

Site Layout

The proposed parking layout (Drawing No. 20001-GAA-A1-XX-DR-T-0112, dated 13/07/21) benefits from an aisle width of 6.0 metres in accordance with the MfS requirements for car parks with spaces perpendicular to the aisle. All proposed spaces measure at least 2.4m x 4.8m in accordance with the required minimum required dimensions.

At the request of SBC Highway and Transport spaces adjacent to walls have been widened to 2.7 metres to ensure that drivers will be able to open their car doors where the space width is restricted,

SBC Highways and Transport also requested the disabled parking spaces provide an additional 1200mm at the end of and to each side of the bay, as per the requirements of Manual for Streets Paragraph 8.3.58 and Inclusive Mobility.

SBC Highways and Transport recommend that further amendments are secured by planning condition as follows:

- The applicant has not provided disabled parking bays in accordance with Government Guidance Inclusive Mobility and Manual for Streets. SBC Highways and Transport recommend that an amended site layout is secured by condition to ensure a hatched 1200mm strip is provided to the side and end of the two disabled spaces, which is achievable with the proposed site plan.
- SBC Highways and Transport request that the gate displayed on the proposed site plan is set back a minimum of 6m from the public highway to ensure a vehicle waiting for the gate to open does not obstruct the safe operation of the public highway. It is recommended that this amendment is secured by condition.

Access by Sustainable Travel Modes

SBC Highways and Transport require the applicant to confirm what measures are being undertaken to support sustainable and low levels of car ownership on site, given a low parking ratio of 0.58 spaces per dwelling is proposed. SBC require a contribution of £20,000 towards the A4 Bath Road Cycle Route which is route 1A (A4 east/west spine) within Slough's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). This contribution would amount to £588 per dwelling. The A4 East/West spine will form the primary east/west cycle route across the entire Borough and will provide linkages towards the town centre, rail stations and large employment areas.

While the site constitutes a sustainable location, SBC expect sites which propose a low parking ratio to include measures which encourage travel by sustainable travel modes.

The site is situated approximately 700m (9 minutes walk) from the western entrance to Slough High Street, 800m (10 minutes walk) from Slough Bus Station and 900m (12 minutes walk) from Slough Railway Station. The area surrounding the site was rated '2' for Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) in a 2018 study of Public Transport Accessibility in Slough.

EV Charging

As the request of SBC, the applicant has committed to provide five active Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP) and five parking spaces with passive provision, which allow the spaces to be fitted with EV Chargers in future, should demand require this. Therefore SBC have no objection to the proposed development due to Electric Vehicle Charging Provision.

Cycle Parking

The proposed site plan displays cycle stores containing 19 Sheffield Stands, providing cycle parking for 36 cycles.

At the request of SBC Highways and Transport, the applicant has amended the proposed site plan to display two Sheffield stands for Short-stay visitor cycle parking. Short-stay visitor cycle parking is required for blocks of flats with 10 flats or more by the Slough Developer's Guide – Part 3: Highways and Transport (2008).

Therefore SBC Highways and Transport have no objection to the proposed development on the basis of cycle parking.

Summary and Conclusions

I confirm that I have no objection to this application from a transport and highway perspective. I recommend the inclusion of the following condition(s)/informative(s) as part of any consent that you may issue.

Conditions for Approval

Vehicular Access

No part of the development shall be occupied until the new means of access has been sited and laid out in accordance with the approval plans and constructed in accordance with Slough Borough Council's Adopted Vehicle Crossover Policy.

REASON: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development.

Visibility

No other part of the development shall begin until visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m have been provided on both sides of the access between a point 2.4 metres along the centre line of the access measured from the edge of the carriageway and a point 43 metres along the edge of the

carriageway measured from the intersection of the centre line of the access. The area contained within the splays shall be kept free of any obstruction exceeding 600mm in height above the nearside channel level of the carriageway.

REASON: To provide adequate intervisibility between the access and the existing public highway for the safety and convenience of users of the highway and of the access.

Car Parking

No part of the development shall commence until an amended scheme for car parking and manoeuvring has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented and made available for use before the development hereby permitted is occupied and that area shall not be used for any other purpose.

REASON: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway.

Electric Vehicle Parking

Prior to the first occupation of each unit, the residential car parking provision for the unit shall be provided, to include a 5 electric vehicle charging points and 5 parking spaces with passive electric vehicle parking provision, providing a total of 10 parking spaces with EVCP provision. The residential electric vehicle charging points must have a 'Type 2' socket and be rated to at least 3.6kW 16amp 0 7kW 30amp single phase, in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure vehicle parking is provided and encourage up-take of electric vehicle use, in accordance with Policy T2 of the Adopted Local Plan (2004), Policies 7 and 8 of the Core Strategy 2008, the guidance contained in the Council's Developer's Guide Part 3 (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework

Cycle Parking

No development shall be begun until details of the cycle parking provision (including location, housing and cycle stand details) 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 Policy T8 of The Local Plan for Slough 2004, and to meet the objectives of the Slough Integrated Transport Strategy.

Bin Storage

No part of the development shall be occupied commence until bin storage has been in accordance with the standards set out in the Slough Developers Guide.

REASON: To ensure that adequate refuse storage is provided to serve the development

Informatives

The applicant will need to apply to the Council's Local Land Charges on 01753 875039 or email to 0350SN&N@slough.gov.uk for street naming and/or numbering of the unit/s.

No water meters will be permitted within the public footway. The applicant will need to provide way leave to Thames Water Plc for installation of water meters within the site.

The development must be so designed and constructed to ensure that surface water from the development does not drain onto the highway or into the highway drainage system.

The applicant is advised that if it is intended to use soakaways as the method of dealing with the disposal of surface water then the permission of the Environment Agency will be necessary.

The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to obstruct the public highway by the erection of scaffolding, hoarding, skip or any other device or apparatus for which a licence must be sought from the Highway Authority.

Assessment

2.0 Archaeology

- 2.1 The condition requested by Berkshire Archaeology may be appropriate given the potential of the site. However, further consultation will be undertaken with this consultee to ascertain whether site clearance will have impacted on their assessment. If they maintain the need for the condition, it is recommended that this be included in the decision if planning permission is granted.

3.0 Impacts on Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation

- 3.1 Paragraph 180 of the NPPF 2021 states that when determining planning applications, if significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated or as a last resort compensated for then planning permission should be refused. It also states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around the developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.
- 3.2 Natural England's comments and objection in relation to effects on Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation refer to a South Buckinghamshire SPD which is not adopted in or applicable to Slough. However, the principle of providing mitigation for any identified significant effects is accepted. Natural England (NE) has asked for a suitable strategy to be agreed that will provide on-going mitigation for future major development within a 5.6km buffer zone around the SAC. This would require mitigation to be secured for an identified project through a planning obligation, in order to ensure that there will not be any in-combination effect as a result of additional recreation pressure on the Burnham Beeches SAC.

3.3 Following discussions with NE regarding the need for mitigation for proposed future development in Slough, a financial contribution for appropriate development within Slough of alternative greenspace will be required. Upton Court Park has been identified as a key site for such works. This will be considered by the Planning Committee at the 23rd June meeting. A financial contribution towards mitigation will be required, as provided for at Section 21 in the Committee report.

4.0 **Highways Issues:**

4.1 Amendments sought by the Highways officer will be provided for as set out in the recommended condition 6 in the Committee report. If agreed prior to the permission being issued, the condition could be amended to reflect the agreed plan.

4.2 The specific conditions sought by the Highways officer will be incorporated into the decision, if planning permission is granted, subject to further review against those already provided in the Committee report as provided for in Part 3) of the Recommendation.

Item 9 – P/00827/032 – 10 Albert Street

1.0 Each and any reference to the NPPF 2019 as set out in the Officers' report should now be taken to refer to the NPPF issued on 20th July 2021, and specifically in paragraph 14.1, the reference to "Paragraph 109" should now read "Paragraph 111".

2.0 Since the report was prepared the following comments were received from Upton Park Roads Ltd.

1. The latest plans state quite clearly that there are no trees on the site. In fact there were 7 purple plum trees which were cut down last weekend, and stones put over the stumps to disguise them. This is a blatant flouting of the planning laws. They were in fact mentioned by the tree surgeon in relation to application P/00827/029. Whilst they do not necessarily have Preservation Orders on them, they were planted around the time the existing house was built, and were contributing to the reduction of the carbon footprint caused by the traffic fumes in Albert Street (something the Council considers to be very important, we understand). Also, the plans show no indication that any new trees will be planted to replace them.

[Officer response further to the existing comments in the Officers' report at section 16: - The trees were indeed removed recently. There was no TPO or conservation area protection; therefore, there was no requirement to seek any formal planning approval. As such, this was not "a blatant flouting of the planning laws". Replacement planting is required under draft condition 8.]

2. Access to the site – The plan does not state whether access will be from Albert Street or the private road of Upton Park. If Upton Park is the intended access route then we have serious doubts that the road surface would support heavy plant constantly traversing it to clear the site and deliver materials. Our Covenant states the access over the roads is solely for residents to get to and from their properties and the road surface reflects this requirement. The access driveway to the site is very narrow which would cause problems for large lorries trying to gain entry. Upton Park road is also quite narrow at this point and no mention has been made in the planning application of how removals and deliveries are to be managed. Upton Park is used by many families making the 'school run' on foot, avoiding the congestion and pollution of Albert Street. Having to walk close to heavy vehicles loading or unloading in the roadway is a totally unacceptable prospect. We cannot see that any of these problems have been addressed in the planning application documents available for public view.

[Officer response: The arrangements for construction would be a matter for the developer to agree as appropriate with the Highway Authority and the Upton park Roads Ltd.]

3. Refuse Collection – The fact that the refuse lorries cannot access the site has been raised in previous correspondence. It is stated that a Management Company would be in place to take all the bins out on to the road on the relevant day. We fail to see how this would work, as Management Companies are not normally on site and are hardly likely to send a representative get the bins emptied once a week. Even if this were to be practical, should each flat have their own refuse bins, this could mean 11 bins blocking the road every week (22 if they had red bins as well). Even if communal bins are used, they would cause an obstruction at the entrance. The

report submitted as part of the application states that the bins would be placed on Upton Park. Bins are supposed to be placed on the edge of relevant properties so the report is clearly indicating that they are to be illegally located on our property. We already have locations with bins being left on our road surface but despite a number of approaches to Slough Borough Council on the matter, no action has been taken to ensure that allocated bin stores are used. This proposed development will doubtless create another eyesore to the area as the report does not satisfactorily address this problem.

[Officer response: The arrangements for refuse storage and subsequent collection would be a matter for discharge under Conditions 10 and 16 respectively.]

4. Sewage system – In the report carried out by Landmark Group it makes no mention of sewage and drainage problems in the vicinity. Adding extra flats to the existing system which is already over capacity, could give rise to serious flooding as occurred there a couple of years ago. On that occasion we had raw sewage running down the road in Upton Park and infiltrating several residents' houses. Thames Water have advised that the existing sewer in Albert Street is hardly able to cope with existing demands.

[Officer response: Thames Water's formal response to the planning application is set out in the Officers' report at 6.2.]