

Our ref: PM/Q230369
Your ref:
Email: philip.murphy@quod.com
Date: 1 April 2025



Principal Planning Officer
Slough Borough Council
Observatory House
25 Windsor Rd
Slough
SL1 2EL

For the attention of Alex Harrison

Dear Alex,

PLANNING APPLICATION REF. P/10076/013
LAND AT MANOR FARM, POYLE ROAD, SLOUGH

I write on behalf of my client, Manor Farm Propco Limited (referred to as 'the Applicant'), with regard to full planning application ref. P/10076/013 in respect of a data centre and battery energy storage system ("BESS") development at Manor Farm, Poyle Road, Slough ("the Site").

I am aware that consultation comments have been provided from a number of Statutory Consultees and I thought it might be useful to provide the Applicant's response to relevant matters raised. In this letter I therefore provide responses to the following consultees:

- Colne Valley Regional Park
- Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council
- Lead Local Flood Authority
- Thames Valley Police
- Berkshire Archaeology
- National Highways
- Thames Water
- Heathrow Airport Limited

Colne Valley Regional Park (CVRP)

It is pleasing to see that the CVRP support the proposed new pedestrian route from the Site to the Arthur Jacobs Nature Reserve, and welcome the proposed landscaping and enhanced pedestrian/cycle connectivity delivered as part of the application proposals.

The response identifies a number of potential concerns which I address in turn below:



- **Buffer to Water Bodies** – The Site is located approximately 20m south of the Poyle Channel and 280m east of Colne Brook, and as a result the proposed development naturally accommodates appropriate Environment Agency compliant watercourse buffers. As described in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report, the topographical survey and Ordnance Survey information shows a series of ditches around the Site, including a ditch network adjacent to Poyle Road to the east of the Parcel A and a ditch following the northern and western boundary of Parcel B. This ditch network is not an identified ‘watercourse’ and as a result buffers are not required to be incorporated into the scheme. The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report demonstrates that the proposed redevelopment has an acceptable flood risk within the terms and requirements of the NPPF, and incorporates appropriate Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) features designed to provide amenity and biodiversity gains, as well as sufficient water quality treatment to protect the receiving sewers and groundwater.
- **Risk of Pollution During Construction** – The planning application is supported by an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (“Outline CEMP”) which comprehensively sets out the construction phase mitigation measures for the proposed development to ensure compliance with environmental commitments, requirements and best practice. The Outline CEMP describes a number of recommended measures to avoid, minimise and control adverse environmental impacts associated with construction, including a specific section on the management of risks to the water environment (see page 39 of the Outline CEMP). The Applicant expects that the Outline CEMP will be secured by a condition imposed on any planning permission granted thereby acting as a commitment to the safeguarding of the environment through the identification, avoidance and mitigation of potential negative environmental impacts.
- **Cooling** – I can confirm that the development will not need to use river water for cooling purposes.
- **SuDS Strategy** - As set out in section 5.4.2 of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report, rain gardens are proposed on the eastern and western elevations of the data centre and will drain a portion of the data centre roof area and the adjacent access road (pending detailed design and levels review). This will provide attenuation whilst also being effective in removing pollutants from surface water run-off. These features will be lined and discharge into the site-wide surface water drainage system via underdrain pipes. Furthermore, Section 5.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report confirms that having followed the Council’s hierarchy of drainage options, surface water run-off from the development will be disposed of into the existing combined water public sewer located in Poyle Road having passed through on-site SuDS features. Therefore, there will be no discharge into the river and no negative impacts on fish.
- **Landscape and Visual** – The planning application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (“LVIA”). Section 3 explains the extensive process followed to determine the locations from which the Site might be visible. In particular, during the field



surveys, public footpaths and roads in the area were walked to determine the visibility of the Site, acknowledging that there can be a contrast in visibility between summer and winter months, with trees during the summer screening some views towards the Site. As a result of this analysis, visual receptors were identified across the following sub-groups:

- Users of Public Rights of Way
- Visitors to Public Open Space
- Users of roads i.e. those travelling in vehicles or pedestrians using the footway; and
- Residents of private properties.

These identified receptors were used as a basis of the landscape and visual assessment. The Applicant is therefore confident that the submitted LVIA comprehensively considers the visual effects of the development from appropriate publicly accessible receptor points.

Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council

The Applicant welcomes the Parish Council's in-principle support for the proposed development. We note that the Parish Council has confirmed support for the design of the proposed development being appropriately set back from Poyle Road, with tree and vegetation planting to minimise visibility. The Parish Council also notes the positive biodiversity net gains achieved and the increased connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists.

We note that the Parish Council has questioned whether the planting could be increased to reduce any potential noise from the Site and further reduce visibility from Poyle Road. The Applicant has considered the Parish Council's comments carefully, but does not consider there is the opportunity to significantly increase planting along Poyle Road beyond the substantial level already proposed. Furthermore, we note that the submitted Noise Assessment and LVIA do not identify any detrimental impacts. However, the Applicant anticipates that a condition will be imposed on any planning permission granted requiring details of the soft landscaping specification to be provided, and as part of this process the Applicant would be willing to consider species selection based on those that best contribute to noise and visual screening.

We note that the Parish Council has raised potential concerns regarding water and electricity supply. In terms of water, the Council will be aware of the response from Thames Water which we address below. In short, there are no supply constraints for the proposed development, especially given the existing uses on site, and hence no impact on residents. In respect of power, the development will be served from dedicated new connections from Iver and Laleham sub stations and therefore there will be no impact on the surrounding local community.

Finally, the Parish Council noted reservations about traffic flows from Junction 14 of the M25, however, as per the submitted Transport Assessment the proposals result in a net reduction in transport movements compared to the uses on site today.



Lead Local Flood Authority (“LLFA”)

We note that the LLFA support the drainage strategy proposed and have requested a condition be imposed on any permission granted regard the submission of as-built details. I can confirm the Applicant accepts the wording of the condition as proposed by the LLFA.

Thames Valley Police

In response to the comments I can confirm as follows:

- **Condition** - The Applicant would be happy to accept a condition requiring the development to comply with the terms of the submitted Security Statement;
- **Fencing** – The Applicant intends for the fencing to be LPS 1175 SR2, 358 single mesh. All gates will be to the same height as the fencing, and the pedestrian gate/turnstile will also to be SR2 rating. Vehicle gates will be PAS 68 Bi-folding speed gates. The Applicants would be happy to accept an appropriately worded condition requiring details of the fencing/gates to be submitted prior to their installation.
- **Vehicle Barrier** – The barrier identified controls access to the BESS only. It will be a manual barrier with a locking mechanism that permits access by the BESS operator, the landlord and the fire brigade only. It is strategically located to prevent anti-social behaviour and vehicles being hidden from view.
- **BESS Emergency Access** – The emergency access into Parcel B which is to be occupied by the BESS is an existing opening with a crossover from the roundabout. The application proposals maintain this access, with improvements to the surfacing of the crossover. The access has a pair of existing gates that would be replaced, details of which the Applicant is happy to provide under condition.
- **Landscaping** – I can confirm that there are no proposed trees or hedges within 3m of the fence line and hence there is no safety concerns regarding climbing aids.
- **Glazing Specification** – The Applicant notes the request for laminated glazing. At this stage the precise glazing specification has not been selected and therefore the Applicant proposes that the matter be controlled by an appropriately worded condition requiring the details to be submitted prior to installation.

Berkshire Archaeology

We note the request for a condition regarding a WSI and I can confirm the Applicant accepts the principle of the condition proposed by Berkshire Archaeology, although it should be structured to restrict “no below ground work”, rather than restrict “commencement”.

National Highways

We note the request for a condition regarding a Construction Transport Management Plan and I can confirm the Applicant accepts the wording of the condition as proposed by National Highways.



Thames Water

Foul Water

Thames Water's response dated 30 January 2025 notes that they are unable to determine the combined waste infrastructure needs of the application. The Applicant's technical team have been separately liaising with Thames Water's Developer Services team who responded in writing on 20 February 2025 (see email chain attached) explaining that there is sufficient capacity for the domestic flows from the office and capacity for the surface water runoff if the development was able to reduce the surface water runoff rate to 2.5 l/s.

The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report notes that the proposal is to reduce surface water runoff to the Q1 greenfield runoff rate 1.335 l/s/Ha. Considering the areas of hardstanding this is equal to 4.45 l/s. However, the Applicant has since reviewed the drainage strategy in light of Thames Water's comment, and I can confirm that the scheme would be able to reduce the surface water runoff rate to 2.5 l/s as requested.

In the context of the above, it is worth noting that the development on site drains into the public sewer at an unrestricted rate, and therefore the application proposals will provide a significant betterment of the existing drainage condition.

In light of the above, any planning condition relating to foul water should require delivery in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report, and adherence to a surface water runoff rate of 2.5 l/s.

Water Supply

Thames Water has proposed a pre-occupation condition which I can confirm the Applicant is prepared to accept.

Heathrow Airport Limited ("HAL")

HAL do not object to the development and have requested three conditions be imposed. The Applicant's response to each is set out below:

- Bird Hazard Management Plan – The Applicant is willing to prepare and submit a Bird Hazard Management Plan under condition, however, this should not be a pre-commencement requirement. Instead, the condition should require details to be submitted prior to the installation of any flat/shallow pitched/green roofs.
- Glint & Glare Assessment – The Applicant accepts the proposed condition as drafted.
- Plumbing Venting – The Applicant is happy with the principle of the condition, however, it should be re-phrased as a pre-occupation condition.



I am aware that there are a number of other consultee comments are outstanding eg highways, and I would be grateful if you could chase them accordingly.

Finally, I'd like to pick up three further points:

- NPPF - as you will be aware the revised NPPF was published days before the planning application was submitted. This revised NPPF confirms the Government's approach to grey-belt, with grey belt amends made to the National Planning Practice Guidance in February 2025. I thought it might therefore be useful to update the relevant sections of the Planning Statement, to make it clear how grey belt policy applies to the Site and the application proposals. Please see a attached a Revised Planning Statement accordingly.
- Neighbour Consultation – a neighbour has queried rights of access to the agricultural land to the south of the proposed data centre/north of the BESS. The Applicant is not aware of any such access rights and has not been provided with any evidence of the same.
- Section 106 – see attached a draft Section 106 Heads of Terms which draws on the assessments submitted in support of the planning application.

I trust the above is clear but should you wish to discuss matters further please do not hesitate to contact me

Yours sincerely

Philip Murphy
Senior Director