ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
PANEL UPDATE

Maidenhead Panel

Application No.:	17/01649/FULL
Location:	Lennox House Ray Park Avenue Maidenhead SL6 8DT
Proposal:	Extension to east elevation and internal alterations to provide 4 new flats and alterations to provide an additional 8 car parking spaces.
Applicant:	
Agent:	Mrs Sarah Hardwick
Parish/Ward:	Maidenhead Unparished/Maidenhead Riverside Ward

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Laura Ashton on 01628 685693 or at laura.ashton@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The applicant has been unable to demonstrate that safe access/egress to the proposed flats would be achievable during a flood event. This is contrary to the advice contained in the NPPF and that provided by the Environment Agency as well as Local Plan Policy F1. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.

The recommendation in the main report is changed to **refuse to grant planning permission** for the reason set out below.

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

2.1 At the time of writing the panel report, the applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate safe access/egress to the proposed flats could be achieved during a flood event. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF explains that local planning authorities should only consider development in areas at risk of flooding where (inter alia) development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant including safe access and escape routes. Given that the proposed flats are on ground floor level a safe escape route is particularly important in this instance.

2.2 The applicant has since provided information that indicates that the escape route during a 1 in 100 (1.0%) probability flood event plus 35% allowance for climate change would have a flood depth of 300mm with an estimated velocity of 0.1m/s. This appears to be a best case scenario. This equates to a 0.75 to 1.25 hazard rating which is classified as a "Danger for Some". This would pose a threat to children, the elderly and the infirm. On this basis the proposal for additional flats would not be considered safe and would place an extra burden upon the emergency services. The development proposal is therefore in conflict with paragraph 103 of the NPPF and policy F1 of the Local Plan. Planning permission should be refused on this basis.

3. RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDED REASONS FOR REFUSAL IF PERMISSION IS NOT GRANTED

3.1 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that safe access and egress would be possible during a 1 in 100 (1.0%) probability flood event plus 35% allowance for climate change. In the absence of safe access and egress the development proposal is contrary to paragraph 103 of the NPPF and policy F1 of the Local Plan.