

NOTICE  
OF  
MEETING

**MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL**

will meet on

**WEDNESDAY, 15TH MARCH, 2017**

at

**7.00 pm**

in the

**COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD**

TO: MEMBERS OF THE MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL

COUNCILLOR DAVID BURBAGE (CHAIRMAN)  
COUNCILLOR DEREK WILSON (VICE-CHAIRMAN)  
COUNCILLORS CLIVE BULLOCK, GERRY CLARK, DAVID COPPINGER,  
MAUREEN HUNT, RICHARD KELLAWAY, PHILIP LOVE, DEREK SHARP,  
ADAM SMITH, CLAIRE STRETTON, LEO WALTERS AND PAUL BRIMACOMBE

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS STUART CARROLL, CARWYN COX, JUDITH DIMENT, GEOFF HILL,  
MOHAMMED ILYAS, MARION MILLS AND LISA TARGOWSKA

Karen Shepherd  
Democratic Services Manager  
Issued: Tuesday, 7 March 2017

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting.

The agenda is available on the Council's web site at [www.rbwm.gov.uk](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk) – if you are viewing this on the website and there are appendices you are unable to access, please contact the Panel Administrator **Shilpa Manek** 01628 796310, or [democratic.services@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@rbwm.gov.uk)

**Fire Alarm** - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

**Recording of Meetings** – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

## AGENDA

### PART 1

ITEM	SUBJECT	WARD	PAGE NO
4.	<p><b>PLANNING APPLICATIONS (DECISION)</b> To consider the Borough Planning Managers report on planning applications received.</p> <p>Full details on all planning applications (including application forms, site plans, objections received, correspondence etc.) can be found by accessing the Planning Applications Public Access Module by selecting the following link. <a href="http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/dc_public_apps.htm">http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/dc_public_apps.htm</a></p>		3 - 30
	ii		

## ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

### Maidenhead Panel

<b>Application No.:</b>	16/02025/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Cliveden View Shopping Centre Shifford Crescent Maidenhead
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of a nursery with associated parking and improvements to existing parking layout and landscaping, together with fascia improvements to existing parade building and relocation of mobile library facility.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Howells
<b>Agent:</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	/Furze Platt Ward
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Susan Sharman on 01628 685320 or at <a href="mailto:susan.sharman@rbwm.gov.uk">susan.sharman@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

#### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Revised information has been submitted in respect to the access arrangements for delivery vehicles to the shopping parade. The Highway Authority no longer raises an objection to the application.
- 1.2 Environmental Protection recommends a condition controlling the delivery times be imposed on any permission, in the interests of the residential amenities of the area.

**The recommendation in the main report is changed to grant planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 3 of this report.**

#### 2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 2.1 Further to the publication of the main report, the applicant has submitted additional and revised information to clarify the access arrangements in respect of the existing service yard to the rear of the shopping parade.
- 2.2 A larger scale swept-path analysis plan has been submitted that shows there is sufficient space at the access point and on site for a delivery lorry of 15.4m to safely enter, turn round and exit onto Switchback Road North in a forward gear. The Highway Authority has confirmed that, based on the submitted additional information and subject to appropriate conditions (outlined in section 3 of this report), it does not raise an objection to the proposal.
- 2.3 As the revised delivery arrangements will lead to more reversing within the service yard, (involving vehicle reversing alarms), Environmental Protection has recommended that a condition restricting delivery times be imposed on any permission to safeguard the residential amenities of the area. This is included in the list of suggested conditions in section 3 of this report.

#### Comments from Consultees

2.4

Comment	Officer response	Change to
---------	------------------	-----------

		<b>recommendation?</b>
Highway Authority - Based on the additional information submitted, the highway authority does not raise an objection to this application, subject to conditions and informatives.	Recommended conditions and informatives are included in section 3 of this report.	Yes.
Environmental Protection – recommends a delivery time condition to protect the residential amenities of the area.	Included in recommended conditions.	Yes.

### **3. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission.  
Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2. No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.  
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policy DG1.
3. No development shall take place a specification of all the finishing materials to be used in any hard surfacing on the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.  
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.
4. The use hereby permitted shall only operate between the hours of 0700hours and 1900 hours on Mondays to Fridays and at no time on weekends, Bank or Public Holidays.  
Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers. Relevant Policies - Local Plan NAP3.
5. No other part of the development shall commence until the access at Switchback Road North has been constructed in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall thereafter be retained.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. Relevant Policies – Local Plan T5, DG1.
6. Prior to the commencement of any works of demolition or construction a management plan showing how demolition and construction traffic, (including cranes), materials storage, facilities for operatives and vehicle parking and manoeuvring will be accommodated during the works period shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented as approved and maintained for the duration of the works or as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. Relevant Policies – Local Plan T5.
7. No part of the development shall be occupied until vehicle parking and turning space has been provided, surfaced and marked out in accordance with the approved drawing. The space approved shall be kept available for parking and turning in association with the development.  
Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety, and to facilitate vehicles entering and leaving the highway in forward gear. Relevant Policies - Local Plan P4, DG1.
8. No part of the development shall be occupied until the visibility splays shown on the approved drawings have been provided. The areas within these splays shall be kept free of all obstructions to visibility above a height of 0.6 metres from the surface of the carriageway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T5.

9. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved within the first planting season following the substantial completion of the development and retained in accordance with the approved details. If within a period of five years from the date of planting of any tree or shrub shown on the approved landscaping plan, that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the immediate vicinity, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its prior written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a form of development that maintains, and contributes positively to, the character and appearance of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.

10. No part of the development shall be commenced until a management plan for delivery vehicles using the Switchback Road North access has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T5.

11. Prior to the occupation of the day nursery, a plan showing the re-routing of the existing footpaths that cross the park from Whitchurch Close and Shifford Crescent up to the shopping parade shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure the pedestrian access to the park and shopping park is sufficiently retained. Relevant Policy - Local Plan DG1.

12. A Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented on first occupation of the development and thereafter for the duration of the development.

Reason: To minimise vehicular movements to and from the site and encourage the use of public transport, walking and cycling as means of accessing the site.

13. The mobile library space shall only be used once a week and not permanently.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application and to protect the amenities of the area, Relevant policy: Local Plan DG1.

14. Deliveries by any vehicle used for commercial purposes shall only be made to or from the site between the hours of 07:00 and 19:00 hours Monday to Saturday, Sunday, Public and Bank Holidays 09:00 and 17:00 hours.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of the area. Relevant Policy Local Plan NAP3.

15. No part of the development shall be occupied until the refuse bin storage area and recycling facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved drawing. These facilities shall be kept available for use in association with the development at all times.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate facilities that allow it to be serviced in a manner which would not adversely affect the free flow of traffic and highway safety and to ensure the sustainability of the development. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T5, DG1.

16. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and plans.

Informatives:

1. Before any development commences the applicant shall enter into a legal agreement with the Council under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to cover the construction of the highway improvement works in Switchback Road North.

2. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Berkshire Act 1986, Part II, Clause 9, which enables the Highway Authority to recover the costs of repairing damage to the footway or grass verge arising during building operations.
3. The attention of the applicant is drawn to Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980 which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic.







**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD  
PANEL UPDATE**

**Maidenhead Panel**

<b>Application No.:</b>	16/02416/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Brill House Mercia Road Maidenhead SL6 3DU
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of 7 x dwellings and building consisting of 5 x 1 bed flats and 1 x 6 bed HMO dwelling, following demolition of existing building.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Stritch - Housing Solutions
<b>Agent:</b>	Miss Katharine Allen - Katharine Allen Architects
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Cox Green Parish/Cox Green Ward
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> April Waterman on 01628 682905 or at <a href="mailto:april.waterman@rbwm.gov.uk">april.waterman@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Additional comments have been received from residents adjoining the site, as set out in the report below.

There is no change to the recommendation in the main report.

**2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**2.1 Comments from Interested Parties**

- 2.2 Additional comments received, summarised as:

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
<i>Having read your proposal for acceptance of the above planning permission we in 21 Mercia Road would like it stated in the report that the window we will have facing a brick wall is NOT in fact a bathroom so considerable loss of light and amenity will affect our outlook .</i>	It is considered that the degree of reduction in outlook from this side facing window would not warrant the refusal of the planning application. However, the proposed pair of houses could be repositioned further back onto their plots, although this would affect the extent of their rear gardens and their uniformity of building line on the street frontage.	No

**Comments from Consultees**

- 2.3 No further comments have been received.

**3. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED**

**3.1** No changes to the conditions set out in the Officer Report are recommended.





**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD  
PANEL UPDATE**

**Maidenhead Panel**

<b>Application No.:</b>	16/02814/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Land At BCA And Bordered By Main Buildings To North And Dellars Copse To South Burchetts Green Road Burchetts Green Maidenhead
<b>Proposal:</b>	Development of a care village comprising of a 50 bedroom care home, village care and wellbeing centre, 26 assisted living units, 82 independent living units, landscaping, parking and associated new access drive
<b>Applicant:</b>	Berkshire College Agriculture
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr D Bond
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Hurley Parish/Hurley And Walthams Ward

**If you have a question about this report, please contact:** Victoria Gibson on 01628 685693 or at [victoria.gibson@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.gibson@rbwm.gov.uk)

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The additional information submitted in regards to trees, ecology and drainage has not overcome the reasons for refusal as cited in the officer's report.
- 1.2 The 'Thames Valley Area Review' is still taking place and plans are being explored to secure the financial stability of the college. The loss of the college's independence and possible transference of title deeds for the estate are not material planning considerations in the determination of this application. Furthermore there is no evidence present to suggest that the educational use of the land would be impacted if this application was refused.
- 1.3 The Highway Officer has confirmed that a refuse vehicle would be able to adequately access and manoeuvre within the site.
- 1.4 The District Valuer (DVS) has reviewed their initial appraisal following discussions with the applicant's viability consultant who drew their attention to the fact that an error had been made regarding the CIL figure. This has now been rectified. The residual land value is now assessed as 8.217m. The developer is offering the college £7.250m which includes £1.6m towards the heritage assets. This gives a surplus of £967,000.

**The following changes to the recommendation are proposed**

**Reason 4 – remove reference to N6. (None of the trees on site are covered by a tree preservation order, however their importance as landscape features are acknowledged in the officers report)**

**Reason 5 – remove the reference to bats.**

**2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

## Viability Appraisal

- 2.1 The main area of disagreement between the applicant and DVS in their valuation reports regards the adopted values and this is summarised below.
- 2.2 In terms of values for the Assisted Living and Independent Living the applicant have used a flat rate average of £520 psf across all unit types. On consideration of evidence available to DVS it is their opinion that the £520 psf adopted may be a little low given the scheme and location as proposed. DVS have therefore adopted a slightly higher rate of £525 psf.
- 2.3 In regards to the 50 bed Care Home JRB have adopted a value of £4,999,951 based upon analysis of comparable sales (equates to some £100,000 per bed). Taking account of the location and after consideration of evidence available and the expert opinion of agents active in the market DVS have adopted a value for the proposed Care Home of some £7.5m (£150,000 per bed).
- 2.4 In their appraisal JRB have included Ground Rents of £510,000 (108 units at £250 pa capitalised at 5% less purchaser costs). DVS have seen comparable evidence of nearby similar properties and indeed the comparable schemes suggested by JRB which suggest that higher ground rents could easily be achieved. DVS have therefore assumed ground rents of £500 per unit. A capitalisation rate of 5% is reasonable and this brings the DVS ground rent value to £1,017,360 after deducting purchasers costs.

## Other Considerations

- 2.5 The agent has advanced the case that the weight attributed to the harm to the Green Belt should be reduced as "The council's acceptance of releasing land from the Green Belt to meet an identified and accepted level of housing need is a "material consideration" within the meaning of the Act (see *Kides* Court of Appeal case)." It is also important to note that the Council has presently only agreed to go out to consultation (Reg18) on the release of certain Green Belt sites. Should the Council accept that it will need to release land this does not have the effect of reducing harm.
- 2.7 The applicant has submitted a letter from the care provider confirming their willingness to offer work experience opportunities to students from the college. Whilst this is welcomed there is no evidence of a shortfall of work experience placements within the borough and no further detail has been provided to demonstrate how this would work.

## **Comments from Interested Parties**

- 2.8 Additional comments received, summarised as:

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Change to recommendation?</b>
<p><b>Burchetts Green Residents Association's Response to the Applicants/Bond Woolf's statements: their mistakes, errors and misleading information.</b></p> <p>Mr. Bond's (of Woolf Bond) email of 13 February. His claim that the site is "not that sensitive" and the land does "not perform any function" runs contrary to all known facts and the very reputable Historic England report and RBWM's independent report where Artemis Heritage says "it would represent a high level of harm to a Grade II park and garden and the setting of a Grade 1 listed building." In addition Historic England says in its report "the historic landscape is designated Grade II so this has national significance in its own right. .... The importance of the heritage asset is thus at the highest level."</p>	Noted	None

Bond says “the scale of the development is linked to its enabling essential works to preserve and enhance important heritage assets”. However as Historic England points out “if the scale of the (conservation work) has not been appropriately identified then the Council cannot be convinced that the funds raised will secure the future viability of the heritage asset.”

The key point of the justification for the application is that the college needs some money which is not a planning issue. The issue is whether the application satisfies VSC and does that outweigh the significant harm to the greenbelt. Moreover the application is being looked at by the applicant as some form of quantitative easing which must be dismissed.

Mr. Bond draws attention to the Sports Centre and describes the site of the proposed development as “degraded land”. Historic England does not accept this argument and says “the scale of the proposed development is many orders of magnitude greater than the sports hall. The damage to the landscape caused by the golf course and high rope facilities is minor and could easily be reversed. In summary the proposed development would represent a high level of harm to the setting of a heritage asset of high significance. It would cause major harm to a heritage asset. As such the proposed development represents very significant further harm and therefore harm to the heritage assets is high”.

The proposal has not adequately addressed the issues regarding bats, badgers or Great Crested Newts.

The proposal represents poor design.

Lastly Mr. Bond says the “scale of the proposed development is linked to its enabling function of securing the future of the college and enabling essential works to preserve and enhance important heritage assets”. Historic England says “enabling development that would secure the future of a significant place, but contravene other planning policy objective should be unacceptable unless it meets eight criteria, and failure to meet any one of which should result in refusal of the application” They go on to say “the current application fails in most if not all of these criteria: it will materially harm the heritage values; selling off a large part of the registered park will fragment the management of the place; the funds are being sought largely to resolve the problems of the present owner’s structural debt; there is little or no evidence that other sources of funding have been sought to secure the future of the heritage assets let alone exhausted. (There is ample evidence of numerous unsuccessful schemes to secure the future of the college, which is not the same thing.) Based on the NPPF and Historic England’s guidance this proposal fails to meet the minimum criteria for enabling development.”

Comments from Consultees

2.9

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
<p><u>Lead Local Flood Authority</u></p> <p>While the Flood Risk and Foul Drainage Assessment Addendum dated November 2016, prepared by WYG Engineering, outlines a surface water drainage scheme that would potentially be acceptable in principle, it acknowledges that the suitability of the final outfall (to the existing ditch to the south and / or the existing pond to the west) would need to be investigated.</p> <p>The Flood Risk and Foul Drainage Assessment Addendum also fails to provides sufficient detail to demonstrate provision of the required attenuation storage volumes and the practicality of the proposed surface water drainage scheme.</p> <p>The Flood Risk and Foul Drainage Assessment Addendum indicates that responsibility for the maintenance of the surface water drainage system will lie with the future owner of the site, but no details of the planned maintenance and inspection regime are provided.</p> <p>It is therefore recommend that the application is <b>not</b> approved until further information is submitted.</p> <p><u>Additional Considerations</u></p> <p>The outfall of the proposed foul sewer system serving the proposed development is also unclear, and reference is made to a pumping station / rising main discharging to the Thames Water sewer system or a package sewage treatment plant. I also note that Thames Water has indicated that the main sewer network in the area is unlikely to be able to support anticipated demand from the proposed development and has indicated that a developer funded impact study will be required.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><u>Ecology</u></p> <p><i>Habitats and Biodiversity Enhancements</i></p> <p>The entire site is listed as the priority habitat wood-pasture and parkland. Wood-pasture and parkland are mosaic habitats valued for their trees, especially veteran and ancient trees, and the plants and animals that they support. Grazing animals are fundamental to the existence of this habitat. Wood pasture and parkland is listed in Section 41 as being a Habitat of Principal Importance for the Conservation of Biodiversity in England as required under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.</p> <p>The applicant's ecologist has provided more detail regarding</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>None</p>



the loss of the priority habitat and includes information to mitigate for this loss including sympathetic management of the surrounding habitats, native species planting, installation of bird and bat boxes and log piles within the new development. However, it is still unclear from the landscape plan how much of the surrounding habitat (which is also priority habitat) is to be managed and whether this will result in a net gain in biodiversity and priority habitat in line with National Policy. As the development will result in the loss of priority habitat, cause a net loss in biodiversity and will require mitigation and compensation as a result, it is recommended that the DEFRA offsetting metric or similar is used in order to calculate the net loss/ gain of habitat following development. **Details of the metric will need to be provided to the LPA prior to the determination of this planning application in order for the LPA to ensure the scheme provides a net gain in biodiversity following development in line with National Policy.**

#### *Bats*

All buildings and trees on site were assessed for their potential to support roosting bats. The buildings were all considered unsuitable to support bats due to their construction and therefore no further survey is deemed necessary. Four trees on site (Trees TN2-5 within the ecology survey) were recorded as having some potential roosting features for bats. The ecologists report states that the trees with bat potential are to be retained. Further survey of this tree has been undertaken and recorded cracks and holes below the bark that were suitable to support roosting bats. The applicant's ecologist has stated that these features can be retained and the crown reduced without causing a destruction or disturbance to bats. This is considered acceptable and could be controlled by condition.

#### *Great Crested Newts*

Four ponds were subject to a Habitat Suitability Index survey and all were assessed to have a poor suitability to support great crested newts. The closest ponds are within approximately 120m and 200m of the proposed development and are not separated from the proposed development by any barriers. There are areas of grassland, woodland and scrub within 500m of the ponds, some of which is within the proposed development which would provide suitable hibernating, foraging and refuge habitat for great crested newts. Great crested newts could be using the proposed development area for foraging and dispersal, if present. In addition, there is a record of great crested newt presence on the National Biodiversity Network Gateway website within a 1km grid square immediately north of the proposed development, increasing the likelihood of great crested newts being within the local area.

Great crested newts receive full legal protection under the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). This makes it illegal to deliberately injure, kill, capture or disturb a

<p>great crested newt, or to damage, destroy or obstruct any places used for shelter and protection.</p> <p>Natural England's standing advice states" <i>Survey for great crested newts if</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>there's a pond within 500 metres of the development, even if it only holds water some of the year;</i></li> <li>• <i>the development site includes refuges (e.g. log piles or rubble), grassland, scrub, woodland or hedgerows".</i></li> </ul> <p>The applicant's ecologist has provided a method statement for great crested newts in order to provide avoidance methods during development to ensure newts are not killed or injured during development. However, without further survey on the ponds within 250m of the proposed development site, the population of great crested newts close to the site cannot be established and therefore how important the site may be for great crested newt during their terrestrial phase.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that further survey is undertaken on the four ponds already assessed prior to the determination of this application, in order to establish the presence/ absence of great crested newts from the waterbodies.</b> Appropriate mitigation strategies and a licence may be required following the further surveys and these should also be provided to the local planning authority.</p> <p><u>Additional Considerations</u></p> <p>There is a barn owl box which is regularly used by barn owls approximately 70m from the edge of the proposed development site. Barn owls, their eggs and active nests are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. In addition, barn owls are Schedule 1 birds meaning that it is also an offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb barn owls at an active nest site with eggs or young or before eggs are laid, or to disturb the dependent young.</p> <p>The applicant's ecologist has recommended that a second barn owl box is installed further away from the development in order to give the barn owl a choice of nest sites and ensure they are not disturbed during development. However, the location chosen is along a public right of way and therefore inappropriate for barn owl boxes due to the possible disturbance. It is recommended that another location for the barn owl box is chosen and provided to the LPA for approval.</p>		
<p><u>Trees</u></p> <p>It is only where the surfacing is unavoidable that permanent hard surfacing within the RPA may be acceptable and then if determined that it is achievable without significant damage to the trees. Some minor incursions into RPA's of trees which</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>None</p>

are lower value, such as 'C' category trees may be acceptable, but trees affected by this scheme include 'A' and 'B' category. The proposal also exceeds the BS5837 maximum 20% incursion of permanent hard surfacing within an RPA, this affects the mature Lime no. 89, 142 and a tree in group 115. The future viability of these trees cannot be assured and it should be assumed they will be lost as a result. There are also localised narrowings of the proposed driveway with two bends. It is likely there will be future pressure to widen these narrowings out to the normal width to provide a more easy ride along the driveway. Two way traffic?

The two Lime trees, planted to comply with a condition, are in strategic positions in order to maintain the integrity of the avenue. The new driveway cuts through the avenue and prevents planting that would restore the original planting scheme of the listed historic park and garden.

The existing parking next to the avenues is short term, mainly for users of the sports centre or other college facilities. The Care Home is residential and bays may be allocated and vehicles parked 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It is therefore likely that those owners will be concerned about honey dew and debris fall which can build up over time. Tilia platyphyllos (Large-leaved lime) are susceptible to aphid infestation. There are no tree health implications and aphids provide a source of food for a number of bird species. The only Lime tree I'm aware of that's not prone to aphids is the Tilia euchlora (Caucasian lime). Caucasian lime would be inappropriate as it is not the species of Lime which is a component of the existing avenues.

Oak no. 27 is as the tree report describes, an 'established tree'. It does make a contribution and it would be premature to remove it. There are a number of other mature Oaks in the avenue and are integral to it.

The proposed landscaping scheme does not compensate for the loss of landscaping around the sports hall.

Shading is an issue which can only effectively be overcome by changing the layout. Predicted conflict, between trees and future owners/occupiers of developed sites, need to be resolved at the design stage prior to planning permission being granted.

It needs to be demonstrated there will be no harm to existing trees, due to the installation of utilities and drainage runs. Details of utilities/drainage will need to be submitted prior to the determination of the application in order to assess impact.

The integrity of the avenues will be depleted owing to the three new access points. Adding to the existing access points will not improve the qualities of the historic park and garden.

There are minor impacts regarding the introduction of the

<p>new bus lane, some of the soft verge will be removed, along with a small group of young 'C' category Ash and one early mature individual Ash of low 'C' grade. This part of the scheme will reduce the greenery in this area, which is undesirable. However, if this was the only impact of the proposal it would not meet with an objection.</p>		
--	--	--





**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD  
PANEL UPDATE**

**Maidenhead Panel**

<b>Application No.:</b>	17/00142/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Newlands Girls School Farm Road Maidenhead SL6 5JB
<b>Proposal:</b>	Two storey extension to existing science block with associated alterations and glazed roof over existing courtyard adjacent to the library.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Ms Pfeiffer - RBWM
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Abraham Laker - Ingleton Wood LLP
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Maidenhead Unparished/Pinkneys Green Ward
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> April Waterman on 01628 682905 or at <a href="mailto:april.waterman@rbwm.gov.uk">april.waterman@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

**1. SUMMARY**

1.1 Amended plans have been submitted which show minor alterations to the scheme: these do not affect the extent of development or the scope and intensity of its impact on the environment. The comments received from the Tree team does not raise any further matters than those already covered in the agenda report.

1.2

**There is no change to the recommendation in the main report.**

**2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

The submitted changes comprise the laying out of an enlarged area of paving outside the external door to the science block to accommodate a desire line pathway and to surface a “stacking” area for people waiting to go into the building. This triangular area is shown on the ground floor plan for the science block classroom extension. Provided that the paving used is porous and appropriately bedded (details of which are already required by recommended condition, and guidance is given in the informatives), then the increased area of hard surfacing in this location would not have a damaging impact on the retained tree close to this part of the development.

Other changes comprise widening of doors leading off the new covered courtyard, and the omission of a ramp (shown on the originally submitted drawings) on the proposed first floor corridor and its replacement with steps to accommodate the level change between the first floor levels of the two and three storey blocks on either side of the new science block classrooms. There is currently no access for wheel-chair users to any of the upper floors of the school, and the omission of this ramp (which would not have met the recommended gradient for wheelchair use anyway) does not, therefore, affect the accessibility of the building as a whole.

**Comments from Interested Parties**

2.2 No additional comments have been received.

## Comments from Consultees

### 2.3

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
<p>RBWM Arboricultural Officer</p> <p>The site contains a large number of mature trees. The proposed development will require the removal of a small apple tree growing in an internal courtyard. The apple is in poor condition with die back throughout the canopy. The loss of this tree will not have a significant impact of the visual amenity of the area.</p> <p>The two story extension is located close to three trees that are shown to be retained (T48, T49 and T69) all the trees will require protection to ensure that they are retained in a safe condition. There are no objections to the application. If this application is approved I would recommend a suitable condition to ensure suitable tree protection.</p>	<p>In anticipation of these comments, the recommended conditions and informatives already include the protection of the retained trees, and safeguards for the type of materials to be used in the hard landscaping of the scheme.</p>	<p>No</p>







**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD  
PANEL UPDATE**

**Maidenhead Panel**

<b>Application No.:</b>	17/00357/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Herons Court Terrys Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9RR
<b>Proposal:</b>	Construction of a new three storey dwelling following the demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Ms Scott
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Paul Norman
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Cookham Parish/Bisham And Cookham Ward
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Antonia Liu on 01628 796697 or at antonia.liu@rbwm.gov.uk	

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Comments have been received from Berkshire Archaeology, Cookham Parish Council, the Ecology Officer, and Environmental Protection. 2 late representations from local residents have also been received.
- 1.2 For clarity a table has been produced setting out existing footprint and volume for the existing house, outbuildings, the refused scheme under 16/01236/FULL and the proposed house.

**There is no change to the recommendation in the main report.**

**2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Additional Consultation Responses

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
<u>Berkshire Archaeology</u>  Berkshire Archaeology's Historic Environment Record (HER) records a Saxon (AD 400 – 900) inhumation cemetery 150m to the north of Herons Court and evidence for Saxon as well as prehistoric remains were recorded during archaeological investigations to the south of Herons Court in 2008.  If permitted, the construction of the new house could potentially impact on buried archaeological remains. There is no objection in principle, however, subject to condition to	No objections to the proposal are raised in relation to archaeology. If recommended for approval an implementation of a programme of archaeological works with a written scheme of investigation could have been secured by condition.	No

<p>secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological works, (which may comprise one or more phases of work) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority to accord with paragraph 141 of the NPPF.</p>		
<p><u>Cookham Parish Council</u> No objection</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p><u>Ecology</u></p> <p><u>Bats</u> The submitted ecology appraisal / surveys recorded bat droppings were found on site and one common pipistrelle was recorded emerging from the main house. All species of bat are protected and it is illegal to deliberately or recklessly kill, injure, capture or disturb bats, obstruct access to bat roosts or damage or destroy bat roosts, whether occupied or not. The applicant has provided a mitigation and compensation plan with appropriate measures to the loss of roosts and removal of bat roosting features.</p> <p>Should the LPA be minded to approval the proposal, the submitted mitigation measures should be secured by condition. The surveys are now approximately 20 months old. If the proposed development does not commence by the end of 2017, it is recommended that additional surveys are undertaken in order to ensure that the roost status within the buildings has not changed and that bats have not begun roosting within the other buildings or trees.</p> <p><u>Reptiles</u> The submitted ecology appraisal / surveys recorded the presence of slow worms, which is a protected species. All native species of reptile are protected from killing and injury. The applicant's ecologist has recommended that a precautionary approach to vegetation clearance is followed in order to prevent the killing or injury of reptiles during development. Should the LPA be minded to grant planning permission the submitted mitigation measures should be secured by condition.</p> <p><u>Birds</u> The trees, hedgerows and scrub were recorded as having the potential to support breeding birds. Breeding birds, their eggs and active nests are protected. Should the LPA be minded to grant planning permission a</p>	<p>No objections to the proposal are raised in relation to ecology. If recommended for approval appropriate mitigation measures relating to bats and reptiles could have been secured by condition. Informatives could also have been included related to breeding birds and biodiversity.</p>	<p>No.</p>

<p>condition is recommended that vegetation removal should be undertaken outside the bird breeding season (March to August inclusive) or else vegetation clearance should be undertaken immediately subsequent to checks by an experienced ecologist.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity</u> To accord with paragraph 109 of the NPPF and Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 it is recommended that detailed ecological enhancement proposals are provided to the local planning authority for their approval. Enhancements suitable for this site include native species planting, installation.</p>		
<p><u>Environmental Protection</u> No objection subject to informatives on dust control, smoke control and hours of construction.</p>	If the application had been recommended for approval, informatives would have been added.	No.

Additional Comments from Local Residents

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
Proposal should be approved	Noted	No.
It would improve Cookham	Noted.	No.

Comparison Table

	Approximate Floor Area (square metres)	Approximate Volume (cubic metres)
<b>Existing House</b>	337.7	1093
<b>Outbuildings to be demolished</b>	392.9	1223
<b>Refused Scheme, ref: 16/01236/FUL (excluding basement)</b>	1113.1	3365
<b>Proposed House</b>	973.6	3168

