

# MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 24TH OCTOBER, 2018

At 7.00 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL,

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

### PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
4.	<p><u>PLANNING APPLICATIONS (DECISION)</u></p> <p>To consider the Head of Planning's 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 at <a href="http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/pam/search.jsp">http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/pam/search.jsp</a>.</p>	3 - 8

This page is intentionally left blank

## ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

### Maidenhead Panel

<b>Application No.:</b>	18/02105/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Land To The South of Stafferton Way And East of Vicus Way Maidenhead
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of five storey split-deck multi-storey car park with access and associated landscaping following removal of existing slab and hardstanding (Regulation 3 application)
<b>Applicant:</b>	The Royal Borough of Windsor And Maidenhead
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Matthew Blythin
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Maidenhead Unparished/Oldfield Ward
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Claire Pugh on 01628 685739 or at <a href="mailto:claire.pugh@rbwm.gov.uk">claire.pugh@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

#### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Highway Authority has requested that a micro-simulation model is undertaken to assess the junctions along Stafferton Way. This information is considered necessary to ascertain the impacts of the proposed development on the Highway Network. The applicant has been asked to undertake this work.
- 1.2 A tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement has been submitted. The Council's tree officer has been consulted on this.
- 1.3 Further information on the proposed drainage strategy has been submitted by the applicant. The Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted on this information. The applicant is required to provide an updated Flood Risk Assessment.
- 1.4 Comments from Thames Valley Police have been received. They seek clarification and further information on the security measures to be implemented in order to help prevent crime. The applicant has provided a response to this. It is recommended that Thames Valley Police are further consulted on the response from the applicant, however, it is considered such measures could be secured through the imposition of planning conditions. It is recommended that the drafting of the conditions is deferred back to the Head of Planning.
- 1.5 The applicant has submitted a report relating to contamination. Environmental Protection and the Environment Agency have been consulted on this information, and it is recommended that if the consultees are satisfied with the information that Panel gives authority to the Head of Planning to amend the wording of recommended conditions 3 and 4 to reflect this.
- 1.6 Comments are awaited from Environmental Protection in respect of the Noise Assessment.

**The recommendation in the main report is changed to:**

**It is recommended that the Panel authorises the Head of Planning**

**1 To grant permission, subject to the resolution of the following matters:**

**i) The receipt of Sustainable Drainage Scheme**

**ii) Highways**

**iii) The receipt of an updated Flood Risk Assessment**

**iv) Confirmation from Environmental Protection that the Noise Assessment is acceptable.**

**v) Trees**

**vi) Contamination**

**vii) Planning conditions being resolved, subject to, the satisfaction of the Head of Planning**

**or**

**2. To refuse planning permission if it is deemed that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on Highways and/or a satisfactory Drainage Scheme has not been received.**

## **2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

### Trees

- 2.1** A Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement has been submitted. The Council's tree officer has been consulted. Provided that they are satisfied with the information submitted, it is recommended that a condition is imposed to ensure that the development is undertaken in accordance with these details. It is recommended that this matter is deferred back to the Head of Planning to resolve.

### Sustainable Drainage and Flood Risk

- 2.2** Further information has provided by the applicant in response to queries raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted on this, and it is recommended that this matter is deferred back to the Head of Planning to resolve.

### Flood Risk

- 2.3** The agent has confirmed that the maximum flood level expected is 23.8m, and that the level of 25.8 as stated in the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is a typographical error. It is understood that the car park itself would not be subject to flooding in a 1 in 100 year, plus climate change event, but that it could flood in more extreme flood event. The agent has been advised that an updated Flood Risk Assessment will need to be submitted to, so that the flood risk associated with the development is clear. It is recommended that this matter is deferred back to the Head of Planning.

### Air Quality

- 2.4** Paragraph 6.29 of the Panel report should have read as:

'An Air Quality Assessment (dated 15.08.2018) has been submitted in support of this planning application. The assessment concludes that the overall operational air quality impacts of the development are judged to be not significant. The approach, methodology and conclusion of the air quality assessment are considered to be acceptable.'

### Accessibility for disabled users of the car park

- 2.5** The agent advises that the Redrow scheme (works to Vicus Way and mini-roundabout) does not require or provide the zebra crossing on Vicus Way that this application will provide. They advise that this crossing will provide a route from the proposed car park to the town centre and station that negates the need to navigate Vicus Way or the Lidl entrance in an uncontrolled way and thus secures a safe route for users.

## Comments from Consultees

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
<p>Since the writing of the main report, <b>Thames Valley Police</b> have commented on the application, and advise that they consider the design and layout to be problematic in crime prevention design terms. Their Observations are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the car park is to be a 24/7 facility, the design of the new car park must incorporate appropriate measures as to deter ASB and criminal activity. They query if there will be a security / Customer Service office / or on site patrols.</li> <li>• Careful consideration must be given to the parking deck surface treatment. Where local factors dictate, it is advised that new parking facilities should be treated with anti-graffiti coatings, textured surface finishes that limit the effect of vandalism in addition</li> <li>• Payment machines/meters should be positioned in the busiest areas of the parking facility and be well illuminated and overlooked by CCTV. Their location should be clearly visible or signed and they should be emptied regularly.</li> <li>• From the plans provided I cannot determine lighting levels or position of lighting within the car park. Lighting can have a dramatic effect in reducing crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. I have concerns that the application does not seem to provide any details as to how the parking areas and any other non-adopted public realm of the car park. It is requested that the car park be lit to BS5489 standard.</li> <li>• Advises that formal surveillance (CCTV) be incorporated into the development, the system should be capable of monitoring all vehicle and pedestrian entrances; circulatory movement of traffic around the parking areas; pay points; any internal or external secluded areas; and stairwell</li> </ul>	<p>The applicant has provided the following response:</p> <p><i>Agree careful detail needs to be taken in the layout of the car park to discourage ASB within the car park by motor vehicles. This should include speed humps and possible build outs.</i></p> <p><i>P&amp;D machines will be positioned on the entry/exit points from floors and need to be covered by CCTV. P&amp;D machines will be emptied a minimum of 3 times per week.</i></p> <p><i>A minimum amount of CCTV will be required for the car park decks to include coverage of P&amp;D machines.</i></p>	<p>No, however, planning conditions would be required.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stairwells due to their lack of natural surveillance can quickly become a location where individuals can gather unobserved these areas are prone to ASB, graffiti, litter. Where possible the stairwells should include open balustrades allowing good visibility on approach to and from landing areas. Stairwell and landing openings to the outside face of car park areas should be glazed for enhanced natural light and surveillance. Where this is not possible, vandal resistant mirrors installed at stair turns can assist with natural surveillance; however I would recommend that CCTV, should be installed within the stairwells</li> </ul>	<p><i>Ideally where possible stairwells should be open to deter ASB and covered by CCTV</i></p>	
--	---	--



This page is intentionally left blank