



# WINDSOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 5TH DECEMBER, 2018

At 7.00 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - GUILDHALL WINDSOR,

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

### PART I

| <u>ITEM</u> | <u>SUBJECT</u>             | <u>PAGE<br/>NO</u> |
|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 4.          | <u>PANEL UPDATE REPORT</u> | 3 - 8              |

This page is intentionally left blank

8<sup>th</sup> December 2018

Windsor Urban Panel

Application No.: **18/02033/FULL**

Location: **College  
Eton College  
Slough Road  
Eton  
Windsor  
SL4 6DJ**

Proposal: **Construction of a new school sports centre comprising a 9-court sports hall capable of offering multipurpose indoor sports, x8 squash courts, general fitness spaces, an athlete development programme space including a sprint track, dojo space, physio spaces, classrooms and offices for PE staff and students, a triple height climbing wall space, rifle range and associated plant, storage, WC and changing facilities. Construction of a new Eton Sports and Aquatics Centre comprising a 25m pool with movable floor suitable for swimming, water polo and teaching use, a 4-court sports hall capable of offering multi-purpose indoor sports and exam use, changing facilities, a spectator area at first floor level which also provides a meet-up space and refreshment point for post-match use, associated plant and storage provision, associated car and coach parking and new access track off Slough Road. Refurbishment and extension of the rackets courts building to provide a new clubroom, viewing gallery and extended changing facilities. Refurbishment of the jacks building to provide a fives clubroom and changing facilities. Refurbishment of fives courts, a new printmaking pavilion to house historic printing presses adjacent to Caxton Schools, following demolition of the existing buildings comprising the gymnasium, indoor swimming pool and the outdoor swimming pool complex (Amended Plans)**

Applicant:

Agent: **Mr John Bowles**

Parish/Ward: **Eton Town Council/Eton With Windsor Castle Ward**

If you have a question about this report, please contact: **Sian Saadeh on 01682 796164 or at [sian.saadeh@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:sian.saadeh@rbwm.gov.uk)**

## 1. SUMMARY

Additional representations have been submitted in support of the application, including from the applicant and agent. A fuller summary of the advice from Historic England is also included below. The reason for refusal is amended to correct an error in the report and incorrect policy reference.

**It is recommended the Panel refuses planning permission for the amended reason set out in Section 3 below:**

## 2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

### 2.1 Correction to the report

The summary reason for refusal included in the box at the end of Section 1 of the main report includes an incorrect reference to "*other harm identified in relation to heritage assets*". The full

reason for refusal also includes an incorrect policy reference. The reason for refusal should be as follows:

*The proposed development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. The proposed development would result in a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and would result in encroachment into the countryside. The Very Special Circumstances put forward are not considered to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness. The proposal fails to comply with paragraphs 143-146 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal also fails to comply with Policies GB1 and GB2 of the Adopted Local Plan, and with emerging Policy SP5 of the Borough Local Plan Submission Version.*

## 2.2 Comments from Interested Parties

Additional comments received in support, summarised as:

| Comment   | Officer response   | Change to recommendation? |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| Windsor School Sport Partnership in support of application as would be of benefit to majority of their members who need to ensure pupils are meeting Key Stage 2 national curriculum requirements for swimming; members would be interested in use of facilities  | Benefit to local schools is acknowledged and has been included in the balancing exercise undertaken in reaching the recommendation | No                        |
| Headmistress of Eton Porny First School in support of application as have not been able to use existing pool at Eton as not shallow enough for beginners; swimming has been financially impossible as requires coach transport and time away from classroom; very limited provision presently; proposal would allow school to offer swimming to children from Year1 to Year 4 without loss of curriculum time and less cost | Benefit to local schools is acknowledged and has been included in the balancing exercise undertaken in reaching the recommendation | No                        |

Additional comments received from applicant and agent, summarised as:

| Comment  | Officer response   | Change to recommendation? |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| <p>Agent has raised a number of points in relation to the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Consider great weight should be given to the positive impact on the conservation area which would arise from the proposed development, as referenced by Historic England</li> <li>☐ ESAC proposal would provide benefit to local schools in meeting Key Stage 1 and 2 National Curriculum requirements and improve access to sports facilities for primary school aged children.</li> <li>☐ Public consultation by the College received support from over 60 local schools and 163 local residents and businesses as set out in application's Statement of Community Involvement</li> </ul> | The points raised have been considered in the assessment and balancing exercise undertaken in reaching the recommendation. | No                        |
| Provost of Eton College has written to the Panel to set out wider benefits of the proposal and details of the proposal. The letter also draws attention to level of public support and recent  | The points raised have been considered in the assessment and balancing exercise  | No                        |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Government "Sporting Future" strategy which encourages independent schools to share facilities with other local schools in the state sector. The College is offering a firm commitment to community use of the ESAC. | undertaken in reaching the recommendation. |  |
|--|--|--|

### 2.3 Comments from Consultees

The response from Historic England was registered against a related listed building consent but is also relevant to the current application.

| Comment  | Officer response  | Change to recommendation? |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| Historic England is supportive of the proposals as an opportunity to upgrade the facilities whilst improving the character of Common Lane and Slough Road; it is a very good scheme which creates a handsome new building (SSC) whilst enhancing the character of the Eton Conservation Area; new swimming pool building (ESAC) would not be visible from the wider landscape and not adversely affect heritage assets; the proposal would make a positive contribution to the conservation area; the new design is outstanding and therefore great weight should be given to it | The comments of Historic England are noted. The high quality of the proposed design has been considered as part of the Very Special Circumstances case in favour of the application. It remains the view of Officers that this would not outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt. | No                        |

### 3. RECOMMENDED REASON IF PERMISSION IS REFUSED

- 3.1 **The proposed development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. The proposed development would result in a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and would result in encroachment into the countryside. The Very Special Circumstances put forward are not considered to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness. The proposal fails to comply with paragraphs 143-146 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal also fails to comply with Policies GB1 and GB2 of the Adopted Local Plan, and with emerging Policy SP5 of the Borough Local Plan Submission Version.**



ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD  
PANEL UPDATE

Windsor Urban Panel

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Application No.:  | <b>18/02637/OUT</b>  |
| Location:   | <b>9 - 11 Imperial Road<br/>Windsor</b>  |
| Proposal:   | <b>Outline application for access, layout and scale to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the construction of 2 x two bedroom dwellings, 14 apartments, associated parking and new vehicular access following the demolition of 9-11 Imperial Road.</b> |
| Applicant:  | <b>Mr Collett</b>  |
| Agent:  | <b>Not Applicable</b>  |
| Parish/Ward:  | <b>Windsor Unparished/Clewer East Ward</b>   |
| If you have a question about this report, please contact: <b>Sian Saadeh on 01682 796164 or at <a href="mailto:sian.saadeh@rbwm.gov.uk">sian.saadeh@rbwm.gov.uk</a></b> |  |

**1. SUMMARY**

The applicant has submitted a proposed affordable housing contribution of 1 shared ownership unit to be provided on site.

**It is recommended the Panel delegates to the Head of Planning in line with the recommendation set out in section 1 of the report**

**2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**2.1 Applicant's Proposal**

The applicant has submitted a letter setting out their position in relation to affordable housing to be provided on the site. Given the NPPF requirement for affordable forms of home ownership, the applicant is proposing to provide a 1-bed shared ownership unit on site. The unit would be transferred to an RSL to manage. The NPPF requirement for 10% of units to be for affordable home ownership would result in the site having to provide 1.4 units. The applicant has rounded this down to 1 unit. The applicant considers that a 1 bed unit is the most appropriate as they consider that it is in line with the evidence set out in the Berkshire SHMA.

**2.2 Officers' Response**

Officers welcome the applicant's agreement to provide on-site affordable housing. The proposed form of affordable home ownership is in line with the NPPF requirements. Officers are still considering the detail of the offer, in particular if a 1 bedroom unit is the most appropriate size of unit. Officers therefore recommend that the Panel resolve in line with the recommendation set out in the main report to allow the Head of Planning to conclude negotiations.

