

# MAIDENHEAD AREA DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY, 2020

At 7.00 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

### PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
4.	<p><u>19/01140/FULL - LAND TO THE SOUTH OF 18 TO 20 AND OPEN SPACE TO THE SOUTH OF RAY MILL ROAD EAST MAIDENHEAD</u></p> <p><i>Proposal: Construction of 17 x one bedroom dwellings; 18 x two bedroom dwellings; 17 x three bedroom dwellings; 28 x four bedroom dwellings, bin storage associated landscaping and parking, new access from Ray Mill Road East and public open space.</i></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> REFUSE</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Cala Homes (Thames) Ltd And RBWM</p> <p><b>Member Call-In:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Expiry Date:</b> 21 November 2019</p>	3 - 8

This page is intentionally left blank

## ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

### Maidenhead Panel

<b>Application No.:</b>	19/01140/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Land To The South of 18 To 20 And Open Space To The South of Ray Mill Road East Maidenhead
<b>Proposal:</b>	Construction of 17 x one bedroom dwellings; 18 x two bedroom dwellings; 17 x three bedroom dwellings; 28 x four bedroom dwellings, bin storage associated landscaping and parking, new access from Ray Mill Road East and public open space.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Cala Homes (Thames) Ltd And RBWM
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Douglas Bond
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Maidenhead Unparished/Maidenhead Riverside Ward

**If you have a question about this report, please contact:** Claire Pugh on 01628 685739 or at [claire.pugh@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:claire.pugh@rbwm.gov.uk)

#### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Environmental Protection have commented in relation to the proposed sewage pumping station located to the northern part of the site. They advise that given that the foul drainage and pumping station will need to meet building control requirements, they do not consider the location and odour from the proposed pumping station would be a reason to refuse the application on planning grounds.
- 1.2 Highways advise that without surveys of the car park used by the family centre, it is not known whether the loss of this car park would affect parking or the safe free flow of traffic in the area. The applicant has indicated that this car park is not well used, and that they would be willing to undertake surveys of this car park, which is acknowledged. However, at the time of making the recommendation, the surveys have not been undertaken. As such, without this information to inform an assessment, it is not possible to conclude if the loss of this car park area would have an acceptable impact upon parking and in turn highway safety in the local area. On this basis, a reason for refusal is recommended in section 3 of this Update report.
- 1.3 Cala Homes (joint applicant) has submitted a letter outlining the benefits of the scheme, and their views on flood risk. The points made in this letter do not affect the planning officer assessment.

**It is recommended that the Panel REFUSES planning permission with the reasons listed in Section 13 of the main report with the additional reason in section 3 below**

#### 2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 2.1 Cala Homes (joint applicant) has submitted a letter outlining the benefits of the scheme, which in summary are:
  - The provision of 80 new homes
  - 47.5% provision of affordable homes
  - Retention and enhancement of the open space

- Biodiversity enhancements
- Provision of electric charging points
- S106 contribution to improved cycling links and the ongoing management of the open space
- Community Infrastructure Levy payment

2.2 This letter sets out that the new EA flood model was published recently and has not been subject to independent scrutiny. The letter sets out that in a 1 in 100 year flood event the floor levels of the dwellings will be raised above the predicted flood level. It is also set out that due to the characteristics of the Thames, there will be sufficient warning time for an extreme flood event.

2.3 Cala Homes set out that they are fully committed to adopting a site wide evacuation plan, which can be secured through a legal agreement. They also explain that they are committed to fully supporting ongoing management of the on-site flood mitigation measures, which they advise can be secured through a legal agreement. They reiterate that the Sequential Test is passed.

**Officer response:** The benefits of the scheme, and the concerns over flood risk are addressed within the officer report.

2.4 There is a concern about the loss of the existing car park used by the family centre on Ray Mill Road East. It is understood from the applicant that this car park is not well used. However, without surveys of the use of this car park, officers cannot be certain that this is the case. As such, without this information, it is not known what impact this displaced car parking would have on the surrounding highway network. The applicant has indicated that they are willing to undertake surveys of the car park to evidence its use. In addition, they advise that if the family centre has not been relocated by the time planning permission has been secured, then off street parking will be created to the front of the two properties with access from Ray Mill Road East, and if it is necessary in the medium term they may look to create parking to the rear of 16 Ray Mill Road East, which is in the Council's ownership. This is acknowledged, however, the change of use of land at 16 Ray Mill Road East would require planning permission, and until the surveys are undertaken, it is not possible to determine whether alternative parking arrangements would be acceptable. In the absence of such surveys, the impact of the loss of this car park is not known, as such an additional reason for refusal is recommended at Section 3 of this update report.

### Comments from Consultees

2.5

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
<b>Highways Authority</b> have provided a final set of comments. Within these comments, they raise the need for a parking survey of the car park belonging to the family centre. They recommend refusal without a parking survey.	Noted.	Yes, an additional reason for refusal is recommended.
<b>Environmental Protection</b> comments that:  The developer has advised the pumping station will not be adopted by (transferred to) Thames Water, in part because there is inadequate space for the parking of vehicles to meet Thames Water's standard. The pumping station will remain the responsibility of the residents. Historically this has been a problematic arrangement. Maintenance has not always been	Noted. Given the comments from Environmental Protection, the location of the pumping station is considered to have an acceptable impact on residential amenity.	No

adequate causing the pumping stations to fail, leading to flooding with sewage and odours. Environmental Protection strongly recommends that the pumping station is built to Thames Water's standard and is adopted by them. They still have a query about where the residents' contractor vehicle will park to service the pumping station. However, as the foul drainage and pumping station will have to meet building control requirements, it is not considered this would constitute a reason for refusal.		
--	--	--

### 3. RECOMMENDED REASONS FOR REFUSAL IF PERMISSION IS NOT GRANTED

- 3.1 Without a parking survey of the existing car park associated with the family centre on Ray Mill Road East, it is not known what impact the loss of this car parking area would have on parking or the safe free flow of traffic in the area. The scheme therefore fails to accord with Policies P4 and T5 of the Adopted Local Plan, and with paragraph 108 of the NPPF.



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

**Maidenhead Panel**

<b>Application No.:</b>	19/03444/OUT
<b>Location:</b>	Poundstretcher 31 - 33 High Street Maidenhead SL6 1JG
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline application for access, appearance, layout and scale to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the part conversion of first floor and new second and third floors to create 10 No. flats with associated works to ground floor.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Howells
<b>Agent:</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Maidenhead Unparished/St Marys
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Antonia Liu on 01628 796034 or at antonia.liu@rbwm.gov.uk	

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Comments have been received from the Council's Arboriculture Officer.

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

**2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

- 2.1 The Council's Arboriculture Officer had reviewed additional information on drainage and utilities.

**Comments from Consultees**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer response</b>	<b>Change to recommendation?</b>
Arboriculture Officer – The Drainage and Utilities Statement shows that foul water, gas, electric, telecommunications and potable water will connect to the development site some distance from the highway trees on Park Street. However, no information has been provided from the relevant utility companies that they support these connection points, or any upgrade of the utilities that may require connection points which could potentially compromise the highway trees.  Should the above be adequately addressed, full details will be required on submission of reserved matters.  A construction management plan will also need to be submitted to show the trees will not be	Had the scheme been found acceptable in all other respects, it is considered that a suitably worded condition could have been devised to secure details of services and utilities that would ensure the root protection areas of the trees are not transgressed, and a condition to secure necessary tree protection.	No.

affected by or within any working area etc required for the development.		
---	--	--