

MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 2022

At 7.00 pm

In the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD, AND ON [RBWM YOUTUBE](#)

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
6.	<p><u>22/01207/OUT - OAKLEY GREEN MUSHROOM FARM OAKLEY GREEN ROAD OAKLEY GREEN WINDSOR SL4 5UL</u></p> <p>Proposal: Outline application for Access, Layout and Scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the demolition of storage buildings (Class B8) and erection of 29 dwellings, together with associated access, parking and provision of amenity space.</p> <p>Recommendation: REFUSE</p> <p>Applicant: Mr East</p> <p>Member Call-In: N/A</p> <p>Expiry Date: 22 August 2022</p>	3 - 8

This page is intentionally left blank

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

Maidenhead Panel

Application No.:	22/01207/OUT
Location:	Oakley Green Mushroom Farm Oakley Green Road Oakley Green Windsor SL4 5UL
Proposal:	Outline application for Access, Layout and Scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the demolition of storage buildings (Class B8) and erection of 29 dwellings, together with associated access, parking and provision of amenity space.
Applicant:	Mr East
Agent:	Mr Douglas Bond
Parish/Ward:	Bray Parish/Bray

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Vivienne McDowell on 01628 796578 or at vivienne.mcdowell@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Since the main report was written comments have been received from the Council's Housing Enabling Officer and the Lead Local Flood Authority. The applicant has submitted a revised Tree Report and plan. A letter of support has been received.

There is no change to the recommendation in the main report. The recommendation is that planning permission be refused for the reasons given in the main report.

For clarity the wording of the reason for refusal No 5 (re: Affordable housing provision) is to be amended – see para. 2.5 below.

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Affordable Housing

- 2.1 To clarify, the amended application form states that the whole proposal is for:

1-bed x 4
2-bed x 5
3-bed x 13
4-bed x 7
Total 29 dwellings

The proposed affordable element is:

1-bed (flats/maisonettes) x 4
2-bed x 5 (houses)
Total 9 affordable dwellings.

- 2.2** The Council's Housing Enabling Officer has commented that with 9 affordable units being the 1 and 2 bed dwellings, this means that all 20 of the market dwellings are 3 and 4-bed houses.
- 2.3** This mix is not considered acceptable. As the proposal comprises a range of 1 to 4-bed dwellings then the affordable housing should include a proportion of each dwelling type, not just the smallest dwellings.
- 2.4** Policy HO3 should be engaged in this respect and the tenure split will be dependent on the agreed mix of dwelling types and the layout of the scheme. In terms of the tenure split for affordable housing the adopted Borough Local Plan policy HO3 requires 45% social rent, 35% affordable rent and 20% intermediate tenure overall.
- 2.5** The wording in the reason for refusal No. 5 is to be amended to read:

'No legal agreement has been provided to secure satisfactory housing provision and a financial contribution. Furthermore, as the proposed housing ranges from 1-bed to 4-bed units, the affordable housing should include a proportion of each dwelling type, not just the smallest dwellings (this application proposes only 1-bed and 2-bed units as affordable). The proposal therefore fails to provide the necessary affordable housing to meet the needs of the local area and is contrary to Policy HO3 of the Borough Local Plan.'

Tree information

- 2.6** The applicant has submitted an amended Tree Report and plan (received 15th August) to confirm that 2 x Category C trees on the eastern boundary of the site are proposed to be removed to make way for the proposed pedestrian footpath access onto Oakley Green Road. These trees form part of a group (G6) of self-set sycamores along the eastern boundary of the site.
- 2.9** The other tree (T10) to be removed is within the site and is a category C, self-set Willow.

Comments from Interested Parties

- 2.10** A letter of support has been received (since the main report was written), summarised as:

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
Support of the application because it reuses previously developed/brownfield land and therefore reduces the need to expand into undeveloped Green Belt elsewhere, such as Maidenhead Golf Course for example. The site is near shops, sport facilities and schools as well as employment areas like Bray Studio. RBWM desperately needs more family homes and affordable housing, which this application helps to provide.	This is a Green Belt site. It has not been allocated for housing development in the adopted Borough Local Plan.	No change to the recommendation.

Comments from Consultees

- 2.11** Comments have been received from the Lead Local Flood Authority and Housing Enabling Officer. These are summarised in the table below

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
---------	------------------	---------------------------

		n
<p>The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has commented on the proposal advising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -1. The proposed discharge rate of of 2.3l/s to the existing watercourse is acceptable. -2. At the next stage it will be expected that a full network model will be provided, as well an exceedance plan to show the flooding in the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change. <p>A condition has been recommended by the LLFA, as follows:</p> <p><i>‘Prior to commencement (excluding demolition) a surface water drainage scheme for the development, based on the submitted sustainable drainage strategy, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Details shall include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculations to include development runoff rates, volumes (attenuation and long-term storage) and topographic details, and any consents required from Thames Water. - Full details of all components of the proposed surface water drainage system including dimensions, locations, gradients, invert levels, cover levels long sections and cross section and relevant construction details of all individual components. - Water quality discharged from the site should be of sufficient water quality. The applicant is to provide evidence that discharge from the site would be of sufficient water quality that it would not result in detriment to any receiving water course. - Details of the proposed maintenance arrangements relating to the surface water drainage system should also be provided, confirming the party that will be responsible. <p><i>The surface water drainage system shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems and to ensure the proposed development is safe from flooding and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.’</i></p>	<p>Had the LPA been minded to grant approval for the proposal, this condition would have been recommended for inclusion.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Housing Enabling Officer</p> <p>As the proposal comprises a range of 1 to 4-bed dwellings then the affordable housing should include a proportion of <i>each</i> dwelling type, not just the smallest dwellings. The proposed mix of affordable housing is not acceptable.</p>	<p>See paragraphs 2.1-2.5 above.</p> <p>Reason no.5 is to be amended for clarity and to reflect the Housing Enabling Officer’s comments.</p>	

3. RECOMMENDATION – REFUSE

3.1 Reasons as per the main report with revised wording for Reason No 5 as follows:

3.2 ‘No legal agreement has been provided to secure satisfactory housing provision and a financial contribution. Furthermore, as the proposed housing ranges from 1-bed to 4-bed units, the

affordable housing should include a proportion of each dwelling type, not just the smallest dwellings (this application proposes only 1-bed and 2-bed units as affordable). The proposal therefore fails to provide the necessary affordable housing to meet the needs of the local area and is contrary to Policy HO3 of the Borough Local Plan.'

This page is intentionally left blank