

# Public Document Pack

## Notice of Meeting

### Maidenhead Development Management Committee

Councillors Joshua Reynolds (Chair), Siân Martin (Vice-Chair), Maureen Hunt, Leo Walters, Mandy Brar, Geoff Hill, Helen Taylor, Gary Reeves and Kashmir Singh

Wednesday 20 September 2023 7.00 pm

Council Chamber - Town Hall, Maidenhead & on [RBWM YouTube](#)

www.rbwm.gov.uk



*The following papers have been added to the meeting's agenda as they were not available for publication when the notice of meeting was issued, 5 working days prior to the meeting date.*

### Supplement

Item	Description	Page
5	<p><b>22/03270/OUT - Maidenhead Office Park Westacott Way Littlewick Green Maidenhead SL6 3QH</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Outline application for access only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site for industrial and logistics use within Use Classes E(G)(iii), B2 and B8, with surface car parking, landscaping, and associated works.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> PERMIT</p> <p><b>APPLICANT:</b> Anglesea Capital LLP</p> <p><b>EXPIRY DATE:</b> 10 March 2023</p>	3 - 8

By attending this meeting, participants are consenting to the audio & visual recording being permitted and acknowledge that this shall remain accessible in the public domain permanently.

Please contact Will Ward, [Will.Ward@RBWM.gov.uk](mailto:Will.Ward@RBWM.gov.uk), with any special requests that you may have when attending this meeting.



This page is intentionally left blank

## ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

### Maidenhead Panel

<b>Application No.:</b>	22/03270/OUT
<b>Location:</b>	Maidenhead Office Park Westacott Way Littlewick Green Maidenhead SL6 3QH
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline application for access only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site for industrial and logistics use within Use Classes E(G)(iii), B2 and B8, with surface car parking, landscaping, and associated works.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Anglesea Capital LLP
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Mark Harris
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	White Waltham Parish/Hurley And Walthams
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Sarah Tucker on or at sarah.tucker@rwm.gov.uk	

#### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report seeks to update the Committee on representations received since the Committee Report was published and to provide clarity/amendment on a number of points.

**There is no change to the recommendation in the Committee Report.**

#### 2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

##### Comments from interested parties

- 2.1 In response to the published committee report, five additional representations have been received from, including one from the West London Aero Club, summarised as:

Comment	Officer Response	Change to recommendation?
Noise of lorries on Westacott Road, there is already noise pollution in the area, this will increase it.	See section 10.35 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
How do we ensure the maximum heights are in relation to existing ground levels if demolition rubble is used to increase site levels?	See section 10.17 of the Officer's Report and conditions 3 (that controls the parameters of the proposed development), 4 (that requires levels and sections at Reserved Matters stage) and condition 11 (waste audit).	No change.

Contradicts Green Belt and Economic Development policy.	See sections 10.2 - 10.19 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
Impact of additional traffic and noise and environmental damage.	See sections 10.26 - 10.29 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
Use of development as housing would be a better use	The application as submitted is assessed in accordance with relevant development plan policies.	No change.
Does not appear to improve biodiversity	See section 10.30 - 10.34 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
Lack of notification of application.	See section 10.45 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
Site is Green Belt and an established employment site	See sections 10.2 - 10.19 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
Should be developed without detriment to amenity.	See sections 10.35 - 10.39 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
More appropriate sites in the Borough for this type of development.	See sections 10.2 - 10.19 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
Development should not be detrimental to residential amenity there is only one access road to the site and the residential estate.	See sections 10.35-10.39 of the Officer's Report.  There is no residential access from the application site access.	No change.
Proposals put forward contradicts economic development policy.	See sections 10.2 - 10.19 of the Officer's Report.	No change.
The heights of the buildings are huge compared to anything in the area. No account taken of use of demolition spoil on site to increase site levels. A condition should control overall height levels, no plans show height levels.	See section 10.17 of the Officer's Report and conditions 3 (that controls the parameters of the development, which includes heights), condition 4 (that requires levels and sections at Reserved Matters stage) and condition 11 (waste audit).	No change.

### Further clarification of Very Special Circumstances (VSC)

- 2.2 As stated in the report, Inappropriate development is by definition harmful, and should only be approved in "very special circumstances". VSC will only exist where the potential harm to the

Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

- 2.3 This application is for redevelopment of an existing employment site for Use Class E(g) and Industrial uses. Unlike most sites within the Green Belt, it is not a green field, but rather previously developed land within the Green Belt and therefore the consideration in terms of impact on the purposes of the green belt and openness is different.
- 2.4 While the site had not been removed from the Green Belt, it is nevertheless an allocated employment site within the Borough Local Plan (BLP). The BLP Employment policies seek to ensure that there is a portfolio of sites to meet the diverse needs of the local economy and redevelopment of premises will be encouraged to meet demand. Retaining or repurposing such sites to ensure they continue to deliver economic activity and employment is important and contributes to both economic and social objectives. The need for economic and employment provision to continue on the site is therefore an important material consideration that should be afforded weight.
- 2.5 In a changing employment market, the majority of the office floor space cannot be let due to the decline in demand for such use but there is an increasing demand for logistics uses. The applicants report identifies the clear need for logistics uses in the borough and this has been independently verified by the Council. This need is an important material consideration that should be afforded weight.
- 2.6 The applicant has supplied a viability report, that has been assessed by the Council's independent expert, that sets out that the scale of the proposed development is viable, but the scale of a smaller scheme is not. Therefore, to bring this site back into a type of employment use for which there is a recognised need, this is the minimum quantum of development that can be delivered. This is a material consideration that should be afforded weight.
- 2.7 The proposed development, due to the significant increase in scale, does adversely impact the openness of the Green Belt, therefore resulting in harm which should be given substantial weight. However, the benefit of proposed employment, industrial and logistics use within Use Classes E(G)(iii), B2 and B8 which would significantly contribute to the Council's employment needs, on this employment site, is considered to be very special circumstance that outweighs this harm.

#### **Further explanation of Section 10.4 of the Officer's Report (Viability)**

- 2.8 The Council's independent viability expert stated that the proposed scheme would not meet the Benchmark Land Value (£39,446,894) but that the Residual Land Value (RLV) including profit, resulted in a RLV of £33,563,022, a deficit of £5.9 million; however, as this would still provide the developer with a profit of £15 million (approximately), the developer considers this is viable enough to proceed. However, the smaller scheme with a deficit of almost £15 million does not provide enough profit to be considered viable and therefore would not proceed.

#### **Clarification of Member questions**

- 2.9 The existing office park is has a floor space of 24,638 sqm, with a building volume of 148,951 m<sup>3</sup>. The maximum height of the existing is 12m.
- 2.10 The indicative proposed scheme (since this is an outline application, this relates to a maximum) would be 55,741 sqm, with a building volume of 641,946 m<sup>3</sup> and a maximum height of 16m.
- 2.11 With regard to the glint and glare assessment, this has been included as a recommended condition so that any future development (if approved) would have to be assessed for any impact this may have on the airfield users.
- 2.12 A technical highways question has been raised regarding the highway impact of the development. RBWM Highways have confirmed the following:

*From the highways report carried out by Project Centre, they have confirmed that from the Transport Assessment there would be no severe concerns and the main two roundabout junctions would operate within the theoretical capacity:*

#### **TRIP GENERATION**

The TRICS database has been interrogated to determine the trips associated with the existing and proposed use. Table 5-1 concludes that the existing use could generate 544 and 389 trips during the AM and PM periods respectively, and 2,846 daily trips. It is noted that the analysis is based on the current 1,389 car parking spaces on site, as opposed to the 27,692m<sup>2</sup> floor area. In such instances, the Highway Authority would invariably expect the floor area to be used to determine the net traffic generation. Nevertheless, the TA concludes the development could lead to a potential reduction of 52 daily trips. However, but due to the nature of the proposed use, the development is predicted to lead to an increase of 750 HGV movements.

#### **TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Section 6 of the TA provides an assessment of the impact associated with the development on the local highway network. As reported in Section 5 [*Trip Generation, Distribution and Assignment*], it is predicted that the development would lead to a reduction in vehicular trips, but a significant increase in HGV movements. The results of the junction capacity modelling on the A4 Bath Road/Westacott Way roundabout suggest that despite the increase in HGV activity, the roundabout will operate within the theoretical capacity.

*From the above, the main concerns are:*

#### **1. The affect it would have on Burchett's Green.**

*The existing site is 13.33 hectares (ha) and already accommodates office land use across seven buildings and provides 1400 car parking spaces. Given the location, it is acknowledged that the site has always relied on the use of private vehicles unless a shuttle service was provided to Maidenhead train station/town centre. The applicant proposes to demolish the site to provide 55,746sqm (GIA) flexible industrial/warehousing (Use Class B2/B8). It is noted a Travel Plan condition was recommended and mentions shuttle services to reduce car trips.*

*From all the details submitted, it is not considered that vehicles associated with this site (including HGV's) would travel through Burchetts Green which is narrow and subject to speed restrictions. All vehicles would naturally use the direct and quicker route via the A4 Bath Road to reach the A404(M) and vice versa.*

#### **2. The A4 is busy and would be at/over capacity which would lead to vehicles travelling along Burchett's Green.**

*A traffic survey was undertaken by the applicants in October 2022 to assess the 'do minimum' traffic flows and are set out in table 6.3 of the Transport Assessment (TA). The technical note produced by AECOM subsequently (Section 2.9 and 2.10) summarises the modelling work undertaken which has been assessed using the industry standard 'Ratios of Flow to Capacity' (RFC). Any number above 0.85 is considered where a junction would become constrained. The future year assessments which take into consideration background traffic growth indicate that the junction will still operate within capacity (0.56). This indicates that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate this proposal.*

*The summary of the results within the TA and as fully assessed and highlighted within the Highway Response indicate that all junctions will operate within the theoretical capacity, which should reduce the need for vehicles from the development needing to travel through Burchetts Green.*

*Table 2: Net Change in Traffic Generation (Revised Development Quantum)*

Period	Total Vehicles			HGVs		
	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way
AM Peak Hour	-448	+88	-360	+17	+44	+61
PM Peak Hour	+95	-214	-120	+22	+3	+24
Daily	-293	-32	-325	+299	+373	+672

2.7 Under the revised proposals, there would be an even greater reduction in total vehicle generation, equating to 325 fewer vehicles fewer than in the extant situation. There is an increase to the proportion of HGVs on the network, however this is an increase of 672 trips per 12-hour daily period which is materially less than 750 trips per day as originally assumed in the TA and the 800 trips per day quoted in some of the comments for the planning application.

*It is noted within the latest Technical note, the revised proposals would reduce the total vehicle generation by 325 vehicles compared to the previous permitted use.*

*In addition, the proposal from the applicant of securing a Traffic Management Plan and Framework Travel Plan is welcomed.*

**Amendment to Officer’s report**

2.13 Amendment to last sentence in section 10.15 of the Officer’s Report to read:

‘Given this, it is considered that the economic viability of the current proposal is part of the positive economic elements of the scheme and as such *it contributes* to the very special circumstance in Green Belt policy terms.’

**Amendments to recommended conditions**

2.14 Condition 1 to be amended to read:

*Details of the appearance, landscaping, scale and layout (hereinafter called the ‘reserved matters’) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development is commenced. The development shall begin either before the expiration of three years from the date of this grant of outline planning permission, or the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters, whichever is the latest.*

2.15 Condition 10 first sentence to be amended to read:

*‘No development apart from on site demolition shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

2.16 Condition 12 first criterion to be amended to read:

*A building induced turbulence assessment for runways 07L/25R and 11/29 as identified in figure 2.1 of the submitted Aviation Assessment.*

The reason should be amended to read:

*To ensure the development does not adversely affect the operations of the adjoining airfield.*

2.17 Condition 15, the plan numbers should read:

*3149 PL-200B received 9/12/22  
3149 PL-201C received 21/7/23*

