

# 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
6	<p><b>23/01142/FULL - Land Between Gringer Hill And Hargrave Road Maidenhead</b></p> <p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Full application for the development of x49 later living apartments and associated communal facilities (residents lounge, store, guest accommodation) on land between Gringer Hill and Hargrave Road, Maidenhead; car parking; vehicular and pedestrian access from Gringer Hill; maintenance and emergency pedestrian access from Hargrave Road; all associated landscaping including removal of existing vegetation and tennis court; associated drainage works and all other associated works.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> PERMIT</p> <p><b>APPLICANT:</b> Mr Rowland</p> <p><b>EXPIRY DATE:</b> 15 August 2023</p>	3 - 6

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>	23/01142/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Land Between Gringer Hill And Hargrave Road Maidenhead
<b>Proposal:</b>	Full application for the development of x49 later living apartments and associated communal facilities (residents lounge, store, guest accommodation) on land between Gringer Hill and Hargrave Road, Maidenhead; car parking; vehicular and pedestrian access from Gringer Hill; maintenance and emergency pedestrian access from Hargrave Road; all associated landscaping including removal of existing vegetation and tennis court; associated drainage works and all other associated works.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Rowland
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr David Murray-Cox
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Maidenhead Unparished/Belmont
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Jeffrey Ng on or at <a href="mailto:jeffrey.ng@rbwm.gov.uk">jeffrey.ng@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

#### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following the publication of the main Committee report, the Council has received a copy of a highway response note prepared by Bellamy Roberts on behalf of the applicant, responding to comments from the Council's Highways Authority dated 05 September 2023 and a copy of a letter, which is prepared by Bailey Venning Associates on behalf of the applicant, responding to comments from the Council's Independent Assessor made under the independent review report.
- 1.2 This report seeks to update the Committee on these points since the Committee Report was published and to provide clarity/amendment.

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

#### 2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

##### **Applicants' response to Council's independent assessor comments**

- 2.1 The Council has received a copy of a letter prepared by Bailey Venning Associates on behalf of the applicant which responds to comments from the Council's Independent Assessor made as part of their independent review report. The applicant's viability consultant concludes that the scheme could not viably provide a surplus to contribute to an affordable housing contribution even were the extant 44-unit scheme to be used for working out the Alternative Use Value (AUV) of the site.
- 2.2 As the review as detailed in the Committee Report was not based on the extant 44-unit scheme as the AUV of the site, it is not possible to comment on this further assessment made by the applicant's viability consultant. However, it is important to note that the key AUV test is whether the scheme to be used is policy compliant. It is noted at section 10.13 of the main report that the proposed 14-unit scheme, which was used to determine the AUV, would provide three rented

affordable units and one intermediate affordable unit and it fully complies with the affordable housing requirement under Policy HO3 of the BLP. There is no restriction on which scheme to use to work out the AUV, subject to this schemes compliance with up-to-date local planning policies.

- 2.3 Notwithstanding the above, both an early and a late-stage viability review mechanism is recommended. This would allow a further review of the scheme's viability (looking at build costs and sales values) to be carried out when construction costs and sales values are known. If at that time there is surplus, a proportion of that, in-line with the policy requirement, would be required as an off-site affordable housing contribution.

### **Response to Council's highways comments**

- 2.4 Following the publication of the Committee Report, the Council has received a copy of a highway response note, prepared by Bellamy Roberts on behalf of the applicant. Notwithstanding the content of the Committee Report, this document seeks to respond to comments from the Council's Highways Authority. The content of the note is summarised below and a response provided.

#### Service and Access

- 2.5 The Council's Highways Authority recommends off-site improvement works to improve the access. The Council's Highways Authority also refers to the Council's Highway Design Guide as it sets out that a shared surface access can only serve up to 25 dwellings only. The Council's Highways Authority also requires a minimum clearance to kerb of 0.3 metre to be provided.
- 2.6 The applicants note sets out that the Council's Highway Design Guide is out of date so it should be disregarded, as the Manual for Street 2010 sets out that shared space with motorists could be accommodated with 100 vehicles per hour and the current scheme does not generate 100 vehicles per day.

#### *Officer response*

- 2.7 Due to the scale and nature of the development, the Council did not request any off-site improvement works when assessing the extant 44-unit scheme. In this context, the recommended off-site improvement works would fail to meet the tests set out in Section 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). This has not therefore been recommended as part of the current application.
- 2.8 Turning to the comments regarding the shared surface access, supporting text 14.6.2 to Policy IF2 of the BLP sets out that the Council will assess development proposals in accordance with the Council's Highway Design Guide. Therefore, the Council's Highway Design Guide is a material consideration when assessing this application. The applicant's highway consultant refers to the Manual for Street and it sets out that a shared access can accommodate up to 100 vehicles per hour. It is important to note that both documents are not conflicting each other. The Council's Highway Design Guide refers to the maximum number of units to be served by a shared access, while the Manual for Street refers to the number of vehicles can be accommodated for a shared access.
- 2.9 The proposed access is the same as approved under the extant 44-unit scheme and the Council's Highways Authority did not raise objection at that time and this is a material planning consideration in the determination of this application. Therefore, it is not considered that the access would result in material harm to highway or pedestrian safety in this particular case.

#### Vehicle Parking

- 2.10 The Council's Highways Authority recommends a justification of the increased development quantum and the resulting increased reliance of public transport to accommodate the reduced parking levels. The applicant's highway response note sets out that the proposed change would increase reliance on walking and the use of public transport, but that the proposed parking

arrangement is still considered to be acceptable.

*Officer response*

- 2.11 This is covered at section 10.67 of the main report. A pragmatic approach should be adopted when assessing the parking arrangement of the current application and it is important to note that there have been no material changes in circumstance or policy when assessing the extant 44-unit scheme. The application site is within a reasonable walking distance to a railway station and bus stops. Therefore, it is not considered that additional information is required in this regard.

Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities (EVCFs)

- 2.12 The Council's Highways Authority recommends that the provision of EVCFs should comply with building regulations.

*Officer response*

- 2.13 This is covered at section 10.69 of the main report. The provision of seven active EVCFs is in line with the Council's Interim Sustainability Position Statement where at least 20% of parking spaces should be provided with active EVCFs. The applicant's transport statement also confirms that the remaining 80% parking spaces would be provided with passive provision. Recommended condition 10 requires the provision of the EVCFs in accordance with the approved plan, prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

Cycle and Other Parking Provision

- 2.14 The Council's Highways Authority recommends increasing the provision of cycle storage and providing necessary electrical infrastructure to charge cycles within the cycle storage area provided.

*Officer response*

- 2.15 This is covered at section 10.71 of the main report. The Council considers that additional cycle parking spaces should be provided to meet the specific need of future residents and to encourage future occupants to cycle as a sustainable mode of transport, which is in line with the objectives of the travel plan framework. Recommended condition 9 requires the provision of details of the cycle parking facilities and that the approved facilities shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

Other Matters

- 2.14 The Council's Highways Authority recommends that the access to Hargrave Road is not suitable for future residents as it features a number of steps.

*Officer response*

- 2.15 As set out within the main report, this access would be used for emergency and maintenance only as with the extant scheme, and that the main access would be from Gringer Hill.

