

# Public Document Pack

## MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL

16.01.19

PRESENT: Councillors Derek Wilson (Chairman), Clive Bullock, Gerry Clark, Maureen Hunt, Richard Kellaway, Philip Love, Derek Sharp, Adam Smith and Claire Stretton.

Officers: Mary Severin (Monitoring Officer), Daniel Bayles, Chris Duncan, Jenifer Jackson (Head of Planning), Shilpa Manek, Sean O'Connor (Solicitor - Shared Legal Solutions), Gordon Oliver (Principal Transport Policy Officer) and Ashley Smith (Deputy Head of Planning)

Also Present:

5 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Walters, Councillor Clark attended as a substitute.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were received from Councillors Kellaway, Love and Wilson for items 4 and 5 as they were all members of the Maidenhead Town Partnership Board. They all had a personal interest and were all attending the meeting with an open mind.

7 MINUTES

**Resolved unanimously: That the minutes of the meeting on 17 December 2018 and 19 December 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.**

8 TO CONSIDER A REPORT FROM THE HEAD OF PLANNING

Jenifer Jackson, Head of Planning, introduced the report.

Councillors Hill and Majeed addressed the Panel for up to three minutes each.

Councillor Derek Wilson read out a personal statement.

The Legal Officer, Sean O'Connor, advised the Panel that they would either be voting for the officer recommendations, if they felt a mistake had been made by Councillor Derek Wilson whilst the Panel had voting at the previous meeting on 17 December 2018 for the refusal of application 18/02105/FULL, Land To The South of Stafferton Way And East of Vicus Way Maidenhead, or they would be voting to reject the officer recommendations or they could abstain. If the Panel agreed with the officer recommendations and voted that a mistake had been made, the previous resolution would be rescinded and the Panel would consider Item 5 on the Agenda. If the Panel did not agree with the officer recommendation, the previous decision would stand and Item 5 would not be heard.

Councillor Stretton proposed to refuse to rescind the previous resolution on application 18/02105/FULL contrary to the Officers recommendation.

Councillor Kellaway proposed to accept the Officers recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Love.

Councillor Hunt seconded the first proposal to refuse to rescind the previous resolution contrary to the Officers recommendation that had been proposed by Councillor Stretton.

A named vote was carried on the motion that had been proposed and seconded, to accept the Officers recommendation, to rescind the previous resolution of the Panel on application 18/02105/FULL.

Six Councillors, Bullock, Clark, Kellaway, Love, Smith and Wilson voted for the motion. Three Councillors, Hunt, Sharp and Stretton voted against the motion.

**Resolved: That the Panel Agreed officer's recommendation be ACCEPTED and the previous resolution be rescind. The Panel would now move to Item 5 on the Agenda.**

As a result of the named vote result, the second motion fell.

## 9 PLANNING APPLICATIONS (DECISION)

The Panel considered the Head of Planning report on planning applications and received a panel update, following the publication of the agenda.

NB: \*Updates were received in relation to the planning applications marked with an asterisk.

**\*18/02105/FULL**

### **Land To The South of Stafferton Way And East of Vicus Way Maidenhead**

Erection of five storey split-deck multi-storey car park with access and associated landscaping following removal of existing slab and hardstanding (Regulation 3 application).

Councillor Stretton proposed a motion to REFUSE the application for the following eight reasons:

- Loss of employment site and further loss would undermine the employment strategy set out in the BLPSV contrary to emerging policy ED2.
- Another site is allocated in policy OA6 of the AAP for a car park and no evidence has been submitted to support the construction of a car park on this site, it is therefore contrary to policy.
- The bulk, mass and scale, is incongruous in the context of nearby dwellings contrary to Local Plan policy DG1, AAP policies MTC1 and MTC4 and policies SP1 and SP2 of BLPSV which indicate high quality development compatible with their location and contribute to community integration. The proposal is poor design contrary to Section 12 NPPF. The proposal would result in an overbearing impact as a result of height and location resulting in loss of sunlight and adversely affecting amenity and quality of life of those nearby occupiers. Contrary to SP3 BLPSV.
- History of antisocial behaviour (ASB) in nearby car parks and the proposal is likely to attract ASB and the possibility of crime, including fear of crime. The location is unsuitable due to proximity to nearby dwellings. Whilst the operation of car park is unlikely to have observable impact on the local communities the application clearly did not take account of ASB contrary to para 127 of the NPPF.
- There is another site available and therefore the proposal has not passed the sequential test contrary to para 158 of the NPPF.

- RBWM is in the process of producing a strategy to deal with tall buildings and parking in the town centre and therefore this application is premature.
- Air Quality results on page 55 of report which are contrary to policy NAP3 of the adopted Local Plan and paragraphs 103 and 181 of the NPPF (2018).
- The points raised by the Access Advisory Forum about the difficulty to cross on Stafferton Way, especially for disabled people.

A second motion was proposed by Councillor Love to PERMIT the application as per Officers recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Kellaway.

Councillor Hunt seconded the first motion proposed by Councillor Stretton to Refuse the application.

A named vote was carried out on the proposal made by Councillor Kellaway as that was seconded first by Councillor Love.

Six Councillors voted for the motion to permit the application, Councillors Bullock, Clark, Kellaway, Love, Smith and Wilson. Three Councillors voted against, Councillors Hunt, Sharp and Stretton.

**Resolved that: The Panel voted that the application be PERMITTED as per the Officers recommendation.**

As a result of the named vote, the second motion fell.

(The Panel were addressed by Non Konig, Stephen and Alexander Konig, Derek Philip-Xu, Sarah Storey, Mathilde Rossignol, Peter Lerner and Andrew Hill, Objectors. Matthew Blythin, Agent, Gurch Singh, resident, Councillors Hill and Majeed, Ward Councillors).

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, ended at 9.28 pm

Chairman.....

Date.....

This page is intentionally left blank