

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## PANEL UPDATE

<b>Application No.:</b>	20/02689/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Land West of Main Farm Buildings Lower Mount Farm Long Lane Cookham Maidenhead
<b>Proposal:</b>	New sports pavilion building with associated parking.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Duncan Gibson
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Duncan Gibson
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Cookham Parish/Bisham And Cookham
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Haydon Richardson on 01628 796697 or at haydon.richardson@rbwm.gov.uk	

### 1. SUMMARY

Two further representations have been received objecting to this application. It has been highlighted that the report states that the application was advertised in the Local Press. This is incorrect and was included in the report in error. The other points raised in addition to those already reported are summarised below, together with a response.

**It is recommended the Panel grants planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 12 of the main report.**

### 2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

#### Comments from Interested Parties

##### 2.1

Additional comments received, summarised as:

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
Issues raised with regard to the RBWM traffic modelling undertaken for the BLP in and around	The BLP is being assessed under a	No.

Cookham. It cannot be concluded that there would be no adverse impact on the highway operation or safety in the area.	separate process. This application has been considered on its own merits and is acceptable on highway grounds, in accordance with the highway officers comments.	
Providing 87 car parking spaces does not provide for a sustainable form of development, does not have regard to climate change nor give people a healthy transport choice.	The application is providing policy compliant car parking provision together with requisite cycle parking provision in a location which already has permission for use for outdoor sport.	No.
The current changing facilities at the Alfred Major site should be improved and children could independently walk to the site. Extra parking could be provided if required at this site	The development proposed in this application must be considered on its own merits.	No.
There is no guaranteed tenure for continued use of this site for sport or by Cookham FC. This should be covered by a covenant. Building could be converted as part of existing Lower Mount Farm business complex.	Recommended condition 5 would prevent alternative uses of the building without planning permission. There is no requirement for a legal agreement in this case.	No.
Building is too large and could be used for functions.	The report makes it clear that it is considered that all of the component parts of the building are appropriate. Recommended conditions 4 and 5 restrict the use and operation times of the building.	No.
Nearby Public Right of Way is affected by the development	This runs entirely outside of the site.	No.
There is a departure from the adopted Local Plan for which policy refers to 'essential facilities', whereas NPPF policy refers to 'appropriate facilities'.	This is not a departure from the development plan. The report recognises that the NPPF is a more up to date expression of government policy and due weight is afforded to it as a significant material consideration.	No.
The significant overhang of the building should be included in its floorspace and it would then comprise major development.	This area is entirely open and does not contribute to the useable floorspace of the building.	No.
In terms of application 12/02188, condition 4	Condition 4 of 12/02188	No.

<p>(surfacing of the access) is a pre-commencement one. There is no approval of these details.</p>	<p>relates to the non-provision of floodlighting. Condition 3 relates to the access and this was superseded by condition 3 of 14/01398, which was approved under 16/00293.</p>	
<p>Because the pitches and parking have not been laid out for use the change of use permission has not been implemented and through passage of time has lapsed.</p>	<p>Requisite operational development proposed as part of that permission has been implemented. Moreover, the area has been levelled and the surface prepared such that sport could be carried on at any time. There has been a clear change of use from agriculture to outdoor sport. The permission has not time-expired.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>The change of use hasn't occurred and under NPPF policy - to be an appropriate facility for outdoor sport, this can only be in association with a change of use. I refer you to paragraph 145 b) of the NPPF 2019</p>	<p>There is a clear intention to use the land for outdoor sport and relevant operational development has been carried out as set out above, which is compliant with para. 145(b).</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Failure to undertake a spatial and visual assessment of the impact on the openness of the Green Belt or any impact from the intensity of the use. Reference to other similar buildings and colour of external materials not relevant to Green Belt assessment.</p>	<p>The assessment included in the report is acceptable for the nature of the development proposed. The references are relevant to an assessment of visual openness. The spatial impact of the proposal is considered in reference to the size and bulk of the building.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>RBWM inconsistent in decision making as equestrian development opposite the site has been refused.</p>	<p>Each application is considered on its own merits.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>In an email you wrote to the Planning Consultant dated 30th November 2020 you stated in respect of the development "...we had some small concerns about it's impact on openness of the Green Belt." This is published on the RBWM Public Access System. I take your word 'concerns' to mean 'harm'; this being the case, why isn't the application recommended for refusal as the size of the development hasn't</p>	<p>The report makes it clear at para. 9.12 that the building would have some impact on openness. The test of whether the proposed development would preserve openness cannot be a total bar on</p>	<p>No.</p>

been reduced?	new buildings, otherwise that would defeat the purpose of the exception.	
<p>No reference to the following adopted SPDs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cookham Village Design Statement</li> <li>- Borough Wide Design Guide.</li> </ul> <p>Which should be afforded significant weight</p>	<p>In accepting that these documents should have been referenced in the report, there is nothing contained within the Guidance that would alter the assessment or recommendation. As SPD's they should be afforded weight as material considerations , where relevant.</p>	No.

