

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## PANEL UPDATE

**Application No.:** 20/01251/OUT

**Location:** Site Known As Nicholson Quarter Bound By High Street And  
Broadway  
Maidenhead

**Proposal:** Hybrid planning application (part-outline, part-full) for comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the site including:

(1) OUTLINE planning application (with all matters reserved) for four buildings that range in height, with the highest being 88.70m AOD and the lowest being 66.20m AOD, on the site for a comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment comprising:

Residential Institutions (Class C2) - up to 29,400 m<sup>2</sup> (GEA); Business Use (Class B1) - up to 29,700 m<sup>2</sup> (GEA); Flexible Retail, financial and professional services, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments, hot food takeaways, non-residential institutions and assembly and leisure (Class A1 / A2 / A3 / A4 / A5 / D1 / D2) - up to 4,400 m<sup>2</sup> (GEA); Parking and plant space - up to 13,600 m<sup>2</sup> (GEA); Formation of new pedestrian and vehicular access; Means of access and circulation and car parking within the site; and Provision of new public open space and landscaping.

(2) FULL planning application for the demolition of all existing buildings on site, except Nicholsons House and Brock House, site preparation, construction of two residential buildings comprising 25 storeys, and part 15/part 10 storey and a landscaped podium (Class C3), construction of a 4 storey office building (Class B1), the provision of a new public open space, and landscaping and the erection of a multi-storey car park and flexible retail, financial and professional services, restaurant and cafes, drinking establishments, assembly and leisure uses (Class A1 / A2 / A3 / A4 / A5 / D1 / D2).

**Applicant:** Areli Estate

**Agent:** Mr Mark Knibbs

**Parish/Ward:** Maidenhead Unparished/St Marys

**If you have a question about this report, please contact:** Tim Chapman on or at tim.chapman@rbwm.gov.uk

## 1. SUMMARY

References within in the report to where responses are to public and consultee comments were not updated in line with the final paragraph numbering. Amendments below provide corrected numbering.

## 2. CORRECTIONS

### Revisions to Section 8: Consultation

10 letters were received supporting the application, summarised as:

Comment		Where in the report this is considered
1.	Support for the principle of development	9.2
2.	Support for independent shops	9.2
3.	Revised scheme has improved significantly in terms of meeting community need, achieving economic sustainability and improving environmental sustainability.	9.9, 9.10
4.	Support reuse of brown field land for housing which takes pressure off green belt.	9.2

52 letters were received objecting to the application, summarised as:

Comment		Where in the report this is considered
1	Objection to 25 storey building	9.3
2	Objection to loss of covered shopping centre – being open air will make it less attractive to use in inclement weather	9.3.14
3	Concern over possible loss of larger retailers	9.2.4
4	Objection to lack of social infrastructure, including health and education	9.7
5	Objection to lack of affordable housing	9.6
6	Objection to overshadowing and loss of light	9.4.5-9.4.7;9.9.9

7	Concern over impact on wind and micro climate	9.9
8	Objection to negative visual impact on character	9.3
9	Concerns over office and residential uses in light of Covid and increase in working from home	The proposal does not specifically address the impacts of Covid and has been assessed on its planning merits.
10	Concern over access for emergency services	9.8 Fire Brigade have not objected to the proposals
11	Objection to increase in traffic	9.8 Impact is not significant
12	Concerns over a lack of sufficient sustainability	9.10
13	Objection to reduction amount of car parking	9.8
14	Concern over lack of parking for residents	9.8
15	Objection to location of blue badge parking	9.8 This has been addressed in the November 2020 revisions
16	Objection to location of shopmobility	9.8 This has been addressed in the November 2020 revisions
17	Objection to location of toilets	9.8 This has been addressed in the November 2020 revisions. Accessible toilets are located in the Shopmobility unit.
18	Objection to construction pollution and disturbance	9.9
19	Objection to lack of green space	9.3

20	Concern about quality of public realm and its maintenance	These are proposed to be covered by condition
21	Objection to the design and massing of the building	9.3
22	Objection to excessive size representing overdevelopment	9.3
23	Objection to the proposal for housing on the site	9.2
24	Objection to lack of traffic impact	9.8
25	Concern over flooding	9.9
26	Concerns over loading and servicing of commercial and residential units	9.8
27	Objection to impact on air quality	9.9.19-9.9.21
28	Objection to dwelling mix – too many small flats	9.4
29	Concern over safety and security of spaces	9.11.5
30	Objection over over looking, loss of privacy, damage to amenity to existing dwelling (Apartment 10 Cresset Court, 71-73 High Street)	9.4.6
31	Loss of views	Not a material planning consideration
32	Loss of existing businesses	9.2.4
33	Loss of existing parking	9.8
34	Loss of retail	9.2.4-9.2.6
35	Lack of existing night club use.	9.2.7 – 9.2.8
36	Revised design worse than original	9.3

### Statutory consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Berkshire Archaeology	High potential for archaeological remains – conditions recommended	9.11.9
Historic	The revised proposal includes significant improvements to	9.3

England	<p>the original scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the reduction in scale of the carpark by three storeys;</li> <li>• the massing of the 25-storey landmark building in zone 5 has been amended to increase its slenderness and improve its design</li> <li>• introducing a less dominating presence on the King Street frontage and resulting in a reduction of the adverse visual impact in views from the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p>but some concerns remain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landmark building, although more effective in design terms, remains a dominating element in the townscape</li> <li>• Scale of proposed buildings on Brock Street would still harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p>Overall the harm to the historic environment is considered to be less than substantial under para 194 of the NPPF.</p>	
LLFA	No objection subject to condition	9.11.7
Thames Water	No objection subject to condition ensuring sufficient foul water capacity is provided before	9.11.7
Natural England	No objection	
Environment Agency	Acceptable subject to conditions	9.11.7

## Consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Design and Conservation	<p>The revised proposal includes significant improvements to the original scheme but some concerns remain:</p> <p>Welcome revisions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in height of car park;</li> <li>• Design of 25 storey tower;</li> <li>• creation of improved public realm;</li> </ul> <p>Concerns remain regarding scale of development and its</p>	9.3

	<p>impact on townscape, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The view along White Hart Yard would be truncated by a 10 storey building. This would create a significant jump in scale from the frontage at 3/ 4 floors that would potentially overpower the small scale and intimate character of the yard and this part of the conservation area.</li> <li>• The buildings would negatively impact on the setting of the non designated historic buildings located at the junction of the High Street and King Street and also in longer views from the eastern end of the Castle Hill Conservation Area.</li> <li>• the tower will be visible from Cliveden and is a discordant element.</li> <li>• cause a level of harm to the setting of the Maidenhead Town Centre Conservation Area, setting of the listed stables on Nicolson's Lane and also to a lesser degree, harms the setting of the Castle Hill Conservation Area and the setting of nos 25-27 The Broadway</li> <li>• Limited design code;</li> <li>• No improvements to the high street or public art</li> </ul> <p>Overall the harm to the historic environment is considered to be less than substantial under para 194 of the NPPF.</p>	
Highway	<p>Proposal acceptable apart from the Highways officer would prefer a rebalancing of parking from office use to residential. Financial contribution requested for transport improvements. Conditions and s106 clauses suggested for highways changes, stopping up orders, bus laybys and loading areas, cycle parking</p>	9.8
Arboricultural officer	<p>Scheme represents a net gain in trees and vegetation. Concerns over microclimate, root space volumes, and service runs would be covered by condition</p>	9.9
Ecology	<p>No objection subject to conditions</p>	9.11.10
Education	<p>No objection. School places would be provided via the IDP. Would favour a nursery on site and improvements to walking and cycling. (TBC)</p>	9.7
EHO	<p>No objection subject to conditions regarding the sound insulation, ventilation and plant noise related to the flexible retail uses.</p>	9.4
Fire	<p>Recommends use of water sprinklers, sufficient space, access and water for fire appliance.</p>	9.9
Thames Valley Police	<p>Object to flexible retail use on the grounds of crime, disturbance, ASB and residential amenity</p>	9.4.3-9.4.4
Surrey Heath	<p>No objection</p>	

Council		
Town Centre Manager	Supports reduction in retail floorspace, increase in residential and flexible retail use; Concern about 25 storey tower and loss of parking. Is office use still viable post Covid? Public realm should be properly curated.	9.2, 9.3 and 9.8  The proposal does not specifically address the impacts of Covid and has been assessed on its planning merits.
Sport England	No Objection	
Education	No contribution to education provision needed. Would like to see a nursery provided on site and improvements to walking and cycling	9.7, 9.8  A nursery does not form part of the proposal but could be accommodated within the flexible retail uses.
Wokingham Borough Council	No Comments	
Spelthorne Borough Council	No Objection	

### Others

Group	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
National Trust	Objection to the 25 storey tower on the basis of its impact on Cliveden 4.5km distant	9.3
Maidenhead Forum	Like permeability;  Concerns over:	9.2, 9.3, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.9

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tall building;</li> <li>• Shade and wind;</li> <li>• Loss of covered shopping areas;</li> <li>• Car park too small;</li> <li>• Small flats and no affordable housing;</li> <li>• Sustainability;</li> <li>• Poorly serves commercial transport, such as taxis</li> <li>• Financial viability;</li> <li>• No large retail units;</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure funding;</li> </ul>	9.8.12
Heathrow Airport	No objection. Suggest informative regarding crane lighting	13
Maidenhead Waterways	Supports the proposal, particularly improvements to permeability	
RBWM Disability and Inclusion Forum	Object to the car park design specifically the location of blue badge parking, shopmobility, Changing Places facility, door and corridor design.	9.8 This has been addressed in the November 2020 revisions
Maidenhead Stroke Group	Object to location of blue badge parking, taller wheelchair accessible vehicles cannot enter the car park, lifts are too small for mobility use, fire safety.	9.8 This has been addressed in the November 2020 revisions
Maidenhead Mencap	Concern over lift position and size, blue badge spaces and access to Shop Mobility	9.8 This has been addressed in the November 2020 revisions
Maidenhead Civic Society	<p>Support improved permeability, variety of retail units and many trees.</p> <p>Concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• absence of pedestrian cover</li> <li>• wind tunnels effect</li> <li>• the height, bulk and mass of the scheme particularly the height of the Landmark building</li> <li>• high rise living, especially for families</li> <li>• potential fire risk associated with tower block</li> <li>• limited residential cores single staircase in Core 5A and Core 5B</li> <li>• lack of detailed plans for outline element and the Senior Living proposals in Zone 6 within the full application</li> <li>• lack of car park capacity and charging points</li> <li>• ongoing maintenance for new public realm</li> <li>• dwelling mix (too many small flats)</li> </ul>	9.2, 9.3, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.9
Maidenhead	Overall supports the development apart from:	9.3, 9.10



and District Chamber of Commerce	Object to lack of sustainable energy provision; Object to 25 storey high tower.	
----------------------------------	--	--

### Revisions to Section 9

Alter 9.5.2 from “*The mix of units, providing in paragraph 5.7, is considered acceptable in providing a range of flat sizes particularly one bed and two bed.*” to read “*The mix of units, provided in paragraph 5.8, is considered acceptable in providing a range of flat sizes particularly one bed and two bed.*”

Alter 9.5.6 from “*The issue of affordable housing is covered in section v, below* “ to read “*The issue of affordable housing is covered in section 9.6, below* “

Alter 9.11.5 from “*Additional measures in the form of postal storage rooms for flatted blocks, and the additional of security gates have been added on the advice of Thames Valley police. Concerns about crime and anti social behaviour regarding the flexible retail uses are addressed in 9.44 and 9.45.*” to read “*Additional measures in the form of postal storage rooms for flatted blocks, and the additional of security gates have been put forward on the advice of Thames Valley police. Concerns about crime and anti social behaviour regarding the flexible retail uses are addressed in 9.4.3 and 9.4.4.*”

Alter 9.11.6 from “*A waste and recycling strategy was submitted with the application. Collection arrangements have been incorporated into the access and servicing arrangements in para 9.75.*” to read “*A waste and recycling strategy was submitted with the application. Collection arrangements have been incorporated into the access and servicing arrangements in para 9.8.11.*”

