

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL**

15 December 2021

**Item: 1**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Application No.:</b>  | 21/00502/FULL   |
| <b>Location:</b>   | Magnet Leisure Centre And Magnet Leisure Complex Car Park Holmanleaze Maidenhead  |
| <b>Proposal:</b>   | Construction of x5 buildings to create x439 homes (use class C3) with car and cycle parking, pedestrian and vehicular access alterations, landscaping works and boundary treatments, following demolition of all existing buildings and structures. |
| <b>Applicant:</b>  |   |
| <b>Agent:</b>  | Mr Bob McCurry  |
| <b>Parish/Ward:</b>  | Maidenhead Unparished/St Marys  |
| <b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Tim Chapman on or at <a href="mailto:tim.chapman@rbwm.gov.uk">tim.chapman@rbwm.gov.uk</a> |   |

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The application seeks detailed planning permission for 434 residential units on the former Magnet Leisure Centre site, just north of Maidenhead town centre on St Clouds Way (A4).
- 1.2 The scale, height and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable. While the proposed development has a negative impact on the setting of a listed buildings and on strategic views, that harm is not considered substantial.
- 1.3 The proposal represents a substantial benefit in terms of the provision of housing (including affordable housing) in line with the Emerging Borough Local Plan AL9 allocation. There are significant improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure.
- 1.4 Overall the application is considered acceptable.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>It is recommended the Committee authorises the Head of Planning:</b> |  |
| 1.  | To grant planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 13 of this report and on the satisfactory completion of a legal undertaking to secure the infrastructure in Section 10 covering the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• £263,872 towards improvements to community facilities.</li><li>• £833k towards A4 at-grade crossing*</li><li>• Travel Plan, including 3 on-site car club spaces</li><li>• Provision of affordable housing</li><li>• Improvements to the existing subway</li><li>• Review mechanism of scheme viability</li></ul> |
| 2.  | In the event the above undertaking is not completed the Committee authorises the Head of Planning to refuse planning permission on the basis that the scheme would not be securing the above listed infrastructure and affordable housing provision contrary to the relevant Local Plan polices,.  |

## 2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- The Council's Constitution does not give the Head of Planning delegated powers to determine the application in the way recommended as it is major development; such decisions can only be made by the Panel.

### 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The Application Site lies within the Urban Area of Maidenhead, to the north of the Town Centre within the St Mary's ward, and comprises an area of some 2.057 hectares ("ha").
- 3.2 The Application Site is occupied by the former Magnet Leisure Centre, which was closed in Autumn 2020 and already has a separate consent to be demolished. The leisure centre building is a typical 'big box' commercial building between two and three storeys in height with materials comprising brick, exposed concrete, metal cladding and glass frontages. The open site is largely used for car parking with 53 trees and other planting.
- 3.2 A 'Tenpin' bowling alley was located towards the north of the Application Site, but this was demolished in Autumn 2018. The bowling alley was of a similar appearance to the existing leisure centre, between two and three storeys high and constructed of materials including brick, exposed concrete, metal cladding and glass frontages. This part of the Application Site is now being used as a temporary car park, as detailed within the planning history section below. In addition, other elements of the existing site comprise a surface level car park with 382 spaces, circulation roads, soft landscaping and trees.
- 3.3 The area north of the Application Site comprises a predominantly suburban residential neighbourhood, with a mixture of Victorian, Edwardian and Late 20th Century dwellings. Further to the north of the Application Site, beyond the streets of 2 and 3 storey housing along Coln Close, Windrush Way and Cherwell Close, is the Evenlode housing estate. This dates to the 1960s and comprises a total of 100 dwellings arranged within 4 storey maisonette blocks.
- 3.4 Two community facilities in the form of the Maidenhead Central Mosque and the Maidenhead Ivy Leaf Social Club are located to the east of the Application Site, on the east side of Holmanleaze. The "Moor" is a large green space located further to the east of the Application Site and running along Strand Water into the town centre.
- 3.5 Directly to the south and west, the site is bounded by key routes in and out of the town centre in the form of the Saint Cloud Way (A4) (running east-west) and Cookham Road (B4447) (running north-south). Beyond the highway to the south is a large Sainsbury's supermarket and multi-storey car park, of circa. 7 commercial storeys in height, with residential units above. This marks the northern edge of the town centre bounded by the ring road of Saint Cloud Way.
- 3.7 Adjacent to the western edge of the site is an existing office building complex, known as Saint Cloud Gate, and next to this is The Wilderness, a Grade II Listed Building, which currently operates as a medical centre.
- 3.8 The site is bounded by Saint Cloud Way, a busy 4 lane road, to the south; by Cookham Road to the west; Holmanleaze, a street with a more residential scale and character to the east; and Kennet Way, which acts as a natural divide between the large modern leisure buildings on the site and the residential area to the north. The site includes a modern sports centre, separate bowling alley and surface car park. It is linked to the town centre via a bridge to the recent Sainsburys building to the south; and an underpass leading to the plaza in front of Sainsburys, which in turn leads to established routes to the High Street. The townscape context to the site is quite varied with modern buildings up to 7 storeys in height to the south along St Clouds Way; lower mainly 2 storey residential buildings to the north; and a grade II listed building, The

Wilderness, that comprises of 2-3 residential storeys, to the west. The recently approved St Cloud Gate development would be 8 office storeys in height and is located to the west of the site.

3.9 There are gentle level changes across the site, however, there is a very noticeable drop between the site and Kennet Road to the north.

#### 4. KEY CONSTRAINTS

4.1 The following are the main constraints associated with the site:

- Adjacent to Grade II Listed Buildings
- Partly in flood zones 2 and 3 (eastern part of the site)
- Source Protection Zone
- Access from an A Class Road

#### 5. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 The original application comprised 439 new homes, comprising 130 shared ownership flats (the affordable housing element) and 309 flats for market sale, in five buildings.

- Raised podium courtyard amenity spaces for use by residents of each block;
- 350 car parking spaces, including 5% blue badge bays and 20% electric vehicle charging points;
- 439 long stay (internal) cycle parking spaces and 32 short stay (external) cycle parking spaces;
- A new 'green link' through the Application Site, east-west, providing access for pedestrians and cyclists between Kidwells Park, the Strand and the Moor, via Kennet Road, as well as north-south connections through the Application Site to the town centre;
- public realm including landscaping improvements, additional tree planting and the provision of children's playspace.

5.2 The proposal was subject to amendments submitted in October 2021 which are as follows:

| <b>COMPARISON BETWEEN ORIGINAL AND AMENDED PROPOSALS</b> |                            |                           |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Metric</b>  | <b>Original Submission</b> | <b>Amended Submission</b> |
| Site area  | <b>2.057 hectares</b>      |                           |
| Total number of homes                                    | <b>439</b>                 | <b>434 (-5)</b>           |
| Total number of affordable homes                         | <b>130</b>                 | <b>87 (-43)</b>           |
| <b>Housing mix</b>                                       |                            |                           |
| 1 bedroom apartment                                      | <b>166 (37.8%)</b>         | <b>165 (38%) (+0.2%)</b>  |
| 2 bedroom apartment                                      | <b>255 (58.1%)</b>         | <b>252 (58.1%) (n/a)</b>  |
| 3 bedroom apartment                                      | <b>18 (4.1%)</b>           | <b>17 (3.9%) (-0.2%)</b>  |
| <b>Housing tenure mix</b>                                |                            |                           |
| Market housing   | <b>309</b>                 | <b>347 (+38)</b>          |
| Affordable Rent homes                                    | <b>0</b>                   | <b>33 (+33)</b>           |
| Shared Ownership homes                                   | <b>130</b>                 | <b>54 (-76)</b>           |
| <b>Building height changes</b>                           |                            |                           |
| Block C2   | <b>8 storeys</b>           | <b>7 storeys</b>          |
| <b>Car and cycle parking</b>                             |                            |                           |
| Disabled car parking bays                                | <b>22</b>                  | <b>22</b>                 |
| Car parking total (inc. disabled parking)                | <b>350</b>                 | <b>346 (-4)</b>           |

|                                 |     |  |     |
|---------------------------------|-----|--|-----|
| bays)                           |     |  |     |
| Long-stay cycle parking spaces  | 439 |  | 439 |
| Short-stay cycle parking spaces | 16  |  | 16  |

5.3 The main changes in the amendments when compared with the original scheme were:

- A reduction in the number of units from 439 to 434;
- A reduction in the amount of affordable housing from 130 to 87 units;
- A change in the proportion of affordable housing from 100% shared ownership to 38% social rented housing and 62% shared ownership housing;
- A change in the proposed route of the Missing Links cycle route through the site;
- A reduction in height of part of Block C adjoining Holmanleaze from 8 to 7 storeys
- 5 Car parking spaces are to be designated for use by the Mosque located on Holmanleaze.

#### Residential

5.4 The proposal includes the delivery of 434 new homes, both affordable and private market dwellings, provided in five blocks. Blocks A1 and A2 is located to the north west, Block B to the north east, Block C to the south east and Block D to the south west. The detailed proposals for each block are set out below.

5.5 All ground floor dwellings have individual front doors onto the street, with communal lobbies serving the upper floors overlooking the public spaces. Private amenity space is provided within balconies, with further amenity space provided in courtyards to the rear of each block, which are provided at first floor level in most cases, with parking provided underneath at ground floor level.

#### Elevational treatment

5.6 The elevational treatment of the proposal is almost entirely brick, with occasional use of other material to provide contrast for key features such as entrances. Projecting and contrasting brickwork and metal balustrades provides variety.

#### Design Process

5.7 The design has been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions, including the input of an independent Design Review Panel. Detail of the Panel's comments is provided in Paragraph 9.12.

#### Block A

5.8 Blocks A1 and A2 are located to the north of the site and are two buildings, separated by an access road and car parking bays. The smaller of the two blocks (Block A2), to the east, measures up to four storeys in height, with a smaller two storey element located closest to adjoining neighbouring properties in the residential cul-de-sac, Holmanleaze. The larger of the two blocks (Block A1), to the west, is up to eight storeys in height.

5.9 Block A1 uses grey brick with a darker grey bricks for the first two storeys with a lighter grey brick sitting on top. For Block A2, a darker grey brick, used as the plinth brick on Block A1, is used for the whole of the building. Light grey metalwork, rainwater goods and windows accompany the grey brick tones.

- 5.10 Car parking: 20 car parking spaces are provided within the courtyard to Block A1 with 16 spaces provided on the street between the blocks. In addition, each residential core is provided with access to secure covered cycle storage, with a total of 82 cycle spaces provided.

#### Block B

- 5.11 Block B is located in the north east corner of the Application Site and closest to the adjoining existing properties located in the residential cul-de-sac, Holmanleaze, to the north. Block B comprises a linear structure running at an east-west orientation, with the majority of the block at three storeys in height and stepping up to five storeys at the western end of the block, forming a corner to the central plaza, in the centre of the site.
- 5.12 The corner uses contrasting projecting brick headers on the lower floors. The Block B town houses form a terraced street along the north side of the main east-west route running through the site.
- 5.13 Car parking for Block B is provided with 10 on-street car parking spaces provided to the North of the block, adjoining the gardens of the southern Holmanleaze houses. 20 cycle spaces are provided in a secure core

#### Block C

- 5.14 Block C is located in the south east corner of the site, with Saint Cloud Way running adjacent to the south, and Holmanleaze to the east. This block is arranged around a central courtyard area and varies in height between two and four storeys at the northern and southern parts, up to six, seven and eleven storeys to the east and west of the block. The eleven storey element of the block is the tallest building on the site and is located in closest proximity to Saint Cloud Way.
- 5.15 The elevation of Block C along the north-south link is separated into a base which is formed with darker brickwork and projecting brickwork linking the ground and first floor windows into bays. The northern link between the two taller elements to the north of Block C houses a number of duplexes that are accessed via the green link that runs through the site, east to west and have darker brick of the plinth and recessed brickwork panels.
- 5.16 A basement is provided beneath Blocks C and D providing 171 car parking spaces, which is accessed from Holmanleaze. Additional car parking for Block C is provided within the podium, with 39 car parking spaces. In addition, each residential core is provided with access to secure covered cycle storage, with a total of 166 cycle spaces provided within Block C.

#### Block D

- 5.17 Block D is located in the south west corner of the site, with Saint Cloud Way running adjacent to the south, and the existing Saint Cloud Gate office development and Wilderness Grade II Listed Building located to the west, the latter located approximately 47m away at its closest point. This block is also arranged around a central courtyard area and varies in height between four and six storeys at the lower levels, stepping up to seven and eight storeys, and then a larger eleven storey block as the tallest element of the block.
- 5.18 Using the level difference across the site a basement is provided beneath Blocks C and D providing 171 car parking spaces, which is accessed from Holmanleaze. Additional car parking for Block D is provided within the podium, with 33 spaces and 53 on street parking spaces to the west. Each residential core is provided with access to secure covered cycle storage, with a total of 171 cycle spaces provided within Block D.

## Access

- 5.19 The Proposed Development includes new north/south and east/west links that provide largely pedestrian/cycle only routes to connect Saint Cloud Way, Kennet Road, Cookham Road and Holmanleaze. An East/West cycle route is provided from Holmanleaze through the site to Cookham Road. the width varies from 3.50m to 4.0m. Textured concrete paving defines the route, whilst the building entrances and ground floor terraces are defined by grey banding block paving.
- 5.20 The proposal removed the pedestrian bridge over Saint Cloud Way and puts forward improvements to the existing subway running beneath Saint Cloud Way.
- 5.21 Vehicle access to the Site will be via three points. The existing entrance from Saint Cloud Way will be retained along with the egress onto Cookham Way. It is proposed that a new access point will be created on Kennet Road to gain access to Block A as well as provide a new north-south route through the Application Site.
- 5.22 Four access points will be created on Holmanleaze, replacing the four existing. Two will provide access to Block B and Block C parking areas respectively. The remaining two will form a one-way loop for refuse and emergency access. Block C parking will be accessed from this route, directly to the west of Holmanleaze.

## Transport

### Car Parking

- 5.23 The proposal includes the provision of 346 car parking spaces at a ratio of 0.8 spaces per dwelling, including 5% blue badge bays, and 20% electric vehicle charging bays with the remaining 80% having 'passive' provision to increase the number of charging points in the future.
- 5.24 Car parking is spread across the site, with Blocks A, C and D providing a concealed podium car park with the residential accommodation itself effectively hiding the spaces from view. Communal amenity space is provided on top of the podium car parks. On-street car parking is provided to the east of Block A, to the north of Block B and to the west of Block D.

### Wilderness Surgery Car parking

- 5.25 The medical centre has a private 17 space car park and drop-off/collection area which is available for patients, staff and emergency vehicles. A separate adjoining 20 space car park is reserved for the medical centre during the hours 8.00am–7.00pm Monday to Friday which is owned and maintained by the Council. This car park is outside the development area of the proposal and it is understood will remain in place by virtue of a long lease. These 20 spaces are made available for pay and display parking after 7.00pm each weekday and then on weekends. In addition to the above, one hour's parking is available in The Magnet car park for patients visiting the medical centre, with parking slips issued at the medical centre reception for this purpose.

### Cycle Parking

- 5.26 A total of 439 long stay cycle parking spaces would be provided across the Application Site. Each residential core is provided with separate secure covered cycle storage. A new cycle link between Kidwells Park and the Moor has been incorporated into the scheme. A total of 32 short stay visitor cycle secure parking spaces are also provided within the public realm.

### Servicing arrangements

- 5.27 Loading/waiting bays are provided to the south of Block C and to the west of Block D to facilitate deliveries and access to the proposal. Limited access routes (Bollard controlled) are proposed, which prioritise the use of shared spaces for pedestrians, run through the centre of the site provide controlled access for refuse collection and emergency access. Each residential lobby is linked with a refuse store for household and bulky waste and recycling.

### Community Facilities

- 5.28 The submitted material makes reference to the existing community facilities, including schools, community halls, religious establishments, parks and leisure facilities, doctors and dentists. The proposal makes no provision for the additional needs that the residents of the new development creates apart from the provision public amenity space within the development including play areas for younger children.

### Environmental Sustainability

- 5.29 The original Sustainability Assessment provision was revised and the updated version was submitted in October 2021. These revisions seek to meet all the requirements of the Council's Interim Sustainability Policy.

### Landscaping and trees

- 5.30 The proposal involves the creation of new public realm, including paving and seating areas, a new east-west shared cycle route, as well as private terraces, balconies, gardens and communal open space. A new north- south route through the site is also proposed.
- 5.31 The proposal puts forward the removal of most of the trees on site in order to facilitate the development. 64 trees are proposed to be planted to compensate for the loss of 58 existing trees. There are no trees of high quality (Category A) on site.

*Table 4: Summary of trees retained and removed from within the site boundary*

| Status of trees | High quality trees (Category A of BS5837) | Moderate quality trees (Category B of BS5837) | Low quality trees (Category C of BS5837) | Trees unsuited to retention (Category U of BS5837) |
|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
| Existing trees  | 0   | 15  | 28                                       | 4  |
| Retained trees  | 0   | 1   | 3  | 0  |
| Removed trees   | 0   | 14  | 25                                       | 4  |

In summary, the proposals remove the vast majority of existing trees and replace with a greater number of semi-mature specimens.

### Flooding and drainage

- 5.32 The North East corner of the site, adjoining Holmanleaze, is within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Following extensive input from the Environment Agency and the LLFA, the proposal has been designed to limit flooding, and to provide appropriate foul water drainage.

### Ecology

- 5.33 The proposed development is approximately 6km from Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area of Protection (SAC). The site is within 2km of several locally designated sites, the closest of which is the Green Way, 74m away.
- 5.34 A bat scoping survey was undertaken in 2018 and concluded the building on site had low potential to support roosting bats. Further survey was undertaken and no bat roosts were recorded within the building and the survey only recorded a single pass of a common pipistrelle bat.
- 5.35 As part of the development proposals, the applicant's ecologist has provided a DEFRA 2 biodiversity metric calculation in order to establish the losses and gains in biodiversity at the site following development. The report concludes that with the proposed landscaping (native tree, hedge and shrub planting and the creation of brown roofs) the site will provide a net gain of 2.60 habitat units and a net gain of 1.07 hedgerow units. In addition, the proposal provides other biodiversity enhancements including the provision of a number of bird and bat boxes.

### **Relevant planning history**

- 5.36 There is recent and relevant planning history relating to the site, albeit relating to the demolition of existing buildings rather than any proposed re-development schemes. In June 2018, two applications were submitted for the demolition of the Tenpin Bowling Centre (ref no. 18/01795/DEM) and the subsequent change of use of the land for a surface car park, with associated re-surfacing works and the erection of hoardings (ref no. 18/01796/FULL).
- 5.37 A formal decision for the prior notification application at the demolition of the Tenpin Bowling Centre was issued June 2018, confirming that prior approval was not required. The building has now been demolished. The proposals to change the use of the land were approved in August 2018 and following the discharge of relevant planning conditions attached to the planning permission, this change of use has been implemented and this part of the site is now being used as a temporary car park.
- 5.38 Subsequently, a prior notification application (ref no. 19/00932/DEM) was submitted in April 2019 for the demolition of the Magnet Leisure Centre. The Council issued a formal decision in May 2019, confirming that prior approval was not required. However, the leisure centre building has not yet been demolished.
- 5.39 The adjacent site to the south west, Saint Cloud Gate, has recent and relevant planning history in relation to the current proposals at the Application Site. A full planning application (ref no. 19/01660/FULL) for the demolition of existing office building and erection of a new office building with associated cafe, communal roof terrace and car parking was refused planning permission in December 2019. This refusal was based on the scale and appearance of the proposals and the harm to setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Building.
- 5.40 Following this refusal, an alternative proposal was submitted in June 2020 (ref no. 20/01463/FULL) and received a resolution to grant planning permission at the Royal Borough Development Management Panel on 18th November 2020, albeit the formal decision notice has yet to be issued. The proposals comprise a 7no. storey office building, ground floor cafe, with an enclosed roof terrace above, with improved car parking and pedestrian access along with enhanced landscaping being provided as well as improvements to the pedestrian subway access points.



5.41 In addition, the adjacent site to the west at Queensgate House, which is directly adjacent to Block A of the Proposed Development, also has recent and relevant planning history. A full planning application (ref no. 18/02186/FULL) for the erection of 3 x 2 mews style houses with undercroft parking was initially refused planning permission in October 2018. A planning appeal was lodged against this decision (ref no. APP/T0355/W/19/3219904), with the appeal being allowed by the Planning Inspectorate and planning permission granted in June 2019.

## 6. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

### Adopted Royal Borough Local Plan (2003)

6.1 The Borough's current adopted Local Plan comprises of the saved policies from the Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted June 2003). The policies which are considered relevant to this site and planning application are as follows

| <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Adopted Local Plan Policy</b> |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Design Guidelines  | DG1                              |
| Trees and development  | N6                               |
| Guidelines on Development affecting Conservation Areas       | CA2                              |
| Proposals affecting Listed Buildings or their settings       | LB2                              |
| Sites of Archaeological Importance and Development Proposals | ARCH2, 3, 4                      |
| Pollution: groundwater                                       | NAP3, NAP4                       |
| Public Open Space Provision in New Developments              | R3,R4                            |
| Children's playspace   | R5                               |
| Protection of existing community facilities                  | CF1                              |
| Provision of new community facilities                        | CF2                              |
| Design in keeping with character and appearance of area      | DG1, H10,H11                     |
| Design and Development Guidelines                            | E10                              |
| Affordable Housing   | H3                               |
| Town Centre Housing  | H6                               |
| Size, type and design of housing                             | H8,H9                            |
| Housing layout and design                                    | H10                              |
| Housing density  | H11                              |
| New Developments and Highway Design                          | T5                               |
| Funding of Improvements                                      | T6                               |
| Cycling  | T7                               |
| Pedestrian Environment                                       | T8                               |
| Public transport   | T10                              |
| Parking within Development                                   | P4                               |
| Implementation   | IMP1                             |

## 7. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

### 7.1 National Planning Policy Framework Sections (NPPF) (2019)

Section 4- Decision-making  
 Section 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes  
 Section 6. Building a strong, competitive economy  
 Section 7. Ensuring the vitality of town centres

Section 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities  
 Section 9- Promoting Sustainable Transport  
 Section 11. Making effective use of land  
 Section 12- Achieving well-designed places  
 Section 14- Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
 Section 15- Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
 Section 16- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

## 7.2 Emerging Borough Local Plan

| Borough Submission Version | Local Plan: Issue                                 | Proposed Changes (2019) | Submission (2017)       | Version |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
|                            | Spatial strategy                                  | SP1                     | SP1                     |         |
|                            | Climate Change                                    | SP2                     |                         |         |
|                            | Sustainability and Placemaking                    | QP1                     | SP2                     |         |
|                            | Maidenhead Town Centre Strategic Placemaking Area | QP1a                    |                         |         |
|                            | Green and Blue Infrastructure                     | QP2                     |                         |         |
|                            | Character and Design of New Development           | QP3                     | SP3                     |         |
|                            | Building Height and Tall Buildings                | QP3a                    |                         |         |
|                            | Housing Development Sites                         | HO1                     |                         |         |
|                            | Housing mix and type                              | HO2                     | HO2                     |         |
|                            | Affordable housing                                | HO3                     | HO3                     |         |
|                            | Housing density                                   |                         | HO5                     |         |
|                            | Economic Development                              | ED1                     | ED1                     |         |
|                            | Maidenhead Retail Centre                          | TR3                     |                         |         |
|                            | Historic Environment                              | HE1                     | HE1                     |         |
|                            | Flood risk  | NR1                     | NR1                     |         |
|                            | Nature Conservation and Biodiversity              | NR2                     |                         |         |
|                            | Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows                    | NR3                     |                         |         |
|                            | Renewable Energy                                  | NR5                     |                         |         |
|                            |   |                         |                         |         |
|                            |   |                         |                         |         |
|                            | Pollution (Noise, Air, Light, Water)              | EP1, EP2, EP3, EP4, EP5 | EP1, EP2, EP3, EP4, EP5 |         |
|                            | Infrastructure and Developer Contributions        | IF1                     | IF1                     |         |
|                            | Sustainable Transport                             | IF2                     | IF2                     |         |
|                            | Green and Blue Infrastructure                     |                         | IF3                     |         |
|                            | Open Space  | IF4                     | IF4                     |         |
|                            | Community Facilities                              | IF6                     | IF7                     |         |
|                            | Utilities   | IF7                     | IF8                     |         |
|                            | Site Allocation                                   | AL9                     |                         |         |

## 7.3 Emerging Local Plan Site Allocation AL9: Saint-Cloud Way, Maidenhead is for “a mixed-use scheme incorporating approximately 550 residential units, community centre and retail”

*“Development of the site will be required to:*

- *Facilitate comprehensive re-development and effective place making in the town centre. This will include playing an important visual and connectivity role in the Town Centre linking ring and fringe areas with the Town Centre Core.*

- *Provide a small amount of non-residential uses at ground floor level, including a small community centre to accommodate community groups and small scale retail/cafe units.*
- *Support delivery of the Maidenhead Missing Links scheme with high quality pedestrian and cycle routes through the site and into the town, and with an improved access across St Cloud Way (A4)*
- *Ensure that the development is well served by public bus routes/demand responsive transport/other innovative public transport solutions, with appropriate provision for new bus stop infrastructure, such that the bus is an attractive alternative to the private car for local journeys.*
- *Develop and implement a robust residential travel plan to manage travel to and from the site and reduce instances of single-occupancy car trips, including a car club for residents.*
- *Provide generous amounts of green infrastructure linking to existing open space to the west (Kidwells Park) and to the waterway (York Stream) to the east.*
- *Conserve and enhance biodiversity, especially in the proximity of the York Stream Local Wildlife Site*
- *Consist of a very high-quality design which supports the character of the area and is sensitively designed to consider the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residential properties*
- *Develop the site in phases, with the Magnet Leisure Centre retained until the new facilities at Braywick Park are open*
- *Integrates well in terms of design, layout, function and connectivity with the adjoining St Cloud Gate allocation site.*
- *Have residential development of an appropriate scale fronting onto Kennet Road, Holmanlease and the waterway, with active frontages onto St Cloud Way, with buildings stepped back from the road, potentially with green walls*
- *Address topographical issues across the site*
- *Be designed sensitively to conserve and enhance the setting of the listed building (The Wilderness)*
- *Provide at least 30% affordable housing and opportunities for custom build housing.*
- *Retain high/medium quality trees and planting of replacement trees*
- *Provide strategic waste water drainage infrastructure*
- *Direct development away from areas at highest risk of flooding on eastern part of site*
- *Address surface water flooding and groundwater source protection zone issues*
- *Consider flood risk as part of a Flood Risk Assessment as the site is partially located within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and bigger than one hectare*
- *Demonstrate the sustainable management of surface water runoff through the use of SuDS in line with policy and best practice; any proposed surface water discharge should be limited to greenfield runoff rates where feasible*
- *Provide appropriate mitigation measures to address the impacts of noise and air quality from St Cloud Way in order to protect residential amenity”*

A summary of the assessment of the proposal in relation to the above objectives is provided in section xii.

7.4 Paragraph 48 of the NPPF sets out that decision-makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) *the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);*
- b) *the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and*
- c) *the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).*

7.5 The Borough Local Plan Submission Document was published in June 2017. Public consultation ran from 30 June to 27 September 2017. The plan and its supporting documents, including all representations received, was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in January 2018. In December 2018, the examination process was paused to enable the Council to undertake additional work to address soundness issues raised by the Inspector. Following completion of that work, in October 2019 the Council approved a series of Proposed Changes to the BLPSV. Public consultation ran from 1 November to 15 December 2019. All representations received were reviewed by the Council before the Proposed Changes were submitted to the Inspector. The Examination was resumed in late 2020 and the Inspector's post hearings advice letter was received in March 2021. The consultation on the main modification to the BLPSV ran from 19 July to 5 September 2021.

7.6 The BLPSV together with the Proposed Changes are material considerations for decision-making. The weight to be given to each of the emerging policies and allocations will depend on an assessment against the criteria set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF. This assessment is set out in detail, where relevant, in Section 11 of this report.

7.7 These documents can be found at:

<https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/planning/planning-policy/emerging-plans-and-policies>

#### 7.8 **Supplementary Planning Documents**

- Planning Obligation and Developer Contributions SPD
- Planning for an Ageing Population SPD
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
- Borough Wide Design Guide SPD

#### 7.9 **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

- Affordable Housing Planning Guidance
- Interpretation of Policy F1
- Interpretation of Policies R2, R3, R4, R5 and R6
- Interpretation of Policy NAP4
- 

#### 7.10 **Other Local Strategies or Publications**

Other Strategies or publications material to the proposal are:

- RBWM Townscape Assessment
- RBWM Parking Strategy
- Placemaking and Maidenhead Town Centre Area Action Plan
- RBWM Environment and Climate Strategy
- RBWM Corporate Plan
- RBWM Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule 2020.
- RBWM Tall Building's strategy
  - D1: Avoid stark contrast in height
  - D2: Landmark buildings should be mixed use
  - D3: Landmarks should be prominent and visible
  - D5: Comprehensive Development
  - D8: A human scale street experience
  - D9: Active street frontages
  - D10: High quality public realm
  - D18: Tall buildings clusters

More information on these documents can be found at:

<https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/planning/planning-policy/planning-guidance>

## 8. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

### Comments from interested parties

511 occupiers were notified directly of the application. The planning officer posted a notice advertising the application at the site and the application was advertised in the Local Press. A revised proposal was received in October 2021 and further public consultation was undertaken on 14<sup>th</sup> October, which put forward a 14 day deadline for responses. However, all comments received to date have been reported. Representations received regarding both the revised and original proposals are summarised below.

| Comment   | Response   | Section where this topic is covered in the report |
|---|--|---|
| Not in character with the area  | Officers consider that the design of the proposal is acceptable  | ii,x  |
| Adverse impact on the listed Wilderness centre                                | It is accepted that the proposal causes limited harm the Wilderness centre in terms of adversely affecting the setting of a listed building  | ii  |
| Poor pedestrian access over St Clouds Way, with the removal of the footbridge | The provision of an at-grade pedestrian and cycle crossing on the A4 will improve access across St Clouds Way  | iii   |
| Resulting lack of parking for patients visiting the doctors' surgery          | The proposal does not cause unacceptable harm to car parking for the surgery. However, separate from the planning process it is understood that additional parking is being provided for use by the surgery outside of the development site. | iii, 9.33   |
| Block C is in the flood zone  | Flood risk and mitigation been addressed in the revisions to the scheme  | vi  |
| Reduced parking and access to the mosque                                      | Additional exclusive parking has been provided to the mosque and improved access to the Hinds Meadow carpark provided via the new at-grade A4 crossing. The access to the mosque itself is unchanged.  | iii, 9.32   |

|   |  |          |
|---|--|----------|
| Destroy local area  | The likely impact of the proposal is analysed within this report which concludes that the development is on balance acceptable   | ii       |
| Loss of privacy, including to community uses on Holmanleaze                               | While it is accepted that there are some negative impacts upon the amenity of existing properties which are assessed further below, overall the proposal is considered acceptable.   | x        |
| Amount of traffic   | The proposal is acceptable in terms of the amount of traffic generated considering the current use as a public car park.   | iii      |
| Lack of amenity space   | It is not considered that the proposal provides insufficient amenity space. All new residential units have adequate private amenity space in the form of balconies, gardens or terraces. The amount of communal outdoor space, including play areas and public realm, is over 4000m <sup>2</sup> | ii, viii |
| Density, bulk and mass of the scheme is excessive, up to 11 storeys on Holmanleaze        | Whilst the size of the proposed buildings is substantial, overall the design of the proposal is considered to be acceptable.   | ii       |
| 4 additional access points onto adjoining roads will increase traffic flow and congestion | The proposal is acceptable in terms of the amount of traffic generated considering the current use as a public car park. The access points have been assessed in terms of highways safety and considered acceptable.   | iii      |

|  |   |                     |
|--|---|---------------------|
| <p>The development will block light, cause loss of privacy and overshadowing of existing buildings, including Queensgate House</p>                               | <p>While it is accepted that there are some negative impacts upon the amenity of existing properties, although not specifically in relation to Queensgate House. Overall the proposal is considered acceptable.</p>   | <p>x</p>            |
| <p>Inadequate car parking / Loss of car park</p>   | <p>The amount of car parking for the proposed residential use is considered adequate. The loss of the public car park is in line with the emerging BLP AL9 site allocation and other public car parking in the form of Hines Meadow car park is available nearby. Specific provisions have been made for the Mosque. There is no unacceptable harm to parking for the Wilderness Surgery. Provision of additional parking outside of planning is being discussed.</p> | <p>iii</p>          |
| <p>Site should provide recreational use for children and teenagers; Site should be used for recreation for children. Kidwell's park skate park is over used.</p> | <p>The proposal provides play areas on site, and a 4000m<sup>2</sup> public realm.</p>  | <p>ii, iv, viii</p> |
| <p>Impact on local services, such as schools</p>   | <p>The impact on community services is addressed with a contribution to improvements to Maidenhead Library. An increase in demand for school places would be accommodated by existing services.</p>   | <p>iv</p>           |
| <p>Low rise housing would be in keeping with the character of the area.</p>  | <p>The AL9 allocation indicates that the site can accommodate the quantum of development proposed. The impact of the height proposed is fully considered and is acceptable.</p>   | <p>i, ii, xi</p>    |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Reduction in amount of affordable housing              | The amount of affordable housing proposed has reduced from 130 units of shared ownership accommodation to 87 units comprising: 54 shared ownership units and 33 affordable rented units. This revised provision is preferred given the large unmet need for rented affordable housing in the Borough. The overall amount of affordable housing is justified by the Financial Viability Assessment. | v.   |
| Too many flats, want family homes                      | The proposed development provides a small number of houses but the level of flats provided is considered acceptable to ensure efficient use of the site and is in line with the emerging BLP Allocation AL9.   | ii, v  |
| Negative effect on property values                     | Not a material consideration   |  |
| Consultation period for revised scheme too short       | 14 days was given for the deadline for comments on the revised scheme. All comments received to date have been reported.   | All representations received following consultation to the revised scheme on 13 <sup>th</sup> October have been accepted and assessed. |
| Noise and disturbance                                  | It is not considered that the proposal would cause significant disruption. Demolition and construction would be subject to a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to minimise any adverse impacts   | x  |
| Paving improvements to Holmanleaze pavements required. | Such improvements would be carried out where required as part of highways works.   | iii  |

### Petition

A petition was received containing 1,713 signatures which objected to the proposal on the following grounds:

MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL



- Not being in keeping with the character of the area.
- Proximity to the road and height of buildings negatively impacting residents and community groups on Holmanleaze,
- With 2 Additional vehicle accesses points from Holmanleaze & 1 from Kennet Road, negatively impacting on traffic in the area and these small roads.
- Removal of overhead footbridge from Hines Meadows car park across St Cloud Way which reduces access to town centre and local parking.

Responses to these points are provided in sections ii, iii and x.

#### Consultee Responses

| Consultee                     | Comment   | Where in the report this is considered |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Lead Local Flood Authority    | No objection subject to condition   | vi                                     |
| Thames Water - Waste          | No objection. Development within Source Protection Zone and may be at particular risk from polluting activities – condition suggested   |  |
| Environment Agency            | No objection subject to conditions  | vi                                     |
| Natural England               | No comment  |  |
| Ecology                       | No objection subject to conditions  | ix                                     |
| Landscape Officer             | No objection subject to conditions  | viii                                   |
| Highways                      | No objection to highways safety and capacity. Financial contribution for at-grade pedestrian and cycle crossing sought.   | iii                                    |
| Highways England              | No objection  | iii                                    |
| Housing                       | The revised provision of affordable housing is preferred given the large unmet need for rented affordable housing in the Borough. No objection to the amount of affordable housing being proposed on the basis of the Financial Viability Appraisal   | v                                      |
| Viability consultants (BPS)   | The submitted revised Financial Viability Appraisal is accepted.  | v                                      |
| Conservation and Urban Design | Comments that:<br><u>Form and Massing</u><br>The proposal is too tall and bulky, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The southern element of Block A1, appears overly tall when seen in the context of the remainder of the block and block A2 to the right. Ideally, A1 should be reduced by 1-3 storeys at this point.</li> <li>• The north west part of Block C is considered too tall in comparison with Block B opposite and should step down towards the corner. The south eastern part of Block C would also appear overly</li> </ul> | ii                                     |

dominant on St Cloud Way and along Holmanleaze, where the existing buildings, including the modern blocks to the south of St Cloud Way are of a lower height. The part reduction in height of Block C is welcomed, but is it still considered that overall, the block needs to be lowered in height.

- The south eastern corner of Block D would also be very dominant on St Cloud Way and should be reduced in height. Again, there is a dramatic drop in scale between the elements that form the St Cloud frontage of this block. A graduation in height would appear more comfortable across all of this frontage. This block would also form part of the backdrop to the listed Wilderness building.
- There are still concerns re the rear of the north western wing of Block B and Block A2 and their height and bulk in comparison with the much smaller existing houses to the rear
- Given the height and massing of Blocks C and D, the north south route between these blocks would appear highly enclosed and rather urban in character. As the principal route through and main link to the town centre this space would benefit from being wider.
- The revised streetscape elevation along St Cloud Way shows the relationship of the proposed blocks in terms of height with the approved gateway building at St Cloud Gate. Whilst the proposed “towers” are slimmer than the office building, their additional height would mean that they would compete with it within the streetscape, and when viewed from the approaches to the town centre

#### Spaces

- The creation of new “local” public spaces is welcomed, as are private amenity spaces on the podium decks and defensible spaces at ground level.
- The amenity areas created at podium and at roof level appear to offer useable space and include suitable planting and features that are easily maintained. These spaces will provide a variety of areas for different uses to cater for all ages and abilities
- The loss of the footbridge is accepted but the

provision of an at-grade crossing at the southern end of Holmanleaze should be considered.

Amenity

- significant number of proposed flats (circa 28-30%) do not appear to meet daylight standards, which appears to be caused by the shadowing of recessed balconies.
- Microclimate and potential wind tunnel issues have been addressed and appear to be at acceptable levels.
- Supporting information advises that sunlight/daylight levels within the areas would be acceptable.

Views and impact on historic assets

- Views from Cliveden and Taplow Court will be affected but will need to be seen in the context of recent approvals for other tall buildings within Maidenhead town centre. This would be considered as unfortunate, as these buildings were designed to take best advantage of the panoramic views across the river valley but given the changing skyline of Maidenhead and its distance from the historic asset, the harm would be considered as less than substantial.
- There will be glimpsed views of the site from the Maidenhead Town Centre Conservation Area, but these are unlikely to negatively impact on its wider setting or its significance.
- Block D is lower to the rear of the Wilderness listed building, and as such from street level views they are unlikely to impinge on its setting. The taller elements of the block will, however, appear to the north of the building across the car park, and also above it in intermediate views from the west, especially from Kidwells Park creating a wall of development to the rear of the listed building. This will have a negative impact on the setting of the historic building, although this could be judged as less than substantial harm and the relevant NPPF tests engaged.

Architecture:

- Roof line could be more varied;
- The use of red and stock brick cladding is welcomed. The use of darker colours for the “base of the buildings” and decorative brickwork

|   |  |      |
|---|--|------|
|   | <p>are also supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design and form of the entrance to the car park on the south elevation of Block C still appears unresolved</li> <li>Whilst the architecture of the proposed scheme is not considered to be “exceptional”, it is nevertheless considered to be of a stylish and restrained design, not dissimilar in appearance to a number of other recent developments already approved within the Town Centre</li> </ul> |      |
| Emergency Planning                            | No objection but note that a flood response plan and effective business continuity plan should be included   | vi   |
| Fire Authority                                | No objection   | -    |
| Sustainability                                | No objections. The revised proposal meets Interim Sustainability Statement requirements  | vii  |
| Arboricultural Officer                        | Concerns regarding loss of existing trees.   | viii |
| Archaeology Officer                           | No objection. No archaeological mitigation is required   | -    |
| Transformation Officer (Community Facilities) | Seeks a contribution to adapt Maidenhead Central Library to improve the delivery of community facilities.  | iv   |
| Education                                     | No specific requirements are necessary in terms of school places   | iv   |
| Historic England                              | No objection   | ii   |
| Designing out crime officer (police)          | Made a series of detailed design suggestions   | ii   |
| Environmental Protection                      | No objection subject to conditions   | x    |
| Bracknell Forest Council                      | No objection   | -    |
| Surrey Heath                                  | No objection   | -    |
| Wokingham                                     | No objection   | -    |
| Bucks CC                                      | No objection   | -    |

## Others

| Group                             | Comment  | Where in the report this is considered |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Islamic Trust (Maidenhead Mosque) | <p>Objects to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in traffic flows;</li> <li>Loss of existing car park and parking for the Mosque</li> <li>Towering building blocking light and overpowering the areas</li> <li>Loss of footbridge which will particularly impact worshippers at the mosque.</li> </ul> | ii, iii                                |

|  |  |                  |
|--|--|------------------|
| Local Access Forum and Windsor & Maidenhead Cycling Action Group | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed design comments regarding the design of the Missing Links cycle route through the site.</li> <li>• Support the removal of the footbridge</li> <li>• A new A4 at grade crossing,(ideally a toucan crossing) should be implemented prior to full occupation of the development</li> </ul>  | iii, viii,       |
| Maidenhead Forum   | <p>Objects on the basis of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in amount of affordable housing</li> <li>• The density, mass and height is excessive.</li> <li>• The visual impact of the high rise blocks on St Cloud Way is overbearing.</li> <li>• poorly designed with unattractive elevations.</li> <li>• Too many flats and should be more variety of housing type with low/mid rise dwellings.</li> <li>• lack of amenity space within the development.</li> <li>• inadequate Parking provision, with none for visitors to doctors' surgeries.</li> <li>• adversely impacts the setting of the listed Wilderness Centre.</li> <li>• poor pedestrian accessibility to the town centre</li> <li>• gas central heating.</li> </ul> | ii, iii, iv. vii |
| Patient Participation Group (PPG) Claremont and Holyport Surgery | <p>Objects to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate parking for existing surgery and for proposed housing;</li> <li>• Design, height, massing, impact on listed Wilderness building;</li> <li>• Construction impacts on staff and patients</li> </ul>   | ii, iii, x       |

## 9. Analysis

- i. Principle of development
  - Loss of Leisure Centre
  - Housing use
- ii. Design and Conservation
- iii. Transport
- iv. Social and Community Infrastructure
- v. Affordable Housing, viability, housing mix and custom build
- vi. Flooding and drainage
- vii. Environmental Sustainability
- viii. Landscape and trees
- ix. Ecology
- x. Amenity

xi. Assessment of proposal against DLP Policy AL9

i. Principle of development

#### Loss of Leisure Centre

9.1 Following the closure of the Magnet Leisure Centre in 2018, the Braywick Centre has been opened, which provides Maidenhead with a replacement facility. As a consequence the loss of the Magnet Centre is accepted. The proposal is therefore considered to conform to Policy CF1.

#### Housing

9.2 The Emerging Borough Local Plan allocation for the site proposes housing as the predominant use of the site. Site Allocation AL9: Saint-Cloud Way, Maidenhead is for “a mixed-use scheme incorporating approximately 550 residential units, community centre and retail”. It should be noted that the allocation includes the Ivy Leaf Club on the east side of Holmanleaze, on the Junction with St Clouds Way, which is outside the red line of development for the proposal. The proposal is entirely residential in character of which and the non-residential uses included with the AL9 allocation do not form part. However those uses could form an element of the adjoining Ivy Leaf Club site which is currently used as a social club. The residential development of the site would provide significant additional housing within Maidenhead Town Centre in line with Local Plan policy H6. Given that the site sits on the edge of the Town Centre and abuts the residential areas to the north of the site, residential use of the site is not out of character with the surrounding area. On this basis it is accepted that an entirely residential use is acceptable.

ii Design and Conservation

#### Layout

9.3 Considerable time has been given at the pre-application stage to developing the layout of the blocks. It is considered that the current layout largely incorporates the points discussed, including comments made by the Design Review Panel. It would work well in terms of links with the existing townscape and the creation of new routes through the site providing a good level of permeability and linkage with the surrounding areas, including Kidwells Park and The Moor.

9.4 There are a number of proposed individual front doors to the ground level units and shared lobbies positioned in locations that are adjacent to the larger or busier public spaces creating active frontages, this is welcomed.

9.5 It is noted that ground floor flats have buffer areas (with planting) to maintain privacy to principal rooms, with some flats also having enclosed private space at ground level, others have shared amenity space on the podium and most have balconies, which is supported.

9.6 Ideally more space should be provided along the St Cloud Way frontage to provide a greater level of screening along this very busy road and also the substation. It is noted, however, that the design of this external space has been revised and improved following previous comments regarding this matter.

9.7 Considerations from the Police (Designing Out Crime Officer) have been addressed through a series of detailed change regarding the following:

- Provision of a series of cages within each cycle parking area to increase security;
- relocation of several car parking spaces to provide improve road safety and avoid potential conflicts with cycles and the movement of bins.
- Change to the depth of some entrances to minimize unsurveilled areas.

- 9.8 One point of access (in and out) to the parking area under Blocks C and D, removing the southern access through what ideally should be an entirely pedestrian area, but overall this element is considered acceptable.
- 9.9 As a consequence the revised proposed is considered to be acceptable in terms of design layout

#### Height and massing

- 9.10 The Conservation and Design officer has concerns regarding the proposed height of some buildings particularly along St Cloud Way and Holmanleaze. As proposed some of these blocks are up to 11 storeys in height..
- 9.11 The proposed development sits within a mixed context which includes taller buildings. It is recognised that in certain streetscapes the scale of the buildings would be greater than surrounding context
- 9.12 Prior to the submission of the application, the proposal was subject to extensive pre-application advice including a formal Design Review, carried out by independent experts and managed by Design South East. The Design Panel provided the following comments on the proposal at that stage:
- *“We support many of the proposed design principles and consider the scheme’s strategic response to the varied contextual conditions to be generally robust. The mix and arrangement of building types across the site is sensible and is a great improvement from what is existing”.*
  - *“This site must be considered as part of an overall expansion strategy for Maidenhead. The ambition for dense development which breaches the A4 shows a commitment for ambitious town centre growth. The links back to the existing urban core is fundamental to the success of this site and future sites across this northern belt and must form the basis for any development”*
- 9.13 Taken as a whole, the design is considered to be an attractive contemporary design with a restrained palette of largely brick materials. However given the height of some of the buildings mentioned above it is considered that the proposed does not conform with the Tall Buildings policy. While the development does represent a denser and taller design than the majority of adjoining buildings, this should be balanced against the benefits that the scheme provides including the need to provide high quality housing in a sustainable location. In this context the scale, massing and height of the proposal is considered acceptable.

#### Spaces

- 9.14 The creation of new “local” public spaces is welcomed, as are private amenity spaces on the podium decks and defensible spaces at ground level.
- 9.15 The amenity areas created at podium and at roof level offer useable space and include suitable planting and features that are easily maintained. These spaces will provide a variety of areas for different uses to cater for all ages and abilities such as doorstep play, quiet seating areas and allotment/ planters. These spaces will need to be maintained long term. Supporting information advises that sunlight/daylight levels within the areas would be acceptable.

While the entrance to the pedestrian subway is improved and opened up and improved lighting is proposed it is considered that perceptions of insecurity will largely remain, particularly for vulnerable pedestrians.

- 9.16 There is no objection to the removal of the pedestrian bridge if accessibility to the town centre is improved. The requirement of an “at grade” pedestrian and cycle crossing across the A4 to the town centre at the southern end of Holmanleaze is supported and will provide a more secure and convenient alternative to the existing subway which reflects an existing desire line as a path has

been worn in the grass verge by people crossing the road at this location. It would also provide cycle access unlike the footbridge or subway.

#### Views and impact on historic assets

- 9.17 It is noted that Block D is lower to the rear of the listed building, and as such from street level views they are unlikely to impinge on its setting. The taller elements of the block will, however, appear to the north of the building across the car park, and also above it in intermediate views from the west, especially from Kidwells Park providing a backdrop to the rear of the listed building. This has a negative impact on the setting of the historic building, although this is judged as less than substantial harm and the relevant NPPF tests engaged. The St Clouds Gate development, closer to the Wilderness, has a greater impact but was on balance considered to be acceptable.
- 9.18 There will be glimpsed views of the site from the Maidenhead Town Centre Conservation Area, but these are unlikely to negatively impact on its wider setting or its significance.
- 9.19 Views from Cliveden and Taplow Court will be affected but will need to be seen in the context of recent approvals for other tall buildings within Maidenhead town centre. Any harm to these views is considered to be less than substantial.

#### Architecture

- 9.20 The architecture creates an identity for this site, with a series of character areas that are considered to reflect elements of the character of the locality and provide wayfinding and legibility. Materials that are appropriate in construction and visual terms, and that are long lasting and minimise maintenance issues. The careful use of colour throughout the site will be an important consideration- for example, to mark entrances.
- 9.21 One of the characteristic features of Maidenhead is its varied roofscape and skyline. Some of the blocks incorporate interesting roof forms, and these are considered to provide a similar variety, providing a distinctive roof line, particularly along the St Cloud frontage, which currently is rather dreary and featureless thoroughfare at present.
- 9.22 The materials of the buildings including the use of red, grey and stock brick cladding is welcomed. The use of darker colours for the “base of the buildings” and decorative brickwork are also supported.
- 9.23 Whilst the architecture of the proposed scheme is not considered to be “exceptional”, it is nevertheless considered to be of a stylish and restrained design, not dissimilar in appearance to a number of other recent developments already approved within the Town Centre,

#### Design Conclusion

- 9.24 The requirement for an at-grade crossing for pedestrians and cyclists is supported and will provide an important link to the town centre, as well as a significant improvement to sustainable transport.
- 9.25 It is considered that the proposed development will have a negative impact on the setting of the grade 2 Wilderness building and on long views from Cliveden and Taplow Court.
- 9.26 While harm is accepted, this harm would be considered as less than substantial and as such, will need to be considered within the guidance contained in para 202 of the NPPF. Overall the height and massing of the proposals are considered to be acceptable. The balance of planning issues is considered later in this report.

#### iii Transport

##### Vehicle Access



9.27 The development would be served by two new accesses off Kennet Road, new accesses off Holmanleaze. The development will be served by the existing entry access from Saint Cloud Way, and the egress only access onto Cookham Road.

- Parking Provision

9.28 The development provides a total of 346 car parking spaces; 22 accessible spaces, plus 5 spaces allocated to Maidenhead Central Mosque. Effectively, the 434 residential units have access to 341 spaces, which equates to 0.78 spaces per dwelling.

9.29 The level of parking is considered appropriate for the development, having regard to the site's location, the existing car parking restrictions in the surrounding area, and complies with local and national aims to promote and encourage sustainable modes of travel. It is noted in paragraph 2.3.5 of the latest Transport Assessment Addendum that 20% of the car parking spaces will be active electric charging points, with the remaining 80% provided with the appropriate infrastructure to allow the conversion to electric charging points. This is welcomed..

9.30 The development also proposes 3 car club spaces. The location of these bays is not identified and should be secured as part of the any legal agreement.

9.31 Five car parking spaces are proposed for the exclusive use of the Mosque located on Holmanleaze. These are to be located on private land and are considered an acceptable improvement for those visiting the Mosque.

9.32 In terms of the parking for the Wilderness Surgery, it is not considered that there is any planning need to address this issue, given the existing car parking associated with the existing use and the close proximity of the Hines Meadow car park. As a consequence it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in this regard. Outside of the formal planning process, it is understood that arrangements to provide exclusive access to an existing car park outside of the development site are being discussed. While these discussion are not yet concluded, and implementation is outside the scope of this application, this proposed solution would represent an equivalent provision to the existing parking situation. However it should be noted that such an arrangement, while welcome, is not relevant to the Committee's decision and that the proposal does not cause harm to parking for the Wilderness centre.

### Cycle Parking Provision

9.33 In line with the Borough's Parking Strategy (2004), the development attracts a demand for 434 cycle parking spaces; 1 space per dwelling. The development provides 439 spaces, plus 16 short-term spaces provided across the development.

### Missing Links

9.34 The proposal includes the Missing Links cycle route which has been designed to run east to west, from Holmanleaze through to Cookham Road and has been subject to a Stage 1 / 2 Road Safety Audit. The alignment of the route changes through the central plaza which will reduce cycling speeds. This coupled with the proposed signage and surface treatments will create an environment where cyclists are aware of pedestrians and behave accordingly. The landscaping strategy has been used to soften the route and encourage lower cycling speeds. A condition is suggested to ensure the design discourages cyclist speeding along straight sections across the development

### Estate Access

9.35 The applicant asserts that the route will be segregated from vehicular traffic, with the exception of refuse collection and occasional maintenance vehicles. This is achieved by

installing retractable bollards to the south of the new internal road that is accessed off Kennet Road, and to the east of the existing internal road that has to Cookham Road.

- 9.36 The installation, maintenance and operation of the bollards would be the subject of a planning condition controlling maintenance of the entire site. If the roads are to be adopted by the Borough's Highway Authority then that appropriate standard needs to be achieved.

#### Saint Clouds Way Crossing

- 9.37 An agreement has been reached that the developer will make a financial contribution towards the delivery of an at-grade new crossing facility for pedestrians and cyclists on the A4, to be located at the Southern end of Homlanleaze.
- 9.38 This crossing is welcomed as a significant improvement in accessibility from North Maidenhead to the Town Centre. It incrementally adds to the town's cycle infrastructure, complementing the Missing Links initiative and providing shared cycle/pedestrian routes east west along the A4.
- 9.39 The proposed improvements to the existing Saint Cloud Way pedestrian underpass are welcomed. In the context of the above improvements the proposal is considered to meet its obligations to improve connectivity into the town centre under draft Policy AL9.

#### Travel Plan

- 9.40 The travel plan satisfies the Borough's requirement in most respects. However, the following changes are required before it can be approved:
- Clearly set out the processes and timescales for review in the case that targets are not achieved and acknowledge the potential for sanctions in the event of non-compliance with implementation of the travel plan and failure to achieve targets;
  - The applicant must commit to submitting an annual monitoring report to the Council for a period of 5 years and with the first report being submitted within 3 months of occupation of the site.
  - The location of the three car club parking spaces and specifics of the terms of membership for new and existing residents including any complementary membership periods.
- 9.41 These details would be resolved as part of the legal agreement should the Committee resolve to grant consent.

#### Transport conclusion

- 9.42 The impact of the proposal in terms of highways congestion is considered acceptable given the current use of the site as a 382 space surface car park;
- 9.43 It is acceptable in terms of access arrangement and road safety. The amount of car and cycle parking is accepted as are arrangement for waste and emergency access. The proposed improvements to accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists is welcomed.

#### iv Social and Community Infrastructure

- 9.44 The submitted Socio-economic study submitted with the application has been revised on two occasions. As submitted the proposal fails to adequately address the likely impact of the proposal upon existing facilities. In order to address this impact comprehensive improvements in the form of works to Maidenhead Library have been suggested and are included within Section 10 of this report. These improvements could provide space for a variety of social infrastructures including health and other community facilities.

- 9.45 The development as originally submitted put forward 130 affordable flats (30% of the total numbers of units) in the form of entirely shared ownership units. This was considered to be unacceptable on the basis that it did not provide any social and affordable rented property, thus not meeting the housing needs of those unable to buy.
- 9.46 The revised proposal puts forward 87 affordable units, with 53 as shared ownership and 34 for affordable rent. This represents approximately 20% of the total.
- 9.47 The submitted Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) has been subject to review by the Council's independent assessors, BPS. Following extensive examination BPS have concluded that the proposal is unable to afford to meet the requirements of the affordable housing policy. BPS conclude that the proposed 87 affordable units (62% shared ownership and 38% affordable rent) is the maximum that the scheme can effectively afford to provide given agreed assumptions about costs and revenues. These costs include the planning obligations package of £1,097,500.
- 9.48 BPS recommend that a late-stage review is required in order to provide the opportunity to capture any improvements to viability over the duration of the development that could be used deliver additional affordable housing to bring the development closer to affordable housing need and policy aspirations.
- 9.49 As a consequence of the assessment of the FVA, the proposed affordable housing is considered acceptable and compliant with Policy H3 and DLP HO3.
- 9.50 The housing mix is shown below.

| <b>: Tenure</b>  | <b>1-bed</b> | <b>2-bed</b> | <b>3-bed</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Private          | <b>129</b>   | <b>201</b>   | <b>17</b>    | <b>347</b>   |
| Shared Ownership | <b>21</b>    | <b>33</b>    | <b>0</b>     | <b>54</b>    |
| Affordable Rent  | <b>15</b>    | <b>18</b>    | <b>0</b>     | <b>33</b>    |
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>165</b>   | <b>252</b>   | <b>17</b>    | <b>434</b>   |

- 9.51 Given the requirement for the necessary housing numbers and resulting density and the highly accessible location a largely flatted development is considered acceptable. The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of H2.
- 9.52 The proposal does not include any custom build plots, and thus does not conform to emerging BLP AL9 site allocation and emerging BLP Policy HO2. However it is considered that this is acceptable given that this policy is not yet part of the development plan.

vi Flooding and drainage

- 9.53 This topic has been the subject of detailed assessment and consideration by the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority. Revisions have included the raising of the ground floor of Block B to avoid flooding of residential units and an increase in the flood containment area of Block C. These changes are satisfactory and the proposal meets the requirements for flooding and drainage.

vii Environmental Sustainability

- 9.54 The environmental impacts of the proposal were revised in October 2021. The revisions fully meet the requirements of the Interim Statement of Sustainability

| <b>Topic</b> | <b>Original Submission</b>     | <b>Interim Policy requirement</b>                     | <b>Revised submission</b>          |
|--------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Energy       | committed to provide 10.43% of | 12% of the total energy demand will be met by on-site | PV provision has been increased to |

|                  |  |   |  |
|------------------|--|---|--|
|                  | energy demand from on-site renewables achieved through a 218kWp solar photovoltaic system                  | renewables  | 254.3kWp to meet the requirements of the 2021 Interim policy. This resulted in a 12.08% improvement in CO2 emissions through renewables which exceeds the requirements of the Interim policy.  |
| EV car parking   | 20% of car parking spaces will have active EV charging points along with 20% enabled for future provision. | 20% of new car parking spaces will be provided with active EV charging facilities – and passive provision (the ducting, cabling, and capacity within the Mechanical and Engineering Services) for the remaining 80% of spaces will be provided. | A total of 350 car parking spaces will be provided, 20% of which will feature active electric charging points whilst the remaining 80% will be passive for future provision. This will be achieved through ducting, cabling, and capacity within the on-site mechanical and engineering Services, offsite load upgrades are not proposed |
| Car Club         | A Car club will be developed to reduce the impacts of private car travel – 2 spaces proposed               |   | To reduce the impacts of private car travel, 3 car club spaces are now provided in response to the feedback from the Local Highway Authority.  |
| Water Commitment | Commitment to 110 litres per person per day.   | 105 litres or less per head per day   | The proposed development is now expected to achieve 105 litres per person per day by incorporating water efficient fixtures and fittings. This exceeds the   |

|                     |                              |  |   |
|---------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                     |                              |  | requirements of the RBWM Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.   |
| High Speed Internet | Not specifically referred to | New build homes will be supplied with high speed internet connection to facilitate home working. | A 1GB Hyper Optic broadband will be delivered to every home in order to promote sustainable way of living to all future occupants. This is expected to assist with greater home ability and reducing dependency on travel due to low internet connectivity. |

9.55 As a consequence the proposal is acceptable in terms of environmental sustainability.

viii Landscape and trees

9.56 The public realm proposed is considered to be high quality, with landscape and planting a central theme in the development of the proposal. A central piazza provides a focus for the new permeable routes through the site and will act as a meeting place. Children’s play is adequately catered for. The design of ground floor areas, providing planting as screening and public facing windows and individual front doors will provide security and privacy whilst enhancing the scope for incidental encounters and good neighbourliness. The streets and spaces created will provide an attractive environment with sufficient public and private outdoor space to meet the appropriate requirements. The greening of St Clouds Way is welcomed and is in accordance with the requirements of the Place Making Study. External lighting proposals will need to be submitted and will need to respond to their location in terms of design and lighting levels

9.57 The design of paving and hard landscaping would be subject to condition to ensure that the east - west shared cycle route minimized safety concerns.

9.58 The proposal involves the loss of 14 trees of moderate quality. Overall 54 trees are to be lost, with 63 new trees being provided. While the loss of these trees is regrettable, it is accepted for the following reasons:

- The replacement trees and planting provide sufficient compensation
- The ecological benefits (see below section ix)
- The constraints that would be caused by the retention of those existing trees would mean that achieving the appropriate number of residential units would be unlikely.
- The removal of existing trees from the site boundary on Kennet Road to the north of Block A1 (off the site) is considered acceptable given the overall improvement in the number of trees on the site as a whole and the need to provide a public facing street within the development running south from Kennet Road.

- There are no objections in principle to the approach to soft landscaping as included in the document, which appears well considered. This will be an integral part of the success of this development.

9.59 As a consequence the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of landscaping and arboriculture.

#### ix Ecology

- 9.60 An ecological survey was undertaken in 2018 and then an update was carried out in 2020 (LUC, February 2021). The majority of the site comprised buildings and hard standing, which is of low ecological value. There were a number of scattered trees and an area of scrub, the majority of which will be lost as part of the development.
- 9.61 The proposed development is approximately 6km from Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area of Protection (SAC). Natural England were consulted on the application and had no comments to make on this site given the distance of the proposed development and the SAC. The site is within 2km of several locally designated sites, the closest of which is the Green Way, 74m away. Given the distance to these sites from the application site, there could be indirect effects on the closest sites from the development including pollution. A Construction Environmental Management Plan is recommended to minimise the risks of pollution to these sites
- 9.62 A bat scoping survey was undertaken in 2018 and concluded the building on site had low potential to support roosting bats, as did subsequent surveys. In any event all bats and their roosts are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended, the Countryside of Rights and Way Act 2000 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Lighting and demolition should be conditioned to minimise any impact on bats.
- 9.63 The report concludes that with the proposed landscaping (native tree, hedge and shrub planting and the creation of brown roofs) the site will provide a net gain of 2.60 habitat units and a net gain of 1.07 hedgerow units. In addition, there are a number of other biodiversity enhancements including the provision of a number of bird and bat boxes. Taken in total, these improvements are considered to be in accordance with paragraph 175 of the NPPF, which states that “opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged”. Overall it is considered that the proposal is acceptable on ecological grounds.

#### x Amenity

##### Privacy

- 9.64 The proposal is a dense urban scheme which attempts to integrate with its existing and approved neighbours.
- 9.65 In terms of the approved St Clouds Gate office building, Block D is approximately 14 metres away at its closest point. Privacy issues have been minimized with the use of dual aspect units and the staggering of units and window to avoid direct overlooking. While the space between the 2 buildings is constrained, any impacts on overlooking, sunlighting, daylighting and privacy have been minimized and are considered acceptable given the urban nature of the proposal and the requirement to provide sufficient housing numbers.
- 9.66 Elsewhere within the site and in relation to existing properties such as those on Holmanlease, an 18 metre window-to- window distance has been generally adhered to. The provision of inset balconies and proposed boundary planting lessens any sense of overlooking.

##### Sunlighting, Daylighting and Overshadowing

- 9.67 A number of existing surrounding properties lose light as a consequence of the proposal.

In terms of the effect on the existing buildings many of the rooms that fall short of the criteria set out by the BRE guidelines do so because of balconies and walkways to their own buildings that heavily restrict the visible sky and potential for light to enter the rooms.

- 9.68 The BRE guidelines should be interpreted flexibly in these cases, in line with the NPPF's July 2021 recommendations. The Vertical Sky Component (VSC) has been assessed and the results show that 372 of the 471 windows (79%) will meet the BRE guidelines requirements for daylight by either obtaining 27% VSC or retaining at least 0.8 times their former values.
- 9.69 This represents a slight improvement in VSC levels when the proposed scheme is compared to the original one, bringing the windows meeting the BRE guidance up from 78% to 79%. In real terms the effect of the revised scheme is that 19, 25 and 27 Holmanleaze all meet the BRE guidance for VSC with the proposed development in place. Of the 21% of windows experiencing adverse impacts, 31 (6.5%) are considered to suffer a minor loss, 50 (10.6%) a moderate loss and 18 (3.8%) a substantial loss. The ones suffering substantial loss include one window at 31 Holmanleaze, one at Lea House and 16 at Providence Place.
- 9.70 In terms of Direct Daylight, 93% of the existing surrounding properties met the BRE standard. In terms of Sunlight, 80%.
- 9.71 A significant number of proposed flats (circa 28-30%) do not appear to meet daylight standards as noted in the revised supporting document. With the majority of cases it is the provision of recessed balconies that causes this deficiency. Overall, these results are commensurate with a high density urban scheme. Whilst there are some deviations from guidance, that deficiency is considered to have a minor adverse impact and this should be balanced against the need for an attractive design and adequately sized balconies. As a consequence it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity.
- 9.72 Microclimate and potential wind tunnel issues have been addressed and are considered acceptable as are the assessments of noise and air quality.
- 9.73 A Construction and Environmental Management Plan is suggested in order to minimise construction impacts upon neighbours. This would be covered by condition.
- 9.74 Overall the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the amenity, including existing neighbours including residential properties.

xi Economic Impacts

- 9.75 It is anticipated that the Development will produce employment for an average of 213 (FTE) workers per month over the 66-month construction period (February 2022 to August 2027).
- 9.76 In addition to jobs created as a direct effect of the construction and management of the Development, further indirect employment and economic benefit will be experienced as a result of the spin-off and multiplier effects. It is calculated that there will be a further 207 indirect jobs created during the construction phase (=213 direct jobs x 0.97 ONS Type 1 multiplier).
- 9.77 The Development will provide 434 new homes. The 434 homes will introduce 434 new households. The new households will provide an increase in consumer spending as the new households use local shops and services to meet their day-to-day needs. It is calculated that that the 434 new households created by the Development could generate £13.4m in commercial expenditure per annum.
- 9.78 Overall the proposal is considered to provide a positive impact upon the local economy and job creation.

xii Assessment of proposal against emerging BLP Site Allocation AL9

| Site Allocation AL9: Saint-Cloud Way, Maidenhead is for   | Summary of conclusion   |
|---|---|
| "a mixed-use scheme incorporating approximately 550 residential units, community centre and retail"   | The proposal is considered to deliver the required density of development (434 units) given site constraints, and the exclusion of the Ivy Leaf element of the allocation   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Development of the site will be required to:</i></li> </ul>  |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Facilitate comprehensive re-development and effective place making in the town centre. This will include playing an important visual and connectivity role in the Town Centre linking ring and fringe areas with the Town Centre Core.</i></li> </ul>   | The proposal is considered to achieve this, providing new routes to the town centre and connecting to visually.   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Provide a small amount of non-residential uses at ground floor level, including a small community centre to accommodate community groups and small scale retail/cafe units.</i></li> </ul>  | Non-residential uses are not included but could be provided on the Ivy Leaf Club site   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Support delivery of the Maidenhead Missing Links scheme with high quality pedestrian and cycle routes through the site and into the town, and with an improved access across St Cloud Way (A4)</i></li> </ul>   | Provides East West cycle route in line with Missing Links scheme;<br>Planning Obligation to provide new at-grade crossing for pedestrians and cyclists across St Clouds Way |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Ensure that the development is well served by public bus routes/demand responsive transport/other innovative public transport solutions, with appropriate provision for new bus stop infrastructure, such that the bus is an attractive alternative to the private car for local journeys.</i></li> </ul> | New bus stop is provided, along with three car club spaces and travel plan in order to promote non-car use  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Develop and implement a robust residential travel plan to manage travel to and from the site and reduce instances of single-occupancy car trips, including a car club for residents.</i></li> </ul>   | Car club and travel plan provided   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Provide generous amounts of green infrastructure linking to existing open space to the west (Kidwells Park) and to the waterway (York Stream) to the east.</i></li> </ul>   | Extensive public realm including enhanced green infrastructure, planting and trees provided in east-west route through the site   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Conserve and enhance biodiversity, especially in the proximity of the York Stream Local Wildlife Site</i></li> </ul>  | Biodiversity is considered to be enhanced. The site does not extend to York Stream  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Consist of a very high-quality design which supports the character of the area and is sensitively designed to consider the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residential properties</i></li> </ul>  | Design is considered to be high quality. The impacts upon daylighting, privacy and amenity, have been assessed and are, on balance, considered to be acceptable.            |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Develop the site in phases, with the Magnet Leisure Centre retained until the new facilities at Braywick Park are open</i></li> </ul>   | The Braywick Park Centre is open and operating.   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Integrates well in terms of design,</i></li> </ul>  | The relationship with St Clouds Gate is   |



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <i>layout, function and connectivity with the adjoining St Cloud Gate allocation site.</i>  | problematic but there is limited scope to improve that given the location of the St Clouds Gate building. Within those parameters the proposal is considered to be acceptable.               |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Have residential development of an appropriate scale fronting onto Kennet Road, Holmanleaze and the waterway, with active frontages onto St Cloud Way, with buildings stepped back from the road, potentially with green walls</i></li> </ul> | The need to achieve the necessary density and housing numbers has meant that the scale of the development is substantial. An active frontage on St Clouds Way is proposed.                   |
| <i>Address topographical issues across the site</i>   | Addressed  |
| <i>Be designed sensitively to conserve and enhance the setting of the listed building (The Wilderness)</i>  | The impact is considered to be harmful to the setting of the Wilderness but that that harm is considered to be less than substantial. This is analysed in the planning balance.              |
| <i>Provide at least 30% affordable housing and opportunities for custom build housing.</i>  | The proposal provides just over 20% affordable housing which is considered acceptable in the light of the submitted financial viability assessment.<br>Custom build housing is not proposed. |
| <i>Retain high/medium quality trees and planting of replacement trees</i>   | The majority of existing trees on site are to be lost but a larger number of replacements are provided.  |
| <i>Provide strategic waste water drainage infrastructure</i>  | Necessary drainage infrastructure is provided.   |
| <i>Direct development away from areas at highest risk of flooding on eastern part of site</i>   | The proposal adequately addresses the flood risk on the eastern part of the site   |
| <i>Address surface water flooding and groundwater source protection zone issues</i>   | The proposal addresses these issues which are proposed to be covered by condition where appropriate  |
| <i>Consider flood risk as part of a Flood Risk Assessment as the site is partially located within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and bigger than one hectare</i>  | A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted and is accepted.  |
| <i>Demonstrate the sustainable management of surface water runoff through the use of SuDS in line with policy and best practice; any proposed surface water discharge should be limited to greenfield runoff rates where feasible</i>   | SuDs has been provided and assessed as part of the proposal and is considered acceptable.  |
| <i>Provide appropriate mitigation measures to address the impacts of noise and air quality from St Cloud Way in order to protect residential amenity”</i>   | The impacts of noise and air quality have been adequately mitigated.   |

## 10. Section 106

1. £263,872 towards improvements to community facilities.
2. £833k towards A4 at-grade crossing\*
- 3 Travel Plan, including 3 on-site car club spaces. No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall then be implemented, monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan targets to the satisfaction of the Council. Fees for approving and monitoring the Travel Plan are applicable, as well as a surety to ensure implementation of the Travel Plan.
- 4 Provision of affordable housing
- 5 Provision of improvements to the St Clouds Way subway
- 6 Review mechanism of scheme viability

\*If necessary part of this funding could be used to provide additional cycle route provision to join up the on-site cycle route with the Missing Links cycle route on either side.

## 11. Conclusion

11.1 In terms of the planning balance the harms and benefits of the proposal should be compared. At the present time the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and therefore in line with Paragraph 11 of the NPPF, the “tilted balance” is engaged.

| <b>Benefits</b>   | <b>Weight</b>                       |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| • Provision of 434 new homes including 87 affordable homes.   | Significant                         |
| • Provision of at-grade crossing, Missing Links link and improvements to the subway considered to be benefits to sustainable travel and the Climate Emergency generally | Significant                         |
| • Contribution to Maidenhead Library  | Moderate                            |
| • Construction jobs and economic benefits   | Significant                         |
| • Improvements to biodiversity.   | Moderate                            |
| <b>Harms</b>  | <b>Weight</b>                       |
| • to the setting of the Wilderness listed buildings and strategic views   | Moderate<br>(Less than substantial) |
| • Exceeds the parameters of the Tall Buildings policy.  | Moderate                            |

11.2 In line with paragraph 11 of the NPPF, there are no policies in the NPPF which provide a clear reason for refusal and the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as whole. In conclusion the benefits outlined above clearly outweigh the harms and the proposal is recommended for approval.

1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission. Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below [to be added]  
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars

3 Prior to the commencement of development, a phasing plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.  
Reason: in the interests of good planning.

4 Prior to their installation, samples and details of the materials to be used on the external surfaces including hard landscaping within the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall accord with the approved details.  
Reason: in order to ensure a satisfactory external appearance and ensure that the shared cycle route is safe.

5 Prior to the demolition of the existing pedestrian footbridge over Saint Cloud Way, a Demolition Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall include details of how the existing opening with the Hines Meadow

Car Park shall be made good. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: in the interests of amenity and public safety.

- 6 No development shall take place until a site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan must demonstrate the adoption and use of the best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise, vibration, dust and site lighting. The plan should include, but not be limited to: Noise a) Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison b) Arrangements for liaison with the Environmental Protection Team c) All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be carried out only between the following hours: 08 00 Hours and 18 00 Hours on Mondays to Fridays and 08 00 and 13 00 Hours on Saturdays and; at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays. d) Deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above. e) Mitigation measures as defined in BS 5528: Parts 1 and 2: 2009 Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites shall be used to minimise noise disturbance from construction works. f) Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours. g) Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants. This must also take into account the need to protect any local resident who may have a particular susceptibility to air-borne pollutants. h) Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes. Biodiversity a) Risk assessment of potentially ecologically damaging construction activities. b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones". c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements). d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features. e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works. f) Responsible persons and lines of communication. g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person. h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details. Reason: In order to protect public amenity and to minimise impacts on biodiversity in accordance with Paragraphs 170 and 175 of the NPPF.

- 7 Prior to the commencement of the development a dust management plan detailing mitigation measures to control dust emission arising from site remediation, construction, and demolition work shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented in full and in accordance with the approved dust management plan.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area and prevent dust nuisance.

- 8 Demolition works shall be undertaken under the supervision of an appropriately qualified ecologist [full member of CIEEM and or a Natural England Bat licence holder with experience of supervising demolitions where there is a risk of bats being present]. Works are to follow a method statement agreed between the ecologist and the contractor detailing techniques and the procedure to follow should bats or signs of bats be found. A closing-out report including details of the methods used, and any bats or signs of bats found, is to be issued to the council. If works do not commence before April 2022, an updated bat survey is to be undertaken and a report detailing the findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

Reason: in the interests of biodiversity.

- 9 No development shall commence until a report detailing the lighting scheme and how this will not adversely impact upon wildlife has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include the following figures and appendices: a) A layout plan with beam orientation b) A schedule of equipment c) Measures to avoid glare d) An isolux contour map showing light spillage to 1 lux both vertically and horizontally, areas identified as being of importance for commuting and foraging bats, and locations of bird and bat boxes. The approved lighting plan shall thereafter be implemented as agreed.

Reason: To limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on nature conservation in accordance with para 180 of the NPPF.

- 10 Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development above slab level, details of biodiversity enhancements, to include integral bird and bat boxes, tiles or bricks on the new

buildings, details of brown roofs and native and wildlife friendly landscaping, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the council. The biodiversity enhancements shall thereafter be installed as approved.

Reason: To incorporate biodiversity in and around developments in accordance with paragraph 175 of the NPPF.

- 11 No tree or hedgerow shown to be retained in the approved plans shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree work be undertaken other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars and without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority, until five years from the date of occupation of the building for its permitted use. Any approved tree work shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 Tree work. If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted in the immediate vicinity and that tree shall be of the size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as specified by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Local Plan Policies DG1 and N6.

- 12 Piling using penetrative methods shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Piling can cause pollutant pathways when undertaken in areas of contaminated land leading groundwater pollution in the source protection zone.

- 13 Prior to commencement (excluding demolition, piling works and bulk excavations) a surface water drainage scheme for the development, based on sustainable drainage principles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include: a) Full details of all components of the proposed surface water drainage system including dimensions, locations, gradients, invert levels, cover levels and relevant construction details. b) Details of the maintenance arrangements relating to the proposed surface water drainage system confirming who will be responsible for its maintenance and the maintenance regime to be implemented. The surface water drainage system shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, and to ensure the proposed development is safe from flooding and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

- 14 Prior to any excavation works within five metres of the existing electrical sub-station, details of the ground investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: in order to minimise land contamination.

- 15 Prior to the occupation of the development, a Verification/Validation Report shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Verification/Validation Report shall set out details of verification sampling carried out at the base of the excavation beneath the existing electrical sub-station and any other excavated areas to demonstrate all contamination has been removed from the site and disposed of appropriately or re-used as part of a Materials Management Plan.

Reason: in order to minimise land contamination

16 No part of the development shall be occupied until vehicle parking space has been provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including details of charging facilities for electric cars (fast charge and rapid charge points). The space approved shall be retained for parking in association with the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety and ensure that the development encourages sustainable travel. Relevant Policies - Local Plan P4, DG1 and complies with Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- 17 No part of the development shall be occupied until covered and secure cycle parking facilities have been provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority. These facilities shall always thereafter be kept available for the parking of cycles in association with the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to encourage the use of alternative modes of transport. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T7, DG1

18 Prior to occupation a Car Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: in order to ensure the provision of car parking in a timely fashion and to ensure it meets the needs created by the development.

19 Prior to occupation a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: in the interests of sustainable transport and the Council's Interim Sustainability Policy

20 No part of the development shall be occupied until the access has been constructed in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant shall enter into a legal agreement with the Council under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to cover the construction of the accesses and associated highway works on Kennet Road and Holmanlease.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T5, DG1.

21 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment Addendum (reference 070244-CUR-XX-XX-RP-C-92003, revision P01, dated 1 October 2021 and prepared by Curtins), including appendices, and the following mitigation measures it details:a) Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 25.04m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) for Block C and ground floor flats in Block B, and no lower than 24.89m AOD for the rest of Block B, in accordance with section 4.3 and drawing number 1810 P 101 002 P7 (titled Site Wide Lower Ground Floor Plan and dated 30 September 2021) in Appendix Fb) Level for level compensatory storage shall be provided as described in sections 4.4 to 4.6 of the FRA addendum and as shown in the drawings within Appendices J and Kc) Land levels shall be set in accordance with drawing number 11036-LD-PLN-206 (titled Levels Intent, issue P04, dated 30 September 2021) in Appendix I These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants, as well as to prevent an increase in flood risk elsewhere by ensuring that compensatory storage of flood water is provided, in accordance with paragraphs 164 and 167 of the NPPF, policy F1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations, adopted June 2003) and emerging policy NR1 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033.

22 Any walls or fencing constructed within the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) plus an appropriate allowance for climate change flood extent shall be designed and constructed to be permeable to flood water and maintained as such for the lifetime of the development, and the areas beneath them shall be kept free of obstructions at all times, other than with the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent an increased risk of flooding elsewhere due to impedance of flood flows and reduction of floodwater storage capacity in accordance with paragraph 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy F1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations, adopted June 2003) and emerging policy NR1 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033.

23 Prior to occupation a Public Realm Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented as approved. This plan will provide details of maintenance, cleaning and access, such as the operation of moveable bollards, should it not be adopted by the Highways Authority.

Reason: in the interests of good management, public amenity and road safety.

## **Informatives**

- 1 All birds, their nests and eggs, are protected by law. It is a criminal offence (with certain exemptions) to deliberately or recklessly take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird whilst it is in use or being built. The buildings and vegetation on the site could be used by nesting birds and any clearance should take place outside the bird nesting season (March - August inclusive) or areas to be cleared should first be checked for bird nests by an appropriately qualified person. If bird nests are found works that could disturb it must stop until any young have fledged the nest. If there is any doubt whether or not birds are nesting in the buildings or vegetation, expert ecological advice should be sought and or clearance work should not be undertaken until after the end of the nesting season
- 2 The chalk in parts of Maidenhead is known to be susceptible to the development of dissolution features and the risk of such features should be assessed and taken into account in the design of any infiltration features and building foundations.
- 3 The Royal Borough receives a large number of complaints relating to construction burning activities. The applicant should be aware that any burning that gives rise to a smoke nuisance is actionable under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Further that any burning that gives rise to dark smoke is considered an offence under the Clean Air Act 1993. It is the Environmental Protection Team policy that there should be no fires on construction or demolition sites. All construction and demolition waste should be taken off site for disposal. The only exceptions relate to knotweed and in some cases infected timber where burning may be considered the best practicable environmental option. In these rare cases we would expect the contractor to inform the Environmental Protection Team before burning on 01628 68 3830 and follow good practice.