

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD  
PANEL UPDATE**

**Maidenhead Panel**

<b>Application No.:</b>	21/02331/OUT
<b>Location:</b>	Station Court High Road Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9JF
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline application for Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the erection of 8 dwellings.
<b>Applicant:</b>	David Howells
<b>Agent:</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Cookham Parish/Bisham And Cookham
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Michael Lee on or at michael.lee@rbwm.gov.uk	

**1. SUMMARY**

1.1 This update relates to the following: -

- Energy and Sustainability issues;
- Heritage Assessment; and
- Ecology Issues.

1.2 There is no amendment to the recommendation, apart from the revisions to the conditions. The recommendation is as follows:

**It is recommended the Committee DEFERS AND DELEGATES the decision to GRANT planning permission to the Head of Planning subject to the following:**

- 1. The conditions listed in Section 15 of this report; and**
- 2. The receipt of a Sustainable Energy Report and the Completion of a Section 106 legal Agreement to secure any Carbon Offset Contributions, the requisite Lifestyle Contribution, and a mechanism to secure compliance testing and any resulting shortfall payments, pursuant to the Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design – March 2021.**

**2. Issues and Matters Arising**

Updated Information on Energy & Sustainability

2.1 Since the publication of the Committee Report Officer's have been in dialogue with the applicant regarding the energy and sustainability credentials of the proposed dwellings and to seek agreement for the payment of the Carbon Offset Contribution pursuant to the Energy Sustainability Position Statement.

- 2.2 Regarding the Carbon Offset Contribution, the applicant has confirmed that they are agreeable to both the carbon offset payment and the Lifestyle Contribution. The extent of the Carbon Offset is to be agreed though the preparation of a detailed Energy Assessment in conjunction with the Lifestyle Contribution of £1,144 per dwelling.
- 2.3 With regard to the sustainability credentials of the 8 dwellings proposed, the applicant has reviewed such matters on recent developments elsewhere as well as looking at the precise nature of the current scheme. They have confirmed that, principally with the use of air source heat pumps, there can be in the region of a 50/55% reduction in carbon emissions over current Building Regulations.
- 2.4 This may be able to be increased further through the use of Solar PV panels although this is dependent upon the precise nature of the roof construction and associated roof space. This would be conformed through the submission of the detailed Energy Assessment.
- 2.5 Notwithstanding the possibility for the use of solar PV panels, it is considered that the 50/55% reduction in carbon emissions through the use of air source heat pumps would result in a substantial improvement over that required by Building Regulations thereby according with the objectives of Policy SP2 of the BLP.

#### Heritage Matters

- 2.6 Heritage Issues are discussed at Section 10.iv of the Committee Report and whilst no specific update was required the applicant had prepared a Heritage Statement to respond to the comments of the Conservation Officer.
- 2.7 The former Waiting Room was considered to represent a Non-Designated Heritage Asset as a result of its connection with the Cookham Railway station. The Heritage Assessment states that the former Waiting Room is constructed some 70m from the railway station, is of a different architectural style, has been heavily modified, particularly internally and externally though the provision of a flat roof extension and was built some 50 years after the railway station.
- 2.8 The Heritage Assessment concludes that by virtue of this the significance of the structure is, at most, very local as part of the group of structures including the railways workers cottages terrace and railway station building and its removal would have an, at most, slight impact.
- 2.9 Such a slight localised impact, together with the issues noted above regarding its extensive modification do not weigh significantly in favour of its retention. Furthermore, the loss of the former waiting room did not constitute a reason to refuse the previous scheme for a flatted development of 12 units (Reference 20/00864/OUT).

#### Ecology Issues

- 2.10 Since the publication of the Committee Report a query has been raised by a local resident regarding the potential ecological impact arising from the development on the Burnham Beeches SAC.
- 2.11 The Burnham Beeches comprise an area of Atlantic acidophilous beech forest with Ilex and also Taxus in the shrublayer. Natural England have stated in their Site Improvement Plan that the issues facing the Burnham Beeches include, inter alia, public access and disturbance. Other issues include habitat fragmentation, deer and invasive species.
- 2.12 Natural England have stated in previous correspondence that only those applications in excess of 50 new dwellings within 5.6km of the SAC are reviewed by Natural England thereby highlighting the potential for large scale developments impacting upon the SAC.

- 2.13 The development proposed represents a minor development of 8 units in an area where there are numerous other areas of open recreational space including Alfred Major Park and the Winter Hill area around the Thames. Such a minor development, with surrounding recreational areas would, individually or cumulatively, be unlikely to materially impact upon the Burnham Beeches SAC. Moreover, the applicant has obtained a prior-approval grant for the conversion of the existing buildings to 4 residential units that can be implemented. The net increase of only 4 units further highlights the small-scale nature of the development proposed.
- 2.14 With the above in mind Officers have concluded that the development would not, individually or cumulatively, materially impact upon the integrity of the SAC and as such have screened out the development. It is not considered that a further appropriate assessment is required.

