

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**31<sup>st</sup> January 2024**

THE FOLLOWING ALTERATIONS AND AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN  
RECEIVED SINCE THE PLANNING OFFICER'S REPORT WAS  
PRESENTED TO MEMBERS

## **Amendment Sheet**

### **1. Agenda Item 5: P/03079/022 – 190-192 High Street**

The applicant has agreed an extension of time on the application until 14 February 2024.

**No change to the recommendation.**

## 2. Agenda Item 7: P/00595/004 - 39-41 Elmshott Lane

### Consultation

#### (i) Further representations since the report was finalised

37 support representations have been received, stating:

- Affordable housing for people
- Hope the Borough will act in the interest of the local people by approving this application.

12 objections have been received, stating (where the same comment has been made by an objector, it is only noted once):

- Removing a store that serves the local area, creates jobs locally etc.
- This application does not appear to have any parking facilities / no car parking. Where are the potential residents meant to park their cars?
- This is a busy road with a large primary school opposite, very little safe street parking. Cars are often parked fully on the path by the crossing point across Elmshott Lane to the school (corner of Bower Way).
- This is a farce. The only shop local for all the older people and neighbours. Do not let this go. We the 'village' outright disagree.
- There does not to be sufficient parking facilities and consideration made to the quality of living for those residents. This will have an adverse affect to those living nearby, especially in an area which is overrun when school children come out!
- This development cannot be allowed to go ahead. The traffic/parking congestion is already bad on Elmshott Lane. How can you build all these flats with no parking. There is already significant parking congestion on all the local roads. And school opposite causes traffic chaos morning and afternoon already. Where is the additional infrastructure to support the extra population, these flats will bring. Also the chaos that would come from the build would be enormous. And we would lose local convenience store. This application was rejected previously and should be again.
- SBC how could you still be considering this application. I totally object to this plan. You will have an increased parking on the corner of a busy road. Its opposite a school too, what happened to your safer routes to school scheme that was implemented a few years ago. I take it no longer exists if you are to allow this development. If this site is allowed to go ahead it is going to be a danger to life, for residence and the emergency services as access will be limited. Can the utilities take any more capacity as we have already noticed a reduction in water pressure.
- The area's overcrowded with no infrastructure for increased traffic / parking/ pedestrians. Local schools have no parking facilities and are getting bigger every year. The elderly have no shops.

- Out of character for the locality and an overdevelopment of our village. Too large a rebel for the location.
- Adding more families to the village with no increase in infrastructure, ie school places, GP etc. Cannot believe that local government officers are that naive to believe that the occupants of the flats will not have cars. It is opposite a primary school, there is a car dealership around the corner with cars all over the place and locals that are unable to park already.
- Previous applications for development along Elmshott Lane of multi-story residential properties have been subject to multiple objections, and the council has previously denied applications. This has been done on objections raised about the impact on traffic, parking and the obvious impact of properties overlooking a primary school location.
- Traffic in Elmshott lane at school opening and closing times is extreme causing congestion on Elmshott lane, Dennis Way, Bower way and Washington Drive. The creation of additional accommodation with no inbuilt parking facilities will further negatively impact on the area and increase potential for accidents within the community.
- The owner of the commercial / residential properties on Elmshott Way has already had a negative impact on the area by imposing parking restrictions in the only available car park location in Cippenham which has been implemented to offset the financial loss of denied planning applications.
- Residents of Cippenham have repeatedly articulated their objections to multi-storey residential developments on Elmshott lane which would negatively impact area. The council's alternative development proposals for the Bath Road Retail Park should remove any requirement to approve this application.
- Redevelopment of this area is probably required, but not in this manner.
- The whole area, including the road that I live in will be chaotic with parking. This will also cause the roads to become more dangerous. No consideration has been given for the current residents of the immediate area. Also, One Stop is a well used and wanted commercial building. Please do not allow this to pass, it will massively diminish the standard of living for the residents.
- 1. It will take away the shop that is needed. Removing it means we'll have to travel further to buy goods. 2. Parking in this area is already problematic especially during school pick up and drop off times. 3. Having no provision for parking won't stop people having cars. People will park in surrounding streets, taking spaces from residents. And where will all these residents do their shopping? The shops in Elmshott lane are hall...not everyone wants to shop there. This is a not going to be good for Cippenham.
- Burden on existing resources and facilities.
- Demolition of main shop in the area.
- As facing the school area, the flats will make the school entry very crowded.

Officer response: with regards to the objections and support representations received, please refer to the committee report for the full assessment.

(ii) Response from Natural England

Objection - further information required to determine impacts on designated sites - development within 5.6 kilometres of Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) within 5.6 kilometres.

It is Natural England's view that the planning authority will not be able to ascertain that this proposed development as it is currently submitted would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC. In combination with other plans and projects, the development would be likely to contribute to a deterioration of the quality of the habitat by reason of increased access to the site including access for general recreation and dog-walking. There being alternative solutions to the proposal and there being no imperative reasons of overriding public interest to allow the proposal, despite a negative assessment, the proposal will not pass the tests of Regulation 62.

This application is supported by a Habitat Regulation Assessment screening report (December 2023) however, Natural England are not in a position to agree with the conclusions.

When there is sufficient scientific uncertainty about the likely effects of the planning application under consideration, the precautionary principle is applied to fully protect the qualifying features of the European Site designation under the Habitats Directive.

Contributions towards the mitigation strategy for Slough Borough Council will be required to avoid adverse impacts at the SAC. Following confirmation that sufficient SANG capacity remains and agreement with the Local Planning Authority, we will be happy to remove this objection.

**No change to the recommendation.**