




Schedule of responses SPZ Deposit - Planning application P/20391/001 for Slough Trading Estate, Slough


Summary




Consultation responses submitted	19+1		Response – no material objections
		MHCLG and DfT	No response
No objection /subject to conditions and informatives	2	Network Rail National Highways	No change
Deferral (of support)	1	Active Travel England	Cycle path elements
Objections	2	Wexham Court Parish – on the non-technical summary only Resident – via APAS	No change – additional information
Comment	4+1	Burnham Foundation – 2 reps Historic England Transport For London SBC Public Health [+1 rep via SBC online form but not valid as no postal address]	No change or Non Material changes
Support	8	Aik Saath Learning to Work Resource Productions CIC Slough Business Community Partnership Slough Council For Voluntary Services Slough Hub Slough Museum Windsor Forest College Group	
No Comment	2	Health & Safety Executive RBWM	


Comment Ref	Who	Support /Object/ Comment -	Extract	Detail	Response
	MHCLG (former DHLUC)	No response yet		 Email re receipt confirmation from D	Noted
	Dft	No response			Noted
1	National Highways	No objection	<p>In summary, subject to the conditions being implemented as set out above, National Highways offer no objection to the proposed Simplified Planning Zone at Slough Trading Estate.</p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>The draft TA submitted is to support a revised SPZ for Slough Trading Estate, which will run from 2024-2034. It contains many of the same restrictions as the previous SPZ and introduces some further restrictions such as restricting large-scale B8 logistics development. The parking cap remains which means that total vehicle parking will not be permitted to exceed the current level, and will remain below the level in 2014.</p> <p>The trip generation and distribution information presented is comprehensive and we agree with its methodology and results. It shows that there is likely to be a net decrease in trip generation for the site, and where there is estimated to be a net increase in the alternative scenarios, the increases are only minor</p>	 24 08 08 National Highways No Objec	Noted




			<p>on M4 junctions 6 and 7 and do not significantly impact the SRN.</p> <p><u>SPZ Deposit Written Scheme</u></p> <p>As demonstrated as required to be implemented in the Draft TA, we strongly support the following proposed planning conditions (as set out in the draft SPZ) to minimise impacts from the proposed SPZ:</p>		
2	ATE	Deferral	<p>. Deferral: ATE is not currently in a position to support this application and requests further assessment, evidence, revisions and/or dialogue as set out in this response.</p> <p>6.0 Next Steps ATE recommends that the local planning authority shares this correspondence with the applicant and their agents. ATE welcomes further dialogue, if necessary, with the overall aim to ensure a SPZ that can facilitate Active Travel modes for its future employees and visitors, along with being a conduit for increased Active Travel mode-share for the surrounding areas</p>	 <p>24 08 19 Active Travel England Defer</p> <p>Background Active Travel England (ATE) welcomes the opportunity to provide further pre-application advice for the proposed Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) relating to strategic landscape and highways improvement works within the Slough Trading Estate (STE). This follows ATE's response on the 1st of December 2023, where Preapplication advice was provided.</p> <p>2.0 Summary Since this initial response ATE has engaged in online and verbal dialogue with representatives of Slough Borough Council (SBC)'s</p>	Noted – updated Travel Plan and Transport Assessments received to address concerns.

				<p>Planning & Highways functions to discuss details of the proposed scheme regarding its' provision of active travel infrastructure. This includes a meeting on the 11th of June 2024.</p> <p>This additional response considers this dialogue and also the submission of various documents to ATE in July 2024 including: The Street Hierarchy & Sub-Zone Plan; Design Code and the Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) scheme. These documents have subsequently been assessed against current national policy and guidance regarding active travel and the criteria within ATE's planning assessment toolkit.</p> <p>As with the initial response, ATE advises that there are still aspects of the proposed development where more detail is required for the SPZ and for the future developments to be in adherence with National Policy Guidance.</p> <p>To summarise, ATE advises SBC that it ensures proposals for the SPZ incorporate the ambitions of the SBC Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and clearly</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--


				<p>stipulates a holistic Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, which demonstrates a commitment to Active Travel provision e.g. how the SPZ will connect with identified routes such as LCWIP Route 14 (Farnham Road to Buckingham Avenue). ATE suggests that this approach is considered by SBC and welcomes further liaison with all applicable parties. Along with this, the Areas of Concern as raised on the 1st of December 2023 and updated review, are detailed as follows:</p> <p>3.0 Areas of Concern</p> <p>1. Bath Road, 2. Buckingham Avenue & Bedford Avenue, 3. Buckingham Avenue & Bedford Avenue. 4. Travel Planning and Transport Assessment</p>	
3	Transport for London	Comment	<p>While Crossrail Safeguarding Directions remain in place those Directions must be observed as a SPZ requirement.</p> <p>Where safeguarding is not in place the 'TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2015 No. 595 and the TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SECTION 62A APPLICATIONS) (PROCEDURE AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER 2015 No. 797' obliges consultation with Network Rail</p>	 <p>24 07 15 Transport for London.pdf</p>	Noted – Informatives as per the TfL requirements are included within the SPZ.






			<p>for any development proposal within 10m of any railway infrastructure and, again, should be observed as a SPZ requirement.</p> <p>This is addressed in the Informatives section but Network Rail may wish to comment further on the detailed requirements.</p>		
4	Network Rail	No objection	<p>Network Rail have no objections to the proposals to create a new simplified planning zone to replace the one currently operating at Slough Trading Estate.</p>	 24 08 12 Network Rail Response.pdf	Noted.
5	Health and Safety Executive	No Comment	<p>This application does not fall within any HSE consultation zones. There is therefore no need to consult the HSE Land Use Planning (LUP) team on this planning application and the HSE LUP team has no comment to make.</p>	 24 07 11 Health and Safety Executive No From: LUP enquiries < LUPenquiries@hse.gov.uk > Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2024 3:29 PM	Noted.
6	SBC Public Health	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPZ Consultation draft has considered majority of health impacts embedded in various assessment reports like Environment, Health impact and Equality impact assessment. Also, all the Healthy Street indicators has been considered which is encouraging. Some criteria require additional considerations for their impact on health. The comments and recommendations with evidence base are presented in table below: 	 24 08 19 Comment SBC Public Health.pd	<p>Noted, the table sets out a number of recommendations to be included within the Travel Plan which is to be conditioned as part of the SPZ. Many of the matters such as promoting cycle ways etc. are incorporated into the TP.</p> <p>With regard to food outlets etc. the Conditions as contained within the SPZ limits the number of retail and F&B offer thus limiting any health impacts.</p>



7	Parish – Wexham Court	Object	<p>The benefits mentioned within the non-technical summary do not go far enough.</p> <p>The benefits mentioned within the document are: Increased business rates, faster availability of sustainable business space, current industrial use only, safe and attractive streets, estate shuttle bus, improved building design, new cycle lane, employment opportunities, locally commissioned public art, funding for local skills and support to charities.</p> <p>There is no information on the amount of money to be invested into the above benefits and nor does it state how the SPZ would contribute and work in partnership in delivering the above benefits with our Parish Council. As a parish council we believe in building community and the scheme being proposed reduces employment significantly, increases heat generation thus impacting the environment due to the extensive densification of data centers, this will significantly clutter the built form. The height of the buildings will distort and disturb the sky line of Slough, as well as, creating a ghost town that being the trading estate.</p> <p>Lastly, it is not evident how the public will actually benefit through the approval of the SPZ as business rates go to central government, already sufficient business space, already have</p>	 <p>24 08 03 Wexham Court Parish Council</p>	<p>Noted – however to address the two key points raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental impacts and additional heights – the environmental and townscape/landscape impacts are adequately mitigated through Conditions contained within the proposed SPZ with mandatory design code and sustainability requirements secured. Additionally, further environmental permits are required from the Environment Agency to ensure there are no microclimate, noise, pollution and heat issues that would have a negative impact on the Borough and its residents would occur. 2. The SPZ not benefitting Wexham Court Parish specifically – The proposed SPZ is considered to benefit Slough residents as a key employment district within the Borough. The opportunities would remain regardless of adoption of the SPZ, however through Economic Development and Skills and training obligations within the S106 the ability to provide pathways for residents to jobs is mitigated.
---	-----------------------	--------	--	---	---


			safe and attractive streets so most of the above mentioned benefits have already been provided hence, there are no additional benefits from the last time the scheme was approved. As a result, the proposed schemes negative impacts far out weight the existing benefits on offer, therefore, our objection stands. We would humbly request an inquiry takes place so residents can express their concerns in an open and transparent hearing.		Furthermore, it is not the role of the SPZ to benefit specific wards, the S106 must align with CIL regulations, i.e. the contributions and obligations contained therein can only mitigate the impact of the development.
8	RBWM	No comment	No Comment	 24 08 19 RBWM No Comment.pdf	Noted.
9	3 rd sector Aik Saath	Support	As a local youth charity, we are writing in support of SEGRO's application for a new Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) at Slough Trading Estate.	 24 08 19 Aik Saath support SPZ.pdf	Noted.
10	3 rd Sector – Burnham Foundation Chair	Comment	Main:- Environmental issues be given more weight, treatment of below ground sewage and other waste material both below ground and above ground should be taken into account, The power station must be the most significant air quality pollutant but other operations within Slough Trading Estate (STE) should also be included. The protection of the nation's infrastructure from conflict. Does the growth of datacentres on STE expose Slough to attack should there be a future	 24 07 23 Burnham Foundation Comme Addendum refers to non spz measure in local area	The comments are noted and appreciated, there are a few key points to address... 1. Air Quality – appropriate mitigation has been secured by way of air monitoring locations and tubes being present and the findings reported within the annual monitoring report. In addition, Environmental Permits from the Environment Agency are required over and above the SPZ conditions and requirements to ensure there is

		<p>global conflict? Is there a limit to how many datacentres or any other future vital facilities should be located in Slough? I suspect that such questions are not within our local remit but should be posed in the appropriate quarters</p> <p>Burnham Grammar School have expressed an interest in monitoring air quality and perhaps some appropriate monitoring equipment can be made available to them and other schools that border STE thus enabling them to further enhance their understanding of the importance of air quality.</p> <p>(1) Has a decision been made as to the future of the existing generating plant – will it be decommissioned?</p> <p>(2) What is the forecast life of the new plant – the Defra paper referred to 25 years?</p> <p>(3) Clearly a lot more heat is going to be generated on STE – what is the thinking as to how best to recover and reuse?</p> <p>Addendum</p> <p>I would suggest that more thought and attention is focused on the treatment of rainwater in the ongoing development of Slough Trading Estate (STE). Should there be more attention given to the harvesting of rainwater?</p> <p>Currently unattractive chainlink fencing signifies the boundaries of many of STE's</p>		<p>no impact on the health and well being of Slough Residents</p> <p>2. Power Station – no development is permitted within the Slough Heat and Power Sub Zone and would be subject to separate consent requirements.</p> <p>3. Conflict – Officers are aware of terrorism and the Design Code is mindful of Planning Out Crime and Planning Out Terrorism. In addition, the security requirements of data centres is such that the Design Code allows for appropriate security measures being included.</p> <p>4. Environmental Improvements – Landscaping as well as Biodiversity Net Gain and SPZ wide public realm improvements is conditioned and secured through the Design Code and the S106.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>new building developments. Why don't we revert to the traditional methods of designating boundaries by incorporating trees and hedges?</p> <p>Could it be that future STE developments will require less car parking provision which opens up the possibility of garden spaces planted with wild flowers and other flora and funga?</p>		
11	3 rd Sector Resource Productions CIC	Support	<p>We believe that the SPZ should continue and particularly support key proposals as follow</p>	 <p>RESOURCE PRODUCTIONS CIC S</p>	Noted.
12	3 rd Sector Slough Museum	Support	<p>Hannah Ellams Chair of Slough Museum The Curve, William St, Slough SL1 1XY</p> <p>SEGRO has been absolutely amazing and has supported us since March 2020 with a space for the Slough collection. The Museum would not exist today if it was not for their support giving space for the collection since 2020. Over the last 18 months they have been more involved both attending and have promoted events we have shared. They have also funded our technological connectivity to help support schools groups visit the museum through the provision of wifi and projection. In addition at times where they can they have supported some of our facility costs when needed. We feel we have a very positive working and good open communication with our</p>		Noted.

			relationship with SEGRO.		
13	3 rd Sector Slough Business Community Partnership (SBCP)	Support	SBCP is happy to support SEGRO's Simplified Planning Zone application to help with the continual need for change but also that the investment that this will bring to help with infrastructure improvements, the commitment to work with partners to enable young people to access jobs in Slough and to improve the overall environment on and surrounding the Trading Estate.	 24 08 19 Support Slough Business Cor	Noted.
14	3 rd Sector Slough CVS	Support	I am writing to you as Chairman of Slough Council For Voluntary Service to express my unequivocal support for Slough Estates Group's proposed Simplified Planning Zone.	 24 08 19 Slough CVS Support.pdf	Noted.
15	3 rd Sector The Slough Hub	Support	I am writing on behalf of The Slough Hub to express our full support for SEGRO's proposed new Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) on the Slough Trading Estate.	 24 08 19 The Slough Hub- Support Letter.	Noted.
16	3 rd Sector Windsor Forest Colleges Group	Support	I am writing on behalf of The Windsor Forest Colleges Group to express our full support for SEGRO's application for a new Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) at Slough Trading Estate.	 24 08 19 Windsor Forest Schools Supp	Noted.
17	3 rd Sector Learning to Work	Support	This is why we, as an organisation, see the SPZ as a crucial way to improve the life chances of young people in Slough and therefore fully support its continuation.	 24 08 16 Learning To Work Letter of Su	Noted.

18	Resident – C/S Portal	Support	Although I am in favour of a continuation of the SPZ I would welcome reassurance that any future buildings just north of the railway line will, in no way, either overlook properties on Burnham Lane just south of the railway, or have windows that may give direct line of sight into those properties.	Mr Peter Godliman  24 07 Resident Support Citizenspace	Noted – the proposed conditions and height conditions have been designed to protected neighbouring residential amenity.
19	Resident – APAS	Object	Although i welcome the news with regards to SPZ but as a resident nearby, i am very concerned with environmental impact to us residents especially when living with young children. I see tall square like metallic buildings popping up fast here n there around me and with a little research i can see these majority are data center hostings mainly along with few others. I have observed huge ventilation plants being installed on these buildings, i see the while smoke from SSE plant nearly by daily in afternoon and in evening and i smell caramelized burnt sugar like smell from Mars daily. I am currently researching on what impact all this is having on our health especially our children and i can see the air quality is becoming worse around slough trading estate. I am hence concerned that slough borough council may leave us like the state as of ghost town center at the end and may impose traffic conditions causing further traffic jams. From me home i have two through roads only jammed packed daily to bath roadwhen going to drop kids,	 24 07 08 APAS Planning Portal Resic	Noted – the conditions and obligations contained within the SPZ as well as additional Environmental permits mitigate the impact of the development. Specifically the mandatory design codes that accompany the SPZ will ensure that the "metallic buildings" that are "popping up" will not be repeated. The aim of the SPZ, as well as enabling economic development is to <i>green</i> the estate as well as provide a far better quality of development in visual and townscape concerns. Regarding health and air quality, the SSE power station has been subject to separate consent and no changes/intensification is possible as a result of the propose SPZ. Existing smells associated with Mars would not be made worse by the SPZ. Regarding transport movements, the move from tradition B8 and offices within the trading estate is expected to have a positive impact in terms of reduced vehicle movements and the sustainable transport solutions, by way of bus service and cycle

			one in front of Mars factory and the other one towards tesco express burnham. I am very concerned that making the area SPZ may benefit the businesses but would impact very negatively to the residents. I therefore ask you to provide what measures and mitigative actions are being considered for the residents of the area. I am eagerly waiting for your reply on each of the point and concern i have raised. As a full council tax payer and a civil servant serving uk government, i believe i have a right to live in a clean, healthy and organised area.		provision should encourage less vehicular movements thereby reducing congestion.
+1	Resident – SBC website	Comment –but no postal address so possibly not duly made	if Slough Borough Council would charge Segro a fee for renewal of the simplified planning zone? If so, how much did/will it charge for the renewal in 2014 -2024 and 2024-2034? Besides, will Slough Borough Council charge on the redevelopment projects inside the SPZ? How to estimate the charge payable to the council?	 24 07 22 Resident SBC Online Form Cor	<p>There is no “application fee” associated with the development of an SPZ, however the officer time and consultants required to review and negotiate the contents of the SPZ were underwritten by the developer.</p> <p>There are no additional charges in terms of bring application fee, however financial and physical obligations are secured through the S106 as well as likely improved business rates which will be realised upon operations permitted coming into use.</p>