



MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 1ST AUGUST, 2018

At 7.00 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
4.	<p><u>PLANNING APPLICATIONS (DECISION)</u></p> <p>To consider the Head of Planning's report on planning applications received.</p> <p>Full details on all planning applications (including application forms, site plans, objections received, correspondence etc.) can be found by accessing the Planning Applications Public Access Module by selecting the following link.</p> <p>http://publicaccess.rbwm.gov.uk/online-applications/</p>	3 - 6

This page is intentionally left blank

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

Maidenhead Panel

Application No.:	18/01675/FULL
Location:	Rosedene Moneyrow Green Holyport Maidenhead SL6 2ND
Proposal:	Replacement porch, replacement single storey side extension with accommodation in the roof space
Applicant:	Mr Biddle
Agent:	Mr Scott Lewis
Parish/Ward:	Bray Parish/Bray Ward
If you have a question about this report, please contact: Sheila Bowen on 01628 796061 or at sheila.bowen@rbwm.gov.uk	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 A letter of support has been received.
- 1.2 A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been published in July 2018, and the Officer Report and the Reason for Refusal need to be updated to reflect this.

The recommendation in the report remains for refusal, but the reason is amended to reflect the new NPPF 2018.

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 2.1 A letter of support has been received.
- 2.2 All references to the NPPF Paragraph 89 in the report should be replaced by NPPF 2018 Paragraph 145, and reference to the NPPF Paragraph 89 should be replaced by NPPF 2018 Paragraph 133.
- 2.3 The reason for refusal in the recommendation should now reflect the NPPF 2018 (see paragraph 3 below).

Comments from Interested Parties

- 2.4 One additional comment received, summarised as:

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
I live locally and am a regular at the White Heart pub nearly next door to the house so I	Support noted, but the	No

<p>know this part of Moneyrow Green well. I support this application for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal will improve the appearance of the area as it will remove an unsightly garage. 2. The proposal will improve the appearance of the area as the new extension is a well-designed fine oak building. 3. The proposal will increase the openness of the area as the extension will be further away from the boundary than the existing garage, thereby opening up the area at this point. 4. Any slight increase in footprint is in my opinion mitigated by the increase in openness between the new extension and the boundary. 5. The extension is very handsome and is in keeping with the area. 6. The proposal is very well designed and it looks like a single storey from the front therefore the design helps to maintain the sense of openness. 	<p>reasons do not overcome the objection on Green Belt grounds.</p>	
---	---	--

3. RECOMMENDED REASON FOR REFUSAL IF PERMISSION IS NOT GRANTED

The proposals are inappropriate development that would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The proposed works would result in a total floorspace increase of the dwelling of 108 sq. metres, which would represent a total percentage increase in floorspace of 198% over and above the original dwellinghouse. Therefore, the proposal, when considered cumulatively with previous extensions carried out to the dwelling and by reason of its siting, size, mass and substantial cumulative volume would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwellinghouse. As such the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 (NPPF) and would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would result in substantial harm to the Green Belt. Paragraph 88 of the NPPF advises that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. In this case, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there are any other considerations that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and, as such, there are no very special circumstances. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to saved Policies GB1, GB2(A) and GB4 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 1999 (incorporating alterations adopted June 2003), paragraphs 143 - 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018 and Policy SP5 of the Borough Local Plan Submission Version.

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

Maidenhead Panel

Application No.:	18/01796/FULL
Location:	Tenpin Holmanlease Maidenhead SL6 8AW
Proposal:	Resurfacing of site with change of use to surface car park and erection of boundary hoarding for temporary 5 year period, following the demolition of existing building
Applicant:	Royal Borough of Windsor And Maidenhead
Agent:	Mr Matthew Blythin
Parish/Ward:	Maidenhead Unparished/Oldfield Ward
If you have a question about this report, please contact: Christine Ellera on 01628 795963 or at chrisie.ellera@rbwm.gov.uk	

1. SUMMARY

The proposed development does not refer to the x38 4m high lighting columns to light the proposed car park. This is shown in the 'Performance Planning Submission Report' prepared by Hore Lea and dated 15 June 2018 which was submitted as part of this planning application.

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on the 24th July 2018. The changes to the NPPF do not impact on the recommendation set out in the main report.

It is recommended the Panel grants planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 10 of the main report.

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 2.1 The officer report has not referred to the proposed lighting as it did not form part of the proposed description of development and was not shown on the proposed plans. It is assumed that such lighting will be erected under 'permitted development.'
- 2.2 Class, A, Part 12, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) England Order (2015) allows for lamp standards to be installed by a local authority without planning permission, provided that the works required in connection with the operation of any public service administered by them. In this instance the public car parks.
- 2.4 Any lighting will still be covered by Environmental Health legislation and cannot be installed in such a manner which results in a statutory nuisance.
- 2.5 It is not considered that the revisions to the NPPF (2018) affect the consideration of this application. The document still seeks a presumption in favour of sustainable development. However for completeness and where specific paragraphs of the NPPF (2012) have been referred to, the following amendments apply:
- Paragraph 6.19 refers to Paragraph 23 of the NPPF (2012), the same requirements are now largely contained in paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF (2018)

