

# Public Document Pack

## Meeting Supplement

### Maidenhead Development Management Committee

Councillors Siân Martin (Chair), Geoff Hill (Vice-Chair), Maureen Hunt, Leo Walters, Mandy Brar, Helen Taylor, Gary Reeves, Kashmir Singh and Gurch Singh

Wednesday 17 April 2024 7.00 pm

Council Chamber - Town Hall, Maidenhead & on [RBWM YouTube](#)

www.rbwm.gov.uk



*The following papers have been added to the meeting's agenda as they were not available for publication when the notice of meeting was issued.*

### Supplement

Item	Description	Page
4	<b>23/01738/FULL 12 Lees Close Maidenhead SL6 4NU</b> <b>PROPOSAL:</b> Outbuilding (retrospective) <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Permit <b>APPLICANT:</b> Mr Thandi <b>EXPIRY DATE:</b> 29 March 2024	3 - 6

By attending this meeting, participants are consenting to the audio & visual recording being permitted and acknowledge that this shall remain accessible in the public domain permanently.

Please contact Democratic Services, [Democratic.Services@RBWM.gov.uk](mailto:Democratic.Services@RBWM.gov.uk), with any special requests that you may have when attending this meeting.



This page is intentionally left blank

## ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

### Maidenhead Panel

<b>Application No.:</b>	23/01738/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	12 Lees Close Maidenhead SL6 4NU
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outbuilding (retrospective)
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Thandi
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Kashif Bashir
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Maidenhead Unparished/Boyn Hill
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Ritu Singh on or at ritu.singh@rbwm.gov.uk	

#### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following the publication of the committee report, comments have been received from the Council's Environmental Protection team on the submitted noise report and these have been summarised below, with a response from Officers on the comments.

**There is no change to the recommendation in the main report.**

#### 2. COMMENTS FROM CONSULTEES

- 2.1 Comments have been received from RBWM Environmental Protection (EP) on the 15<sup>th</sup> April, summarised as follows:

Comment	Officer Response	Change to recommendation?
EP would not have grounds to object to this application in principle; however, would request that the acoustic assessment is as far as possible, is carried out in accordance with industry best practice and British Standards and includes current measurements to confirm the model predictions. The report offers a modelled situation of the potential for noise, with and without the building. Would have expected that actual noise measurements were taken and reported rather than modelled predicted noise levels given that the building is already in place and real time measurements	Officers note that the submitted report is on the basis of modelled data. However, this modelling provides sufficient information, based on established modelling information, in order to address the potential impacts of the development, particularly when taking into consideration the nature and scale of the development.  Furthermore, in this particular case, Officers would note that the construction of residential outbuildings for a use incidental to the main dwellinghouse have become an increasing feature of rear garden areas such as this and it is noted that the property benefits from	No

<p>could be utilised. The report is insufficient in proving the negative impacts if any, of the development on nearby sensitive receptors as real time measurements have not been utilised.</p>	<p>permitted development rights. The outbuilding which is the subject of this application has a height of 2.6m, and with a reduction in height of only 0.1m would constitute permitted development for which no noise assessment would be required. As such, Officers conclude that the scope of the submitted report is acceptable for the purposes of the assessment of the application and it is noted that EP raise no objection to the principle of the development.</p>	
<p>Do not wholly agree with the consultant's professional opinion that little noise mitigation is achieved by trees and hedges as such. By itself, I can agree that trees and hedges do not offer a full solution but as part of a scheme which as I understand, was the case in this instance, along with the acoustic fence, can offer partial mitigation.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the report has been drafted by suitably qualified noise consultants and forms a professional opinion and assessment of the development which is the subject of this application.</p>	<p>No</p>



This page is intentionally left blank