

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

Maidenhead Panel

Application No.:	23/01558/FULL
Location:	Elmgrove House 48 Castle Hill Maidenhead SL6 4JW
Proposal:	2no. detached dwellings with parking and amenity space following demolition of existing dwelling and garage.
Applicant:	Mr Bertram
Agent:	Not Applicable
Parish/Ward:	Maidenhead Unparished/St Marys
If you have a question about this report, please contact: David Johnson on 01628 685692 or at david.johnson@rbwm.gov.uk	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 One further letter has been received – this is summarised in section 2.
- 1.2 National Rail have been consulted on the planning application; however, comments are outstanding and there is therefore a change to the recommendation.

It is recommended that the Committee delegates authority to the Assistant Director of Planning:

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 1. | To grant planning permission, subject to no objections from National Rail and imposition of any additional conditions, if required, and on the satisfactory completion of a unilateral undertaking to secure the Carbon Off-set and Biodiversity Net Gain contributions as detailed in Section 10 of this report and with the conditions listed in Section 14 of this report. |
| 2. | To refuse planning permission if National Rail raise an objection which cannot be overcome and if an undertaking to secure the Carbon Off-set and Biodiversity Net Gain contributions as detailed in Section 10 of this report has not been satisfactorily completed. |

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Comments from Interested Parties

- 2.1 One objection has been received in connection with the application. The main points are summarised in the table below:

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
Query as to whether National Rail have been consulted on the application.	National Rail have been formally consulted on the planning application. However, comments are outstanding and there is therefore a change to the recommendation.	Yes
Less than substantial harm has been identified to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposals are therefore in conflict with Policy HE1 of the Local Plan. Given this policy conflict, it is wrong to state in Section 12 of the Committee report that the proposals comply with the Development Plan.	Borough Local Plan policy HE1(2) states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and works which would cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset (whether designated or non-designated) or its setting, will not be permitted without a clear justification in accordance with legislation and national policy. Section 10 of the Committee Report identifies the harm and carries out a full assessment of the development.	No
The Conservation Officers comments should be provided in full to the Committee.	The full comments, and all those from consultees, are available on the Council's website for Committee members and residents to view.	No
The development would be cramped and result in overdevelopment of site, in particular there would be insufficient space between House A and the boundary to the railway line.	Section 10 of the Committee Report addresses this. A distance of approximately 1.95m would be retained to the western boundary of the site at its closest point. This is a similar relationship to the railway line as April Cottage to the north.	No
The frontage is dominated by hardstanding and cars with a lack of room for planting.	The existing access to the site would be retained, with the removal of the garage. Parking for four vehicles would be provided (two for each dwelling); however, this is limited and the block plans show areas of grass associated with the garden areas for the units.	

<p>The Conservation Officer is critical of the design stating that the houses lack individuality.</p>	<p>This is addressed in section 10 of the Committee Report.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>The only benefit identified is the contribution of one additional house. The contribution to housing supply from this development would be very limited for the Borough and could not be said to benefit the public at large. Therefore, the proposals fail to accord with paragraph 208 of the NPPF as there aren't the public benefits required to outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.</p>	<p>Section 10 of the Committee Report identifies the harm and carries out a full assessment of the development.</p>	<p>No</p>

