



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/20/3263870

15 Breadcroft Road, Maidenhead, SL6 3PA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Paula Aldridge against the decision of The Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 20/00575, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is Use of rear bedroom for beauty treatments, change of use from residential to A1.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development was complete, with the bedroom fully converted for use as a treatment room. I also note that the application has been submitted retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the development upon the living conditions of current and future occupants of the premises.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached 2 storey house in a residential street. An existing treatment room on the rear ground floor is accessed from the garden. The treatment room subject of this appeal is on the first floor and is accessed from the front door of the house. It contains a treatment chair, a chair for the beautician and a small hand basin. The remainder of the first floor comprises bedrooms and a bathroom.
5. The room is used alternately by the appellant and her daughter for licensed beauty treatments described as providing semi-permanent makeup treatment. Bookings are by appointment only. According to the appellant she and her partner live at the property and are unaffected by the room's use.
6. Nevertheless, the treatment room is used by non-residents. To enter it customers must use the front door of the house, pass the lounge entrance, climb a central staircase, and walk past a bedroom and shared bathroom. Whilst the comings and goings associated with the business may be limited,

due to one client being treated at a time, occupants of the upstairs rooms would still be affected by customers using common areas including landings, stairs, and potentially toilet facilities. Whilst that may not cause problems for the current occupiers, it would harm the living conditions of future occupants in terms of general disturbance during business operating hours.

7. The appellant refers to being issued a tattoo license to work in the room since 2004. Whilst no license details have been provided to me, I agree with the Council that the licensing regime is different to that of planning. The granting of a license does not mean that the use is acceptable in planning terms, nor does the fact that the use is easily reversible, as is suggested by the appellant.
8. Overall, I conclude that the development would harm the living conditions of future occupants with regard to general disturbance and would conflict with saved policy DG1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which require separate access to residential accommodation within mixed use schemes and that development should provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

9. I have considered representations in support of the appeal, and concerns regarding alleged breaches of planning consent, noise, parking, and loss of privacy. However, these do not alter my view, or add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR