

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Planning Appeals Received

13 November 2017 - 7 December 2017

MAIDENHEAD

The appeals listed below have been received by the Council and will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate. Further information on planning appeals can be found at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> Should you wish to make comments in connection with an appeal, please use the PIns reference number and write to the relevant address, shown below.

Enforcement appeals: The Planning Inspectorate, Room 3/23 Hawk Wing, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN or email teame1@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Other appeals: The Planning Inspectorate Room 3/10A Kite Wing Temple Quay House 2 The Square Bristol BS1 6PN or email teamp13@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Ward:
Parish: Maidenhead Unparished
Appeal Ref.: 17/60103/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/02290/FULL **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/3187808
Date Received: 22 November 2017 **Comments Due:** Not Applicable
Type: Refusal **Appeal Type:** Householder
Description: First floor rear extension with Juliette balconies and alterations to fenestration
Location: **19 Brompton Drive Maidenhead SL6 6SP**
Appellant: Mr Kobir Ahmed **c/o Agent:** Mr Reg Johnson 59 Lancaster Road Maidenhead SL6 5EY

Ward:
Parish: Maidenhead Unparished
Appeal Ref.: 17/60112/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/02231/FULL **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/3187866
Date Received: 5 December 2017 **Comments Due:** Not Applicable
Type: Refusal **Appeal Type:** Householder
Description: Part single part two storey rear extension
Location: **45 Summerleaze Road Maidenhead SL6 8EW**
Appellant: Mr M S Khan **c/o Agent:** Mr Reg Johnson 59 Lancaster Road Maidenhead SL6 5EY

Ward:
Parish: Maidenhead Unparished
Appeal Ref.: 17/60113/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/00806/FULL **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/3184452
Date Received: 5 December 2017 **Comments Due:** Not Applicable
Type: Refusal **Appeal Type:** Householder
Description: Part demolition. Reconstruction and enlargement of dwellinghouse.
Location: **2 Lexington Avenue Maidenhead SL6 4HW**
Appellant: Mr M Shahiad **c/o Agent:** Mr Reg Johnson 59 Lancaster Road Maidenhead SL6 5EY

Appeal Decision Report

13 November 2017 - 7 December 2017

MAIDENHEAD

Appeal Ref.: 17/60079/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/00524/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T035/W/17/3179164

Appellant: Mr Muir **c/o Agent:** Mr Simon Millett Walsingham Planning Bourne House Cores End Road Bourne End SL8 5AR

Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse

Description: New dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling.

Location: **Ann Cherry Cottage Howe Lane Binfield Bracknell RG42 5QS**

Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 17 November 2017

Main Issue: The proposed replacement house would be materially larger than the one it would replace and therefore was inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In addition, the proposal would cause loss of openness to the Green Belt. However, the Planning Inspector considered the permitted development fallback scheme, (which had been established by a Certificate of Lawfulness and had commenced) to be a "realistic prospect" and to have a greater impact on openness than the appeal proposal. In addition, the appeal proposal would have a far smaller impact on the storage of flood water in the flood plan and have significant benefits in terms of safety in the event of flooding, reducing flood risk overall. The Inspector considered that overall the benefits of the appeal scheme over the fallback position clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and amount to very special circumstances. The costs application was dismissed.

Appeal Ref.: 17/60089/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/01026/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/17/3182668

Appellant: Mr S Thorn **c/o Agent:** Mr Duncan Gibson 74 Parsonage Lane Windsor Berkshire SL4 5EN

Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse

Description: Removal of existing tree to form new access road off Altwood Road to 59 Altwood Road (Windy Ridge).

Location: **Windyridge 59 Altwood Road Maidenhead SL6 4PN**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 29 November 2017

Main Issue: The Inspector concluded that the loss of part of an important local landscape feature would harm the area's character with an associated loss of public amenity value in respect of the partial removal and splitting of the protected tree group. The claimed justification for the proposed access road is weak and is insufficient to override this harm. The development of the road would consequently contravene the development plan and there are no other overriding material considerations.

Appeal Ref.: 17/60094/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/01193/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/3182812

Appellant: Mr & Mrs P. Griffin **c/o Agent:** Mr James Lambert James Lambert Architects Ltd 50 Kingsway Place London EC1R OLU

Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse

Description: Construction of a timber outbuilding/tree house - retrospective

Location: **Dean Grange Terrys Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9RS**

Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 29 November 2017

Main Issue: The Inspector concluded that the timber outbuilding did not constitute inappropriate development and neither the openness of the Green Belt nor the character or appearance of the area would be harmed. It does not conflict with the Framework or the Council's policies and therefore the appeal succeeds.

Appeal Ref.: 17/60095/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/01445/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/3181841

Appellant: Mr Robert Creer **c/o Agent:** Mr Justin Coles Coles Designs 17 Stratford Drive Wooburn Green High Wycombe HP10 0QQ

Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse

Description: First floor rear extension

Location: **Rosemount Burchetts Green Road Burchetts Green Maidenhead SL6 6QS**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 29 November 2017

Main Issue: Inspector agreed that proposal would result in disproportionate additions resulting in inappropriate development as defined in the NPPF. Proposal not considered to cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Inspector did not considered that very special circumstances exist.
