# **Appeal Decision Report**

# 21 September 2016 - 10 November 2016

#### MAIDENHEAD



Appeal Ref.:	16/00029/REF	Planning Ref.:	15/03531/LBC	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/Y/16/ 3142400			
Appellant:	Mr B Palmer-Page <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Martin Crook MSC Planning Ltd 259 Amersham Road Hazlemere High Wycombe Buckinghamshire HP15 7QW							
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recomme	endation: F	Refuse			
Description:	Consent to conver	t existing barn to a d	welling with ancillary	<sup>,</sup> landscaping v	vorks			
Location:	Paradise Farm Tv	yford Road Waltha	m St Lawrence Rea	ading RG10 0	HL			
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	9 November	2016			
Main Issue:	the barn in a way interrupt the bold windows and door contribution to the subdivision would the opposing cart of barn's special inter of the fields to the The proposal wou Listed Building, w preserve a Grade	and deep sweep of s would adversely h farmstead and the C interrupt the open s entrances, and would rest. The large rear farmstead, and wo ld result in less that	the rear roofscape. arm the special inte conservation Area. T pacious interior and d be at harmful odds garden would distort uld erode the chara n substantial harm t ned by public benefit d its special interest.	an form, and y The position rest of this Lis The internal ho the open thro s with a fundar the visual and cter and appe to the Conserv fits. The prop , its setting an	would unacceptably ning and number of sted Building and its prizontal and vertical pugh-way formed by mental aspect of the d functional linkages earance of the area. vation Area and the posal would neither d that of others, nor			
Appeal Ref.:	16/00030/REF	Planning Ref.:	15/03528/FULL	PIns Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/16/ 3142397			
Appellant:		e <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Ma /ycombe Buckinghar		anning Ltd 25	9 Amersham Road			
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recomme	endation: F	Refuse			
Description:	Conversion of exis	ting barn to a dwellir	ng with ancillary land	scaping works	i			
Location:	Paradise Farm Tv	vyford Road Waltha	m St Lawrence Rea	ading RG10 0	HL			
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	9 November	2016			
Main Issue:	the barn in a way interrupt the bold windows and door contribution to the subdivision would the opposing cart of barn's special inter of the fields to the The proposal wou Listed Building, w preserve a Grade preserve or enhan use of the land to	and deep sweep of s would adversely h farmstead and the C interrupt the open s entrances, and would rest. The large rear farmstead, and wo ld result in less that hich is not outweig II Listed Building and ce the character or a	to tits simple utilitaria the rear roofscape. arm the special inte conservation Area. T pacious interior and d be at harmful odds garden would distort uld erode the chara n substantial harm t ned by public benef d its special interest. appearance of the C riate development i	an form, and The position rest of this Lis The internal ho the open thro with a fundar the visual and cter and appe to the Conserv fits. The prop , its setting and conservation A n the Green E	would unacceptably ning and number of sted Building and its prizontal and vertical pugh-way formed by mental aspect of the d functional linkages earance of the area. vation Area and the posal would neither d that of others, nor rea. The change of Belt, and this is not			

Appeal Ref.:	16/60056/NOND ET	Planning Ref.:	16/00584/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T035 3150386	55/W/16/
Appellant:			lartin Crook MSC F Imshire HP15 7 QW	Planning Ltd 2		am Road
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recomm	nendation:	Would Refused	Have
Description:	Conversion of exis	sting barn to a dwell	ing with ancillary lan	dscaping work	<s< th=""><th></th></s<>	
Location:	Paradise Farm T	wyford Road Walth	am St Lawrence R	eading RG10	0HL	
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		<b>Decision Date:</b>	9 Novembe	er 2016	
	utilitarian vernacu adversely harm f farmstead and the interrupt the open entrances, and w interest. The large the farmstead, an would result in les which is not outwe Listed Building an the character or a garden is inappro	lar appearance. The the special interest conservation Area spacious interior a ould be at harmful e rear garden would d would erode the ss than substantial h eighed by public ber d its special interest appearance of the 0 priate development	esidential appearance e positioning and nut of this Listed Bu . The internal horizon nd the open through odds with a fundam distort the visual an character and appen narm to the Conserv- nefits. The proposa , its setting and that Conservation Area. in the Green Belt, nt to very special circ	Imber of wind ilding and its ontal and verti n-way formed nental aspect d functional lir arance of the ation Area an I would neithe of others, nor The change and this is no	ows and doo contribution cal subdivision by the oppo of the barn's nkages of the area. The d the Listed r preserve a preserve or of use of the	rs would n to the on would sing cart s special e fields to proposal Building, Grade II enhance e land to
Appeal Ref.:	16/60057/NOND	Planning Ref.:	16/00585/LBC	Pins Ref.:	APP/T035	55/Y/16/

Appeal Ref.:	16/60057/NOND ET	Planning Ref.:	16/00585/LBC	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/Y/16/ 3150390
Appellant:		e <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Ma /ycombe Buckinghar		anning Ltd 2	59 Amersham Road
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recomme		Would Have Refused
Description:	Consent to conver	t existing barn to a d	welling with ancillary	landscaping	works
Location:	Paradise Farm Tv	wyford Road Waltha	am St Lawrence Re	ading RG10 (	)HL
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	9 Novembe	r 2016
Main Issue:	building, and the d would be unaccep glazed hips would utilitarian vernacul adversely harm t farmstead and the interrupt the open entrances, and we interest. The large the farmstead, an would result in les which is not outwe Listed Building and	lominant effect of the ptably eroded by the d give an overtly res ar appearance. The he special interest Conservation Area. spacious interior an ould be at harmful of e rear garden would of d would erode the of s than substantial has sighed by public ben	e two barns due to the e size of the propo- sidential appearance e positioning and nur of this Listed Buil The internal horizon d the open through- odds with a fundame character and appea- arm to the Conserva efits. The proposal its setting and that c	eir size and c sed extension e to the build mber of windo ding and its ntal and vertic -way formed b ental aspect of functional line arance of the ation Area and would neither	hating addition to the cohesive appearance n. The provision of ling at odds with its ows and doors would contribution to the cal subdivision would by the opposing cart of the barn's special kages of the fields to area. The proposal d the Listed Building, preserve a Grade II preserve or enhance

Appeal Ref.:	16/60060/REF	Planning Ref.:	16/00785/FULL	PIns Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/16/ 3151162		
Appellant:		n <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Torr ad Maidenhead Berks		h _ Kemp Ltd	, The Granary Hyde		
Decision Type:	Committee		Officer Recomme		Application Permitted		
Description:		f existing detached with retention of deta					
Location:	47 Allenby Road	Maidenhead SL6 5E	E				
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	21 Septemb	per 2016		
Main Issue:	The Inspector agreed that the appearance of the locality would remain largely unchanged if the development proceeded, albeit that the building works already carried out conveys a cramped impression. However, he considered that the character of the area would be materially affected for the worse were the appeal granted permission. The use of the building, together with the adjoining garage as an independent dwelling, would materially and harmfully transform the perceived character of the immediate area. The development, including No 47, and its use as a separate dwelling would be perceived as overly cramped and congested in comparison with and in the context of the over-riding spacious residential characteristics of the wider area. The appellant has failed to appropriately distinguish between the terms 'appearance' and 'character' and that the proposed development would be perceived as wholly and harmfully uncharacteristic of this good quality residential area. The Inspector considered that the residual space left to the respective properties would just about provide an adequate level of amenity space for their future residents in terms of quality and quantity.						
Appeal Ref.:	16/60062/NOND ET	Planning Ref.:	16/00960/VAR	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/16/ 3151815		
Appellant:		Agent: Mr Tom McA denhead Berkshire SI		d Kemp The	Granary Hyde Farm		

	Marlow Road Maldernead Bersshire SL6 6PQ					
Decision Type:	Committee	Officer Recommendation:	Would Refused	Have		

**Description:** Construction of a detached 2 bedroom agricultural workers dwelling as approved under planning permission 09/02083 without complying with condition 3 (Agricultural occupancy) to vary the wording of the condition

Location: Glebeland Farm Drift Road Maidenhead SL6 3ST

Appeal Decision:AllowedDecision Date:27 October 2016

**Main Issue:** The main issue is whether it would be appropriate to widen the occupancy restriction. There is more than a theoretical possibility that permitted development rights may be utilised to allow a limited equestrian enterprise to take place on site. Extending the occupancy of the dwelling to allow or an equestrian worker would allow for that to take place. There would be in line with paragraph 28 and 81 of the Framework which seeks to support economic growth of all types of business in rural areas and would assist in supporting opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation providing a beneficial use in the Green Belt.

Appeal Ref.:	16/60063/NOND Planning Ref.: ET		APP/T0355/W/16/ 3151610
Appellant:	Ms J Bennet <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Tom Mc Farm Marlow Road Maidenhead Berks		he Granary Hyde
Decision Type:	Committee		ould Have fused
Description:	Change of use from agriculture to eq stick and ball pitch	uestrian to install full size polo pito	ch and associated
Location:	Glebeland Farm Drift Road Maidenho	ead SL6 3ST	
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed	Decision Date: 27 October 20	016
Main Issue:	Exception 2 is the provision of appropr as it preserves the openness of the material change of use from agricultur use is not implicitly included within exc for outdoor use. The proposal therefor Belt, which is by definition harmful to t to this harm. There would also be har the area due to the increase need for H as this would have an urbanising effect the benefits of providing opportunities damaged land, which are given mode Consequently very special circumstance	Green Belt. The proposal includes e to polo use, but the making of a more ception 2 and the land has to be alre- re represents inappropriate develops the Green Belt and substantial weight m to openness and the character a HGVs and player's cars, and creation t, encroaching on the countryside. S for sports, enhancing visual ameni- trate weight and do not outweigh the	the making of a material change of eady in lawful use ment within Green int should be given and appearance of of a parking area set against this are ity, and improving
Appeal Ref.:	16/60064/NOND Planning Ref.: ET		APP/T0355/W/16/ 3151615
Appellant:	Ms J Bennet <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Tom McA Marlow Road Maidenhead Berkshire S		Granary Hyde Farm
Decision Type:	Committee	Officer Recommendation: Wo	ould Have Refused
Description:	Construction of quadrangle of 66 no. s day room following demolition of existin		y barn and groom's
Location:	Glebeland Farm Drift Road Maidenhe	ead SL6 3ST	
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed	<b>Decision Date:</b> 27 October 20	016
Main Issue:	The construction of new buildings is in Exception 2 is the provision of approp as it preserves the openness of the proposal includes the making of a material cha and the land has to be already in lawf proposal therefore represents inappro- footprint and volume are reduced from The proposal would also enhance cha of unkempt appearance and poor con- to the lack of details on incidental ac- would be and thus tempers the weige contribution of health and well-being would be private rather than a public outdoor sports taking place under p possibility but would have a fewer ar moderate weight in favour of the d possibility of a change of use to a dwel a theoretical possibility of occurring. No the lack of information and evidence uncertainties as the likelihood of agricu- is only given limited weight. There wo moderate weight. Overall, the benefits as a whole Very Special Circumstances	riate facilities for outdoor sports and Green Belt. Although for operational terial change of use from agriculture inge of use is not implicitly included ful use for outdoor use which is not opriate development within Green B in the existing situation and would of racter given the loss of existing build dition and consolidation of development trivity gives uncertainty as to what ght given to benefits to openness a is only given moderate weight be facility. The fall-back position of the ermitted development has a great ind lesser effect than the proposal, evelopment. Little weight is given ling or state-funded school as there o weight is given to the unviability of . There would be a reduction in the ultural use taking place to the level in build be benefits to the local econom- are not considered to outweigh the	d recreation as long al development the e to keeping of polo d within exception 2 the case here. The Belt. The proposed enhance openness. Idings and structure nent. However, due the effect in reality and character. The ecause the facilities e use to indoor our ter than theoretical and so given only to the theoretical would no more than the farm use due to raffic but given the ndicated this benefit ny and this is given harm identified and

Appeal Ref.:	16/60078/REF	Planning Ref.:	15/03871/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/16/ 3152240
Appellant:		estments Ltd <b>c/o Age</b> Oxfordshire OX10 0E		ler Cutler Arc	hitects 43 St Mary's
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recomme	endation: F	Refuse
Description:	New chalet bunga	low following demoliti	on of shed and store	е	
Location:	Land Adjacent 35	5A And 35B Boyn Va	alley Road Maidenh	nead	
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	21 October	2016
Main Issue:	The Inspector found that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. She also found that it would be harmful to the living conditions of both the existing occupants of 10 and 12 Lexington Avenue, in terms of loss of light and outlook, and the future occupants of the chalet bungalow due to lack of suitable garden space.				
Appeal Ref.:	16/60083/REF	Planning Ref.:	16/01201/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/16/ 3158107
Appellant:	Mr Arvydas Kolelis RG12 9BY	s <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Pete	er M Salmon Cambe	er Broad Lane	Bracknell Berkshire
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recomme	endation: F	Refuse
Description:	Construction of de	tached garage and a	Iterations to drivewa	у	
Location:	Katura Fifield Ro	ad Fifield Maidenhe	ad SL6 2NX		
Appeal Decision:	Allowed		Decision Date:	14 October	2016
Main Issue:	Whilst the detached garage subject of the application is not directly attached to the host dwelling, the close proximity to it and the use in connection with it lead to the conclusion that it would be assessed as an extension rather than a new building. The host dwelling has not previously been extended and as such it was considered that the proposed detached garage would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling.				

## **Planning Appeals Received**

## 13 October 2016 - 10 November 2016



#### 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 <a href="https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/">https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/</a> 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 <u>teame1@pins.gsi.gov.uk</u>

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

Ward: Parish:						
Appeal Ref.:	16/60092/REF	Planning Ref.:	16/00831/CLAS SO	PIns Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/16/ 3156044	
Date Received: Type: Description: Location: Appellant:	18 October 2016 Refusal Change of use from c <b>Forever Fuels Sum</b> Forever Fuels <b>c/o Ag</b> Aylesbury Buckingha	nerleaze Barn 225 Jent: Mrs Jan Moly	i Blackamoor Lane	Maidenhead	SL6 8RT	
Ward: Parish: Appeal Ref.:	Bray Parish 16/60094/NONDET	Planning Ref.:	16/01887/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/16/ 3157199	
Date Received: Type: Description: Location: Appellant:	24 October 2016 Comments Due: 28 November 2016   Non-determination Appeal Type: Written Representation   Conversion and change of use of barn to dwelling including raising of roof. Unit 1 Coningsby Farm Coningsby Lane Fifield Maidenhead   Mr Michael Smyth c/o Agent: Ms Shelley Woods Relic Studio Ltd Battlers Green Farm   Common Lane Radlett Hertfordshire WD7 8PH					
Ward: Parish: Appeal Ref.:	Hurley Parish 16/60095/REF	Planning Ref.:	16/01317/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/16/ 3159328	
Date Received: Type: Description: Location: Appellant:	27 October 2016 Comments Due: Not Applicable   Refusal Appeal Type: Householder   Single storey front and rear extensions 4 Choseley Road Knowl Hill Reading RG10 9YT   Miss G Shepherd c/o Agent: Mr Eric Bolton Newtown House Newtown Road Henley On					
Ward: Parish: Appeal Ref.:	Thames Oxon RG9 1 16/60096/REF	HG Planning Ref.:	16/01491/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/16/	
Date Received: Type: Description: Location:	27 October 2016 Refusal Part single, part two s of existing garage and <b>4 Gordon Road Mai</b> d	d 2 No. sheds.	Comments Due: Appeal Type: on and widening of f	Not Applicab Householder ront access fo		
Appellant:	Mr Craig Irvine 4 Gor		ead SL6 6BT			

Ward: Parish: Appeal Ref.:	Bray Parish 16/60098/REF	Planning Ref.:	15/04034/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/Y/16/ 3156321
Date Received: Type:	9 November 2016 Refusal		Comments Due: Appeal Type:	14 Decembe Written Rep	er 2016
Description: Location: Appellant:		<b>jh Street Bray Mai</b> / <b>o Agent:</b> Mr Robe			oment Partnership