ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD PLANNING COMMITTEE

MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

Planning Appeals Received

7 December 2017 - 5 January 2018

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 <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 teamp13@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Ward: Parish: Appeal Ref.:	Bray Parish 17/60117/REF	Planning Ref.:	17/00686/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/17/ 3186099	
Date Received: Type: Description: Location: Appellant:	7 December 2017 Comments Due: Appeal Type: 18 January 2018 Refusal Appeal Type: Written Representation Construction of a pair of detached cottages. Written Representation Land Opposite Lenore Cottage Rolls Lane Holyport Maidenhead Mrs Lucy Pickering 116 Woodlands Road Ashurst Southampton SO40 7AL					
Ward: Parish: Appeal Ref.:	Bray Parish 17/60118/NONDET	Planning Ref.:	17/02821/CPD	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/X/17/	
Date Received: Type: Description: Location: Appellant:	7 December 2017 Comments Due: 18 January 2018 Non-determination Appeal Type: Written Representation Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the proposed replacement building is lawful Land Opposite Lenore Cottage Rolls Lane Holyport Maidenhead SL6 2JQ Mrs Lucy Pickering 116 Woodlands Road Ashurst Southampton SO40 7AL					
Ward: Parish: Appeal Ref.:	Bray Parish 18/60001/REF	Planning Ref.:	17/01510/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/17/ 3185038	
Date Received: Type: Description:				Not Applicable Householder vay and replacement of the		
Location: Appellant:	existing wooden fencing with brick walls and piers Ashbery Fifield Road Fifield Maidenhead SL6 2NX Mr Ryan Best Ashbery Fifield Road Fifield Maidenhead SL6 2NX					

Appeal Decision Report

8 December 2017 - 5 January 2018

MAIDENHEAD

Appeal Ref.:	17/60100/REF	Planning Ref.:	17/01325/FULL	PIns Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/17/ 3183273		
Appellant:	Mr Nick Brandon-King c/o Agent: Mrs Emily Temple ET Planning Ltd Beechey House 87 Church Street Crowthorne RG45 7AW						
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recommendation: Refuse				
Description:	Two storey and single storey rear extension, first floor front extension, single storey front porch extension, 6 No. front and 2 No. rear roof light's following demolition of existing annexe.						
Location:	Path Head Kinghorn Lane Maidenhead SL6 7QG						
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed Decision Date: 22 December 2017						
Main Issue:	Development as proposed would appear incongruous and represent an overdevelopment of the appeal site that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, contrary to national policy in the Framework as referred to above and saved Policy H14 (1) of the Local Plan. Development as proposed would also have an unacceptably harmful impact on the living conditions of existing and future residents of 69 and 69a Switchback Road South, contrary to saved Policy H14 (2) of the Local Plan.						
Appeal Ref.:	17/60101/REF	Planning Ref.:	17/01694/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/17/ 3183516		
Appellant:	Mr And Mrs Parker c/o Agent: Mr Oliver Hill Rectory Barn Berriew Near Welshpool Powys Wales SY21 8AN						
Decision Type:	Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse						
Description:	Proposed two storey front/side extension following demolition of existing part single/ part two storey front projection						
Location:	Spring Cottage Sutton Road Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9SY						
Appeal Decision:	Allowed		Decision Date:	22 December	er 2017		
Main Issue:	The Inspector acknowledges that the extension would be readily visible from the street scene and would radically change appearance of the building. However, due to the wide range of dwelling designs in the area, the Inspector did not consider that the proposed extension would appear out of place and would not be at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling. The Inspector did not therefore agree with the Council's reason for refusal which referred to poor design.						

Appeal Ref.:	17/60103/REF	Planning Ref.:	17/02290/FULL	PIns Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/1 7/3187808			
Appellant:	Mr Kobir Ahmed c/o Agent: Mr Reg Johnson 59 Lancaster Road Maidenhead SL6 5EY							
Decision Type:	Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse							
Description:	First floor rear extension with Juliette balconies and alterations to fenestration							
Location:	19 Brompton Drive Maidenhead SL6 6SP							
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	29 Decembe	er 2017			
Main Issue:	The Inspector agreed with the Council's decision to refuse the application based on its impact on the character of the area and on the amenities of no.18 Brompton Drive. The Inspector did not however agree with the reason for refusal relating to insufficient parking. The Council's standards pre-date the National Planning Policy Framework which states that local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network. No such justification has been provided and the Inspector therefore attached limited weight to the Council's parking standards. He also considered that even if there would be parking spill onto the roads as a result of the proposal, there was no evidence of any local parking stress and no regime for restricting parking on the surrounding roads.							