# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

# **Planning Appeals Received**

3 March 2018 - 29 March 2018



#### **MAIDENHEAD**

The appeals listed below have been received by the Council and will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate. Should you wish to make additional/new comments in connection with an appeal you can do so on the Planning Inspectorate website at <a href="https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/">https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/</a> please use the Plns reference number. If you do not have access to the Internet please write to the relevant address, shown below.

Enforcement appeals: The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol,

BS1 6PN

Other appeals: The Planning Inspectorate Temple Quay House, 2 The Square Bristol BS1 6PN

Ward:

Parish: Maidenhead Unparished

**Appeal Ref.:** 18/60034/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/02443/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355W/17/

3189731

**Date Received:** 7 March 2018 **Comments Due:** 11 April 2018

Type: Refusal Appeal Type: Written Representation

Description: Third floor roof extension to create 1self-contained (studio) apartment Location: Gardiner And Leader 23 Queen Street Maidenhead SL6 1NB

Appellant: Mr C Josephs - Partbridge Estates c/o Agent: Mr Anthony Allen Allen Planning Ltd The Old

Fire Station EC Salt Lane Salisbury SP1 1DU

Ward:

Parish: Maidenhead Unparished

**Appeal Ref.:** 18/60035/REF **Planning Ref.:** 16/03440/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/17/

3189525

**Date Received:** 7 March 2018 **Comments Due:** 11 April 2018

Type: Refusal Appeal Type: Written Representation

**Description:** Construction of two detached dwellings (house A and B) and a new access onto Sandisplatt

Road to serve House B following demolition of 1 Woodfield Drive.

Location: Piersburgh House 1 Woodfield Drive Maidenhead SL6 4NX

Appellant: Mr Sid Dhillon c/o Agent: Mr Paul Butt Planning Ltd 8 Hyde Copse Marcham

Abingdon Oxfordshire OX13 6PT

Ward:

Parish: Cox Green Parish

 Appeal Ref.:
 18/60038/REF
 Planning Ref.:
 17/01897/FULL
 Plns Ref.:
 APP/T0355/D/18/

3194942

Date Received:12 March 2018Comments Due:Not ApplicableType:RefusalAppeal Type:Householder

**Description:** Erection of a new 2m high fence which has extended the area of the enclosed garden.

(retrospective)

Location: 23 Farmers Way Maidenhead SL6 3PJ

Appellant: Miss Michelle Hawthorn 23 Farmers Way Maidenhead SL6 3PJ

# **Appeal Decision Report**

# 3 March 2018 - 29 March 2018

## **MAIDENHEAD**



Appeal Ref.: 18/60005/REF Planning Ref.: 17/02327/FULL Plns Ref.: APP/T0355/D/17/

3187904

Appellant: Mr G Mornard c/o Agent: Mrs Rebecca Lord Rebecca Lord Planning Delfryn Portesbery

Road Camberley GU15 3TD

Decision Type:DelegatedOfficer Recommendation:RefuseDescription:Construction of new gate and driveway following removal of existing hard surface.

Location: The Barn The Straight Mile Shurlock Row Reading RG10 0QP

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed **Decision Date:** 5 March 2018

Main Issue: The Inspector found that clear visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m cannot be achieved in a

suitable and sustained manner and consequently concluded that the planned access would be contrary to the interests of protecting highway safety. The proposal is contrary to Saved Policy TR5 of the Council's Local Plan which seeks access arrangements which are safe and

in compliance with relevant standards.

**Appeal Ref.:** 18/60006/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/01142/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/TO355/D/17/

3189155

Appellant: Mr Simon Kelly c/o Agent: Mr Edward McGill McGill Urban Design Holly Tree House 15

Green Lane Radnage Buckinghamshire HP14 4DJ

**Decision Type:** Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse **Description:** Construction of a replacement detached garage with accommodation in roofspace

Location: Waltham Lodge Nut Lane Waltham St Lawrence Reading RG10 0HJ

Appeal Decision: Dismissed Decision Date: 5 March 2018

**Main Issue:** The proposed replacement garage would be materially larger than the garage it would

replace and is therefore deemed inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed garage by reason of its height, volume and bulk would result in significant harm to

the openness of the Green Belt which is afforded substantial weight.

**Appeal Ref.:** 18/60014/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/01004/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/17/

3181907

Appellant: Mr Keevill c/o Agent: Mr Andy Moth Vale Garden Houses Ltd Londonthorpe Road Grantham

Lincolnshire NG31 9SJ

Decision Type: Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse

**Description:** Single storey rear extension

Location: Cromwell Cottage Alleyns Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9AD

Appeal Decision: Dismissed Decision Date: 26 March 2018

**Main Issue:** The garden room would be over-large and assertive in too close a proximity to the historic

building, vying for attention and taking the eye away from the more organic forms of the cottage. The building would appear as an intrusive element in the appreciation of the building from important, albeit mostly private, viewpoints that encompass the angle of the main range and the rear wing. The design of the addition would appear out of place against the building, confusing the history of the structure, appearing fussy in the number and size of windows. The proposed addition would cause harm to the architectural and historic significance of the

listed building for which there is no satisfactory justification.

Appeal Ref.: 18/60015/REF Planning Ref.: 17/01005/LBC Plns Ref.: APP/T0355/Y/17/

3181905

Appellant: Mr Keevill c/o Agent: Mr Andy Moth Vale Garden Houses Ltd Londonthorpe Road Grantham

Lincolnshire NG31 9SJ

Decision Type: Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse

**Description:** Consent for a single storey rear extension

Location: Cromwell Cottage Alleyns Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9AD

Appeal Decision: Dismissed Decision Date: 26 March 2018

**Main Issue:** The garden room would be over-large and assertive in too close a proximity to the historic

building, vying for attention and taking the eye away from the more organic forms of the cottage. The building would appear as an intrusive element in the appreciation of the building from important, albeit mostly private, viewpoints that encompass the angle of the main range and the rear wing. The design of the addition would appear out of place against the building, confusing the history of the structure, appearing fussy in the number and size of windows. The proposed addition would cause harm to the architectural and historic significance of the

listed building for which there is no satisfactory justification.

**Appeal Ref.:** 18/60022/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/02696/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/

3189227

Appellant: Mr & Mrs P Horner 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 rear extension, front open porch, 1 No. front rooflight and alterations to

fenestration.

Location: 64 Oaken Grove Maidenhead SL6 6HH

Appeal Decision: Allowed Decision Date: 21 March 2018

Main Issue: The Inspector found that although the rear extension would be relatively large, it would not

be unduly out of scale or proportion with the original house. He found that the rear extension would have no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the property or street scene and would accord with Local Plan policies DG1 and H14. There would also be no

conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Appeal Ref.:** 18/60024/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/02261/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/

3190418

Appellant: Mr Clive Nicholls c/o Agent: Mr Stuart Keen SKDdesign Ltd Unit 3 Woodlands Business

Park Woodlands Park Avenue Maidenhead SL6 3UA

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

**Description:** Construction of replacement garage with habitable accommodation over, single storey rear

annexe and first floor extension over existing study, following demolition of existing garage

and outbuilding

Location: The Field House 10 Sutton Close Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9QU

Appeal Decision: Dismissed Decision Date: 21 March 2018

**Main Issue:** The Inspector found that the development would be of a significant scale and mass

stretching towards the boundary with No.9 Sutton Close. Its extent would be visible from the cul-de-sac, even though it is a corner plot, and would appear as overdevelopment because

of its siting and size. The form of development would fail to respect the design and

proportions of the existing building. He also found that the proposed development would cause some increased loss of outlook when viewed from the garden of No.9. This is because of its proposed height and proximity to the boundary. The proposal is contrary to Policies

H14 and DG1 of the Local Plan.