

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

Planning Appeals Received

25 May 2018 - 20 June 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 <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> please use the PIns 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: Bray Parish

Appeal Ref.: 18/60071/REF

Planning Ref.: 18/00008/FULL

PIns Ref.: APP/T0355/D/18/
3201798

Date Received: 11 June 2018

Type: Refusal

Comments Due: Not Applicable

Appeal Type: Householder

Description: Replacement garage and first floor annexe.

Location: **1 Memorial Cottage Fifield Road Fifield Maidenhead SL6 2NX**

Appellant: Mr L Page **c/o Agent:** Mr David Bates Domus Design Associates The Gatehouse Sonning Lane Sonning Reading Berkshire RG4 6ST

Appeal Decision Report

25 May 2018 - 20 June 2018

MAIDENHEAD

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Appeal Ref.: 18/60019/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/02159/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/17/3188043

Appellant: Coghlan Lodges Limited **c/o Agent:** Miss Michaela Mercer Planning Consultants Ltd 22 Tanglewood Close Pyrford Woking Surrey GU22 8LG

Decision Type: Committee **Officer Recommendation:** Application Permitted

Description: Change of use from C1 (Guesthouse) to C2 (Residential Institutions) - Retrospective

Location: **15 Ray Drive Maidenhead SL6 8NG**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 11 June 2018

Main Issue: The Inspector considered the potential level of activity resulting from the proposed use would be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring residents by reason of noise and disturbance. The scheme was considered to conflict with paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to amongst other things, to ensure a good standard of amenity for existing occupants. The proposal would also conflict with policy SP3 of the emerging Local Plan however this has been given limited weight.

Appeal Ref.: 18/60040/REF **Planning Ref.:** 17/02677/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/18/3194752

Appellant: Mr & Mrs J Smith **c/o Agent:** Stephen Varney Associates Stephen Varney Associates Ltd Siena Court The Broadway Maidenhead SL6 1NJ

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

Description: Single storey extension with accommodation in roof space to detached outbuilding

Location: **Sundance Thicket Grove Maidenhead SL6 4LW**

Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 29 May 2018

Main Issue: The Inspector did not consider that the proposal would compromise the future health and longevity of the trees, provided appropriate measures are taken during construction to protect them. The Inspector found that there would be no greater threat to the trees in terms of pressure to fell or prune them than exists as a result of the current use of the building. He concluded that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the trees and that it would not subsequently be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. It would not be contrary to local plan policy N6
