

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

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL**

**Planning Appeals Received**

**6 March 2021 - 8 April 2021**

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:** Horton Parish

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60027/ENF

**Enforcement Ref.:** 19/50267/ENF

**PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/C/2  
1/3270786

**Date Received:** 24 March 2021

**Type:** Enforcement Appeal

**Comments Due:** 5 May 2021

**Appeal Type:** Written Representation

**Description:** Appeal against the Enforcement Notice: Without planning permission, erection of a single storey rear extension.

**Location:** **18 Coppermill Road Wraysbury Staines TW19 5NT**

**Appellant:** Ms Linda Zita Webb **c/o Agent:** Mr Kevin John Turner Kevin J Turner FRICS 64 Wood Road Shepperton Middlesex TW17 0DX

# Appeal Decision Report

6 March 2021 - 8 April 2021

**Appeal Ref.:** 20/60076/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 19/03547/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/20/  
3257723

**Appellant:** Mr David Chapman **c/o Agent:** Mr Tom Rumble Woolf Bond Planning The Mitfords  
Basingstoke Road Three Mile Cross Reading RG7 1AT

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

**Description:** Construction of a detached four bedroom dwelling with associated parking and landscaping.

**Location:** **Land At Lady Margaret Cottage Charters Road Sunningdale Ascot**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 23 March 2021

**Main Issue:** The proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would be in conflict with saved Policies H10, H11 and DG1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 1999 (incorporating alterations adopted 2003) (Local Plan) and Policies NP/DG1, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3 of the adopted Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2026 (Neighbourhood Plan) (2014). Amongst other matters these policies seek that development proposals should be of the highest standards of design in order to create attractive residential areas, should not harm the character and appearance of the area with regard to density, should not result in a cramped appearance and the scale and layout should respond positively to townscape and integrate with local surroundings. The proposal would make a welcome contribution of one new dwelling to the area's housing stock in line with the Government's aim in Framework Paragraph 59 to significantly boost the supply of homes. It would also include modest associated economic and social benefits, and it would be situated in an accessible location. However, even if the shortfall in the 5-year HLS is of the scale suggested by the appellant, the Inspector found that the adverse impacts of granting permission, including the harm to the character and appearance of the area, living conditions of existing occupiers and to a protected tree, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 20/60095/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 20/00686/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/20/3260378  
**Appellant:** Mrs Joit Uppal **c/o Agent:** Mr Robin Bretherick Robin Bretherick Associates Woodbank The Ridgeway Chalfont St. Peter Gerrards Cross Bucks SL9 8NP  
**Decision Type:** Delegated      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Detached outbuilding.  
**Location:** **Santana 54 Llanvair Drive Ascot SL5 9LN**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 10 March 2021

**Main Issue:** It is concluded that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would conflict with Policy DG1 of the Local Plan and Policies NP/DG1, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3 of the Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan 2011 - 2026 (adopted 2014) (Neighbourhood Plan), which collectively seek to prevent harm to the character of the surrounding area. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which provides that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character. An overriding justification for the proposal to be placed with the RPAs of the relevant trees has not been provided, and it has not been demonstrated that the encroachment into the RPAs of the relevant trees would be compensated for elsewhere (both required by BS5837), although the appellant has mentioned that land is available below the driveway. However, the construction methods proposed would ensure that the relevant trees would remain viable, and mitigation measures to improve the soil environment have been specified (again, both required by BS5837). Considering the minimal encroachment into the RPAs that the proposal would cause, it is considered that the deficiency with respect to the overriding justification and the compensatory measures is acceptable in this instance. The proposal would have an acceptable effect on the protected trees on the site. The proposal would comply with Policy N6 of the Local Plan and Policy NP/EN2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, which collectively seek to ensure that development proposals retain important trees.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 20/60042/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 19/02442/OUT      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/20/3251269  
**Appellant:** Mr Geoffrey Copas **c/o Agent:** Mr Tom McArdle Pike Smith & Kemp Rural The Old Dairy Hyde Farm Marlow Road Maidenhead SL6 6PQ  
**Decision Type:** Committee      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Outline application for access and layout only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for a proposed new equine centre with worker accommodation  
**Location:** **Land At Lower Mount Farm And To West of Unit 2B And South of Long Lane Cookham Maidenhead**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 11 March 2021

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60001/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 20/02132/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D20  
/3263453  
**Appellant:** Mr Mannie Bhui **c/o Agent:** Mr Richard Simpson 132 Brunswick Road London W5 1AW  
**Decision Type:** Delegated      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Single storey rear extension  
**Location:** **211 Coppermill Road Wraysbury Staines TW19 5NW**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 12 March 2021

**Main Issue:** The Council indicate that planning permission was granted in April 1999 to extend the original building (ref. 99/77868/FULL), which was subsequently implemented. The Council calculate that the total increase in floorspace, of the existing and proposed extensions, compared to the original building, would be around 260%. The Appellant has not challenged these figures. The analysis required by paragraph 145 c) of the Framework is whether the additions are disproportionate in relation to the 'size' of the original dwelling. The proposed increase in volume, scale and floorspace, of the existing and proposed extensions, are, therefore, relevant to that assessment. Based on these factors, when taken together, the sum total and size of the existing and proposed extensions would be disproportionate to the original dwelling. This finding is reflected by the cumulative increase in floorspace, volume and scale that results from the existing and proposed extensions compared to the original dwelling, and increase which would be significant. For these reasons, it is concluded that the proposed extension, when taken in combination with the existing extension, would be disproportionate to the original dwelling and represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which Paragraph 143 of the Framework states is harmful by definition and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Accordingly, it would fail to accord with Policy GB4 of the Local Plan or paragraph 145 c) of the Framework. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and its essential characteristics are therefore its permanence and openness. The impact on openness has a spatial as well as a visual aspect. In my judgement, the size, volume and floorspace of the appeal proposal, combined with the existing extension, would fail, in visual and spatial terms, to preserve the openness of the Green Belt. The Framework advises at Paragraph 133 that openness is an essential characteristic of Green Belts, and the appeal proposal would therefore cause harm in this regard. The appeal proposal, when taken together with the existing extension to the original building, constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would reduce the openness in this location. The Framework states that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. It is found that the other considerations in this case do not clearly outweigh the harm identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. The proposed development would be contrary to Policies GB1, GB2 and GB4 of the Local Plan and with the guidance in the Framework relating to Green Belt.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60004/ENF      **Enforcement Ref.:** 20/50142/ENF      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/C/20/  
3264580  
**Appellant:** Sines Parks Ltd **c/o Agent:** Mr Matthew Green Green Planning Studio Ltd Unit D Lunesdale Shrewsbury Upton Magna SY4 4TT  
**Decision Type:**      **Officer Recommendation:**  
**Description:** Appeal against the Enforcement Notice: Without planning permission, the importation and distribution of materials, including but not limited to road plainings to facilitate the formation of a hard surface.  
**Location:** **Farm House Crown Farm Eton Wick Road Eton Wick Windsor SL4 6PG**  
**Appeal Decision:** Enforcement Notice Withdrawn by LA      **Decision Date:** 17 March 2021

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60017/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 20/01992/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/21/3266900

**Appellant:** D Ovens **c/o Agent:** Mr Scott Wood SDW Design 63 Hillary Road High Wycombe HP13 7RB

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

**Description:** Two storey front/side extension, relocation of front door, altered front drive to allow for a new drop curb for two repositioned parking bays and alteration to fenestration.

**Location:** **11 Windmill Road Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9NE**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 19 March 2021

**Main Issue:** As a result, the proposed extensions would appear as a dominant, incongruous form of development, which would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area and would fail to respect the design and appearance of surrounding development. Furthermore, due to its size and scale, it would significantly reduce the open gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling, which would harm the open aspects of this part of the estate.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60018/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 20/02316/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/21/3267132

**Appellant:** Mr S Afzal **c/o Agent:** Mr Reg Johnson 59 Lancaster Road Maidenhead Berkshire SL6 5EY

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

**Description:** Part single part two storey side extension, replacement roof including x1 rear dormer and alterations to fenestration following demolition of the existing single storey side element - part retrospective.

**Location:** **40 Queensway Maidenhead SL6 7SD**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 23 March 2021

**Main Issue:** The Inspector found that the level of overlooking would be significantly increased, which would harm the living conditions of surrounding residents. The Inspector also found that the proposal would substantially increase the bulk of the property, when seen from neighbouring properties it would appear as an overbearing form of development.

---