

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

**Planning Appeals Received**

**5 June 2021 - 9 July 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

<b>Ward:</b>				
<b>Parish:</b>	Windsor Unparished			
<b>Appeal Ref.:</b>	21/60046/REF	<b>Planning Ref.:</b>	21/00468/FULL	<b>PIns Ref.:</b> APP/T0355/D/21/ 3277854
<b>Date Received:</b>	2 July 2021	<b>Comments Due:</b>	Not Applicable	
<b>Type:</b>	Refusal	<b>Appeal Type:</b>	Householder Appeal	
<b>Description:</b>	Raising of the main ridge, x1 front rooflight and x1 rear dormer.			
<b>Location:</b>	<b>14 Clewer Fields Windsor SL4 5BW</b>			
<b>Appellant:</b>	Mr Alper Aslan <b>c/o Agent:</b> Miss Michaela Mercer Mercer Planning Consultants Ltd Castle Hill House 12 Castle Hill Windsor Berkshire SL4 1PD			

# Planning Appeal Decisions

5 June 2021 - 9 July 2021

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60009/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 20/00575/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/20/3263870

**Appellant:** Ms Paula Aldridge 15 Breadcroft Road Maidenhead SL6 3PA

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

**Description:** Part change of use of the first floor from Residential (C3) to Hair and Beauty treatment (A1) (Retrospective).

**Location:** **15 Breadcroft Road Maidenhead SL6 3PA**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 15 June 2021

**Main Issue:** The Inspector concluded that the development would harm the living conditions of future occupants with regard to general disturbance and would conflict with saved policy DG1 of the RBWM Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which require separate access to residential accommodation within mixed use schemes and that development should provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The Inspector took into consideration the representations in support of the appeal and concerns regarding alleged breaches of planning consent, noise, parking, and loss of privacy.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60015/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 19/01513/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/20/3253114

**Appellant:** Dr C Marsden-Huggins **c/o Agent:** Mr Andrew Ransome ADP Ltd Hophouse West Bergholt Colchester CO6 3TJ

**Decision Type:** Committee      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse

**Description:** Construction of 50 bedroom hotel.

**Location:** **S G Autopoint 437 - 441 St Leonards Road Windsor SL4 3DT**

**Appeal Decision:** Allowed      **Decision Date:** 15 June 2021

**Main Issue:** The Inspector concluded that the proposed building would not appear cramped or the site overdeveloped as the sides of the building would be set in from the plot boundary, the gap between buildings would be significant, the width to height ratio is well proportioned and would follow the building line of properties along this stretch of road, and buildings in the immediate surrounds (including the Victorian houses, Littleacre and Imperial Court) have limited landscaped curtilages. Whilst the roof height would exceed that of its neighbour, the distance between buildings and the stepped profile and insets that break up the form of the proposed building would moderate the perceived scale of the building, and the roofscape on this side of the road is not uniform. Harm to the most prominent tree affected by the proposed development can be protected by careful excavation during construction and pruning to reduce further root expansion. Although the use of proposed raised beds and need for significant pruning to prevent encroachment onto adjacent land would somewhat limit the effectiveness of proposed planting, overall more trees are proposed in the landscaping scheme than would be removed. Furthermore, it was noted that scheme reflects low level planting at the Imperial Court flats opposite, and houses further along St Leonards Road towards Windsor Town Centre.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60016/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 20/00932/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/20/3265485

**Appellant:** N Dearman c/o **Agent:** Mr Krzys Lipinski 39 Roundwood Road High Wycombe Buckinghamshire HP12 4HD

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

**Description:** Construction of a new crossover and access with a vehicular entrance gate.

**Location:** **Oakley Green Nurseries Oakley Green Road Oakley Green Windsor SL4 4PZ**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 15 June 2021

**Main Issue:** The RBWM Highway Design Guide and Parking Strategy (2004) (August 2010) (DGPS) seeks to control new accesses onto primary and district distributor roads to ensure the free flow of traffic. It notes that the number, position and types of junctions can affect the efficiency and safety of those roads and sets a minimum junction spacing of 30 metres to an adjacent access and 15 metres where a proposed access is opposite an existing access. The proposed development does not comply with these minimum requirements. The Inspector took into consideration the appellants wish to separate delivery vehicles from customer parking, but no evidence had been provided that the existing service road leading to the rear storage area is unsuitable or could not be improved to achieve this. The Inspector found no justification for an additional access that would outweigh the harm to highway safety. The proposed development would therefore conflict with saved policy T5 of the RBWM Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003) which requires development to comply with the DGPS and paragraph 108(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires safe and suitable access for development.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 21/60035/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 20/01735/TPO      **Plns Ref.:** APP/TPO/T0355/8101

**Appellant:** Mr Ajay Khindria 6 Foxborough Court Maidenhead SL6 2PX

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

**Description:** (T1) - 2x Oak - Crown reduction to a height of 12m and a crown spread of 10m. TPO 57 of 1998

**Location:** **6 Foxborough Court Maidenhead SL6 2PX**

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

**Main Issue:** The Inspector concluded that the need for the work applied for must be weighed against the resultant loss to the amenity of the area. In this case, no substantial evidence had been put forward to show the trees require the work proposed, or that it will provide any tangible benefits. On his site visit he observed nothing to make him think otherwise. On the evidence available, the work would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area through the pruning of these trees. The Inspector was not satisfied that there is sufficient justification for the work.

---