Appeal Decision Report 07 June 2022 to 11 July 2022

<u>Maidenhead</u>

Appeal Ref.:	21/60066/ENF	Enforcement Ref.:	21/50122/ENF	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/C/21/ 3284003	
Appellant:	James Lee c/o Agent: Mrs Maria Boyce ArkleBoyce Matthew Murray House Unit 9 First 97 Water Lane Leeds LS11 5QN					
Decision Type:	Officer Recommendation:					
Description:	Appeal against the Enforcement Notice: Without planning permission, the erection of a marquee structure within the curtilage of a listed building, attached to outbuildings associated with the public house, with facilitating metal support poles, ground anchors and two timber structures used as entry/exit points.					
Location:	The Crown High Street Bray Maidenhead SL6 2AH					
Appeal Decision:	Allowed Decision Date: 10 June 2022				22	
Main Issue:						
Appeal Ref.:	21/60079/REF	Planning Ref.:	21/01434/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/21/ 3284858	
Appellant:	Mr Anthony c/o Agent: Mr Joshua Harrison Cohanim Architecture 207 Regent Street 3rd Floor London W1B 3HH					
Decision Type:	Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse					
Description:	1 No. new dwelling with associated amenity space, new pedestrian entrance, refuse and bicycle store and unallocated on-street parking.					
Location:	Land At 11 Mallow Park Maidenhead					
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	15 June 202	22	
Main Issue:						
Appeal Ref.:	22/60002/REF	Planning Ref.:	21/02124/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/21/ 3287328	
Appellant:	Mr William Fitzgibbon c/o Agent: Mr William Fitzgibbon Chalkline 43 Delamere Road Ealing W53JL					
Decision Type:	Committee Officer Recommendation: Refuse					
Description:	x1 new dwelling, following demolition of the existing workshop.					
Location:	Acorn Cutters Limited The Old Workshop Lower Boyndon Road Maidenhead SL6 4DD					
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	6 July 2022		
Main Issue:						

	22/60009/REF	Planning Ref.:	21/01855/CLAS SO	PIns Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/21 3283130	
Appellant:	Millie Boffey c/o Agent: Miss Harriet Nind Planning And Design Group (UK) Limited Pure Offices Lake View Drive Annesley Nottingham NG15 0DT					
Decision Type:	Delegated		Officer Recomm	endation:	Prior Approval Required and Refused	
Description:	Change of use fro	om offices (Class B1)	(a)) to dwellinghouse	s (Class C3)	to create x18 flats.	
Location:	Belmont Place Belmont Road Maidenhead					
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	22 June 20)22	
Main Issue:						
Appeal Ref.:	22/60015/REF	Planning Ref.:	20/00529/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/2 ⁻ 3285209	
Appellant:	Ms Jeanette Jones c/o Agent: Mr Neil Davis Davis Planning Ltd 19 Woodlands Avenue Winnersh Wokingham RG41 3HL					
Decision Type:	Committee		Officer Recomm	endation:	Refuse	
Description:	Use of land for private equestrian use and erection of new equestrian yard comprising of stables, storage barn, open arena, associated hardstanding and new access.					
Location:	Land To The North of Clock Cottage Sturt Green Holyport Maidenhead					
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed Decision Date: 30 June 2022)22	
Main Issua	I have identified t	hat the development	would be inappropria	ate developm	ent in the Green Re	
Main Issue:	as defined by the required by the F Therefore, the pro- harm which the F other consideration have identified. H sufficient to clear circumstances ne conflicts with the	Framework as it wound ramework. The property oposed development ramework indicates as ons, which at best ho Having regard to all n ly outweigh the harm accessary to justify the	would be inappropria uld not preserve the o osal would conflict wi would by definition, l should be given subs dom moderate weight, natters raised, I concl to the Green Belt. C e development do not ad the advice in the F	openness of t th Policy QPS be harmful to tantial weigh do not outwe lude that the onsequently, exist. The pr	the Green Belt as of the Local Plan. the Green Belt, t. The benefits of the igh the harm that I are no consideration the very special oposed developmen	
Main Issue: Appeal Ref.:	as defined by the required by the F Therefore, the pro- harm which the F other consideration have identified. H sufficient to clear circumstances ne conflicts with the	Framework as it work ramework. The proper- oposed development ramework indicates sons, which at best ho Having regard to all n ly outweigh the harm ecessary to justify the development plan ar	uld not preserve the opsal would conflict with would by definition, is should be given subsolid moderate weight, on atters raised, I conclute to the Green Belt. Ce development do not	openness of t th Policy QPS be harmful to tantial weigh do not outwe lude that the onsequently, exist. The pr	the Green Belt as of the Local Plan. the Green Belt, t. The benefits of the igh the harm that I are no consideration the very special roposed developmen or the reasons giver	
	as defined by the required by the F Therefore, the pro- harm which the F other consideration have identified. H sufficient to clear circumstances ne conflicts with the I conclude that the 22/60017/REF	Framework as it work ramework. The proper- oposed development ramework indicates as ons, which at best ho Having regard to all n ly outweigh the harm eccessary to justify the development plan ar be appeal should fail. Planning Ref.: r And Pauline Janiko	uld not preserve the opsal would conflict with would by definition, is should be given subsolid moderate weight, on atters raised, I conclute to the Green Belt. Conclute development do not and the advice in the F	ppenness of t th Policy QPS be harmful to tantial weigh do not outwe lude that the onsequently, exist. The pr ramework. For PIns Ref.:	the Green Belt as 5 of the Local Plan. the Green Belt, t. The benefits of the igh the harm that I are no consideration the very special roposed development or the reasons giver APP/T0355/D/22 3291565	
Appeal Ref.:	as defined by the required by the F Therefore, the pro- harm which the F other consideration have identified. H sufficient to clear circumstances ne conflicts with the I conclude that the 22/60017/REF Mr And Mrs Pete	Framework as it work ramework. The proper- oposed development ramework indicates as ons, which at best ho Having regard to all n ly outweigh the harm eccessary to justify the development plan ar be appeal should fail. Planning Ref.: r And Pauline Janiko	uld not preserve the operative serve the operative would conflict with would by definition, it would by definition, it should be given subsolid moderate weight, on atters raised, I conclusion the Green Belt. Conclusion of the advice in the F	ppenness of t th Policy QPS be harmful to tantial weigh do not outwe lude that the onsequently, exist. The pr ramework. For PIns Ref.:	the Green Belt as 5 of the Local Plan. the Green Belt, t. The benefits of the igh the harm that I are no consideration the very special roposed development or the reasons giver APP/T0355/D/22 3291565	
Appeal Ref.: Appellant: Decision Type:	as defined by the required by the F Therefore, the pro- harm which the F other consideration have identified. If sufficient to clear circumstances ne conflicts with the I conclude that the 22/60017/REF Mr And Mrs Pete Alma Road Wind Delegated	Framework as it work ramework. The proper- oposed development ramework indicates as ons, which at best ho Having regard to all n ly outweigh the harm eccessary to justify the development plan ar be appeal should fail. Planning Ref.: r And Pauline Janiko	uld not preserve the operation of the op	ppenness of t th Policy QPS be harmful to tantial weigh do not outwe lude that the onsequently, exist. The pr ramework. For PIns Ref.:	the Green Belt as 5 of the Local Plan. 5 the Green Belt, t. The benefits of the igh the harm that I are no consideration the very special roposed developmen or the reasons giver APP/T0355/D/22 3291565 arter Planning Ltd 85	
Appeal Ref.: Appellant: Decision Type: Description:	as defined by the required by the F Therefore, the pro- harm which the F other consideration have identified. H sufficient to clear circumstances ne conflicts with the I conclude that the 22/60017/REF Mr And Mrs Pete Alma Road Wind Delegated First floor front ex	Framework as it work ramework. The proper- oposed development ramework indicates as ons, which at best ho Having regard to all n ly outweigh the harm ecessary to justify the development plan ar- ne appeal should fail. Planning Ref.: r And Pauline Janiko sor SL4 3EX	uld not preserve the opsal would conflict with would by definition, is should be given subsolid moderate weight, on atters raised, I conclute to the Green Belt. Contend the advice in the F	ppenness of t th Policy QPS be harmful to tantial weigh do not outwe lude that the onsequently, exist. The pr ramework. For PIns Ref.:	the Green Belt as 5 of the Local Plan. 5 the Green Belt, t. The benefits of the igh the harm that I are no consideration the very special roposed development or the reasons giver APP/T0355/D/22 3291565 arter Planning Ltd 85	
Appeal Ref.: Appellant:	as defined by the required by the F Therefore, the pro- harm which the F other consideration have identified. H sufficient to clear circumstances ne conflicts with the I conclude that the 22/60017/REF Mr And Mrs Pete Alma Road Wind Delegated First floor front ex	Framework as it work ramework. The propo- oposed development framework indicates as ons, which at best ho Having regard to all n ly outweigh the harm development plan ar the appeal should fail. Planning Ref.: r And Pauline Janiko sor SL4 3EX	uld not preserve the opsal would conflict with would by definition, is should be given subsolid moderate weight, on atters raised, I conclute to the Green Belt. Contend the advice in the F	ppenness of t th Policy QPS be harmful to tantial weigh do not outwe lude that the onsequently, exist. The pr ramework. For PIns Ref.:	the Green Belt as 5 of the Local Plan. the Green Belt, t. The benefits of the igh the harm that I are no consideration the very special roposed developmen or the reasons giver APP/T0355/D/22 3291565 arter Planning Ltd 85 Refuse	

Delegated Fwo storey side ex	-	Reg Johnson 59 Lanc Officer Recomme			
Two storey side ex	rtension and part sin	Officer Recomme	andation:	Defer	
	tension and part sin		Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse		
Two storey side extension and part single/part two storey rear extension following demo of existing element.					
5 Harrow Lane Maidenhead SL6 7PD					
Dismissed		Decision Date:	21 June 20)22	
22/60027/NOND ET	Planning Ref.:	21/02543/OUT	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/\ 3287327	
Mr Craig Harrod c/o Agent: Miss Eva Gascoigne Pike Smith & Kemp Rural Hyde Farm Marlow Road Maidenhead SL6 6PQ					
Delegated		Officer Recomme	endation:	Would Have Refused	
Outline application for scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the construction of an M4 noise abatement and landscaped screening bund w post rail fence.					
Land At Binfield Paddocks Twyford Road Binfield Bracknell					
Dismissed Decision Date: 13 June 2022					
	22/60027/NOND T Mr Craig Harrod c / Marlow Road Maid Delegated Dutline application eserved for the co post rail fence. Land At Binfield I	22/60027/NOND Planning Ref.: ET Mr Craig Harrod c/o Agent: Miss Eva Marlow Road Maidenhead SL6 6PQ Delegated Dutline application for scale only to be eserved for the construction of an M4 bost rail fence. Land At Binfield Paddocks Twyford	22/60027/NOND Planning Ref.: 21/02543/OUT ET Mr Craig Harrod c/o Agent: Miss Eva Gascoigne Pike Smit Marlow Road Maidenhead SL6 6PQ Officer Recomme Delegated Officer Recomme Dutline application for scale only to be considered at this stateserved for the construction of an M4 noise abatement and post rail fence. Land At Binfield Paddocks Twyford Road Binfield Brack	22/60027/NOND Planning Ref.: 21/02543/OUT Plns Ref.: 21/02543/OUT Plns Ref.: 21/02543/OUT Plns Ref.: 21/02543/OUT Construction Construction Register Additional Statement and Landscaped Deserved for the construction of an M4 noise abatement and landscaped Dost rail fence. 20/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04	

Appeal Ref.:	22/60031/REF	Planning Ref.:	21/00427/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/W/21/ 3288055		
Appellant:	Mr David Lee c/o Agent: Mr John Hunt Pike Smith And Kemp Rural And Commercial Ltd The Old Dairy Hyde Farm Marlow Road Maidenhead SL6 6PQ						
Decision Type:	Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse						
Description:	Extension of the e	xisting fishery/fish bro	eeding pond and rel	ocation of exis	sting fencing.		
Location:	Waltham Farm Shurlock Road Waltham St Lawrence Reading						
Appeal Decision:	Dismissed		Decision Date:	7 July 2022			
Main Issue:	Overall, there is insufficient evidence to determine that the proposal would not harm the openness of the Green Belt, or that it would comprise not inappropriate development under Paragraph 150(b) of the Framework. Paragraph 147 of the Framework makes clear that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 of the Framework goes on to establish that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Overall, there is insufficient evidence that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on flood risk. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy NR1 of the Borough Local Plan 2022, which among other things seeks to manage flood risk so that it is acceptable and consistent with the provisions set out within Paragraphs 159 to 169 of the Framework. Flooding can have serious implications for those subjected to it. Consequently, I give this matter substantial weight. Overall, whilst the proposal would be acceptable in relation to great crested newts, there is insufficient evidence to determine that the proposal would conflict with Policy NR2 of the Borough Local Plan 2022, which among other things requires proposals to demonstrate how they would maintain, protect, and enhance the biodiversity of application sites. These provisions are consistent with Paragraphs 174 to 180 of the Framework. The cumulative effects of biodiversity and protected species harms, and the international importance of the latter, means I give this matter substantial weight.						

Planning Appeals Received

06 June 2022 to 11 July 2022

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 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: Appeal Ref.:	Bray Parish 22/60049/REF	Planning Ref.:	22/00974/FULL	Pins Ref.:	APP/T0355/D/22/ 3301858	
Date Received: Type: Description: Location: Appellant:	7 July 2022 Comments Due: Not Applicable Refusal Appeal Type: Householder New detached carport with accommodation in the roof space and external staircase. Two Ways Avenue Road Maidenhead SL6 1UG Mr And Mrs Holmes c/o Agent: Mr Sam Dodd Authorised Designs Ltd Suite 1 Hardy House Northbridge Road Berkhamsted HP4 1EF					