## **Appeal Decision Report**

## 24 May 2022 - 22 July 2022

## Windsor and Ascot

| Appeal Ref.:        | 21/60032/ENF  | Enforcement<br>Ref.:  | 16/50363/ENF   | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/C/2<br>1/3268946 |  |  |
|---------------------|---|---|----------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Appellant:          |   | Mrs Kamaljeet Kaur Sall <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Paul Butt Paul Butt Planning Ltd 8 Hyde<br>Copse Marcham Abingdon Oxfordshire OX13 6PT |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Decision Type:      | No Further Actio  | No Further Action Officer<br>Recommendation:  |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Description:        | Appeal against the Enforcement Notice: Change of use from a single dwellinghouse into 4 'studio' flats and 2 en-suite bedrooms with a shared kitchen on the ground floor without planning permission. |   |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Location:           | 17 Rydings Wir  | idsor SL4 4HF   |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Quashed   |   | Decision Date: | 30 June 2     | :022                       |  |  |
| Main Issue:         |   |   |                |               |                            |  |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 22/60007/REF   | Planning Ref.:   | 21/01983/FULL   | PIns<br>Ref.:  | APP/T0355/W/2<br>1/3282347  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Appellant:          | Mr Dalhit Bhail B  | rookfield House Pa   | ark Lane Horton Sl  | ough SL3 9F  | ۶R  |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated  |  | Officer<br>Recommendati   | Refuse<br>ion:   |   |  |
| Description:        | Single storey link   | c extension betwee   | n existing cottage  | and summer   | room.   |  |
| Location:           | Brookfield Lode  | ge Datchet Road  | Horton Slough SL  | .3 9PS   |   |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Dismissed  |  | Decision Date:  | 12 July 20   | 22  |  |
| Main Issue:         | balance, the pro<br>Il listed building.<br>the Framework a<br>seek, amongst o<br>environment and<br>would accord wit | posal would fail to<br>It would fail to satis<br>and conflict with Po<br>ther things, to cons<br>I achieve high qual | sfy the requirement<br>licies HE1 and QP<br>serve and respect t<br>ity design. Therefo<br>y, the proposal wou | al historic int<br>ts of the Act,<br>1 of the Loca<br>he significar<br>re, notwithst | erest of the Grade<br>, paragraph 197 of<br>al Plan which<br>nce of the historic<br>tanding that it |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 22/60008/REF  | Planning Ref.:   | 21/01984/LBC            | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/Y/2<br>1/3282346 |  |
|---------------------|---|--|-------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| Appellant:          | Mr Daljit Bhail B   | rookfield House Pa   | rk Lane Horton SL       | 3 9PR         |                            |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated   |  | Officer<br>Recommendati | on:           | Refuse                     |  |
| Description:        | Consent for a sir room.   | Consent for a single storey link extension between existing cottage and summer room. |                         |               |                            |  |
| Location:           | Brookfield Lode   | ge Datchet Road  | Horton Slough Sl        | _3 9PS        |                            |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Dismissed   |  | Decision Date:          | 12 July 2     | 2022                       |  |
| Main Issue:         | In the absence of any defined public benefit, the Inspector concludes that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building. It would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 197 of the Framework and conflict with Policies HE1 and QP1 of the Local Plan which seek, amongst other things, to conserve and respect the significance of the historic environment and achieve high quality design. Therefore, notwithstanding that it would accord with Green Belt policy, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan considered as a whole. |  |                         |               |                            |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 22/60011/REF  | Planning Ref.:                                    | 21/00835/FULL                        | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/W/2<br>1/3285134 |  |
|---------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| Appellant:          | •   | er <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Ju<br>artlebury Kiddermir | ustin De Vries Mou<br>nster DY11 7YQ | ule And Co N  | /illridge Farm             |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated   | Officer Refuse<br>Recommendation:                 |                                      |               |                            |  |
| Description:        | x1 shed, x3 gree  | nhouses and x2 ne                                 | etted fruit cages.                   |               |                            |  |
| Location:           | Land To The North West of Cedar House Coombe Lane Ascot   |   |                                      |               |                            |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Allowed   |   | Decision Date:                       | 22 June 20    | )22                        |  |
| Main Issue:         | The Inspector concludes that the proposal would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt or conflict with the purposes of including land within it as it would fall within the paragraph 149(a) exception of the Framework. The proposal would not conflict with Policy QP5 of the Local Plan as the proposal would not be inappropriate development under the Framework. |   |                                      |               |                            |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 22/60016/REF  | Planning Ref.: | 21/01100/FULL  | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/W/2<br>1/3285155 |  |  |
|---------------------|---|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Appellant:          | Mr Vipen <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr G Benning G T Designz Ltd 82 Holyhead Road<br>Wednesbury West Midlands WS10 7PA       |                |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated Officer Refuse Recommendation:  |                |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Description:        | Part single part two storey side/rear extension to create x1 dwelling, following demolition of the existing garage. |                |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Location:           | The Firs Mill Lane Horton Slough SL3 9PN  |                |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Dismissed   |                | Decision Date: | 17 June 20    | )22                        |  |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 22/60018/REF   | Planning Ref.: | 21/01877/FULL  | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/D/2<br>1/3287460 |  |  |
|---------------------|--|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Appellant:          | Mr And Mrs Guy And Sandra Matthews And Moore <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Nick Griffin Inception Planning Limited Quatro House Lyon Way Camberley GU16 7ER |                |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated Officer Refuse Recommendation:   |                |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Description:        | Part single/part two storey side/rear extension, relocation of front entrance door following demolition of existing conservatory.                  |                |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Location:           | Tudor Cottage 5 Bedford Lane Sunningdale Ascot SL5 0NP   |                |                |               |                            |  |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Allowed  |                | Decision Date: | 14 July 202   | 2                          |  |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 22/60022/NON<br>DET  | Planning Ref.:                                 | 21/02054/FULL            | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/W/2<br>1/3283139 |  |
|---------------------|--|--|--------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| Appellant:          | •  | de Ltd <b>c/o Agent:</b> l<br>h Wokingham Berk |                          | s Planning    | g Ltd 19 Woodlands         |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated  |  | Officer<br>Recommendatio | on:           | Would Have<br>Refused      |  |
| Description:        | Construction of x6 three-bedroom dwellings with associated parking and new shared vehicular access, following demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings.  |  |                          |               |                            |  |
| Location:           | Former Missand   | da Wells Lane Asc                              | ot SL5 7DY               |               |                            |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Dismissed  |  | Decision Date:           | 15 June       | 2022                       |  |
| Main Issue:         | Dismissed on the grounds that the development fails to respect and preserve the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Local Plan Policy QP3 and Neighbourhood Plan Policies NP/DG1 and NP/DG2. The lane has a distinctive rural nature. The cumulative scale and prominence of the 2 large, similar and closel positioned buildings would be dominant and at odds with the rural characteristics found generally in the 'Villas in a Woodland Setting'. The buildings would constitute a pronounced suburban intrusion into this part of Wells Lane and would detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of Wells Lane and be discordant and incongruous. |  |                          |               |                            |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 22/60023/REF  | Planning Ref.:   | 21/01844/FULL  | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/W/2<br>1/3289134 |  |  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|---------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Appellant:          |   | Mr And Mrs J Butler <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Laurence Moore Woolf Bond The Mitfords<br>Basingstoke Road Three Mile Cross Reading RG7 1AT |  |               |                            |  |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated Officer Refuse Recommendation:  |  |  |               |                            |  |  |
| Description:        | x2 new dwellings with detached garage and vehicular entrance gates, following demolition of existing dwelling and garage. |  |  |               |                            |  |  |
| Location:           | Linthorpe Fireball Hill Sunningdale Ascot SL5 9PJ   |  |  |               |                            |  |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Allowed   |  | Decision Date:   | 18 July 20    | )22                        |  |  |
| Main Issue:         | appearance of F   | ireball Hill and has   | evelopment would r<br>no reason to find th<br>al is allowed subjec | he scheme     | would compromise           |  |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 22/60030/REF   | Planning Ref.:   | 21/03264/CLA<br>SAA       | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/D/2<br>1/3289697                |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|---------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|
| Appellant:          | •  | C/o CDP <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr David Holmes G F Falconer 24D Peters Close Prestwood Great Missenden HP16 9ET |                           |               |   |  |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated  |  | Officer<br>Recommendation | on:           | Prior Approval<br>Required and<br>Refused |  |  |
| Description:        | Application for prior approval for construction of one additional storey to the property with a maximum height of 2.60m. |  |                           |               |   |  |  |
| Location:           | Jasmin House 2 The Hatch Windsor SL4 5UD   |  |                           |               |   |  |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Dismissed  |  | Decision Date:            | 26 May 2      | 2022                                      |  |  |

| Appeal Ref.:        | 21/60081/REF  | Planning Ref.: | 21/02034/FULL                  | PIns<br>Ref.: | APP/T0355/W/2<br>1/3284812 |  |
|---------------------|---|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|
| Appellant:          | Mrs Odette Paesano <b>c/o Agent:</b> Mr Mark Leedale Mark Leedale Planning 52<br>Crondall Lane Farnham Surrey GU9 7DD |                |                                |               |                            |  |
| Decision Type:      | Delegated   |                | Officer Refuse Recommendation: |               | Refuse                     |  |
| Description:        | Two storey front/side extension with rear balcony and alterations to fenestration.                                    |                |                                |               |                            |  |
| Location:           | 16 Washington Drive Windsor SL4 4NS   |                |                                |               |                            |  |
| Appeal<br>Decision: | Dismissed   |                | Decision Date:                 | 20 June 20    | 22                         |  |