



## Planning Appeals Received

6 April - 8 June 2023

### 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:** Maidenhead Unparished  
**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60039/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 22/02811/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/23/3317148  
**Date Received:** 19 April 2023      **Comments Due:** N/A  
**Type:** Refusal      **Appeal Type:** HouseHolder Appeal  
**Description:** Part single part two storey front/side/rear extension and new dropped kerb following demolition of existing shed.  
**Location:** **41 Holmanleaze Maidenhead SL6 8AW**  
**Appellant:** Mr M S Mureed **c/o Agent:** Mr Reg Johnson 59 Lancaster Road Maidenhead SL6 5EY

**Ward:**  
**Parish:** Maidenhead Unparished  
**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60042/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 22/03235/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/23/3319379  
**Date Received:** 20 April 2023      **Comments Due:** N/A  
**Type:** Refusal      **Appeal Type:** HouseHolder Appeal  
**Description:** Part single part two storey wraparound extension (front/side/rear) with Juliet balcony to rear, alterations to existing front canopy and steps following demolition of existing store and garage.  
**Location:** **11 Wavell Road Maidenhead SL6 5AB**  
**Appellant:** Mr James Holmden **c/o Agent:** Mr Allen Watson Berry House 78 Altwood Road Maidenhead Berkshire SL6 4PZ

**Ward:**  
**Parish:** Cookham Parish  
**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60040/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 22/02245/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/23/3315038  
**Date Received:** 28 April 2023      **Comments Due:** N/A  
**Type:** Refusal      **Appeal Type:** HouseHolder Appeal  
**Description:** First floor front/side extension.  
**Location:** **Rose Cottage Kings Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9TZ**  
**Appellant:** Tim Wilson **c/o Agent:** Miss Katie Hogendoorn Bourne House Bourne End SL8 5AR

**Ward:**  
**Parish:** Hurley Parish  
**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60041/ENF      **Enforcement Ref.:** 22/50301/ENF      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/C/23/3319664

**Date Received:** 3 May 2023  
**Type:** Enforcement Appeal  
**Description:** Appeal against the Enforcement Notice for THE MATTERS WHICH APPEAR TO CONSTITUTE THE BREACH OF PLANNING CONTROL: Without planning permission: Erection of close boarded timber fencing and gates adjacent to Black Boys Lane (western boundary) and identified in the images marked AJH1, Erection of decking with associated paraphernalia identified on the appended plans BB-R00-EX-102 and BB-R00-EX-103 and further identified in the attached images marked AJH2, Erection of a timber pergola identified in the appended images marked AJH3 and Formation of a hardsurface identified in the images marked AJH4.

**Location:** **The Black Boys Inn Henley Road Hurley Maidenhead SL6 5NQ**  
**Appellant:** Nicole Eve Gregor The Black Boys Inn Henley Road Hurley Maidenhead SL6 5NQ

**Ward:**  
**Parish:** Waltham St Lawrence Parish  
**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60047/REF  
**Date Received:** 25 May 2023  
**Type:** Refusal  
**Description:** Erection of 12no. dwellings with associated parking and landscaping and the retention of the existing access road following the demolition of the existing buildings, warehouse, external storage areas and hardstanding.

**Location:** **Bellman Hanger Shurlock Row Reading RG10 0PL**  
**Appellant:** Shanly Homes c/o Agent: Rosalind Graham Cheyenne House, West Street, Farnham, Surrey, GU9 7EQ

**Ward:**  
**Parish:** Bray Parish  
**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60048/REF  
**Date Received:** 26 May 2023  
**Type:** Refusal  
**Description:** Single storey rear extension and first floor side extension following demolition of existing conservatory.

**Location:** **Cleeve Brayfield Road Bray Maidenhead SL6 2BW**  
**Appellant:** Harry Bowden c/o Agent: Other ET Planning Office 200 Dukes Ride CROWTHORNE RG45 6DS

**Ward:**  
**Parish:** Maidenhead Unparished  
**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60049/REF  
**Date Received:** 6 June 2023  
**Type:** Refusal  
**Description:** Single storey side/rear extension, alterations to the roof to include; x1 side rooflight and x1 rear dormer, detached rear annexe and alterations to fenestration.

**Location:** **80 Westborough Road Maidenhead SL6 4AS**  
**Appellant:** Mr Waqas 80 Westborough Road Maidenhead SL6 4AS

# Appeal Decision Report

6 April - 8 June 2023

Maidenhead

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough  
of Windsor &  
Maidenhead

**Appeal Ref.:** 22/60077/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 22/00754/OUT      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/22/3305525  
**Appellant:** Natalie Guest **c/o Agent:** Mr. Jack Clegg The Old Dairy Hyde Farm Maidenhead Berkshire SL6 6PQ  
**Decision Type:** Delegated      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Outline application for access and scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for a Clubhouse Pavilion.  
**Location:** **Zacara Polo Ground Martins Lane Shurlock Row Reading RG10 0PP**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 6 June 2023

**Main Issue:** The proposed building would have floorspace of 283.8m<sup>2</sup>, which would be a large building in the context of the site. The indicative plans show how that floorspace could be created with a single storey building. The overall scale of the proposed building would be far in excess of that advised in the Sport England Clubhouse Design Guidance Notes, and there is no substantive evidence that a clubhouse must be of the scale proposed in this case. A building of this scale would fill an existing relatively undeveloped space, and this would lead to a visual and spatial change at the site. A building of this size would be clearly visible in the polo ground and from limited public vantage points on Callin's Lane. In this regard the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would lead to a loss of openness to the Green Belt. These are matters that carry substantial weight. The other considerations identified in this case at most carry limited weight. Even when considered together, these considerations do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. As a result, the very special circumstances that are necessary to justify the proposal do not exist. The proposal would conflict with Policy GP5 of the Local Plan and the NPPF in respect of protecting Green Belt land. There are no other considerations which outweigh this finding.

The proposal would not have a harmful impact on highway safety in the area. In this regard, the proposal would not conflict with Policies IF2 and QP3 of the Local Plan. These policies collectively state, amongst other matters, that new development will be expected to deliver easy and safe access. The proposal would also not be contrary to the NPPF in respect of this issue.

This conclusion arises from the proposed structure having been designed to cater for the existing use at the ground; there being more than one entrance available; and there being considerable space for parking on site for vehicles including horseboxes and trailers.

The consultation response from the Highways Authority correctly referenced the proposal as a clubhouse; this is also stated in the Council's report. While there is more than one entrance to the polo ground, the submitted plans show the access to the appeal site via the entrance referenced in the Highways Authority's comments and the Council's report. These comments were therefore neither inaccurate nor unreasonable in this respect.

While the Inspector disagrees with the Council's judgement on highway matters in this case, the Council did substantiate its reasons for refusal with reference to relevant policies. The Council did not provide an appeal statement during this process, but the Council did submit the officer's report and consultation responses received during the planning application process. The Council has provided evidence through the appeal process in this regard, and the Inspector found no compelling evidence that the Council has failed to engage during the application or the appeal process.

In light of the above it has not been demonstrated in this case that the Council has behaved unreasonably in refusing permission. As a result, the Inspector found that the behaviour of the Council has not led to the applicants incurring unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process for the reasons outlined above

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 22/60078/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 21/03573/OUT      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/22/3309281  
**Appellant:** Ms Janet Meads-Mitchell **c/o Agent:** Ms. Kate Pryse Land Adjacent Pond View Sturt Green Holyport Maidenhead Maidenhead SL6 2JF  
**Decision Type:** Delegated      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Outline application for access only to be considered at this stage for x4 serviced plots for Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding.  
**Location:** **Land Adjacent Pond View Sturt Green Holyport Maidenhead**  
**Appeal Decision:** Allowed      **Decision Date:** 17 April 2023  
**Main Issue:** The Inspector concluded that the development was inappropriate development within the Green Belt, which they afforded substantial weight to. The Inspector considered that the benefits in respect of additional housing, economic activity and highway safety would each attract limited weight given the scale of the development proposed. However, they were of the view that the provision of four self build custom home dwellings in the face of a substantial shortfall in delivery of such housing against statutory requirements was a matter of overriding weight. As such they concluded that Very Special Circumstances existed which outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60013/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 22/01171/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/22/3307484  
**Appellant:** Mr Daniel Torrance **c/o Agent:** Mr Matthew Corcoran CDS Planning And Development Consultants Pure Offices Midshires House Smeaton Close Aylesbury HP19 8HL  
**Decision Type:** Delegated      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Development of the site to provide 2no. detached dwellings with revised access, hardstanding and landscaping.  
**Location:** **Land Rear Between 1 And 5 The Fieldings Holyport Maidenhead**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 7 June 2023  
**Main Issue:**

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60017/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 22/02789/OUT      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/23/3314990  
**Appellant:** Ms Janet Meads-Mitchell **c/o Agent:** Ms Rosie Dinnen Tetlow King Planning Ltd, Unit 2, Eclipse Office Park High Street, Staple Hill BRISTOL BS16 5EL  
**Decision Type:** Delegated      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Outline application for access only to be considered at this stage for x4 serviced plots for Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding.  
**Location:** **Land Adjacent Pond View Sturt Green Holyport Maidenhead**  
**Appeal Decision:** Allowed      **Decision Date:** 17 April 2023  
**Main Issue:** The Inspector concluded that the development was inappropriate development within the Green Belt, which they afforded substantial weight to. The Inspector considered that the benefits in respect of additional housing, economic activity and highway safety and the provision of an affordable home would each attract limited weight given the scale of the development proposed. However, they were of the view that the provision of four self build custom home dwellings in the face of a substantial shortfall in delivery of such housing against statutory requirements was a matter of overriding weight. As such they concluded that Very Special Circumstances existed which outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60018/NOND **Planning Ref.:** 22/01391/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/22/3309308 ET  
**Appellant:** C/o Agent **c/o Agent:** Mr Ben Thomas Savills 33 Margaret Street London W1G 0JD  
**Decision Type:** Committee **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Construction of x91 residential units together with associated landscaping, car parking and infrastructure works, following demolition of the existing building.  
**Location:** **Mattel UK Mattel House Vanwall Road Maidenhead SL6 4UB**  
**Appeal Decision:** Allowed **Decision Date:** 6 June 2023

**Main Issue:**

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60020/REF **Planning Ref.:** 22/02528/FULL **Plns Ref.:** TBA  
**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:** Two storey front/side extension and alterations to fenestration.  
**Location:** **11 Mallow Park Maidenhead SL6 6SQ**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed **Decision Date:** 19 April 2023

**Main Issue:** The Inspector found that the development would almost double the width of the principal elevation and would maintain the existing ridge height, and would fail to appear subservient in form to the host dwelling. It would fail to respond positively to the visual amenities of the locality, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60021/REF **Planning Ref.:** 22/02514/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/22/3312635  
**Appellant:** Mrs Butt **c/o Agent:** Mr Reg Johnson 59 Lancaster Road Maidenhead SL6 5EY  
**Decision Type:** Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** x1 first floor rear dormer.  
**Location:** **18 Gloucester Road Maidenhead SL6 7SN**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed **Decision Date:** 19 April 2023

**Main Issue:** Together with the previously permitted extensions the scheme would appear as an incongruous and alien feature that would not be sympathetic to the design and scale of the existing house. The development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 23/60027/REF **Planning Ref.:** 22/01806/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/22/3308994  
**Appellant:** Mr Burton Hill Grove Farm Bradcutts Lane Cookham Dean Maidenhead SL6 9AA  
**Decision Type:** Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** New dual pitched roof above the existing single storey element on the South East elevation with accommodation in the roof space and alterations to fenestration and to external finishes/materials, following demolition of the existing single storey element on the South West elevation and part demolition of the existing single storey element on the South East elevation.  
**Location:** **Hill Grove Farm Bradcutts Lane Cookham Dean Maidenhead SL6 9AA**  
**Appeal Decision:** Allowed **Decision Date:** 11 April 2023

**Main Issue:** The proposed new pitched roof would remove what is currently a highly negative feature. The new roof would be in keeping with the building and main dwelling. The timber boarding would unify the building. This outweighs the harm to the Green Belt caused by inappropriateness and harm to the openness, so very special circumstances exist which justify approving the proposal.

---