

# Appeal Decision Report

2<sup>nd</sup> September 2009 - 30 September 2009

## MAIDENHEAD

**Appeal Ref.:** 09/60031/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 08/02572/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2099399

**Appellant:** Mr Roger Grey **c/o Agent:** Mr Andrew Lacey 18 Chestnut Grove Fleet Hampshire GU51 3LW

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

**Description:** Replacement two car garage and log store

**Location:** **Horseshoe House Millers Lane Littlewick Green Maidenhead SL6 3GQ**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 9 September 2009

**Main Issue:** The positive impact on the Conservation Area and the other matters are not sufficient to amount to very special circumstances to outweigh the harm that would be caused by reason of inappropriateness and to the openness of the Green Belt. As a result, there are no very special circumstances sufficient to justify the proposal.

**Appeal Ref.:** 09/60040/ENF      **Enforcement Ref.:** 08/00558/ENF      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/C/09/2097632

**Appellant:** Hodson Developments Ltd. **c/o Agent:** Vail Williams LLP 3000 Cathedral Hill Guildford Surrey GU2 7YB

**Decision Type:** Issue Notice      **Officer Recommendation:**

**Description:** Appeal against the Enforcement Notice for: The erection of a boundary wall adjacent to Malders Lane.

**Location:** **Former Old Kiln Industrial Estate Malders Lane Maidenhead**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 2 September 2009

**Main Issue:** The Inspector considered that the wall as built was not in accordance with the approved plans as it was higher and longer than that approved, and the height and appearance was now a dominant and discordant feature in the road. It was also considered to be "inappropriate development" in the Green Belt and materially harmed the openness of the immediate area. He upheld the requirements of the Notice, but extended the period for compliance from one month to three months.

**Appeal Ref.:** 09/60058/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 08/02940/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2103557

**Appellant:** Mr And Mrs Richard Allen **c/o Agent:** Avanti Design PO Box 1266 Beaconsfield Bucks HP9 1US

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

**Description:** Construction of a detached double garage

**Location:** **Winter House Waltham Road White Waltham Maidenhead SL6 3SH**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 17 September 2009

**Main Issue:** The Inspector considered that the scale and its relationship with the host property mean it cannot be regarded as an extension to the house. In addition the fact that the proposal would have been permitted development under the previous GPDO is irrelevant. The scale of the proposal and its detachment from the host building would result in it having a material detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Its impact would be greater as the property is located on the edge of the settlement.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 09/60068/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 09/00304/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2105098

**Appellant:** Mr Williams **c/o Agent:** Maze Planning Ltd 1 Rooks Close Welwyn Garden City Hertfordshire AL8 6JT

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

**Description:** First floor front extension to provide conservatory

**Location:** **White Walls Quarry Wood Road Marlow SL7 1RE**

**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 21 September 2009

**Main Issue:** The proposal would result in a disproportionate addition to the dwelling not totally overcome by the size of the plot, screening or lack of public views. There would be no very special circumstances. The dominance of the proposal would produce a discordant element on the front elevation. The Inspector could not conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the living conditions of the neighbouring property.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 09/60079/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 08/02539/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2107285

**Appellant:** Mr And Mrs R Sumroy **c/o Agent:** Mr John Spratley Isis House 43 Station Road Henley On Thames Oxon RG9 1AT

**Decision Type:** Committee      **Officer Recommendation:** Application Permitted

**Description:** Single and two storey side and front extensions. Demolition of existing garage, stables and outbuildings, construction of replacement garage with store over pool building with swimming pool and garden store

**Location:** **The Coach House Winter Hill Road Maidenhead SL6 6PJ**

**Appeal Decision:** Withdrawn      **Decision Date:** 23 September 2009

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 09/60094/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 09/00838/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/09/2109352  
**Appellant:** Mr Martin Hayward 67 Cadwell Drive Maidenhead SL6 3YS  
**Decision Type:** Delegated      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Two storey side extension and boundary wall  
**Location:** **67 Cadwell Drive Maidenhead SL6 3YS**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed      **Decision Date:** 17 September 2009

**Main Issue:** A two-storey extension of this scale would be visually over-dominant and would be significantly out of keeping with the character and appearance of the immediate street scene. The combination of the bulk of the extension and the replacement of the current screening provided by a hedge with a starker brick wall would have a harmful effect on the relationship between No 67 and the wider street scene. The proposed development would result in significant material harm to the appearance of both 67 Cadwell Drive and the surrounding area and would be contrary to the general design guidelines of Policy DG1 of the adopted Local Plan.

---

**Appeal Ref.:** 09/60096/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 09/00839/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/09/2110166  
**Appellant:** Mrs Margaret Rawlinson **c/o Agent:** Mr K Marshall - Marshall Associates Monyash Curls Lane Maidenhead Berkshire SL6 2QF  
**Decision Type:** Delegated      **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Two storey side extension  
**Location:** **Tedward Cottage Bradcutts Lane Cookham Maidenhead SL6 9EW**  
**Appeal Decision:** Allowed      **Decision Date:** 17 September 2009

**Main Issue:** With regards to the character and appearance of the host dwelling the Inspector considered that as the property is not listed the proposal would not harm its appearance. The amenity space that would be lost is of limited appearance and receives very little direct sunlight. Its loss would not harm the occupiers of the property. The garage provides one parking space and the Inspector could not see who else would use the access to it apart from the applicant. It was not demonstrated why the proposal would conflict with Policy T5.

---