



Appeal Decision Report

14th October 2009 – 11th November 2009

WINDSOR

Appeal Ref.: 09/60053/REF **Planning Ref.:** 09/00400/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2103456

Appellant: Mr J Skinner **c/o Agent:** R Clarke Planning Consultants Ltd Kewferry Farm Rickmansworth Road Northwood Middlesex HA6 2RF

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

Description: Two storey extensions to side elevations

Location: **Ditton Cottage Ditton Park Road Datchet Slough SL3 7HZ**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 22 October 2009

Main Issue: The Inspector dismissed the appeal. The Inspector considered that the proposed extensions would harm the openness of the Green Belt, increase the prominence of the building in the street scene and would not be in keeping with the simple proportions of the existing property.

Appeal Ref.: 09/60054/REF **Planning Ref.:** 09/00401/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2103446

Appellant: Mr J Skinner **c/o Agent:** R Clarke Planning Consultants Ltd Kewferry Farm Rickmansworth Road Northwood Middlesex HA6 2RF

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

Description: Replacement dwelling

Location: **Ditton Cottage Ditton Park Road Datchet Slough SL3 7HZ**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 22 October 2009

Main Issue: The Inspector dismissed the appeal. He considered that the additional building bulk, compared with the existing cottage and the permitted replacement house would detract from the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to policy GB2.

Appeal Ref.: 09/60070/REF **Planning Ref.:** 09/00399/CPD **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/X/09/2103502

Appellant: Mr J Skinner **c/o Agent:** R Clarke Planning Consultants Ltd Kewferry Farm Rickmansworth Road Northwood Middlesex HA6 2RF

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

Description: Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the proposed extensions to Ditton Cottage are lawful

Location: **Ditton Cottage Ditton Park Road Datchet Slough SL3 7HZ**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 22 October 2009

Main Issue: The Inspector dismissed the appeal. He considered that the proposed 2 storey extension would extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by more than 3 metres.

Appeal Ref.: 09/60061/REF **Planning Ref.:** 08/02754/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2104409
Appellant: Mr Lulzim Leku **c/o Agent:** Paul Dickinson And Associates Highway House Lower Froyle Hants GU34 4NB
Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse
Description: Change of use from B2 General Industry to car wash business (Sui Generis) (Retrospective)
Location: **Overdale Works 88 Maidenhead Road Windsor SL4 5EJ**
Appeal Decision: Withdrawn **Decision Date:** 22 October 2009

Appeal Ref.: 09/60065/ENF **Enforcement Ref.:** 09/00571/ENF **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/C/09/2104530
Appellant: Mr L Leku, Mr A Lintott & Lintott Property Developments Ltd **c/o Agent:** Paul Dickinson And Associates Highway House Lower Froyle Hants GU34 4NB
Decision Type: Issue Notice **Officer Recommendation:**
Description: Appeal against the Enforcement Notice for: Unauthorised change of use of the land from general industrial use (B2) to a car wash business (sui generis) without Planning Permission.
Location: **Overdale Works 88 Maidenhead Road Windsor SL4 5EJ**
Appeal Decision: Withdrawn **Decision Date:** 22 October 2009

Appeal Ref.: 09/60069/ENF **Enforcement Ref.:** 09/00578/ENF **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/C/09/2104120
Appellant: Dr Rahul Chauhan **c/o Agent:** Carter Planning Ltd 85 Alma Road Windsor Berkshire SL4 3EX
Decision Type: Issue Notice **Officer Recommendation:**
Description: Appeal against the Enforcement Notice: Without planning permission, change of use from residential use to a mixed use of residential and office use
Location: **2 Chaucer Close Windsor SL4 3ER**
Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 3 November 2009

Main Issue: The Inspector allowed the appeal under S. 174 (2) (a) of the Act that planning permission should be granted. The Enforcement Notice was issued solely on the grounds that there was insufficient parking available on the site, but the Inspector considered that the existing 2 spaces were adequate for a mixed residential and office use as carried on by the appellants who, he was told, work at the adjoining Princess Margaret Hospital and had reserved parking there. He went on to say that as the site was "reasonably close" to the town centre, on a bus route, and with on-street parking nearby the appeal should be allowed and no additional off-street parking provision was required.
