

Appeal Ref.: 09/60074/REF **Planning Ref.:** 08/02864/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2105361

Appellant: Ms P Grimster **c/o Agent:** Mr John Hunt (Wayside Stables) The Granary Hyde Farm Marlow Road Maidenhead Berkshire SL6 6PQ

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

Description: Permanent retention of existing temporary field access

Location: **Land West Of Electricity Sub Station Coningsby Lane Fifield Maidenhead SL6 2PF**

Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 23 November 2009

Main Issue: The Inspector found that the proposal was not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and that there would be no harm to the openness of the Green Belt nor the purposes of including land within it. The hedgerow would be re-instated, and the access would be typical of its countryside and Green Belt location.

Appeal Ref.: 09/60072/REF **Planning Ref.:** 08/02600/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2105464

Appellant: Mr M Malhotra **c/o Agent:** Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy Ferndale Tiddington Thame Oxfordshire OX9 2LQ

Decision Type: Committee **Officer Recommendation:** Defer and Delegate

Description: Construction of a 3 bedroom detached dwelling

Location: **Land At 18 Westmead Maidenhead**

Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 19 November 2009

Main Issue: The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the adjacent Green Belt and the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene. The Inspector considered that the area of scrubland to the north of the appeal site provides a soft edge between the appeal site and the Green Belt. Although the scrubland and the public footpath is in the Green Belt, views of the development will not be materially different from the existing situation; views are already compromised by the football ground with its floodlighting and perimeter spectator barrier. The Inspector considered that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on views enjoyed from the public footpath or wider views. In terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, the Inspector did not consider that the proposed house would be out of context given the differing house types on the estate.

Appeal Ref.: 09/60077/REF **Planning Ref.:** 09/00490/TPO **Plns Ref.:** APP/TPO/T0355/659

Appellant: Mr Wilfred A Phillips 3 Underhill Close Maidenhead SL6 4DS

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

Description: Consent to fell one Oak

Location: **3 Underhill Close Maidenhead SL6 4DS**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 20 November 2009

Appeal Ref.: 09/60088/REF **Planning Ref.:** 09/00058/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2108142

Appellant: Mr David Corston 94 Priors Way Maidenhead SL6 2EN

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

Description: Construction of an end of terrace three bedroom house, including 2 parking bays adjacent 90 Priors Way.

Location: **Land At 94 Priors Way Maidenhead**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 23 November 2009

Main Issue: 1) The proximity of the proposed house to the trees T1 and T3 covered by a TPO would result in pressure to have the trees pruned or removed which would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the area. 2) The parking provision would be within an area of un-assigned spaces which could be occupied by other users.

Appeal Ref.: 09/60109/REF **Planning Ref.:** 09/00959/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/09/2112949

Appellant: Mr Michael Stone **c/o Agent:** Carter Planning Limited 85 Alma Road Windsor Berkshire SL4 3EX

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

Description: .Two storey side extension

Location: **High Pines The Avenue Maidenhead SL6 8HG**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 10 November 2009

Main Issue: The Inspector considered that:- The rear dormers would appear over-dominant; Proposed balcony would appear incongruous; Proposal would not result in a cohesive, pleasing design; It would add significantly to the bulk and width and introduce unsatisfactory features; Front projection would appear would appear bulky, unbalanced and poorly related to the house.
