



Appeal Decision Report

23rd December 2009 - 20th January 2010

MAIDENHEAD

Appeal Ref.: 09/60073/REF **Planning Ref.:** 09/00305/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/A/09/2105701

Appellant: D And C Diggers **c/o Agent:** Geo-Plan Consultants Ltd Broadway House 21 Broadway Maidenhead Berkshire SL6 1NJ

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

Description: Rebuilding and extension of light industrial units

Location: **Potters Yard Drift Road Maidenhead SL6 3ST**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 15 January 2010

Main Issue: The Inspector determined that as the development involved the complete replacement of the previous buildings with the new, the development did not accord with any of the acceptable types of development in the Green Belt as specified in Policy GB1. The proposal was therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the Inspector was not persuaded that there were any very special circumstances to justify it.

Appeal Ref.: 09/60100/ENF **Enforcement Ref.:** 09/00591/ENF **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/C/09/2110 130

Appellant: Mr Chris Hancock **c/o Agent:** Geo-Plan Consultants Ltd Broadway House 21 Broadway Maidenhead Berkshire SL6 1HJ

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

Description: Appeal against the Enforcement Notice for: Rebuilding and extension of light industrial units located along the south side of the yard.

Location: **Potters Yard Drift Road Maidenhead SL6 3ST**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 15 January 2010

Main Issue: The Inspector determined that as the development involved the complete replacement of the previous buildings with the new, the development did not accord with any of the acceptable types of development in the Green Belt as specified in Policy GB1. The proposal was therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the Inspector was not persuaded that there were any very special circumstances to justify it. In particular, he did not agree with the appellants that the demolition of all four units was excessive and required all the units be removed (S. 174 (2) (f)).