



**SUNNINGHILL & ASCOT  
PARISH COUNCIL**

The Courtyard (Ascot Racecourse)  
High Street, Ascot, Berkshire SL5 7JF

Tel: 01344 630141

Email: enquiries@s-a-pc.com

Website: www.sunninghillandascotparishcouncil.co.uk

**Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at the Parish Council Office, The Courtyard, High Street, Ascot, SL5 7JF on Tuesday 13 December 2016 commencing at 7.00pm**

Members Present: Councillors B Hilton (Chairman), P Deason (Vice-Chairman), B Humphreys, C Lester, A Sharpe, B Story, R Wood.

In attendance: Elizabeth Yates, Clerk to the Council, Peter Shaw (SPA) and Peter Standley (SPA)

**6602 TO NOTE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillors Phil Carter and David Hilton.

**6603 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting, held on 22 November, were considered a correct record and signed as such.

**6604 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman asked to receive any Declarations of Interest in accordance with the adopted Code of Conduct. None were received.

**6605 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Application No.	Location and Description
16/03115 (Outline)	<p>Heatherwood Hospital, London Road, Ascot, SL5 8AA</p> <p>Hybrid planning application comprising: 1) Application for full planning permission for the development of a new Elective Care Hospital and associated Admin Hub with associated parking, vehicle access, highway works, plant and landscaping 2) Application for full planning permission for the change of use of existing building to provide GP Practice, Office, Data Centre and Staff Restaurant in association with the Elective Care Hospital 3) Application for outline planning permission (access and layout determined with all other matters reserved for future consideration) for demolition of existing hospital and redevelopment of up to 250 dwellings with associated vehicle access and highway works 4) Application for full planning permission for the change of use of existing woodland to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) in association with the outline residential planning permission</p> <p>Recommendation: <u>Objections as set out in Appendix A.</u></p>
16/03417 (Full – amended)	<p>76 Kennel Ride, Ascot, SL5 7NW</p> <p>Single storey rear extension and alterations to existing ground floor roof</p> <p>Recommendation: The committee considered that the original objections still stood which were: ‘Objections on the grounds of inadequate parking as three spaces were required and there was only room for 1 car on site, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP/T1.2. The committee also considered the application to be unneighbourly and an overdevelopment of the site, leading to a loss of amenity space.’</p>
16/03465 (Full)	<p>2 Nash Gardens, Ascot, SL5 8TD</p> <p>First floor front extension, alterations to material to front elevation, new pitched roof over single-storey side and first floor rear extension</p> <p>Recommendation: Objections as the application was considered to be unneighbourly to 4 Nash Gardens and out of keeping with the street scene, contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy NP/DG1.</p>

16/03532 (Full)	Dukes Head, Upper Village Road, Ascot, SL5 7AG Single storey rear extension with flat roof and canopy and formation of rear doorway following removal of existing smoking shelter Recommendation: No Objections.
16/03552 (Works to Trees Covered by TPO)	27 Langdale Drive, Ascot, SL5 8TQ (T1,T2) Oak - crown reduction of 4-5m Recommendation: Referred to the Borough's Tree Officer.
16/03572 (Works to Trees Covered by TPO)	17 Woodlands Close, Ascot, SL5 9HU (T1) Silver Birch – remove to source of dominant stem and tip reduction of 1.5m Recommendation: Referred to the Borough's Tree Officer.
16/03577 (Works to Trees Covered by TPO)	Street Record, Queensbury Gardens, Ascot See Schedule: Recommendation: Referred to the Borough's Tree Officer.
16/03609 (Full)	Winbar, 58 Llanvair Drive, Ascot, SL5 9LN New vehicular access from Coronation Road and new gates Recommendation: The committee requested that this application was referred to the Borough's Tree Officer, due to concerns over the root protection area of adjacent trees, and to the Borough's Highway Officer regarding change of access.
16/03617 (Full)	Heath End House, Windsor Road, Ascot, SL5 7LQ Replacement dwelling and single storey detached garage including ancillary accommodation following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings Recommendation: No Objections.
16/03620 (Full)	Land at Faith Cottage, Wells Lane, Ascot Change of use of existing detached garage with new first floor to create dwelling with shared access and additional parking Recommendation: Objections. The committee considered the application to be contrary to the Townscape Assessment designation of the site which is in 'villas in a woodland setting.' This application is contrary to NP /DG 1.2 and NP/DG 2.1, 2.2.
16/03623 (Full)	1 Ridings Close, Ascot, SL5 7SQ Addition of 3x windows to side elevation Recommendation: No Objections provided it was ensured that the windows were made of frosted glass.
16/03629 (Full)	The White House and Wee Flat, Englemere Estate, Kings Road, Ascot Construction of 4 x two bed apartments with access, parking and landscaping following demolition of existing 2 x ancillary outbuildings Recommendation: Objections. The committee considered the proposal for one extra property in addition to the extant planning permission for three dwellings to be an overdevelopment of the site in the Green Belt. They also thought that the amenity space for plot 1 was small which could put the adjacent trees at risk.
16/03658 (Full)	Silver Birches, Watersplash Lane, Ascot, SL5 7QP Construction of two side dormers on the south-west elevation Recommendation: No Objections.
16/03663 (Full)	St Georges School, Wells Lane, Ascot, SL5 7DZ Erection of swimming pool and changing facilities etc with ancillary paths, landscaping etc and re surface existing adjoining car park (renewal of planning approval 13/02832/FULL) Recommendation: No Objections.

16/03674 (Full)	<p>Land At Blacknest House, Titness Park, London Road, Sunninghill, Ascot</p> <p>Construction of a facilities building in connection with the use of the existing building for educational purposes</p> <p>Recommendation: Councillors were supportive of the ideals behind the application, but wish to refer the application to the Borough's Planning and Ecology Officer to ensure that it met Green Belt Guidelines given the increase of activity on the site. They also requested that a condition was imposed (should the Borough be minded to approve the application) that the building was only used for the education of children, as they were concerned about its use for residential accommodation and corporate hire.</p>
16/03683 (Full)	<p>37 Bouldish Farm Road, Ascot, SL5 9EN</p> <p>Single storey rear extension</p> <p>Recommendation: No Objections.</p>
16/03732 (Works to Trees Covered by TPO)	<p>Gainsborough House, Furlong Drive, Ascot, SL5 7GW</p> <p>(T19) Scots Pine - selective tip reduction of 10 branches by up to 3m to natural target pruning points (T22) Sweet Chestnut - crown reduction to final height of 14m with 5m radial branch spread (T23) Sweet Chestnut - crown reduction final height of 18m with 4m radial branch spread (T24) Sweet Chestnut - remove epicormic growth to 8m (T27) Scots Pine - fell (T11) Beech - crown lift to 4.5m (T10) Beech - clear building by 3m retaining over hanging branches, crown lift to 4.5m and reduce branches growing towards dwelling to north west to radial length of 4.5m</p> <p>Recommendation: Objections to the felling of the Scots Pine and excessive pruning of the trees which were considered to be of amenity value as the property is defined as being one of 'villas in a woodland setting.'</p>

#### 6606 PLANNING APPEALS

No matters were received by the time of sending out the agenda.

#### 6607 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

No matters were received by the time of sending out the agenda.

#### 6608 APPROVALS AND REFUSALS

The approvals and refusals for the weeks ending 18 November to 2 December were considered.

#### 6609 OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairman informed Members that there were a number of planning applications whose deadline for Parish Council representation fell before the next scheduled Planning Committee, to be held on 10 January. It was agreed that she would draft a response, for Member's comments, before submission to the Borough on behalf of the Parish Council.

Councillor Peter Deason raised the need for the Parish Council to respond to the Borough's Local Plan. It was agreed that a meeting would be held on Thursday 5 January at 10.00am, in the Parish Council Office, to draft a response which would be put to the Planning Committee on 10 January, which would start at 5.45pm. Councillor Deason stated that he would submit a paper for Member's comments in advance of these meetings.

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 8.30pm.

-----  
Councillor Barbara Hilton, Chairman

**Appendix A:**

**Application 16/03115 – Heatherwood Hospital: Parish Council Recommendations.**

Our Parish Council is fully supportive of a new Hospital on the site of the form shown in the application, a new GP surgery and the principle of housing to support the hospital funding. We do not support, however, the proposals as presented in the planning application.

Our headline objections are:

1. The phase 2 location of the admin hub in the protected woodland area of the green belt.  
*We cannot see any very special circumstances for this location.  
It is also contrary to NP/SS4.*
2. The Hospital location.  
*The NP policy NP/SS4 requires all the re-development to be within the previously developed area.  
We favour a location on the street frontage where it will be far more accessible and will provide a strong Ascot Gateway statement.*
3. The housing numbers and density.  
*The proposed number of dwellings will result in a density incompatible with the scale and character of the local area and fails to deliver good design.*
4. The site accesses.  
*The presence of the two accesses and pelican crossing close to the roundabout are of concern in relation to the disruption of the traffic flows around the roundabout.*
5. The SANG.  
*The proposals are incompatible with preservation of the nature of the woodland area and its biodiversity.*

We are also concerned that the hybrid nature of the application makes it inevitable that if an objections is upheld in relation to any element of the application the whole application has to be rejected. It seems to us that it would have been better to have submitted an application for the phase 1 development only, and to make a separate application to relocate the hub in the woodland as and when needed. The phase 2 location of the hub is of concern, and if the planners reject it the hospital will be delayed

Our detailed objections are presented below.

**General:**

- The proposals are contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan policy NP/SS4, which was adopted with over 90% community support at referendum.
  - NP/SS4.1 limits the redevelopment to the previously developed site. Both the Hospital and Admin hub are outside this area in the woodland area
  - NP/SS4.2 requires the development plans to be consulted on. We can't find evidence that the Phase 2 proposals, which include the admin hub, have been.
  - NP/SS4.3 requires high quality of design appropriate for the site's gateway location. We don't consider the line of flats meet this requirement.
  - NP/SS4.4 requires substantial green space and landscaping. LP policy R3 requires 15%. The housing area, with only 9% public green space, doesn't deliver this
- The proposal is also contrary to the emerging BLP, which also shows the redevelopment confined within the previously developed area (HA32, section E).
- The proposals are contrary to LP policy GB9: which applies to designated major developments in the green belt, and states:

C) INFILLING OR COMPLETE OR PARTIAL REDEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGNATED MAJOR DEVELOPED SITES SHOULD ALSO:

1. NOT EXCEED THE HEIGHT OF EXISTING BUILDINGS;

## 2. DEMONSTRATE THAT ANY NEW BUILDING DOES NOT MATERIALLY EXTEND THE DEFINED DEVELOPMENT ENVELOPE OF THE SITE;

- If the planners are minded to approve the application there should be a condition that there will not be any further incursion into the woodland area, together with other safeguards to stop over development of the site.

### **Hospital:**

- It is located outside the previously developed site, contrary to NP/SS4.
- The woodland location will impact on the openness of this undeveloped green belt.
- We don't consider that the case for very special circumstances is sufficiently robust to justify the impact on the green belt. We note that financial constraints don't constitute very special circumstances.
- Contrary to NPPF policy 109:  
*"The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures".*
- We have concerns that the hospital location in the woodland isn't easy to access on foot, owing to its distance from the High street and the gradients involved.
- A location on the main highway frontage is favoured as it will ease access and provide a more fitting gateway statement. We understand this is possible while maintaining the existing hospital services.

### **Administration Hub**

- It is located outside the previously developed site, contrary to NP/SS4.
- The special circumstances case for locating the hub in the woodland is weak.
  - It impacts on the openness of the woodland green belt and its biodiversity.
  - This site for the hub hasn't been consulted upon.
  - It brings together the current Trust admin staff, but doesn't materially increase employment.
  - There is no convincing argument for not keeping it in an up-graded block 40.
  - There is plenty of vacant office accommodation in the area.
- We consider it inappropriate to include the phase 2 location of the hub in this application. It should be the subject of a separate application in due course.

### **Residential Development**

We recognise that the application is only for outline approval of the residential development. None the less we consider that at the density proposed it will not be possible to deliver a solution that meets planning policies, including in the following respects:

- The proposals introduce a scale and density of development that is incompatible with the local area and will cause damage to the character and amenity of the area (LP H11)
- Contrary to paragraph 64 of the NPPF.  
The proposals fail to take the opportunity to improve the quality of the area and the way it functions (NPPF paragraph 64)
- No affordable housing is proposed. Owing to the severe shortage of development sites the developer should be required to provide these homes on site (LP policy H3).
- The secondary streets are on the pedestrian routes into and through the site. They are narrow shared surfaces with no defined pavements or parking and are not considered to safeguard the safe movement of residents, particularly children, within the site (LP policy H10 (5) and NP/DG3.1).
- Visitor parking isn't possible in the secondary streets, and visitors will have to find spaces well away from their hosts (NP/T1). Some of the off-street parking is in front gardens. (NP/DG3.3).
- There are areas where there is off-street parking in front gardens and on-street on the opposite side of roads. There is also on-street parking around the site of the Barrow. This impacts on the character of the area (NP/T1.2).

- The height and alignment of the flats along the High Street do not provide a high quality street scene appropriate to the site's gateway location. (NP/SS4.3 and NP/SS4.4 (b))
- The amount of green space, at 9%, is considered inadequate (NP/SS4.4 (d)). LP policies require 15%.
- The number of dwellings will impose significant pressure on local schools.

Note: The applicant argues that the 250 homes are required to meet the funding shortfall. This statement should be subjected to close scrutiny by the borough before approving the application.

### **Access**

- Two site accesses, a bus bay and a pelican crossing are proposed in close proximity to the roundabout. We are concerned that the volumes of traffic entering and leaving the site at peak times will disrupt the flow of traffic, reducing the road capacity and causing traffic to back up around the roundabout.
- The current poor bus services and the distance from Ascot Station will limit the numbers arriving by public transport.

The parking provision on site is tight, particularly for the Hospital, GP surgery and Admin, and most travel plans don't deliver any benefit. Historically the parking demand in Hospitals and Offices always exceed the provision. If parking in the residential area is to be prevented these facilities should have generous parking provision.

*Note: The highway infrastructure upgrading is that required to mitigate the impact of the development and is does not offer betterment (3.8).*