



**SUNNINGHILL & ASCOT  
PARISH COUNCIL**

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

Tel: 01344 623480

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 24 April 2018 commencing at 7.00pm**

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

In attendance: Elizabeth Yates, Clerk to the Council and Peter Shaw, SPAE

**7035 TO NOTE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillors David Hilton and Allison Sharpe.

**7036 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 April were approved as a correct record and signed as such.

**7037 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

**7038 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Application No.	Location and Description
18/00326 (Certificate of Lawfulness of Development)	Natures Nursery, Meridian House London Road, Sunninghill, Ascot SL5 0PL Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the existing porta cabin for use as a kitchen/canteen is lawful <b>Recommendation: No objections provided it meets Green Belt requirements and the Disability Access Forum's questions.</b>
18/00648 (Full)	Okanargon Limited Annexe, Kingswick House, Kingswick Drive, Ascot SL5 7BH Change of use / conversion & extension of existing mixed use office / residential building to provide 9 self contained flats <b>Recommendation: Objections on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site, bulk and scale, the lack of amenity space and inadequate parking as three of the car parking spaces lay outside of the site and a number were by a fence line making them too narrow. The committee also thought the proposal was of a poor design due to the configuration of the flats and could have a harmful impact on neighbour amenity due to overlooking from the balconies on the south-west elevation. Thus the application was thought to be contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policies NP/DG2, NP/DG2.1, NP/DG3.</b> The committee also questioned the safety of the proposal due to the adjacent electricity substation and overhead cables, thought that the buildings should be at least one metre from the boundary and queried the site lines.
18/00658 (works to trees covered by TPO)	Paddock House, Burleigh Road, Ascot SL5 8FG (T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5) Species Unknown - Fell to ground level <b>Recommendation: Objections as no sound arboricultural reasons had been given or a report submitted with the application. The committee expressed disappointment over the poor quality of the drawings.</b>

18/00749 (Full)	38 Kingswick Drive, Ascot SL5 7BQ Two storey side extension with x1 front facing dormer Recommendation: No Objections.
18/00779 (Full)	35 Oliver Road, Ascot SL5 9DN Part single part two storey side extension and x1 rear facing dormer Recommendation: Objections as the application was considered to be too close to the boundary and the parking inadequate.
18/00873 (Full)	8 Llanvair Drive, Ascot SL5 9HT Single storey side extension Recommendation: Concerns were expressed regarding the width of the garage.
18/00874 (works to trees covered by TPO)	Woodcote, Brockenhurst Road, Ascot SL5 9HA T1 (Acacia) – Fell Recommendation: Objections as no sound arboricultural reasons had been given.
18/00945 (Outline)	Shorts Waste Transfer And Recycling Facility, St Georges Lane, Ascot SL5 7ET Outline application for access only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the redevelopment of the existing waste transfer station and recycling facility to provide up to 131 dwellings with associated access, parking, open space, landscaping and other associated works, following the demolition of all existing buildings and structures, removal of existing stockpiles and regrading and reprofiling of land Recommendation: Objections. <b>Please see Appendix A</b>
18/00971 (Full)	4 Gatcombe Crescent, Ascot SL5 7HA Erection of single storey rear extension Recommendation: No Objections.
18/01011 (works to trees covered by TPO)	Domino House Brockenhurst Road, Ascot SL5 9HB T1 Douglas Fir - Remove over extended limbs over driveway and road, T2 Persian Iron Wood - Reduce by up to 1m to reshape Recommendation: Referred to the Borough's Tree Officer.
18/01023 (Full)	15 Woodlands Ride, Ascot SL5 9HP Part two/part single storey side extension following demolition of existing side extension, part two/part single storey rear, enlargement of existing roofspace by increasing the height of the front and rear gables, the overall ridge height and inserting two front dormers. New entrance porch. Recommendation: Objections due to the approval under planning application 17/03979 to remove the scots pine trees that would have screened the application from the street which, as a consequence, was now thought would have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
18/01040 (works to trees covered by TPO)	Woodside, Horse Gate Ride, Ascot SL5 9LS T1, T2m T3 (Beech) - Crown reduction by 2 metres Recommendation: Referred to the Borough's Tree Officer.

## 7039 PLANNING APPEALS

### 17/01560 Land off London Road, Ascot SL5 7QN

The development proposed is installation of a 20m high slim line telecommunications tower with 3no. antennas within a GRP shroud, 2no. 300mm dishes and 3no. ground based equipment cabinets and other ancillary equipment thereto.

The appeal was dismissed.

### 17/00146 'Mikado' London Road, Ascot SL5 7DL

The development proposed is partial redevelopment of site, including single-storey extensions following the removal of existing outbuildings and decking.

The appeal was dismissed.

**7040 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

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

**7041 APPROVALS AND REFUSALS**

The approvals and refusals for the weeks ending 30 March to 13 April were considered.

**7042 OTHER BUSINESS**

Councillor Peter Deason, the Vice-Chairman of the committee, gave feedback from the last Parish Stakeholder Group, stating that an extension of time had been granted for the Borough to respond to the Planning Inspector’s comments on the merging Borough Local Plan, that how to deliver affordable housing in the Borough was discussed and that an application for a Health Centre at the BEN Lynwood Care Village site was expected. The committee asked that the Borough consulted with the Parish Council on this application as it is adjacent to the Parish boundary.

Councillor Barbara Story informed members that the Clinical Commissioning Groups had merged in the wider area which may have an impact on this application.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.00pm.

-----  
Councillor Barbara Hilton, Chairman

**Appendix A 18/00945 Shorts Waste Transfer And Recycling Facility, St Georges Lane, Ascot SL5 7ET**

**Objection:**

- St Georges Lane is contrary to Borough Highway Design Guide:
  - There is insufficient information re the carriageway widths in St Georges Lane to confirm they comply with the RBWM requirements (5.5m wide + 2m footpath for access to 100 houses or 6m + 2m footpath for access to development of up to 300 houses). The proposed access geometry drg 39125/550/026 shows that the carriageway width on the west side is between 2.25 and 2.38 m, implying a full width of between 4.5m and 4.76 m.
- It is unsatisfactory for the access to be along an un-adopted road whose ownership is unknown.
- The EoS part 2 – constraints and opportunities delivery assessment, states that delivery should not come forward until after the development of Ascot Green and Ascot Village, when there is an opportunity to resolve the junction issues for all the sites in a coordinated way.
- Loss of parking in St Georges Lane – this parking is for the visitors to the properties opposite the parking and for deliveries etc.
- Double yellow lines are proposed along St Georges
  - \* These are unduly restrictive.
  - \* Their legality and enforceability is also questioned in an un-adopted road.
- Contrary to the statements in the transport assessment the changes to the junction with the London Road does not help traffic flows at the junction, and in some cases make the situation worse, as the following extracts from the Transport Study show:

**Ref Table 8.1,page 44:**

St Georges Lane – Morning Peak	baseline delay	99 seconds
Improved Jn	78 second	
Evening Peak	baseline delay	54 seconds
	Improved Jn	62 seconds

**Ref Table 8.2 page 45**

Winkfield Road	Morning Peak baseline delay	104 seconds
	Morning Peak improved jn	104 seconds
London Road	Morning Peak baseline delay	224 seconds
	Morning Peak improved Jn	304 seconds

- The Transport Study uses equivalent PCU's to compare the traffic movements into and out of the site now and when the housing development is complete.  
This means that each HGV is equivalent to 2.4 cars. By using this approach the study claims that the impact from the housing is less than for the transfer station. We consider this to be flawed. For example:  
in the morning peak 15 HGVs arrive 17 HGVs depart.  
25 cars arrive 52 cars depart.  
In the evening Peak 1 HGV arrives 2 HGVs depart  
post the development 44 cars arrive 28 cars depart.

This increase will inevitably impact negatively on the flows at the junction, as shown in tables 8.1 and 8.2 above.

- HGV movements exceed permitted limit:  
The HGV figures presented show that there are 273 HGV movements per day, which equates to 1365 movements in a 5 day week, well above the permitted movements of 990 per week.
- Insufficient Parking Provision vs standards:  
There appears to be a small deficit in the parking provision of 14 spaces and at 24 spaces the visitor parking is totally inadequate for 131 dwellings.
- Some of the on-site roads appear very narrow (the lanes), preventing visitor parking and making it difficult for refuse vehicles to navigate.
- The site roads are not able to accommodate refuse vehicles and other HGVs safely.
  - \* The swept path analyses drawings show that in places the turning vehicle will be extremely close to two dwellings. Swept path analyses are theoretical and in practice it is considered that there is a real risk to the buildings. The swept paths are tight in a number of other places.
  - \* If any visitors or other vehicles are parked in the road maneuvering by larger vehicles will be impaired.
- At places the sight lines are inadequate as they pass across front gardens.

#### **Re the development itself:**

- The housing numbers are too high.
  - \* On a pro-rata basis (based on site area to the HA10 proforma area) the site's share of the 300 dwellings in HA10 of the emerging BLP is around 90 units.
  - \* The site is bounded on the east side by an area classified as 'Villas in a Woodland Setting', with a low density of housing. The borough EoS part 2 states that site development should be classified as 'Villas in a Woodland Setting' and not the 'Victorian Village' classification claimed by the developer.
- \* No affordable homes are offered.
- \* The development impacts negatively on the openness of the green belt
  - \* The site is in the green belt. Although the emerging BLP proposes its removal the document isn't as yet a material consideration.
  - \* The EoS Part 2 states that the site makes an important contribution to the green belt.
- \* The development doesn't take proper account of the environmental constraints, as set out in EoS Part 2 and the developer's environmental statement.  
The EoS states that:
  - \* A buffer zone of 15 m to be retained between the development and St Georges Lane Fields.
  - \* Priority habitats were identified within and around the parcel.
  - \* There is a high probability of foraging / commuting bats and common / widespread breeding birds.
  - \* A Berkshire Protected species Buffer for pipistrelle bats is located in the NW of the parcel.
  - \* There is a dense area of woodland is located in the southern part of the parcel.

The environmental report (which seems to have paragraphs redacted) identifies that the site may be used by protected species, including red kite, hobby, stag beetles, common toad, and hedgehogs.

The proposal use the tree belt to the S and E of the site may therefore cause environmental damage.  
The question of a SANG relating to this application has not been addressed.