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**Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee**

**Held at the Parish Council Office, The Courtyard, High Street, Ascot, SL5 7JF**

**On Tuesday 15 October 2019 commencing at 7.00pm**

Members Present: Councillors R Wood (Chairman), P Deason (Vice Chairman), J Gripton, C Herring, A Sharpe, B Story, S Verma.

In attendance: Patrick Griffin, SPAE; Helen Goodwin, Clerk to the Council.

**7486 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Cllr B Hilton; Cllr P Carter was absent. **7487 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 September were approved as a correct record and signed as such.

**7488 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**The Chairman asked to receive any Declarations of Interest in accordance with the adopted Code of Conduct. Cllr C Herring declared an interest in application 19/02742.

**7489 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application No.** | Location and Description |
| **19/01608 (Full)** | 5 Cissbury Windsor Road Ascot SL5 7LF **Single storey extension to house boiler.**  **Recommendation: No concerns.** |
| **19/02311 (Full)** | 68 High Street Sunninghill Ascot SL5 9NN **Change of use of the existing first floor flat from residential to retail, new shop front, part single, part two-storey rear extension with parapet wall, installation of a chiller unit, new boundary fence and alterations to fenestration to create new first floor flat with amenity space and external stairs.**  **19/01201, which was very similar, was withdrawn.**  **Recommendation: Objection:**   * **We consider that the proposals will have a significant adverse impact on the existing viability of the village and should be refused in accordance with emerging BLP 9.14.7. We consider that the development, which is large enough for a small supermarket, will elevate Sunninghill to a Higher Level in the Hierarchy, contrary to emerging BLP policy TR5.2. There are already two convenience stores in the village, sufficient to serve a Local Centre.** * **Contrary to NP T1.1 & 1.2 and NP SV1.1 & 1.3: The available on-site parking is removed, so the 15 parking spaces needed in accordance with the borough parking strategy have to be accommodated on the neighbouring streets. This will create harm to the community. The village already has a parking deficit and cannot accommodate this number, as the borough Parking Officer will confirm.**   **With so few free spaces available, distributed throughout the village, cars will cruise around looking for a space, adding to the congestion in the High Street. The lack of parking is a serious matter in Sunninghill as it discourages visitors and results in parking in residential roads.**  **We suggest that borough Highways Officer studies the parking figures in the limited transport study:**  **The ADL Axiom Parking Beats show that most of the ‘free’ spaces are over the assumed max walking distance. There are few spaces in the immediate vicinity of the store.**  **Our review shows that:**   * **Fox Covert (five spaces) is well over 150m away;** * **The High Street East (35-37) alleged parking 14 spaces are all over 160m away;** * **The Queens Road Car Park is a min of 140m away** * **Many of the spaces are shown as Bridge Road (up to 40% of free) which is a private residential street, shortly to become access to the Gas Holder site.**   **A check at 10.30 on Monday 14th Oct (wet) showed that there were no spare spaces on the High Street / Bagshot Road from Kings Road to beyond Fox Covert Close. There were four in the Queens Road Car Park.**  **Recent new developments have been permitted in the High Street, without off street parking. We assess that this has added approx 15 spaces to the parking shortfall in the village.**  **A large community store / small supermarket (77% larger than existing) will have around 20 deliveries, from 10.5m long vehicles, each week. The Transport Study shows these parking on the High Street just outside the store. The delivery tracking for deliveries (Transport Statement) shows the pavement outside the store, already narrow, will be reduced in width, which is unacceptable. The vehicle will also occupy three on-street parking bays, and if cars are parked here deliveries won’t be possible. The Beats survey shows that these spaces were occupied most of the day.**  **If leaving towards the south visibility is very poor due to the crown of the hill.**  **• The proposal is contrary to NP/E3.2: We feel it will lead to a loss of amenity to local residential properties due to the extended opening hours.** |
| **19/02439 (Full)** | 15 Brockenhurst Road Ascot SL5 9DJAlterations to front and rear boundary treatment.Recommendation: No concerns. |
| **19/02457 (Full)** | 59 New Road Ascot SL5 8PZFormation of vehicular access (bridge) and dropped kerb to the front of the property. **Recommendation: Concerns as this could increase the flood risk as it**  **• Turns the whole of the front garden to hardstanding but should be permeable**  **• Risk of oil etc polluting the stream.**  **• Makes stream maintenance more difficult.** |
| **19/02500 (Works To Trees Covered by TPO)** | **50A Lower Village Road Ascot SL5 7AU Oak - reduce height by 50%. Recommendation: No concerns.** |
| **19/02566 (Full)** | 45 Bowden Road, Ascot, SL5 9NJ Single storey side extension. Recommendation: No concerns. |
| **19/02580 (Works to Trees Covered by TPO)** | Hanover House Hancocks Mount Ascot SL5 9PQ Sweet Chestnut - fell. Beech Tree - fell. Recommendation: Refer to the borough’s tree officer. The committee felt that, at a time when the borough has declared an environmental and climate emergency, and in view of the community wish to retain the green and leafy character of the area, it is important that trees are retained wherever possible and, where it is essential to fell them, that they are replaced on a 2 for 1 basis. It is noted that these felling would result in 4 mature trees being lost, since the house was recently built, questioning whether the development should have been permitted from a tree perspective. |
| **19/02657 (Full)** | Hatchet Lane Farm, Hatchet Lane Ascot SL5 8QE Construction of 6no. dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings. Recommendation: Objection. **The lack of information regarding the details of the individual houses was noted and concerns were expressed about surface water and the need for a drainage scheme. The committee thought that the application needed to demonstrate very special circumstances for such a development within the Green Belt and also thought that the proposal would increase traffic and activity on the site.**  **• GB1 Requires VSC for residential development in accordance with GB3-5. None are provided.**  **• NPPF para 144 requires planning authorities to give substantial weight to any harm the development would cause to the GB. ‘VSC will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.**  **In accordance with para 145 residential development is, by its nature, inappropriate, and doesn’t meet any of the exceptions.**  **We consider the large new detached houses and their height, layout and positioning changes the very character of the site from a rural to built up environment, and has a far greater impact on the GB than the earlier proposal, which retained many of the existing buildings. All the proposed buildings are 1.5 storeys 8m high, compared with existing single storey stables and outbuildings**  **• The loss of trees also affects impacts on the GB**  **• Contrary to GB2: Has greater spatial and visual impact on the openness of the GB owing to the positioning, layout and height of the new dwellings.**  **• Contrary to GB3: The proposals don’t comply with any of the sub-clauses 1) to 6)**  **• Contrary to GB8: These are new buildings, not a change of use of existing buildings.**  **• The developer argues that the replacement buildings comply if they are within the curtilage of the plot within which the existing building sits. Our understanding is that they must be within the building curtilage, as per the previous development.** The site is currently rural in character – very different from these proposals. |
| **19/02727 (Full)** | **4 Woodend Drive Ascot SL5 9BG Part single part two storey wrap around extension with new front entrance canopy and first floor rear Juliet balcony and bay window. Recommendation: No concerns.** |
| **19/02742 (Outline)** | Land Adjacent Pine View 1 Woodside Road Winkfield WindsorOutline application for Access and Layout only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for a detached two storey dwelling. **Recommendation:** **Concerns of increasing flood risk in an already high risk area and highway access being within 15m of main road.**  **Previous refused apps include 15/01871, 14/03253 refused by the borough on the ground that it isn’t infilling and is contrary to GB 1, 2 & 3.The applicant argues that the borough GB policies are out of date and don’t carry weight and the NPPF doesn’t define infilling.** |

**7490 PLANNING APPEALS  
18/03474 Land West of The White Cottage, Buckhurst Road, Mill Lane, Ascot, Berkshire, SL5 7QE**

The development proposed is erection of a single dwelling with associated landscaping and parking following demolition of existing residential outbuildings. The appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

**7491 APPROVALS AND REFUSALS**

The approvals and refusals were considered for the weeks ending 20th September, 27th September and 4th October.

**7492 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

i) The committee discussed its concerns over the issue of permitted development. It was agreed that the clerk should write to RBWM on the committee’s behalf urging the borough to lobby the government to change permitted development rules.

ii) Placemaking: The committee discussed the progression of the local plan and placemaking, in particular the possibility of intensifying pressure for proper engagement and securing more influence in the process. It was suggested that we may wish to try to secure the support of the Prince’s Foundation.

iii) Members of the committee expressed frustration at the ongoing issues over parking and congestion in Sunninghill High Street. The committee discussed the merits of undertaking a traffic survey as well as possible sites for car parks such as the old Alexander David site or the Kings Corner site should the new health centre be built.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 8:10pm.

----------------------------------------

Councillor Robin Wood