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

# Held at the King Edward VII Meeting Room, Ascot Racecourse, Ascot SL5 7JX on Tuesday 16 April 2024 commencing at 7.00pm

# Members Present: Members – Councillors R Wood (Chairman); D Hilton (Vice-Chairman), C Herring, B Hilton, M Turton, B Story & S Verma.

# In attendance: Maryann Morgan, Administration Assistant to the Clerk, Simon Gledhill & Robert Gregory (SPAE)

# 8740 APOLOGIES

#  Apologies were received from Cllr Allison Sharpe. Cllr Phil Carter was absent.

# 8741 MINUTES

#  The minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2024 were approved and signed as such.

# 8742 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

#  Cllr Charlotte Herring advised that she owns a property in the vicinity of the application 24/00189 regarding the BT Telephone Exchange.

# 8743 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application No.** | **Location and Description** |
| **24/00178 (Works to Trees Covered by TPO) AS** | **Fir Tree Cottage Blythewood Lane Ascot SL5 8EWOak Tree - Reduce as shown (012/2004/TPO)Parish Council Recommendation: Refer to Tree Officer****The neighbours have applied for these works, not the owners.  They state that the tree has suffered damage in the past and it would seem a very good idea for the tree officer to inspect it.  Just because neighbours fear it might fall doesn’t mean it will.  It could be that crown lifting will ensure a longer life for the tree.  The tree officer should also advise on the correct season for the pruning.** |
| **24/00189 (Full) CH** | **British Telecom Telephone Exchange Upper Village Road Ascot SL5 7AJInstallation of 1no. flagpole which will support 1no. flagpole antenna at 14.5m together with ancillary equipment thereto including 3no. 0.6m dish, GPS Antenna, cabinets, RRUs, ERSs and supporting grillage.Parish Council Recommendation: Objection/ Concerns** **The proposed 5 flagpoles, with 4 dishes and 5 antennae in total, plus 4 cabinets, will detract from the visual amenity and appearance of the surrounding area. While the existing telephone exchange has a utilitarian appearance, it is of concern that it seems to be considered acceptable to continue to add further unattractive features (in addition to the 2 current mobile masts) that will appear as incongruous/jarring additions in a village setting. It is also stated that no residential dwelling directly overlooks the site and will not have a direct view of the proposal. However, the site will be clearly visible from the upper floor of 45 Bowden Road and overlooks the rear of nos. 1-8 The Mews and their gardens. While the proposal is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), and the EU Council recommendation of 12 July 1999 on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields, (0Hz to 300GHz) ‘in all areas legitimately accessible to the public’, no specific quantifiable radius of risk is given. It is therefore of concern that the new masts and dishes (in addition to the 2 existing masts) will be in close proximity and direct line of sight of the bedrooms of the adjacent properties.** |
| **24/00557 (Full) SV** | **6 Silwood Close Ascot SL5 7DXErection of a replacement 2-storey detached dwelling with roof mounted PV panels and detached single-storey garage/store building with EV charger, 1no. air source heat pump, new driveway gates and new pedestrian access and gate, with associated landscaping following demolition of existing 2-storey dwelling and linked single-storey garaging/store/workshop.Parish Council Recommendation:****This application is for a HUF house in the Green Belt and replaces application 23/02129 which was withdrawn. The building proposed is further into the site than existing, slightly less wide but deeper but the height is the same as existing. Overall, there is an increase in volume of c 30% which may be deemed acceptable in the GB.****THE PC objected to the previous on the following grounds.****NP/DG2.1 and 2.2 states the buildings should be of good design and enhance the neighbourhood.****NP/H2.1 states Dwellings should be in size and type in keeping with size and type already prevalent in surrounding area,****The building proposed is more in keeping with the style of buildings in the close but is of different materials.**  |
| **24/00576 (Part 1 Class AA) MT** | **5 Llanvair Drive Ascot SL5 9HSApplication for prior approval for construction of one additional storey to property with a maximum height of 2.67m.Parish Council Recommendation: Objection****The house proposed in this application would be of a height, mass and scale that would both dominate neighbouring premises and negatively impact the locality. In particular, the height of the roof ridge would increase from 7.26 metres to 10.12 metres, an increase of 40% and also 40% above the height of the roof ridge of the neighbouring houses. Such increases in height, mass and scale would be inconsistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties so that the resulting property would appear unduly prominent in the street scene and out of keeping with the locality in general. This would detract from the quality of the area and the Leafy Residential Suburbs townscape, key features of which are low density and privacy. For neighbours, the resulting house would have a negative impact on their privacy, amenity and light. The height and scale of the side elevations, which are very close to both boundaries, would appear domineering and oppressive. Considering the restrictions detailed in section AA.1, restriction i) forbids that “any additional storey is constructed other than on the principal part of the dwelling house”.****Extending on top of previous extensions is questioned.** **In addition, if RBWM are minded to sanction this application a condition ought to be applied that no further extensions at any level incl. ground floor should not be permitted.** |
| **24/00578 (Part 1 Class AA)MT** | **5 Llanvair Drive Ascot SL5 9HSApplication for prior approval for construction of one additional storey to property with a** **maximum height of 2.67m.Parish Council Recommendation: Objection****The house proposed in this application would be of a height, mass and scale that would both dominate neighbouring premises and negatively impact the locality. In particular, the height of the roof ridge would increase from 7.26 metres to 10.12 metres, an increase of 40% and also 40% above the height of the roof ridge of the neighbouring houses. Such increases in height, mass and scale would be inconsistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties so that the resulting property would appear unduly prominent in the street scene and out of keeping with the locality in general. This would detract from the quality of the area and the Leafy Residential Suburbs townscape, key features of which are low density and privacy. For neighbours, the resulting house would have a negative impact on their privacy, amenity and light. The height and scale of the side elevations, which are very close to both boundaries, would appear domineering and oppressive. Considering the restrictions detailed in section AA.1, restriction i) forbids that “any additional storey is constructed other than on the principal part of the dwelling house”.****Extending on top of previous extensions is questioned. This version wishes to extend above the garage extension which should not be permitted as it is only permitted on the original footprint. Also the effect on the neighbours and on the street-scene is exacerbated by his increase in the bulk and scale of the building at or very close to the property boundary to #3 and 7. There are NO other 3 storey building in the area.****In addition, if RBWM are minded to sanction this application a condition ought to be applied that no further extensions at any level incl. ground floor should not be permitted.** |
| **24/00643 (Full) BS** | **8 Course Road Ascot SL5 7HLPart single part two storey side/rear extension, alterations to the existing 1no. rear Juliet balcony and fenestration.Parish Council Recommendation: no concerns** **- this application isn’t for a major development, and it just builds upon what was approved and implemented in 2001** |
| **24/00660 (Prior Approval Class MA)BH** | **Radnor House Surgery 25 London Road Ascot SL5 7ENChange of use of the building from clinic use (Class E) to 1no. 4-bedroom house (Class C3) with associated parking.Parish Council Recommendation: No issues.****Property has been empty since the transfer to Brooke House****There is no change to the exterior of the building and parking is good.****It will bring an extra 4 bed property on to the market.** |
| **24/00714 (Prior Approval Class MA) AS** | **G M T Accountancy Bureau 31 Upper Village Road Ascot SL5 7AJPrior approval for the change of use from office building to residential for 1no. dwelling.Parish Council Recommendation:**No building plans are attached to the application.**One of the quirks of Upper Village Road.  A room used by an accountant who is now retired.  The room is in front of No. 29 and they are wishing to buy the room from the accountant to bring it back into (what I assume was) their original property.  It would seem that this might reduce the parking requirement on Upper Village Road by one car?!  The owners of No. 29 are not indicating that they wish to redevelop the site, just to absorb the room back into the main building but they state this is a net increase of one dwelling, which is a bit puzzling as there is already one dwelling.  Perhaps they intend to rent it out, in which case can we ask for single family occupancy?** |
| **24/00752 (Full) RW** | **3 Armitage Court Ascot SL5 9TAGarage conversion, part two storey, part first floor front/side extension with 1no. Juliet balcony, 2no. front dormers, changes to the external finish and a detached garage.Parish Council Recommendation: Objection****At the ground floor this proposal is to make the existing garage into a gym and create a new garage to the front of the property. This is directly in conflict with policy NP/DG3.3 which states that garages should be set back from the street frontage and should be located in between houses (rather than in front).****In addition, the dormer windows in the roof (to simply provide light to the uninhabitable loft) change the street scene as well as the garage in front and is out of keeping with the neighbouring properties. If light is all that is required simple roof lights to the rear would be distinctly better.** |
| **24/00754 (Variation Under Reg 73) CH** | **Carabacel Ravensdale Road Ascot SL5 9HJVariation (under Section 73A) of Condition 12 (Approved Plans) to substitute those plans approved under 22/00386/FULL for a x1 detached dwelling and x1 new garage with carport, new entrance gates and associated landscaping following demolition of existing elements with amended plans.Parish Council Recommendation: Objection****The Parish Council’s objections of March 2022 still stand. In fact, a bigger, bulkier double garage, closing in the carport, simply reinforces our objection to the structure being placed forward of the house, further affecting the street scene (contrary to NP/DG3.3). It is also questioned as to why such a large1-storey ‘extension’ to the garage is needed for bike storage. The larger garage will further increase the cramped nature of the proposed building and loss of green space compared with the surrounding properties. In the Parish Council’s opinion, the development therefore remains contrary to LP/QP3, LPNR3, NP/DG1, NP/DG2, NP/EN2 and NP/EN3.** |
| **24/00798 (Full) DH** | **Land At The Garden Lodge Bagshot Road Ascot 1 no. dwelling with 2 no. EV charging points, following demolition of the existing outbuildingParish Council Recommendation: Concern?****The site has been subject to three previous planning applications since 2016 each refused by RBWM and each dismissed at appeal.****The last appeal was dismissed on the grounds of design where the inspector argued that the design had a vertical emphasis rather than the horizontal emphasis in the design of the wider dwellings on St Mary’s Road. He also stated that the dwelling would be dominant and intrusive in the street scene along Bagshot Road.****In the current design the southeastern elevation has been moved back from the Bagshot Road boundary to 8 metres from 5.5 metres, the depth reduced from 16 metres to 13 metres and the height from 8 metres to 7.7 metres. This is a more modest dwelling which has a reduced impact on Bagshot Road. It will have a slate roof and rendered walls.****I find it difficult to establish any sound reason for refusal but would prefer the walls to be brick rather than rendered which would be less visible from Bagshot Road. We may make this as a comment.** |
| **24/00823 (Works to Trees Covered by TPO) BS** | **Merlin House Bagshot Road Ascot SL5 9JL(T1 and T2) Birch Trees - fell. (005/1975/TPO).Parish Council Recommendation: concerns, refer to Tree Officer** **- the reasons for felling don’t appear to be strong** |

# 8744 PLANNING APPEALS

None received.

**8745 APPROVALS AND REFUSALS**

 The approvals and refusals were considered for weeks ending 15,22 & 28 March & 05 April.

8746 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. A point was raised that Planning application No. 23/01879 which was submitted in August 2023 has gone to appeal as no decision has so far been given on the application. This application is in the area covered by the Parish Council Village Green application which is awaiting a determination from RBWM.
2. A point was also raised that a Licensing application (107233/LAPLO1) has been submitted to RBWM with regard to a Coop Food Store opening in Kings Road, Sunninghill selling alcohol. It was felt this should not have been submitted as the planning application appeal relating to the site 23/60080 has not yet been decided.

 There being no other business the meeting concluded at 7.40pm.

Cllr R Wood (Chairman)