

WINDSOR AND ASCOT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 1ST DECEMBER, 2021

At 7.00 pm

by

GREY ROOM - YORK HOUSE, ON [RBWM YOUTUBE](#)

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
5.	<p><u>21/01721/FULL - SUNNINGDALE PARK - LARCH AVENUE - ASCOT - SL5 0QE</u></p> <p><i>PROPOSED: The redevelopment of part of the Sunningdale Park estate including the erection of new buildings to provide 96 homes (Class C3), conversion of 3x market dwellings to shared ownership in Mackenzie House alongside associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping, footpaths, drainage, provision of 19 hectares of SANG and other associated works.</i></p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATION: PERMIT</i></p> <p><i>APPLICANT: Mr Hill</i></p> <p><i>MEMBER CALL-IN: N/A</i></p> <p><i>EXPIRY DATE: 8th September 2021</i></p>	3 - 6

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

Application No.:	21/01721/FULL
Location:	Sunningdale Park Larch Avenue Ascot SL5 0QE
Proposal:	The redevelopment of part of the Sunningdale Park estate including the erection of new buildings to provide 96 homes (Class C3), conversion of 3x market dwellings to shared ownership in Mackenzie House alongside associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping, footpaths, drainage, provision of 19 hectares of SANG and other associated works.
Applicant:	Mr Hill
Agent:	Not Applicable
Parish/Ward:	Sunningdale Parish/Sunningdale And Cheapside
If you have a question about this report, please contact: Susan Sharman on 01628 685320 or at susan.sharman@rbwm.gov.uk	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Comments on the application have been received from the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Group, plus additional comments from 4 neighbours living opposite the site on Larch Avenue.
- 1.2 A consultation response from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has been received in relation to additional information submitted. The LLFA recommends a condition be attached to any permission granted, as per condition 14 in the main report.
- 1.3 Subject to condition 16 of the main report, all 96 dwellings proposed under the current application would comply with the Council's Interim Sustainability Position Statement, unlike any of the 74 dwellings approved under the extant permission 18/00356. This adds to the weight in favour of supporting the application and would help meet key aims of the Council's Corporate Plan.

It is recommended the Committee DEFER and DELEGATES to the Head of Planning:	
1.	To grant planning permission on the satisfactory completion of an undertaking to secure the affordable housing, SANG and contribution to the Council's Carbon Offset Fund, if necessary, referred to in Section 9 of the main report and with the conditions listed in Section 13 of that report.
2.	To refuse planning permission if an undertaking to secure the affordable housing, SANG and contribution to the Council's Carbon Offset Fund, if necessary, as referred to in Section 9 of the main report has not been satisfactorily completed for the reason that the proposed development would not be accompanied by the necessary associated affordable housing, SANG, and climate change improvements.

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 2.1 For clarification, subject to condition 16 in the main report, the total 96 dwellings, and not just the
Planning Panel Windsor Area

22 dwellings in addition to the 74 approved 18/00356, would comply with the Council's Interim Sustainability Position Statement. Accordingly, this is given significant weight in the Very Special Circumstances and Planning Balance for the proposal as, if the application is refused and the extant permission built out, 74 homes would be built without sustainability credentials. The amended scheme would also assist in meeting key aims of the Council's Corporate Plan.

Comments from Interested Parties

2.2

Additional comments received, summarised as:

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
<p>Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Group Late Observations:</p> <p>We have evaluated the application in detail and have major concerns in respect of Parking and the effect on the Character of the Area.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan carries exactly the same weight as other development plans policies.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan policies NP/DG1 and NP/SS8.4 make clear that any redevelopment of the site must respond to the surrounding green and leafy character and the design should have regard to the key characteristic and description of 'Villas in a Wood land Setting' or 'Leafy Residential Suburbs'.</p> <p>The application proposes to increase the number of dwellings from 74 to 96 and to increase the number of surface parking spaces from 19 to 93.</p> <p>This is a 30% increase in dwellings and an overwhelming increase in surface parking contrary to the established character of the area. It cannot help but have a permanent and detrimental urbanising effect on the well-established character of this area.</p> <p>The Highways comments rely entirely on the out of date 2005 Parking Standards and give no consideration to Neighbourhood Plan Policies, which post-date the Parking Standards by 10 years, and which fully reflect the views and concerns of local residents.</p> <p>Policy NP/T1 requires development proposals to have adequate provision for parking. Sunningdale Park is not a sustainable location and therefore future occupiers of the development will rely on using their cars. Also 9 visitor parking spaces is inadequate. Parking</p>	<p>Section 6 of the main report includes the NP under the heading of Development Plan.</p> <p>NP policies were adopted and considered as part of the original application 18/00356. See paragraphs 9.18 – 9.20 of main report.</p> <p>Considered in paragraphs 9.17 to 9.22 of main report.</p> <p>The Highways advice considers national planning policy set out in the NPPF 2021, which is a material consideration to the proposal.</p> <p>See paragraph 9.33 of main report.</p>	<p>No.</p>

<p>will overspill onto Larch Avenue and surrounding roads which is contrary to policy NP/T1 and will cause further harm to the character of the area.</p> <p>Surprised at so little provision being made for charging points for electric vehicles. Given the scale of groundworks being undertaken on site, this seems another missed opportunity to make this development significantly more sustainable. Representations from neighbours.</p>	<p>Covered in paragraphs 9.38 – 9.39 of main report.</p>	
<p>Additional comments received from 4 neighbours:</p> <p>Inadequate/insufficient foliage cover/screening of the proposed development. Visible from properties on Larch Avenue opposite the site.</p> <p>Proposal will not preserve the 'Villas in a Woodland Setting'.</p>	<p>See paragraphs 9.17-9.18 and 9.24 of main report.</p>	<p>No.</p>

Comments from Consultees

2.3

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in respect of additional information received: Broadly approve the drainage design strategy but require clarity on some issues. Agree that the proposed SuDS system will provide adequate water quality treatment. Noted that the exceedance flows indicate flows will be diverted from property as far as is possible. Noted that the landscaped podium area of the site has been modelled as 100% impermeable, which represents a conservative estimate of its impacts on the wider drainage system. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to grant permission, it is recommended a condition is included.</p>	<p>LLFA recommended condition is as per condition 14 in the main report.</p>	<p>No</p>

