

WINDSOR AND ASCOT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 5TH OCTOBER, 2022

At 7.00 pm

In the

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

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
4.	<u>22/00721/OUT - OLD BOUNDARY HOUSE AND NEW BOUNDARY HOUSE LONDON ROAD SUNNINGDALE ASCOT</u> PROPOSAL: Outline application for access, layout and scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the construction of 28 apartments following demolition of the existing buildings. RECOMMENDATION: Refuse APPLICANT: Mr Inchbald MEMBER CALL-IN: N/A EXPIRY DATE: 16 June 2022	3 - 8

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

Application No.:	22/00721/OUT
Location:	Old Boundary House And New Boundary House London Road Sunningdale Ascot
Proposal:	Outline application for access, layout and scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the construction of 28 apartments following demolition of the existing buildings.
Applicant:	Mr Inchbald
Agent:	Miss Helen Lowe
Parish/Ward:	Sunningdale Parish/Sunningdale And Cheapside
If you have a question about this report, please contact: Katherine Hale on or at katherine.hale@rbwm.gov.uk	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following the publication of the main Committee report, the Council has received updated comments from the Ecology Officer to advise no objections, subject to conditions.
- 1.2 Two letters have been received from the Agent, both dated 30 September 2022. The first letter seeks to address the factual inaccuracy on the committee report with regards to who the applicant is. The applicant is Elliot Charles Holdings Ltd and not the stated Mr Inchbald.
- 1.3 The second letter seeks to address the areas of concern raised by the Council. Additional information has been provided in the letter, but it is considered that all matters have already been addressed in full in the main Committee report. The letter does not change the officer recommendation.

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Council has received a letter from the Agent dated 30 September 2022. The letter is seeking to respond to and address issues raised in the Committee Report. It is considered that all matters have already been addressed in the main report, and the contents of the letter does not alter the Council's recommendation.
- 2.2 The contents of the letter and the Officer's response is summarised in the table below.

Comments	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
Para. 3.1 - The site areas is 0.52ha and not 0.31ha as quoted.	Noted, this is an error within the committee report and it is agreed that the site area is 0.52ha.	No

<p>Para. 10.13-10.14 We addressed the loss of offices in detail within our Planning Statement and then further in our letter dated 7 July 2022 as part of a planning balance consideration with the provision of housing.</p> <p>In February 2022 a survey was provided to planning officers evidencing that there was a total of 745,242 square feet (or 69,234 sqm) of office accommodation available across the Windsor and Maidenhead area.</p> <p>The existing office accommodation within Old Boundary House and New Boundary House has limitations in terms of its flexibility and are not as modern as many other providers. The loss of these buildings as office accommodation would not therefore represent the loss of the most versatile or desirable office premises and there is plentiful capacity in the local office market to more than absorb the current and likely future office demands of the area. We are not aware that there have been any objections to the proposed application by any of the current office occupiers.</p>	<p>The application is contrary to Local Plan Policy ED3. As stated in the report no marketing evidence has been supplied. The report submitted by the Agent/Applicant demonstrates there is sufficient space elsewhere however Policy ED3 seeks to protect existing employment sites and therefore the proposal is contrary to this policy.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Para 10.29-10.30 We maintain that the degree of setback is suitable in urban design terms and that an attractive development will result. The development will not have a cramped appearance.</p>	<p>No additional comments, the Committee report covers this.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Para. 10.40 The Council's concern is restricted to one point with that being the distance of new windows that would face the back garden of plot 1 of the former Lime Tree Villa site that would be between 9-12.5 metres away. There are a limited number of apartments (4 in total that are also dual aspect) that would face in this direction and given the retention of trees on site in this corner, the boundary trees to the adjacent car park access road that are in the ownership of the Council, and the privacy screens that can be incorporated into the development, we are confident that residential amenity can be suitable protected.</p>	<p>The Council remains concerned, whilst it is noted that there are currently trees along the boundary, these cannot be guaranteed for the lifetime of the development.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Para. 10.44-10.48 All ground floor units would have access to</p>	<p>The Committee report clearly</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>private outdoor amenity spaces in the form of immediately adjacent garden areas exceeding 10 sqm. It is not correct for the report to state that none of the ground floor units on Block A would have a private terrace space – they have a garden space to the frontage that will be screened from view and hence private. All first and second floor flats also have some private (balcony) space as required by the Design Guide. Communal space is also provided via a communal decked amenity space above eight of the proposed car parking spaces and would be just over 121 sqm. There is no mention of this communal space within the report. Every apartment will have access to a combination of private and communal amenity space.</p>	<p>states that the ground floor units all have private amenity space. However the Design Guide states that the private amenity space should be at least 3m deep and the same width as the flat. Each balcony/garden area has been measured and some have been found to not comply with this or face directly into the car park, this private amenity space is considered to be inadequate given its location.</p> <p>With regards to the communal space, this would be in effect, within the car park albeit over a section of it, this is considered insufficient particularly given its location within the car park.</p>	
<p>Para. 10.53-10.54 31 trees are to be removed but as stated 28 of these are only moderate quality and 3 are low quality. Not all trees are being removed from site, with 16 being retained and at least 10 new trees will be planted. There is no reference to this retention of trees or new tree planting in the report. There is not a wholesale removal of existing trees as stated in para. 10.54 or a complete removal of all boundary trees as stated in para. 12.4.</p>	<p>The report is correct, and has assessed the impact of the loss of trees and potential for new landscaping on site. The Committee report clearly states that it is considered that there is insufficient room on site “to implement a landscaping scheme to offset such wholesale removal of existing trees”.</p>	No
<p>Para. 10.72 Given that these final Reports were sent to the Council 6 weeks ago it is disappointing that officers have not received any response from the Council ecologist.</p>	<p>Comments have now been received from the Ecology Officer confirming no objections</p>	
<p>Para. 10.75 Our client is fully committed to ensuring that suitable mitigation is put in place having regard to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and is in dialogue with Simon Cridland at Bracknell Forest BC. This can be secured via s106 and there is no reason why there can't be a “resolution to grant” subject to s106 in relation to this matter.</p> <p>We understand from the planning policy team that within RBWM that there may be</p>	<p>At the time of writing the committee report the Agent/Applicant had not made contact with Bracknell Forest BC and therefore it was considered that no mitigation was in place.</p> <p>With regards to the remaining potential availability within Allen's Field this is insufficient</p>	No

<p>some limited new capacity at Allen's Field and that there may be a new SANG at Sunningdale Park due to open later this year. However, we have previously very much been directed towards BFC and have progressed on this basis.</p>	<p>for a proposal of this size.</p> <p>Whilst the Council is aware that the applicant has been progressing this matter and considering options, it remains the case that there is no mechanism currently in place for securing SPA mitigation. Only if the scheme were acceptable in all other regards would officers advise members to delegate this matter back to the Head of Planning to resolve.</p>	
--	---	--

There is no change to the recommendation in the main report.

This page is intentionally left blank