

NOTICE  
OF  
MEETING



# WINDSOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

will meet on

**WEDNESDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 2015**

**At 7.00 pm**

in the

**HOLY TRINITY CE SCHOOL, CHURCH ROAD, SUNNINGDALE SL5 0NJ,**

TO: MEMBERS OF THE WINDSOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

COUNCILLORS CHRISTINE BATESON (CHAIRMAN), COLIN RAYNER (VICE-CHAIRMAN), GEORGE BATHURST, MALCOLM BEER, DAVID HILTON AND JOHN LENTON

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS MICHAEL AIREY, DR LILLY EVANS, LYNNE JONES, SAYONARA LUXTON, JOHN STORY AND LYNDA YONG

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: Tuesday, 10 November 2015

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at [www.rbwm.gov.uk](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk) or contact the Panel Administrator **Wendy Binmore** 01628 796 251

**Fire Alarm** - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Car Park, and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

**Recording of Meetings** – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

## AGENDA

### PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u>  To receive any apologies for absence.	
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u>  To receive any Declarations of Interest.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u>  To confirm the Part I Minutes of the meeting of the previous meeting	7 - 10
4.	<u>PLANNING APPLICATIONS (DECISION)</u>  To consider the Director of Development & Regeneration / Development Control Manager's report on planning applications received.  Full details on all planning applications (including application forms, site plans, objections received, correspondence etc.) can be found by accessing the Planning Applications Public Access Module by selecting the following link. <a href="http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/dc_public_apps.htm">http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/dc_public_apps.htm</a> or from Democratic Services on 01628 796251 or <a href="mailto:democratic.services@rbwm.gov.uk">democratic.services@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	11 - 46
5.	<u>ESSENTIAL MONITORING REPORTS (MONITORING)</u>  To consider the Essential Monitoring Reports.	47 - 50



This page is intentionally left blank



## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

In accordance with the requirements of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act

1985, each item on this report includes a list of Background Papers that have been relied

on to a material extent in the formulation of the report and recommendation.

The list of Background Papers will normally include relevant previous planning decisions, replies to formal consultations and relevant letter of representation received from local societies, and members of the public. For ease of reference, the total number of letters received from members of the public will normally be listed as a single Background Paper,

although a distinction will be made where contrary views are expressed. Any replies to consultations that are not received by the time the report goes to print will be recorded as

“Comments Awaited”.

The list will not include published documents such as the Town and Country Planning Acts

and associated legislation, Department of the Environment Circulars, the Berkshire Structure Plan, Statutory Local Plans or other forms of Supplementary Planning Guidance,

as the instructions, advice and policies contained within these documents are common to

the determination of all planning applications. Any reference to any of these documents will be made as necessary under the heading “Remarks”.

## **STATEMENT OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998**

The Human Rights Act 1998 was brought into force in this country on 2nd October 2000, and it will now, subject to certain exceptions, be directly unlawful for a public authority to act in a way which is incompatible with a Convention right. In particular, Article 8 (respect

for private and family life) and Article 1 of Protocol 1 (peaceful enjoyment of property) apply to planning decisions. When a planning decision is to be made however, there is further provision that a public authority must take into account the public interest. In the vast majority of cases existing planning law has for many years demanded a balancing exercise between private rights and public interest, and therefore much of this authority's decision making will continue to take into account this balance.

The Human Rights Act will not be referred to in the Officer's report for individual applications beyond this general statement, unless there are exceptional circumstances which demand more careful and sensitive consideration of Human Rights issues.

## MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

### DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

#### **DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)**

DPIs include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any license to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where
  - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
  - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

#### **PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS**

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

#### **DECLARING INTERESTS**

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed. A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

# Agenda Item 3

## WINDSOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 21 OCTOBER 2015

PRESENT: Councillors Christine Bateson (Chairman), Colin Rayner (Vice-Chairman), George Bathurst, Malcolm Beer and John Lenton

Also in attendance:

Officers: Wendy Binmore, Simon Rowberry, Sarah L Smith, Chris Nash, Laurel Isaacs, Victoria Goldberg and Vivienne McDowell

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr David Hilton.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

**Cllr Rayner** – Declared a personal interest and a pecuniary interest on item 15/01567 as the applicants owned property near land belonging to The Rayner Family Trust. I am a trustee of the Rayner Family Trust. Cllr Rayner did not vote on the item. He left the Room. Cllr Rayner also declared a personal interest in item 15/02563 as he was invited to visit the site

**Cllr Lenton** – Declared a personal interest on item 15/02563 as he had visited the site with his wife (Chairman of Wraysbury Parish Council) when no Officer had been available to attend. He also declared a pecuniary interest in item 15/01567 as he owned a property adjacent to the site. Cllr Lenton made a statement and left the room. He did not vote on the item.

### MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Part I minutes of the meeting of the Windsor Rural Development Control Panel held on 23 September 2015 be approved.

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS (DECISION)

The Panel considered the Head of Planning's report on planning applications received and received updates in relation to a number of applications, following the publication of the agenda.

NB: \*Updates were received in relation to planning applications marked with an asterisk.

<u>Application</u>	<u>Applicant and Proposed Development</u>
--------------------	---

15/01517*	Mr Mills – Kebbell: New building to provide 4 x 2 No. bedroom and 1 x 3 No. bedroom apartments, detached triple garage, detached bin store, associated parking and landscaping following demolition of existing property at Four Seasons, Bagshot Road, Ascot SL5 9JL – <b>THE PANEL VOTED UNANIMOUSLY to REFUSE planning permission against the recommendations of the Director of</b>
-----------	---

**Development and Regeneration's recommendations for the reasons as listed below:**

- **The area is defined in the Townscape Assessment as having the characteristics of villas in a woodland setting with the key characteristics of the designation being tranquil, quiet and essentially private in character. The building now proposed would be deeper, wider and taller with a more prominent wings and gables these factors would have a materially different, and greater impact than the approved scheme for five flats on the site.**
- **This increased bulk and mass of the building would impact, and substantially detract from the special qualities of this area and would thereby be harmful to the distinctive character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. The proposal fails to comply with policies DG1, H10 and H11 of the Local Plan and Policies NP/DG1, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3 of the Neighbourhood Plan.**

(The Panel were addressed by Diana Tombs (NPDG) and Patrick Griffin (SPAЕ) in objection).

15/01567\* Mr Khalili – Favermead Holdings Limited: Replacement of existing lodge, jetty and retaining wall around lake edge (part Retrospective) at RK Leisure, 94A Welley Road, Wraysbury, Staines TW19 5EP – **THE PANEL VOTED UNANIMOUSLY That: the application be APPROVED in accordance with the Director of Development and Regeneration's recommendations and with the conditions as listed in Section 10 of the main report.**

(The Panel were addressed by Raphael Khalili the Applicant).

15/01961\* Mr Duncan: Construction of two replacement dwellings and a clubhouse for the fishing lake following the demolition of the existing as approved under planning permission 13/01547 without complying with condition 2 (materials) and 4 (Design and Access Statement) to allow changes to materials at La Garenne And Kotan, 62A Wraysbury Road, Staines TW19 6HA – **THE PANEL VOTED UNANIMOUSLY That: the application be APPROVED in accordance with the Director of Development and Regeneration's recommendations and with the conditions listed in Section 10 of the main report and with the additional conditions listed in Section 3 of the Panel Update Report as listed below:**

- **The development shall be carried out with the sustainability measures set out in the Design and Access Statement dated 7 October 2015. Reason: To ensure that measures to make the development sustainable and efficient in the use of energy, water and materials are included in the development and to comply with the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning document.**

15/001962 Mr Vali: Construction of double garage (retrospective) at Friary House, 6 Friary Island, Friary Road, Wraysbury, Staines TW19 5JR – **THE PANEL VOTED That: the application be APPROVED in accordance with the Director of Development and Regeneration’s recommendations and with the conditions listed in Section 10 of the main report but with the amendment to condition 5 as listed below:**

- To refer to a balcony screen on the eastern elevation of the balcony and to refer to a fixed, non openable Juliette balcony rather than a barrier.

Four Councillors voted in favour of the motion (Cllrs Bateson, Bathurst, Beer and Yong), one Councillor voted against the motion (Cllr Rayner) and one Councillor abstained from the vote (Cllr Lenton).

15/02563\* South East Power Engineering Limited: Construction of a hydro power scheme consisting of three Archimedes’ screws and associated infrastructure at Bell Weir (excluding eel pass), at Bell Weir, Riverside, Egham, TW20 0AA – **THE PANEL VOTED UNANIMOUSLY That: the application be APPROVED in accordance with the Director of Development and Regeneration’s recommendations to grant planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 10 of the main report and with additional conditions in Section 3 of the Panel Update Report as listed below:**

- The Environment Agency Pollution Guidelines PPG5 Works and Maintenance in or near water (2007) must be followed during the construction of the Archimedes Screws/turbines, in particular in relation to silt which can suffocate aquatic life within the river system. Reason: In the interests of protecting aquatic life within the river system. Relevant Policies – NPPF.
- Prior to the commencement of any works of demolition or construction a management plan showing how demolition and construction traffic, (including cranes), materials storage, facilities for operatives and vehicle parking and manoeuvring will be accommodated during the works period shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented as approved and maintained for the duration of the works or as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. Relevant Policies – Local Plan T5.
- No development shall take place until the designs of the fish pass as shown in drawing 105, V15 Bell Weir Site Plan dated 23 July 2015 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented fully in accordance with the approved details before development takes place and shall subsequently be retained. Reason: The incorporation of

**the fish pass is fundamental to the biodiversity mitigation in order for this hydropower scheme to be acceptable, in accordance with paragraphs 109 and 118 of the NPPF. This detail needs to be approved prior to commencement to ensure that there is no adverse impact on biodiversity and ecology as a result of the proposed works.**

- **The development hereby approved shall not be implemented until the eel pass proposed under Runnymede Application RU.15/1418 has been provided in accordance with the details approved under that application. Reason: The incorporation of the eel pass is fundamental to the biodiversity mitigation in order for this hydropower scheme to be acceptable, in accordance with paragraphs 109 and 118 of the NPPF.**

(The Panel were addressed by David De Chambeau, South East Power Engineering Ltd on behalf of the applicant).

ESSENTIAL MONITORING REPORTS (MONITORING)

Details of all Planning Appeals Received were noted.

The meeting, which began at Time Not Specified, finished at Time Not Specified

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

# Agenda Item 4

## ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD

### Windsor Rural Panel

18th November 2015

#### INDEX

APP = Approval  
CLU = Certificate of Lawful Use  
DD = Defer and Delegate  
DLA = Defer Legal Agreement  
PERM = Permit  
PNR = Prior Approval Not Required  
REF = Refusal  
WA = Would Have Approved  
WR = Would Have Refused

**Item No.** 1      **Application No.** 15/02272/FULL      **Recommendation** DLA      **Page No.** 13  
**Location:** St Marys School St Marys Road Ascot SL5 9JF  
**Proposal:** Upper Sixth Form Accommodation, Pastoral Centre, Staff Accommodation and Laundry  
**Applicant:** St Mary's School      **Member Call-in:** N/A      **Expiry Date:** 12 November 2015

---

**Item No.** 2      **Application No.** 15/03006/FULL      **Recommendation** PERM      **Page No.** 38  
**Location:** Redwood House Dawn Redwood Close Horton Slough SL3 9QD  
**Proposal:** Two storey side extension  
**Applicant:** Mr Puruthuveetil      **Member Call-in:** Cllr. Rayner      **Expiry Date:** 4 December 2015

---

**Planning Appeals Received**  
**Appeals Decision Report**

**Page No. 47**  
**Page No. 48**

This page is intentionally left blank



**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**WINDSOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL**

18 November 2015

Item: 1

<b>Application No.:</b>	15/02272/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	St Marys School St Marys Road Ascot SL5 9JF
<b>Proposal:</b>	Upper Sixth Form Accommodation, Pastoral Centre, Staff Accommodation and Laundry
<b>Applicant:</b>	St Mary's School
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Martin Leay - Martin Leay Associates
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Sunninghill And Ascot Parish
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Alistair De Joux on 01628 685729 or at <a href="mailto:alistair.dejoux@rbwm.gov.uk">alistair.dejoux@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This proposal is to provide a small complex of buildings intended primarily as improved boarding accommodation and a pastoral centre for the school's upper sixth form pupils, along with staff accommodation to consist of one 4-bedroom and two 2-bedroom houses. The scale of the buildings is mostly two storeys, rising to three storeys for the 4-bedroom house. The total floor space provided would be 3405 sq.m., which amounts to a 28% increase over the existing built floorspace of all types at the school.
- 1.2 The proposed buildings would be well screened from views into the site from neighbouring properties or public land. Nevertheless, the proposals do not properly satisfy the criteria for what the NPPF defines as appropriate within the Green Belt, and the proposals can therefore only be approved if there is a very special circumstances (VSC) case that would overcome the proposal's inappropriateness in Green Belt terms. The application advances a case that the need to provide better facilities for its upper sixth form pupils provides such a case. This is set out in detail within this report, with the conclusion that there is a good VSC case that can allow the application to be approved, subject to other matters being resolved.
- 1.3 The proposals are acceptable in terms of design of the buildings, and impacts on trees and wildlife.
- 1.4 A Sustainable Drainage Strategy has been provided, and reviewed by the Council's Flood Risk Manager who has raised significant uncertainty regarding the satisfactory operation of the proposed drainage system. This matter would need to be resolved before planning permission can be granted.

<b>It is recommended the Panel authorises the Director of Development and Regeneration:</b>	
1.	<b>Subject to there being no call-in by the Secretary of State in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009, to grant planning permission on satisfying the statutory requirements in regard to sustainable drainage of the site and flood risk, and with the conditions listed in Section 10 of this report.</b>
2.	<b>To refuse planning permission if the statutory requirements in relation to sustainable drainage have not been satisfactorily completed by 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016, for the reason that the proposed development would not provide appropriate sustainable drainage and would be likely therefore to exacerbate surface water flooding.</b>

## **2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION**

- The Council's Constitution does not give the Director of Development and Regeneration delegated powers to determine the application in the way recommended; such decisions can only be made by the Panel.
- The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009 sets out criteria for applications that must be referred to the Secretary of State, where the Local Planning Authority does not wish to refuse the application. The criteria include, at clause 4, inappropriate Green Belt development that consists of buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more.

## **3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

- 3.1 St. Mary's School is a private girls boarding school on a site of approximately 18 hectares that is located to the south of Ascot between Coronation Road, Horsegate Ride and St Mary's Road. The whole of the school lies within the Green Belt, with most of the buildings located in a cluster between the two main access points, which are on Horsegate Ride to the west of the buildings and St Mary's Road to the east. Within the school grounds, the site area that is relevant to this application, including access from St Mary's Road, is 0.56 ha.
- 3.2 The school's main building complex is surrounded by amenity space, playing fields and woodland, with neighbouring residential properties largely screened from views to and from the buildings although there is some intervisibility between dwellings on St Mary's Road.

## **4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 The school's extensive amenity areas include tennis courts and other open land on the south side of the main complex. It is within this area that the current proposal for a complex of buildings to provide additional boarding accommodation would be provided. This proposal is to provide a complex of four buildings intended primarily as improved boarding accommodation and a pastoral centre for the school's upper sixth form pupils along with staff accommodation to consist of one 4-bedroom and two 2-bedroom houses. The scale of the buildings is mostly two storeys, rising to three storeys for the 4-bedroom house. The total floor space provided would be 3405 sq.m., which amounts to a 28% increase in the built accommodation of all types at the school.
- 4.2 The proposed buildings would be grouped in a roughly triangular arrangement, directly to the south of existing staff houses to the north and on the eastern side of another pupil accommodation complex known as Mary Ward Courtyard. Further to the east, there is an area of woodland that provides an approximately 150 m wide band of screening vegetation between the site and the closest houses which are at The Covert.
- 4.3 The buildings proposed are as follows:
- the smallest of the three pupil accommodation buildings would be located on the northern side of the triangle, and would also include one of the 2-bedroom houses at its the western end and a laundry on its eastern side;
  - the next smallest of the three pupil accommodation buildings would be located on the western side of the triangle, with the second 2-bedroom house at its southern end;
  - the largest building in the grouping would form the western side of the triangle, with the pastoral centre forming at the southern end;
  - the detached 4-bedroom dwelling would close the north-eastern corner of the group.
- 4.4 The courtyard between the buildings would be appropriately landscaped, including a mix of hard-paved circulation areas and lawn, with indicative plantings of seven trees shown on the proposed layout drawings. Additional plantings would also be provided on the northern and western side of the group and around the southern side of the pastoral building, providing a link to the larger area of woodland to the west of the buildings.

- 4.5 The site has a long planning history that has resulted in a considerable amount of development of the school over recent decades. The application gives the following figures for increased floor space at the site since 1947:

	<u>sq. metres</u>
1947 total	5267
added since 1947	6729
Existing	11996

- 4.6 The application also submits that pupil numbers have increased from 147 to 378 at present, which corresponds proportionately to the increase in floor space over this two-thirds of a century. Pupil numbers increased more rapidly during the period from about 1977 to 1997 than either before or since, with the increase since then being from 345 pupils in 1997 to 365 in 2007, along with the modest increase in the eight years since then to 378 as noted above. While there has been a considerable amount of development since the late 1990s, much of this has been associated with improvements to facilities, such as sports facilities and a theatre, as noted in the following more recent planning history:

Ref.	Description	Decision and Date
99/78056/OUT	Provision of an all weather playing surface and changing room area.	Permitted, 17 August 1999.
00/79369/REM	Provision of an all-weather playing surface (reserved matters on outline permission 99/78056).	Permitted, 11 July 2000.
01/81172/OUT	Erection of sports hall and relocation of existing tennis courts (proposal amended 3 August 2001)	Permitted, 4 January 2002.
02/82506/FULL	Erection of a sports complex comprising hall, fitness suite, dance studio, two squash courts and 'social area'.	Permitted, 24 July 2003.
02/82533/FULL	Relocation of hard tennis court.	Permitted, 18 February 2003.
12/00514/FULL	New 400m all-weather athletics track and hockey pitch with artificial lighting, fencing, and ancillary store and a control hut; artificial lighting for existing hockey pitch; and photovoltaic panels on the roof of the existing sports centre.	Permitted, 3 July 2012
12/00515/FULL	Refurbishment and ground and first floor extensions to provide new kitchen and dining facilities. Refurbishment and two storey, part single storey extension to former concert hall to form a two storey library and new terrace. Temporary kitchen/dining and classroom facilities whilst works are completed.	Permitted, 23 April 2012
13/00065/FULL	Refurbishment and ground and first floor extensions to provide new kitchen and dining facilities, and provision of temporary dining facilities whilst works are completed	Permitted, 4 March 2013
14/03304/FULL	Single storey extension to Mary ward courtyard.	Permitted, 18 December 2014

## 5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

### The Development Plans

- 5.1 The main strategic planning considerations applying to the site and the associated policies are:

	<b>Building design</b>	<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>Protected Trees</b>	<b>Biodiversity</b>	<b>Highways and parking issues</b>
RBWM Local Plan	DG1	GB1, GB2	N6		T5, P4
Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan	NP/EN4, NP/DG3, NP/DG5		NP/EN2	NP/EN4	NP/T1, NP/T2

5.2 Supplementary planning documents adopted by the Council relevant to the proposal are:

- Interpretation of Policy F1 – Area Liable to Flood
- Sustainable Design and Construction

More information on these documents can be found at:

[http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/pp\\_supplementary\\_planning.htm](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web/pp_supplementary_planning.htm)

### **Other Local Strategies or Publications**

5.3 Other Strategies or publications relevant to the proposal are:

- RBWM Landscape Character Assessment - view at: [http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web\\_pp\\_supplementary\\_planning.htm](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web_pp_supplementary_planning.htm)
- RBWM Parking Strategy - view at: [http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web\\_pp\\_supplementary\\_planning.htm](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web_pp_supplementary_planning.htm)
- RBWM Strategic Flood Risk Assessment - view at: [http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web\\_pp\\_supplementary\\_planning.htm](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/web_pp_supplementary_planning.htm)

National Planning Policy Framework	
Core Planning Principles	
Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision taking. These twelve principles are that planning should:	
•	be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;
•	not simply be about scrutiny but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;
•	proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities;
•	always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;

•	take account of the different roles and character of different areas promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it;
•	support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change and encourage the reuse of existing resources including conversion of existing buildings and encourage the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy);
•	contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land or development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework;
•	encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;
•	promote mixed use developments and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage or food production);
•	conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations;
•	actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable; and
•	take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

## 6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

### 6.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i whether the proposal amounts to appropriate development in the Green Belt, and if not whether there are any very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness and any other harm caused by the proposal;
- ii the appearance of the development;
- iii impacts on trees and woodland that form an important part of the character of this edge-of-settlement Green Belt site, and the provision of new plantings;
- iv whether the proposal would result in impacts on protected wildlife that would require mitigation;
- v whether the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of sports facilities;
- vi car parking provision and highways matters; and.
- vii Sustainable drainage and building sustainability.

**Whether the proposal amounts to appropriate development in the Green Belt, and if not whether there are any very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness and any other harm caused by the proposal**

- 6.2 NPPF paragraph 89 sets out that Local Planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, with exceptions to this position including limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites that would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. Considered quantitatively, the proposed buildings represent an increase of 14% of the overall existing school buildings footprint of 11,994m<sup>2</sup>. The applicant has noted that the overall school grounds area of 22.25 hectares the built percentage of the school grounds at present comprises 5.4% of the total land area; the new scheme proposals would comprise an additional 0.7% of the school area, resulting the built development at the school amounting to 6.1% of the school grounds overall. The proposed buildings would be close to the existing main cluster of school buildings, close to existing staff housing and student accommodation known as the Mary Ward Courtyard. However, the proposals would represent a southward extension of the complex of school accommodation, and the additional built form would therefore not consist of in-filling.
- 6.3 The application is therefore inappropriate in Green Belt terms, and can therefore only be approved if there is a very special circumstances case that would overcome the proposal's inappropriateness in Green Belt terms. The application advances a case that the need to provide better facilities for its upper sixth form pupils is important to ensure that this age group of pupils is properly provided for within the school. The intention here is to retain existing pupils as they move up the school, rather than to attract significant numbers of sixth form pupils from elsewhere. The proposals result from a wish to improve the standard of both staff and pupils accommodation, and approval of this scheme would allow other accommodation to be refurbished with an improve space ratio both for pupils elsewhere in the school and for some staff. A considerable level of detail has been provided by way of drawings at Appendix 9, in Volume 3 of the Design and Access Statement, showing where some of these refurbishments elsewhere in the school would follow on from the provision of the new accommodation, as part of a long term programme of improvements to the school.
- 6.4 Additional information was sought during the assessment of the application, and has been provided by the applicant, as to whether the standard of accommodation proposed is comparable to that provided elsewhere. The additional information provided sets out that standards of boarding accommodation is dictated by The National Minimum Standards for Boarding Schools. This does not dictate specific minimum standards but is focused on ensuring that boarding accommodation is not overcrowded, using a number of criteria to assess this. The submission goes on to state that proposed accommodation has been designed for 17/18 year old girls studying for their A Levels, which by September 2018 all A Levels will all rest entirely on examination at the end of the Upper Sixth year. This requires individual private and quiet space to sleep and study that is comparable to what pupils at a day school may reasonably expect to enjoy at home. In addition, the school seeks to prepare the pupils for university life and the proposals are designed to achieve that by emulating the environment of a typical Hall of Residence in terms of its size, structure and shared facilities. The areas of the study / bedrooms is therefore intended also to be comparable to that of a live-in university facility, and the following figures have been provided that shows that the space provision would be towards the more modest end of the spectrum as compared to typical Hall of Residence accommodation at a number of universities, with the proposed development referred to here as "MW2" ("Mary Ward 2"):

University	Range	"Average"
Solent University	11m <sup>2</sup> - 13m <sup>2</sup>	12m <sup>2</sup>
Oxford Brookes University	12.2m <sup>2</sup>	12.2m <sup>2</sup>
<b>St Mary's School Ascot – MW2</b>	<b>12.1 – 12.7m<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>12.4 m<sup>2</sup></b>
Edinburgh Napier University	12.5m <sup>2</sup>	12.5m <sup>2</sup>
Goodenough College London	12.7m <sup>2</sup>	12.7m <sup>2</sup>
Northumbria	13m <sup>2</sup>	13m <sup>2</sup>
University of Arts London	13.7m <sup>2</sup>	13.7m <sup>2</sup>
Cardiff University	10.4m <sup>2</sup> - 17.6m <sup>2</sup>	14m <sup>2</sup>
Nottingham University	12.5m <sup>2</sup> - 16.25m <sup>2</sup>	14.4m <sup>2</sup>
LSE	11.6m <sup>2</sup> - 17.1m <sup>2</sup>	14.6m <sup>2</sup>
Southampton University	15m <sup>2</sup>	15m <sup>2</sup>
City University	16m <sup>2</sup> - 18m <sup>2</sup>	17m <sup>2</sup>

- 6.5 Areas of the two 2-bedroom staff houses proposed are similarly modest, at 89 sq. m., and while the detached dwelling is larger at approximately 237 sq.m., the application has made a case that standards of accommodation for teaching staff is also currently cramped; a house of this size would be reasonable accommodation for a senior staff member.
- 6.6 Considered in qualitative terms, it is noted that the fall in ground levels to the south of the main school complex would result in the buildings proposed here being set at a lower level than those for the main school complex. Views across the school grounds from the south they would be viewed against the existing built form, and such views are in any case very restricted from any points that are not within the school grounds. There will be a marginal impact on the openness of the school grounds but this of a lesser degree than would be the case on non-institutional land within the Green Belt. Part of the site is currently in use as tennis courts, so while these may need to be re-provided elsewhere on the school grounds, the impacts on Green Belt openness of development in this part of the site are less than they would be on, for example, agricultural land. Alternatives were considered in the formulation of the proposals, including whether the required accommodation could be provided within the existing buildings and extensions to them. Both these options were however rejected at an early stage of the design process as no sensible extension option was identified that was considered workable from an aesthetic, practical and operational perspective.
- 6.7 The design process then moved to a consideration of five possible sites within the school grounds, and a detailed consideration of this process is set out in the Design and Access Statement. The process found that the proposed site provides the best physical and functional relationship of the five sites considered with the rest of the school complex, and would have the least impact of the alternatives on the amenities of neighbouring properties. These findings are concurred with by officers. It is noted also that one of the sites considered also currently has an existing building which has an important staff accommodation function for the school, and while that site had some merit, its use would have necessitated the demolition of the existing staff accommodation and a likely need for replacement elsewhere within the school. The site selected is considered to be the most satisfactory of the five in functional in locational terms.
- 6.8 Provided that the proposals do not result in any significant net gain in pupil or staff numbers, the proposals would not result in an intensification of activities at the school or associated additional traffic movements on local roads. As the application states that pupil numbers would be capped at 400, this requirement would be satisfied, and can be controlled by condition as recommended below. Overall, it is considered that the accommodation to be provided is commensurate with the needs of the school and its pupils, and that the case made provides a satisfactory very special circumstances case that allows the application to be approved, subject to other criteria being satisfied as discussed below.

### **The appearance of the development**

- 6.9 The proposal exhibits considerable architectural interest, with the buildings being well proportioned to each other and other nearby buildings within the school complex. Variations in roof include off-sets in the two longer two pupil accommodation buildings, which are set a moderate pitch on to the outside of the complex and at a steeper pitch towards the interior courtyard. The Pastoral Centre is a contrasting, predominantly rounded form with a flat green roof over, and this type of roof would also be used for the smaller single storey laundry element. Provided that the proposed buildings would be constructed using high quality materials for their exteriors, it is considered that the appearance of the development would be acceptable.

### **Impacts on trees and woodland, and the provision of new plantings**

- 6.10 The site is close to attractive woodland that includes high quality trees along its edge, adjacent to the larger building within the development. A BS5837:2012 compliant tree survey and constraints plan has been provided. The building would be located away from the root protection areas of the woodland trees to the west, although four specimen trees would be lost on the western side of the site, adjacent to the Mary Ward Courtyard. These comprise two cedars, a Lawson cypress and a red oak. None of the trees are natives or aged trees, and new landscape plantings are indicated on the layout drawings that would provide a considerably greater number of trees than those proposed for removal.

- 6.11 A fifth tree, which is on the access road to the site, is also identified as potentially affected by the proposals. This is also a red oak, one that is much larger than the one identified for removal. Impacts on this tree could arise from the likely adjacent routing of construction traffic. It would be important to ensure that this tree is protected during construction, and further details for this and also the protection of the larger number of woodland trees directly to the west of this site should be required before any works commence in connection with the development.
- 6.12 While the ultimate size of the species and varieties chosen for most of the new plantings will be somewhat constrained by their proximity to the buildings, the massing of trees particularly around the outside perimeter of the complex provides scope for providing an attractive planted setting. This would also provide an opportunity for the selection of species that would improve the already good wildlife habitat in this area.

### **Impacts on protected wildlife**

- 6.13 An assessment of the wildlife and habitat impacts of development on all five sites considered for this development was submitted with the application. Three of the five sites have some wildlife-related constraints to development, to varying degrees. The survey works on the site brought forward in this application has no constraints other than impacts on the adjacent woodland should be avoided. While the Council's ecologist may wish to comment in more detail on the proposals, key provisions are likely to include controls on external lighting to ensure that there is no overt conflict with bats, while choice of appropriate tree and other landscape species as noted above would also be beneficial in ensuring that additional wild food sources, such as berries and nectar, are provided in the landscape plantings.
- 6.14 The application states that there will be no additional staff and no net addition of dwellings at the school. However while the application states that pupil numbers would be capped at 400, it is not stated whether there would be a similar cap on staff numbers. While the application is for Class C2 (residential institutions) rather than C3 use (residential dwellings), any increase would be likely to require mitigation on the impacts of additional residents on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (the SPA). Mitigation could be provided either by provision of land within the school's control as a designated Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), or through a condition that required the school to enter into an agreement under the Local Government act to make a financial contribution towards a SANG that has been provided by the Council and the associated visitor monitoring project, (Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM)). Clarification will be provided in an update.

### **Whether the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of sports facilities**

- 6.15 The proposal would result in the loss of two tennis courts. The School is well provided with sports facilities with considerable investment in indoor and outdoor sports facilities over the last decade and a half. It is not considered that the loss of two tennis courts as proposed would be so detrimental as to require the application to be refused.

### **Car parking, highway issues and servicing**

- 6.16 As the proposal is not expected to generate any additional staff or pupils, there would be no additional car parking provided in association with the development. This would be satisfactory only if the proposal would not result in any additional staff or pupils at the school.

### **Sustainable Drainage and building sustainability**

- 6.17 While the application site is not in a flood prone area, all planning proposals on sites of this size are now required to provide a Sustainable Drainage Strategy. A Drainage Strategy was provided and Council's Flood Risk Manager requested additional information, which was submitted but still not considered to provide significant clarity to allow the application to be approved. Any further information provided before the Panel meeting will be reported in an update, and the recommendation for approval is subject to this issue being fully resolved.
- 6.18 The application includes a very detailed Sustainability Report that addresses the issues in the Council's 'Sustainable Design and Construction' SPD, which is a material consideration in the



assessment of the proposals. While the Sustainability Report shows that high levels of sustainability performance can be secured in the buildings proposed. However, as a wide range of technologies and measures have been considered in the Report to provide for this; clarification of the measures selected would be provided for by the condition as recommended below.

### Other Material Considerations

- 6.19 Berkshire Archaeology has commented that it is unlikely that any archaeology would be present at the site. The applicant has referred to the details submitted for another application at the school in 2012; however, on a precautionary basis, a condition is recommended below with would set out a process to be followed if any unexpected archaeology is revealed during site preparations.
- 6.20 The school has consulted with local residents before submitting the application, including a publicity event that was held prior to the application being made.

## 7. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

### Comments from interested parties

26 occupiers were notified directly of the application. The planning officer posted a statutory notice advertising the application at the site on 24 August 2015.

One letter was received in support of the application, summarised as:

Comment		Where in the report this is considered
1.	The school has kept residents informed and consulted prior to making the application.	6.21
2.	It is important for good quality facilities to be provided at the school.	6.3
3.	The proposal is well thought through.	6.5
4.	Green Belt impacts are minimal.	6.2 - 6.9
5.	The proposals would not lead to an increase in student numbers, and this should be controlled by condition.	6.9

### Statutory consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Parish Council:	The proposals would be an overdevelopment of the site representing a disproportionate increase within the Green Belt, for which no acceptable special circumstances had been submitted. The 11m high accommodation was also considered to be intrusive in design and therefore contrary to policy NP/DG3. The committee further considered that bio-diversity issues and conditions should be considered by the Borough.	6.2 - 6.9

### Other consultees and organisations

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
-----------	---------	--

Flood Risk Manager:	<p>The Addendum provided in the Drainage Statement, Issue 4, dated 25<sup>th</sup> September 2015 indicates that it is proposed to undertake a detailed site investigation including groundwater monitoring and infiltration tests as the proposed scheme progresses to detailed design. No infiltration tests have been undertaken to date and while a factor of safety has been added to the infiltration rates used in the Micro Drainage calculations, submitted as part of the proposed drainage scheme design, significant uncertainty remains regarding the satisfactory operation of the proposed drainage system.</p> <p>Ground conditions and infiltration rates are known to be variable in the Ascot area and accurate infiltration rates should be determined in accordance with BRE Digest 365. If infiltration tests are not to be undertaken prior to determination of the planning application the applicant should demonstrate that alternative surface water drainage provisions not reliant on infiltration are practical.</p> <p>The drain-down times indicated in the Micro Drainage calculations are also excessive and the infiltration scheme design should be reviewed to achieve 50% drain down times within 24hours.</p> <p>If the planning application is to be determined as submitted without the applicant being given the opportunity to submit additional information it is recommended that the application be refused.</p>	6.18
Tree officer:	Comments awaited.	6.11 - 6.13
Ecologist:	<p>The majority of the site comprises amenity grassland and hard standing, which were deemed to be of low ecological value. The eastern boundary of the site comprises woodland with a variety of tree species, some of which are likely to have the potential to support bat roosts. In addition, the woodland edge provides excellent commuting and foraging habitat for bats. It is understood that this area of woodland to the east of the site is to be retained and protected during and after development. It is recommended that in addition to the protection, a 10m buffer is retained between the proposed development and the woodland edge in order to reduce the impact of disturbance to species within the woodland.</p> <p>Other species are also considered in the ecologist's response, and controls recommended by condition.</p>	6.14 - 6.15
Highways Officer:	<p>No objections on highways safety grounds. The response notes that there will be a construction Management Plan. To ensure this is submitted and is acceptable the CMP will be covered by condition. Routing of construction is to be along a woodland track off the schools internal road network. It is stated vehicles will access the site from St Mary Road. Due to St Marys Road being classified as a Private Street which are generally maintained by frontagers the highway authority feels it is essential that the CMP is accompanied by a highway condition survey so as not to put an undue burden on local residents.</p>	6.17
Berkshire Archaeology:	<p>This proposal is an above average scale of development for Sunninghill within a largely undeveloped part of the School grounds. However a series of archaeological investigations</p>	6.19

	and observations were undertaken within the School grounds in 2012, all largely with a negative outcome. On balance, therefore, the likelihood of impacts on buried archaeological remains is low and therefore, should the proposal be permitted, no further action is required as regards the buried archaeological heritage.	
--	---	--

## 8. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site location plan
- Appendix B - layout and elevation drawings
- Appendix C - plan showing the alternative sites considered

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. The Case Officer has sought solutions to these issues where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area, in accordance with NPFF.

In this case the issues have been successfully resolved.

## 9. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission.  
Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- 2 Prior to the commencement of any works of demolition or construction a management plan showing how demolition and construction traffic, (including cranes), materials storage, facilities for operatives and vehicle parking and manoeuvring will be accommodated during the works period and including a pre-commencement road condition survey of St Marys Road, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented as approved and maintained for the duration of the works or as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic and apportionment of any road repairs that may be required following the implementation of the development. Relevant Policies - Local Plan T5 and Neighbourhood Plan NP/T1.
- 3 No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site and no demolition or development shall take place until details of the measures to protect the trees adjacent to the site and to the access road that would be used for construction traffic have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be fully implemented before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site, and thereafter maintained until the completion of all construction work and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been permanently removed from the site. These measures shall include fencing in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: To protect trees which contribute to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1 and N6 and Neighbourhood Plan NP/EN2.
- 4 No construction shall take place in association with the development until a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include details of habitat improvements including provision within the landscaping materials of plants that are of value as wildlife food sources, bat and bird boxes and roosting spaces, and log piles and / or other features that have value for

invertebrates and / or reptiles and details of habitat provision / improvements. The approved mitigation measures, including any additional measures recommended in the survey report(s), shall then be implemented in their entirety within the timescales approved within the strategy.

Reason: In order to comply with advice in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Neighbourhood Plan NP/EN4.

- 5 No development shall take place until a statement has been submitted and approved in writing from the Local Planning Authority that sets out the procedures to be followed during excavation of the development, in the event that any possible archaeological remains are discovered. The approved details shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the continued preservation in situ or by record of any finds made in this area of archaeological interest. Relevant Policies - Local Plan ARCH2 and ARCH4.

- 6 No development shall take place until details of sustainability measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall demonstrate how the development would be efficient in the use of energy, water and materials in accordance with the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document. The development shall be carried out and subsequently retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that measures to make the development sustainable and efficient in the use of energy, water and materials are included in the development and to comply with the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document.

- 7 No works of construction other than site preparation and excavation shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works together with details of the routing of all underground services, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved within the first planting season following the substantial completion of the development and retained in accordance with the approved details. If within a period of five years from the date of planting of any tree or shrub shown on the approved landscaping plan, that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the immediate vicinity, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its prior written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a form of development that maintains, and contributes positively to, the character and appearance of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1 and Neighbourhood Plan NP/EN2, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3.

- 8 The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the building shall be in accordance with those specified in the application unless any different materials are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall then be maintained in accordance with these details.


Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1 and GB2.

- 9 No external lighting shall be installed in association with the approved extensions until details of the appearance and levels of illumination of the structures and fittings to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting (if any) shall be installed and maintained only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to minimise impacts on bats that are likely to be present in the adjacent woodland. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1 and GB2 and Neighbourhood Plan NP/DG2, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3.

- 10 Enrolled pupil numbers at the school shall not exceed 400 at any one time.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory control over any further intensification of activities and occupation within this Green Belt site. Relevant Policies - Local Plan GB1 and GB2, and advice within the NPPF.




*PROPOSED BUILDINGS  
(refer also to Appendix C for site context)*

November 2014 5221-60 B

Proposed Site Location Plan  
Mary Ward 2





0m 2m 4m 6m 8m 10m


**PERSPECTIVE VIEWS KEY**

- 1 View looking North West towards Mary Ward Court
- 2 View looking East towards 4 Bed House
- 3 View in Courtyard looking South West
- 4 View in Courtyard looking North
- 5 View in Courtyard looking North East
- 6 View in Courtyard looking North West
- 7 View in Courtyard looking towards Two Bed House & Pastoral Centre
- 8 View in Courtyard looking South East towards Pastoral Centre
- 9 View in Courtyard looking South towards Pastoral Centre


**ACCOMMODATION KEY**

- PUPIL ACCOMMODATION
- PASTORAL CENTRE
- STAFF 2 BED HOUSE
- STAFF 4 BED HOUSE
- LAUNDRY

0m 2m 4m 6m 10m  
SCALE 1:100 @ A1




Key Plan - Block A  
1 : 500





27

Block A - North West Elevation  
1 : 100




Block A - South East Elevation  
1 : 100


Block A - Proposed Elevations - South East / North West  
St.Mary's School Ascot - Mary Ward 2




Key Plan - Block B - 4 Bedroom Staff House  
1 : 500




Block B - South West Elevation  
1 : 100



Block B - North West Elevation  
1 : 100






Block B - North East Elevation  
1 : 100




Block B - South East Elevation  
1 : 100







Block C - East Elevation  
1 : 100



Block C - West Elevation  
1 : 100




Block C - South Elevation  
1 : 100




Block C - North Elevation  
1 : 100

0m 2m 4m 6m 8m 10m  
SCALE 1:100 @ A1




Key Plan - Block D  
1 : 500




Block D - West Elevation  
1 : 100


30





Block D - East Elevation  
1 : 100




Block D - South Elevation  
1 : 100



Block D - North Elevation  
1 : 100







BLOCK A

PUPIL HOUSE


PUPIL HOUSE

PUPIL HOUSE








33



Block A - Attic Floor Plan

St.Mary's School Ascot - Mary Ward 2







0m 2m 4m 6m 8m 10m  
SCALE 1:100 @ A1





EDGINGTON  
SPINK • HYNE  
CHARTERED  
ARCHITECTS

Blocks B, C & D - Ground Floor Plan  
St.Mary's School Ascot - Mary Ward 2

August 2015 5221 - 159 A










A, B, D and E are the alternatives considered prior to making the application. C is the application site.



- Distance From Main Reception Entrance
- Main Vehicular Routes
- Campus Boundary
- Potential Site Boundary



5221-105 C

Overall Site Analysis - Proposed

Mary Ward 2 - Proposed Sixth Form Accommodation - St Mary's School Ascot

## WINDSOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

18 November 2015

Item: 2

<b>Application No.:</b>	15/03006/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Redwood House Dawn Redwood Close Horton Slough SL3 9QD
<b>Proposal:</b>	Two storey side extension
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Puruthuveetil
<b>Agent:</b>	Asim Hussain - AH Architecture
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Horton Parish

**If you have a question about this report, please contact:** Brian Benzie on 01628 796323 or at [brian.benzie@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:brian.benzie@rbwm.gov.uk)

### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application seeks permission for a two storey side extension. The proposed extensions are considered to be proportionate additions within the Green Belt which would not result in a significant loss of openness to the Green Belt in compliance with the NPPF and the Adopted Local Plan
- 1.2 Overall the extensions, by reason of their design and appearance would respect the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the area in general.
- 1.3 The proposals would not cause an unacceptable loss of light or privacy to adjacent properties, or significantly affect their amenities, nor would they impair highway safety or lead to an inadequate car parking provision within the curtilage of the property.

**It is recommended the Panel grants planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 9 of this report.**

### 2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- At the request of Councillor Rayner as Horton Parish Council consider the proposal to be overdevelopment and overbearing to the adjoining properties in Dawn Redwood Close, the loss of garage will reduce the already limited parking provision, thus creating possible on street parking which is detrimental to highway safety. The current property was created by the sub division of the garden at Freshfields and the Parish Council believe that when approved, due to the limitations of the site Permitted Development Rights were removed by condition. If the latter is confirmed the Parish Council are of the opinion that the removal of PD rights should be upheld as no Special Circumstances have been submitted to override same.

### 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 Redwood House is a modern, detached, 3 bedroom dwelling at the end of a spur road off Dawn Redwood Close in the Parish of Horton. There is a mix of dwelling size and style within the immediate area consisting of terraces, link detached and detached dwellings.
- 3.2 The property is located within the recognized settlement of Horton and therefore within the Green Belt.

### 4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 The application is for full planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension following the demolition of the existing attached garage.
- 4.2 Outline planning permission was granted (ref.462390) in 1984 for the erection of a detached house on part of the rear garden of "Fairfields" with access from Dawn Redwood Close. A

reserved matters application (ref.463918) was granted for the erection of the existing dwelling and attached garage. Conditions were attached to the outline permission which removed all permitted development rights, restricted the use of the garage for the storage of private vehicles or for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house and the limiting the gross habitable floor area of the house to not exceeding 125 sqm excluding garages.

- 4.3 Planning permission for a single storey rear extension was granted under permission ref.466900 of 1988 but the permission has not been implemented.

## 5. MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

### Royal Borough Local Plan

- 5.1 The main strategic planning considerations applying to the site and the associated policies are:

	Within settlement area	Green Belt	Parking
	✓	✓	✓
Local Plan	DG1, H14	GB1, GB2, GB4	P4

## 6. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i impact on Green Belt
- ii impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area in general;
- iii impact on highway safety;
- iv impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties

### Green Belt

- 6.2 Local Plan Policy GB4 identifies that within the Green Belt, residential extensions that do not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling, are considered to be appropriate development in the context of GB1. Within the subtext of the Policy GB4 it is stated that the floor space will be a guiding factor in assessing whether a proposal is in accordance with the policy. However, percentage increases are not the sole determining factor. The bulk and scale of the proposals, their effect on the openness and the purpose of the Green Belt and their impact on the general appearance of the area as well as the individual property will all be considered in assessing a proposal.
- 6.3 In this case, the floor space of the original dwelling is calculated to be 152 sqm, this includes the floor area of the garage as, notwithstanding the condition attached to ref. 462390, the garage could be converted to habitable accommodation without the need for planning permission and therefore its floor space should be included in the calculations.
- 6.4 The increase in floor space as a result of the proposal would be 42 sqm, (11 sqm at ground floor level and 31 sqm at first floor level) and would result in an increase in the floor area of the dwelling by 28% over that of the original dwelling and garage (152 sqm). This is considered to be a fairly modest increase in the size of the dwelling.
- 6.5 The most important attribute of the Green Belt is its openness. The proposed extension would make the dwelling considerably wider at first floor level. However, the first floor extension is set

back from the existing front building line and set down from the existing ridge line and the ground floor extension will be within the envelope of the existing dwelling. Taking this into account it is considered that the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling and would not have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and would be in compliance with Policy GB4 of the Adopted Local Plan.

### **Character and appearance of the area**

- 6.6 The appearance of a development is a material planning consideration and in general terms the design of a proposal should not adversely impact on the character and appearance of the wider street scene. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and is a material planning consideration in the determination of planning decisions. One of the core planning principles contained within the NPPF seeks to ensure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Paragraph 59 of the NPPF concentrates on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new buildings in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.
- 6.7 Local Plan Policy H14 advises that extensions should not have an adverse effect upon the character or appearance of the original property or any neighbouring properties, nor adversely affect the street scene in general. Policy DG1 seeks to secure a high quality standard of design.
- 6.8 The proposed extension is simple in design to match the simple design of the original dwelling and the extension is subservient to the original dwelling. The proposal is considered to respect the appearance and design of the host dwelling and the appearance and character of the street scene would not be harmed.

### **Highway safety**

- 6.9 Notwithstanding the loss of the garage, the site can provide at least three on site parking spaces to the front and side of the property, this being the case sufficient space would remain on the site to accommodate the car parking for the resulting dwelling in compliance with the adopted parking standards in Appendix 7 of the Local Plan as amended by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Parking Strategy, May 2004. There is a sliding gate to the front of the property which does not interfere with the parking spaces and given its location at the end of a cul-de-sac the requirement for the provision of a turning area within the site could not be justified.

### **Living conditions of neighbouring properties.**

- 6.10 It is considered that due to the separation distance between the application properties and the other dwellings in Dawn Redwood Close and Milton Close and the intervening garage blocks that there would be no significant harm caused to those properties in terms of loss of privacy, outlook, daylight, or sunlight neither would the proposal result in an overbearing form of development or result in overdevelopment of the site.

## **7. Other Considerations**

- 7.1 A letter has been received from the Dawn Redwood Close Management Company questioning why the owners of nos. 7, 9 and 11 Dawn Redwood Close all of whom live right next door to the applicant were not notified.
- 7.2 The Local Planning Authority is required to notify all neighbouring properties that share a boundary with the application property in addition a site notice is posted at the property. In this case there are blocks of garages and an associated turning area between the application property and the properties were not notified. However, the comments made have been taken into account in the consideration of this application.
- 7.3 Horton Parish Council has advised that the current property was created by the sub division of the garden at Freshfields and the Parish Council believe that when approved, due to the limitations of the site Permitted Development Rights were removed by condition. If the latter is

confirmed the Parish Council are of the opinion that the removal of PD rights should be upheld as no Special Circumstances have been submitted to override same.

- 7.4 The removal of Permitted Development Rights does not preclude further extensions to the property being made but does allow Local Authorities greater control over the size of the extensions especially considering the recent changes to the General Permitted Development Order. As such all proposed extensions have to be the subject of a full planning application and National and Local Plan Policies are applied in the same way. In this case it is considered that the extension satisfies both National and Local Plan Policies and therefore the applicant is not required to provide a very special circumstance case. The granting of this planning permission does not remove the condition on the original permission that removed 'permitted development' rights.

## 8.0 CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

### Comments from interested parties

3 occupiers were notified directly of the application.

The planning officer posted a statutory notice advertising the application at the site on 22 October 2015.

1 letter was received summarised from the Dawn Redwood Close Management Company which is addressed under Part 7 above.

### Other consultees and organisations

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Horton Parish Council	Overdevelopment and overbearing to the adjoining properties in Dawn Redwood Close.	6.10
	Loss of garage will reduce the already limited parking provision, thus creating possible on street parking which is detrimental to highway safety.	6.9
	The current property was created by the sub division of the garden at Freshfields and the Parish Council believe that when approved, due to the limitations of the site Permitted Development Rights were removed by condition. If the latter is confirmed the Parish Council are of the opinion that the removal of PD rights should be upheld as no Special Circumstances have been submitted to override same.	7.3

## 9. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site location plan
- Appendix B - Floor Plans
- Appendix C - Elevations

Documents associated with the application can be viewed at <http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/pam/search.jsp> by entering the application number shown at the top of this report without the suffix letters.

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. The Case Officer has sought solutions to these issues where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area, in accordance with NPPF.

In this case the issues have been successfully resolved.

**10. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED:**

1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development shall match those of the existing building unless first otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.

3 Prior to the substantial completion of the development a water butt of at least 120L internal capacity shall be installed to intercept rainwater draining from the roof of the building. It shall subsequently be retained.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding and demand for water, increase the level of sustainability of the development and to comply with Requirement 4 of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document.


4 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and plans.

Appendix A – Site Location Plan




Appendix B – Planning Layout





Appendix C - Elevations







## Planning Appeals Received

9 October 2015 - 5 November 2015

### WINDSOR RURAL

The appeals listed below have been received by the Council and will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate. Further information on planning appeals can be found at [www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs) Should you wish to make comments in connection with an appeal, please use the PIns reference number and write to the relevant address, shown below.

**Enforcement appeals:** The Planning Inspectorate, Room 3/23 Hawk Wing, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN or email [teame1@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:teame1@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Other appeals:** The Planning Inspectorate Room 3/10A Kite Wing Temple Quay House 2 The Square Bristol BS1 6PN or email [teamp13@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:teamp13@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Parish/Ward:** Sunninghill And Ascot Parish  
**Appeal Ref.:** 15/00078/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 15/00292/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/15/3134104  
**Date Received:** 9 October 2015      **Comments Due:** 13 November 2015  
**Type:** Refusal      **Appeal Type:** Written Representation  
**Description:** Erection of 2 new dwellings with associated garaging, following demolition of existing dwelling.  
**Location:** **48 Llanvair Drive Ascot SL5 9LN**  
**Appellant:** Mr And Mrs T Brocklehurst **c/o Agent:** Ms Nicola Broderick NMB Planning Ltd 124 Horton Road Datchet Slough SL3 9HE

**Parish/Ward:** Sunningdale Parish  
**Appeal Ref.:** 15/00079/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 15/01428/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/15/3131009  
**Date Received:** 14 October 2015      **Comments Due:** 18 November 2015  
**Type:** Refusal      **Appeal Type:** Written Representation  
**Description:** Erection of detached dwelling with new access  
**Location:** **Land At Oakwood House 15 Sunning Avenue Sunningdale Ascot**  
**Appellant:** Mr And Mrs R Bond **c/o Agent:** Mr Mark Carter Carter Planning Limited 85 Alma Road Windsor Berkshire SL4 3EX

**Parish/Ward:** Sunningdale Parish  
**Appeal Ref.:** 15/00084/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 14/03771/FULL      **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/15/3127972  
**Date Received:** 21 October 2015      **Comments Due:** 25 November 2015  
**Type:** Refusal      **Appeal Type:** Written Representation  
**Description:** Construction of 6x 4 bed dwellings, with associated access, parking, landscaping and infrastructure, following demolition of existing dwelling.  
**Location:** **2 Sunning Avenue Sunningdale Ascot SL5 9PN**  
**Appellant:** Bewley Homes And Joint LPA Receivers of Savills Uk Ltd **c/o Agent:** Mr Mark Carter Carter Planning Limited 85 Alma Road Windsor Berkshire SL4 3EX



# Appeal Decision Report

9 October 2015 - 5 November 2015

## WINDSOR RURAL

**Appeal Ref.:** 15/00042/MINC **Planning Ref.:** 15/00072/ADV **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/Z/15/3026351  
**Appellant:** Mitchells And Butlers Retail Ltd **c/o Agent:** Mr Andy Rushby Assent Planning Consultancy Ltd Unit 4 Navigation Court Calder Park Wakefield West Yorkshire WF2 7BJ  
**Decision Type:** Committee **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Consent to display 2x internally illuminated fascia signs, 4 x non illuminated signs and 2 x internally illuminated signs. (retrospective)  
**Location:** **The Bells of Ousley Straight Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2SH**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed **Decision Date:** 12 August 2015

**Main Issue:** The existing public house is an existing commercial presence in what is preponderantly a residential area. Notwithstanding that, it is reasonable, in principle, to allow a public house to advertise its presence. However, the advertisements that have been installed on and around the building make the building appear cluttered and the site overburdened with signage. This proliferation is seen as a pronounced and obtrusive addition to the street-scene, which appears as a strident contrast with the surrounding residential area. On that basis, the advertisements have had a significantly harmful impact on the building, and, as a result, the amenity of the wider area. This brings them into conflict with the approach of the Framework and Policy ADV1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Incorporating Alterations Adopted in June 2003), which is a material consideration. This policy states that advertisements that would be out of keeping with the character of a building or its surroundings or would be detrimental to amenity by reason of, amongst other things, general design, size and position, will not be permitted.

**Appeal Ref.:** 15/00048/REF **Planning Ref.:** 14/03801/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/15/3074181  
**Appellant:** Mr Martin Bredner- Wentworth Homes **c/o Agent:** Mr Ian Phillips Cunnane Town Planning Churchward House 4 Foundry Court Gogmore Lane Chertsey Surrey KT16 9AP  
**Decision Type:** Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Description:** Erection of 3x detached two storey dwellings with access driveways following the demolition of 9 Llanvair Close.  
**Location:** **9 Llanvair And Rear of 11 Llanvair Close Ascot**  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed **Decision Date:** 4 November 2015

**Main Issue:** The Inspector commented that the form and layout of the proposed development has two insurmountable shortcomings, the first regarding the cramped arrangement of the forward part of Plot 1 and the access drive from Llanvair Close and, the second, concerning the visual impact on Hurstwood. The Inspector commented that the dwelling on Plot 3 would appear unduly dominant especially when viewed from the rear of No 47 Hurstwood and its immediate neighbours. The Inspector considered that these considerations demonstrate that the proposed development would be significantly out of character with the surrounding area and in conflict with the provisions of Policies DG1, H10, H11 and NP/DG1-2. The Inspector also concluded that the socio-economic benefit of two additional dwellings would be demonstrably outweighed by the environmental harm to the character of the local area and to neighbouring amenity.

**Appeal Ref.:** 15/00051/REF      **Planning Ref.:** 15/00525/FULL      **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/15/  
3063811

**Appellant:** Mount Kellet Limited **c/o Agent:** Mr Sam Tiffin Progress Planning 5 Emenio Station Road  
Beaconsfield Buckinghamshire HP9 1AU

**Decision Type:** Committee      **Officer Recommendation:** Application  
Permitted

**Description:** Six detached dwellings with access from Nursery Place following demolition of the existing  
properties.

**Location:** **6 - 7 Newton Lane Old Windsor Windsor**

**Appeal Decision:** Allowed      **Decision Date:** 23 October 2015

**Main Issue:** The appeal Inspector considered that the siting and layout of the proposed development  
would be similar to that of the recently completed development to the north and would not  
appear out of place with its surroundings. The Inspector expressed the opinion that it would  
provide a suitable transition between the recently completed scheme and the generally  
smaller scale established buildings in Newton Lane and there was no reason why it would  
not create a safe and secure environment. He concluded there would be no harm to  
character and no conflict with the NPPF and Local Plan Policies DG1, H10, H11. The  
Inspector also concluded that the proposed development would not unduly harm the living  
conditions of the adjoining occupiers.

---

This page is intentionally left blank