



Planning Appeals Received

7 October 2016 - 1 December 2016

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 <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> 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

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

Ward:

Parish: Sunningdale Parish

Appeal Ref.: 16/60104/REF **Planning Ref.:** 16/01127/FULL **PIns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/16/3161016

Date Received: 30 November 2016

Comments Due: 4 January 2017

Type: Refusal

Appeal Type: Written Representation

Description: 2 No. new dwellings with basement garage and associated landscaping following demolition of existing 2 No. dwellings and associated garaging.

Location: Sandhills And Sandhills Cottage And The Sunningdale Osteopathic Sandhills Cottage Cross Road Sunningdale Ascot

Appellant: Mr Michael Smith **c/o Agent:** Mrs Rosalind Gall Kevin Scott Consultancy Sentinel House Ancells Business Park Harvest Crescent Fleet Hampshire GU51 2UZ



Appeal Decision Report

7 October 2016 - 1 December 2016

WINDSOR RURAL

Appeal Ref.: 16/60051/REF **Planning Ref.:** 15/03090/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/16/3145589

Appellant: Kebbell Homes Ltd **c/o Agent:** Mr Duncan Gibson Duncan Gibson Consultancy 74 Parsonage Lane Windsor SL4 5EN

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

Description: Redevelopment of site to provide 6 x 3 bedroom apartments

Location: **The Little House Charters Road Sunningdale Ascot SL5 9QF**

Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 28 October 2016

Main Issue: The Inspector considered that overall the apartment building is consistent with the character and appearance of the area which is generally that of relatively large scale residential development set back from the road, with spacious and deep plots with mature gardens. The Inspector commented that garages prominently sited in front of various types of residential buildings in this part of the street scene are part of the character of the area and their inclusion within this scheme would not stand out as a departure from this pattern of development. The Inspector also commented that the extent of the development within the site and its effect on spaciousness would be similar to that previously approved under planning permission 14/01846 and would not result in an over development of the site. The Inspector accepted that the Section 111 Agreement signed by both the Council and the appellant would secure the required mitigation for the Thames Basin Heath SPA.

Appeal Ref.: 16/60070/REF **Planning Ref.:** 15/03143/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/16/3152712
Appellant: Mr David Holmes - G F Falconer Sorbon 24 - 26 Aylesbury End Beaconsfield Buckinghamshire HP9 1LW
Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse
Description: Construction of barn
Location: **Land At Priory Stables Church Road Old Windsor Windsor**
Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 11 October 2016

Main Issue: The Inspector considered that the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and on important views from the River Thames. The lack of a detailed assessment on the effect on the scheduled ancient monument meant that the Inspector was not satisfied that the development would not have an adverse effect on this nationally important heritage asset. The Inspector gave this harm great weight. The Inspector commented that the proposal would reduce the amount of traffic visiting the site and there would be economic advantage through reduction in the number of visits and through the loss of hay and straw to weather, giving these benefits limited weight in support of the proposal. Overall, the Inspector considered that these other considerations do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and the other harm. Very special circumstances do not exist in this case.

Appeal Ref.: 16/60071/NOND ET **Planning Ref.:** 16/00947/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/16/3153212
Appellant: Heywood Real Estates (The Chalet) Ltd **c/o Agent:** Mr Robert Clarke R Clarke Planning Ltd Kewferry Farm Rickmansworth Road Northwood Middlesex HA6 2RF
Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Would Have Refused
Description: Two detached houses with integral garages and revised access arrangements following demolition of existing house
Location: **The Chalet Ravensdale Road Ascot SL5 9HJ**
Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 11 October 2016

Main Issue: The Inspector considered that the proximity of the trees to the south, particularly for Plot 1, would give rise to pressure for otherwise unnecessary works to the protected trees either to allow light into the properties or allow reasonable sized garden for these family houses. Such works would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Within the constraints of the site, the development would be incompatible with the character of the area and would not display a high standard of design in that it fails to take appropriate account of the constraint of trees. Given that records show that protected species are present in the area and that the building to be demolished could provide roosting opportunities there is a reasonable likelihood of bats being present. That being the case, and given the creation of dwellings is not an exceptional occurrence, this matter should not be left to conditions after planning permission has been granted. The Inspector considered that there would be no adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of Elmwood House. The Inspector considered that the imposition of a negatively worded condition to secure payments via a Section 111 agreement towards the delivery of SANG and SAMM, did not meet the tests for conditions as set out in paragraph 206 of the Framework or the guidance in the PPG.

Appeal Ref.: 16/60080/REF **Planning Ref.:** 16/00159/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/16/
3149232

Appellant: Mr T Malhas **c/o Agent:** Mr Jason O'Donnell Arktec Ltd Lodge Farm Barn Elvetham Park
Estate Fleet Road Hartley Witney Hampshire RG27 8AS

Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse

Description: Construction of detached replacement dwelling, with associated off road parking, access and
landscaping following demolition of existing buildings

Location: **Oak Cottage 1 High Street Sunningdale Ascot SL5 0LX**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 21 October 2016

Main Issue: The Inspector stated that although the proposed dwelling would sit lower than the adjacent
property 3 High Street, it would be taller, by some 490mm, and would have a higher eaves
level. It would also be visually bulkier than No 3, and the other properties along this side of
High Street, due to it having a full second storey. A two storey dwelling in this position would
therefore be at odds with the pattern of development along this section of High Street, where
taller properties are located on the opposite side on lower ground, and lower single storey
and chalet style properties are on the side of the appeal site.
