

Planning Appeals Received

11 October 2017 - 3 November 2017



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.:	17/60098/REF	Planning Ref.:	17/00939/CPD	PIns Ref.: APP/T0355/X/17/31 82211
Date Received:	31 October 2017	Comments Due:	12 December 2017	
Type:	Refusal	Appeal Type:	Written Representation	
Description:	Certificate of Lawfulness to determine whether the proposed erection of outbuilding (leisure building) and provision of related hard standing is lawful.			
Location:	Greenwood The Covert Ascot SL5 9JS			
Appellant:	Mr M Willis c/o Agent: Mr Murray Chrystal Woolf Bond Planning The Mitfords Basingstoke Road Three Mile Cross Reading RG7 1AT United Kingdom			

Appeal Decision Report

11 October 2017 - 3 November 2017

WINDSOR RURAL



Appeal Ref.: 17/60028/REF **Planning Ref.:** 15/02727/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/16/3160065

Appellant: Mr Rob Bolton - Altitude (Ascot) Ltd **c/o Agent:** Mr Matthew Stimson Shoosmiths LLP Witan Gate House 500 - 600 Witan Gate West Milton Keynes MK9 1SH

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

Description: Redevelopment of the waste transfer station to provide 12 No. dwellings and associated landscaping and car parking.

Location: **Oakfield Farm Wells Lane Ascot SL5 7DY**

Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 17 October 2017

Main Issue: Proposal amounts of inappropriate development in Green Belt and would be harmful to character of the area. It was considered that the proposal would have a neutral impact on openness. Against the harm there are moderate benefits arising from the cessation of the use, significant benefits relating to remediation of the site, the woodland and ecology and substantial benefits in relation to housing provision. Collectively these represent benefits that would clearly outweigh the totality of the harm identified. Given the findings in regards to the Green Belt the proposal is considered to be sustainable development and in respect of the presumption set out in paragraph 14 of the Framework should not be resisted.

Appeal Ref.: 17/60070/NOND **Planning Ref.:** 17/01065/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/W/17/3177412
Appellant: Heywood Real Estate 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: Erection of two detached houses with integral garages and revised access arrangements, following the demolition of the existing house.
Location: **The Chalet Ravensdale Road Ascot SL5 9HJ**
Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 26 October 2017
Main Issue: The Inspector concluded that the shadowing caused by protected trees would significantly reduce the amenity of the back garden of plot 2 and would prevent light reaching the habitable rooms at the back of the house. This effect on the living environment of the future occupiers of plot 2 would lead to a significant risk of pressure to severely cut-back or fell them. The Inspector considered that the loss of these trees would reduce the wooded setting of the site and its contribution to the sylvan character of the area. The Inspector acknowledged that the proposal would contribute to reducing the Council's housing land supply shortfall and provide a social benefit. It would bring economic benefits from its construction and from the spending in the local economy of the future occupiers. However, as the proposal would provide only 2 houses, these benefits in the economic and social dimensions of sustainable development weigh only modestly in favour of the proposal. The Inspector concluded therefore that they would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse impact of the development on the character of the surrounding area.

Appeal Ref.: 17/60080/REF **Planning Ref.:** 16/03202/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/3175740
Appellant: Mr Stuart Kinner **c/o Agent:** Mr Neil Davis Davis Planning Ltd 19 Woodlands Avenue Winnersh Wokingham Berkshire RG41 3HL
Decision Type: Delegated **Officer Recommendation:** Refuse
Description: Replace existing property border with new wall, pillars, rear fence panels and front railings (retrospective).
Location: **2 Oakdene Sunningdale Ascot SL5 0BU**
Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 11 October 2017
Main Issue: The Inspector found that the perceived benefits of the scheme to the appellant, without appropriate long-term mitigation, are clearly outweighed by the harm caused to the public realm (impact on street scene).

Appeal Ref.: 17/60082/REF **Planning Ref.:** 16/03443/FULL **Plns Ref.:** APP/T0355/D/17/3178951

Appellant: Mr Christopher Barry **c/o Agent:** Mr Peter Bird Bird Charles Surveyors Ltd Unit 1 Queen Square Ascot Business Park Lyndhurst Road Ascot SL5 9FE

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

Description: Two storey side extension

Location: **22 Murray Court Ascot SL5 9BP**

Appeal Decision: Dismissed **Decision Date:** 19 October 2017

Main Issue: The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies DG1 and H14 of the Local Plan and Policies NG/DG2 and NP/DG3 of the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan 2014. The development would also conflict with the Council's Guidance Note 1 on House Extensions which specifies that a minimum gap of at least one metre should be kept between any wall of a two storey extension and a boundary with an adjoining property to provide a visual separation between properties.
