Planning Appeals Received



16 July - 8 September 2016

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:

Sunninghill And Ascot Parish Parish:

Appeal Ref.: 16/60074/REF Planning Ref.: 16/00438/FULL PIns Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/

3152097

Date Received: 18 July 2016 **Comments Due:** 22 August 2016 Type: Refusal Appeal Type: Written Representation **Description:** Replacement dwelling with lower ground and basement and detached garage with

accommodation above following demolition of existing dwelling.

Sunnycroft Larch Avenue Ascot SL5 0AP Location:

Crownvale Properties Ltd c/o Agent: Ms Louise Morton Quadrant Town Planning Ltd The Appellant:

Office 14 Harcourt Close Henley-On-Thames Oxfordshire RG9 1UZ

Ward:

Parish: Old Windsor Parish

16/60076/NONDET 16/01175/FULL APP/T0355/W/16/ Appeal Ref.: Planning Ref.: PIns Ref.:

3154088

22 August 2016 **Date Received:** 18 July 2016 **Comments Due:** Type: Non-determination Appeal Type: Written Representation **Description:** Erection of 4 x dwellings with associated works, following demolition of existing garage block Location:

Garages To The South West of Lynwood Cottages Robin Willis Way Old Windsor

Windsor

Appellant: Mr Christopher Andrews c/o Agent: Mr David Stewart David J Stewart Associates Bloxham

Business Centre Barford Road Bloxham Banbury OX15 4FF

Ward:

Parish: Sunningdale Parish

Appeal Ref.: 16/60080/REF Planning Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/ 16/00159/FULL PIns Ref.:

3149232

Date Received: 3 August 2016 **Comments Due:** 7 September 2016 Type: Refusal Appeal Type: Written Representation

Description: Construction of detached replacement dwelling, with associated off road parking, access and

landscaping following demolition of existing buildings

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

Appellant: Mr T Malhas c/o Agent: Mr Jason O'Donnell Arktec Ltd Lodge Farm Barn Elvetham Park

Estate Fleet Road Hartley Wintney Hampshire RG27 8AS

Ward:

Parish: Sunninghill And Ascot Parish

16/60081/REF Appeal Ref.: Planning Ref.: 16/00117/FULL Pins Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/

3154153

Date Received:9 August 2016Comments Due:13 September 2016Type:RefusalAppeal Type:Written Representation

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

Appellant: Mr Martin Brebner - Wentworth Homes c/o Agent: Mr Ian Phillips Cunnane Town Planning

Churchward House 4 Foundry Court Gogmore Lane Chertsey Surrey KT16 9AP

Appeal Decision Report

16 July - 8 September 2016

Windsor Rural



Appeal Ref.: 16/60044/PRPA Planning Ref.: 15/03663/TPO Plns Ref.: APP/TPO/T0355/

5203

Appellant: Mr Peter Baker 21 Huntsmans Meadow Ascot SL5 7PF

Decision Type: Officer Recommendation: Partial

Refusal/Partial

Approval

Description: (T1) Blue Atlantic Cedar - Fell (T2) Norway Maple - fell. (TPO 22 of 1998)

Location: 21 Huntsmans Meadow Ascot SL5 7PF

Appeal Decision: Dismissed Decision Date: 21 July 2016

Main Issue: The felling of the tree, coupled with that of the adjacent Norway maple, will detract from the

amenity of the area. The Council has granted consent for limited shortening of the crown spread. The Inspector found that this is of satisfactory scale to the setting and accordingly did not conclude that the tree is far too big for its setting. The tree contributes to the

appearance and setting of the end of the Huntsmans Meadow development.

Appeal Ref.: 16/60050/REF Planning Ref.: 16/00099/FULL Plns Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/

3147260

Appellant: Cruciate Properties Ltd c/o Agent: Mr George Vasdekys Salisbury Jones Planning 33

Bassein Park Road London W12 9RW

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

Description: Change of use from B1 Business to B1 Business and D1 Medical, installation of 1 external

extract grille for quench pipe at first floor level to rear elevation

Location: Unit 6 Queens Square Ascot Business Park Lyndhurst Road Ascot SL5 9FE

Appeal Decision: Allowed Decision Date: 17 August 2016

Main Issue: The inspector concluded that the appeal proposal is an appropriate location in principle for

the proposed development in the light of local and national planning policies. She found neither conflict with Policy E5 of the Local Plan nor Policy NP/E2 of the NP which seek to support and protect employment land. She also found no conflict with paragraph 22 of the

Framework the aims of which are set out above.

Appeal Ref.: 16/60055/REF Planning Ref.: 15/02474/FULL Plns Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/

3147112

Appellant: Mr G Assaiante c/o Agent: Mr Mark Carter Carter Planning Limited 85 Alma Road Windsor

Berkshire SL4 3EX

Decision Type: Delegated Officer Recommendation: Refuse

Description: Two storey extension to south elevation and part two storey, part first floor extension to East

elevation and new garage replacing conservatory. Construction of four dwelling terrace with associated bin store and alterations to driveway following demolition of existing stable block

and garage

Location: Moram House Datchet Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2RQ

Appeal Decision: Allowed Decision Date: 17 August 2016

Main Issue: The Inspector considered that the mature landscaping of the site and surroundings and the

substantial set back from the road would ensure that the building held a recessive position in the street scene. The Inspector considered that the building would be part of a complex within a well landscaped area, which would sit comfortably with the character of its immediate surroundings and the pockets of development in landscaped surroundings. The Inspector recognised that the proposed terraced plots would subdivide the rear amenity space into individual gardens and these would produce plots that would be narrower than surrounding plots, and whilst this potentially could have an effect on the character of an area, the Inspector was satisfied that given the set back of the site, the location of the proposed terrace building, the relationship with adjoining properties and the location of public vantage points this would not be readily visible in the area. They concluded that there would not be a significant effect on the appearance of the area and the wider character would not be substantially harmed. The Inspector was of the view that the additional housing provision in the absence of a five year housing land supply was of significant local and district benefit. They also thought that the increased flood storage capacity and improved water run-off were site specific and the economic benefits resultant from occupation would be into the local economy which were wider sustainability benefits, which met the requirements of the Exceptions Test. In respect of the use of voids, the Inspector addressed the concerns from the Council over potential blockage either from storage or debris, however, the Inspector concluded that not using voids was not part of policy F1, and therefore had less weight. It was also from a policy document from 1999. The Inspector considered the use of voids was

acceptable.

Appeal Ref.: 16/60061/PRPA **Planning Ref.:** 16/00182/TPO **Plns Ref.:** APP/TPO/T0355/

5239

Appellant: Judith Macfarlane c/o Agent: Mr Ben Abbatt Sapling Arboriculture Ltd 94 Mount Pleasant

Road Alton Hants GU34 2RS

Decision Type: Officer Recommendation: Partial

Refusal/Partial Approval

Description: (T1) Oak, crown reduction to final height of 14m and radial branch spread of 6m.

Location: 3 Stonehill Gate Hancocks Mount Ascot SL5 9WA

Appeal Decision: Allowed **Decision Date:** 30 August 2016

Main Issue: The appeal oak tree makes a contribution to the local landscape and the proposed pruning is

likely to have a moderate adverse effect on the shape and form of the appeal tree and on amenity. On the basis of the evidence the Inspector finds the reasons for pruning marginally outweigh the amenity value of the tree and warrant the proposed works. The Inspector concluded that the proposed pruning of the appeal oak tree is warranted on the evidence

and therefore allows the appeal, subject to conditions.

Appeal Ref.: 16/00026/REF Planning Ref.: 15/02473/FULL Plns Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/

3144941

Appellant: Mr Richard Barter - Millgate c/o Agent: Mr Paul Dickinson Paul Dickinson And Associates

Highway House Lower Froyle Hants GU34 4NB

Decision Type: Committee Officer Recommendation: Defer Legal

Agreement

Description: Conversion of The White House and The Wee Flat from offices into residential dwellings

Location: The White House And Wee Flat Englemere Estate Kings Ride Ascot

Appeal Decision: Allowed Decision Date: 7 September 2016

Main Issue:

Appeal Ref.: 16/00027/REF Planning Ref.: 15/02450/VAR Plns Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/

3144940

Appellant: Mr Richard Barter - Millgate c/o Agent: Mr Paul Dickinson Paul Dickinson And Associates

Highway House Lower Froyle Hants GU34 4NB

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

Permitted

Description: Redevelopment to provide 17 apartments with basement car park and associated works

following demolition of existing buildings and removal of hardstanding areas as approved under planning permission 13/03515 without complying with condition 18 (demolition of

outbuildings) to include the retention of The White House and The Wee Flat

Location: Former Englemere House Englemere Estate Kings Ride Ascot

Appeal Decision: Allowed Decision Date: 7 September 2016

Main Issue:

Appeal Ref.: 16/60066/NOND Planning Ref.: 16/01179/FULL Plns Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/

ET 3152607

Appellant: Mr Dudley Mills - Kebbell Developments Ltd c/o Agent: Mr Paul Dickinson Paul Dickinson

And Associates Highway House Lower Froyle Hants GU34 4NB

Decision Type: Committee **Officer Recommendation:** Would Have

Approved

Description: Erection of 5 x apartments with associated works

Location: Land At Hill House Cross Road Sunningdale Ascot

Appeal Decision: Dismissed Decision Date: 7 September 2016

Main Issue: The main issues considered were the effect on the appearance and life expectancy of a

large protected oak tree to the rear of the proposed apartment building, and the effect on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and SSSI. The Inspector concluded that relationship between the proposed building and the protected oak tree would be satisfactory, but dismissed the appeals because there were no satisfactory measures in place to mitigate

the impact on the SPA / SSSI.

Impacts on the privacy of neighbours were also considered. The Inspector considered that the relationship of the proposed building with the neighbouring Richmond House and Hill

House would be satisfactory in terms of privacy, light and visual impacts.

Appeal Ref.: 16/60067/NOND Planning Ref.: 16/00266/FULL Plns Ref.: APP/T0355/W/16/

ET

3147424

Appellant: Kebbell Developments Ltd c/o Agent: Mr Paul Dickinson Paul Dickinson And Associates

Highway House Lower Froyle Hampshire GU34 4NB

Decision Type: Committee **Officer Recommendation:** Would Have

Approved

Description: Erection of 4 x apartments (3 x 2 bed and 1x 3 bed). **Location:** Land At Hill House Cross Road Sunningdale Ascot

Appeal Decision: Dismissed Decision Date: 7 September 2016

Main Issue: The main issues considered were the effect on the appearance and life expectancy of a

large protected oak tree to the rear of the proposed apartment building, and the effect on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and SSSI. The Inspector concluded that relationship between the proposed building and the protected oak tree would be satisfactory, but dismissed the appeals because there were no satisfactory measures in place to mitigate

the impact on the SPA / SSSI.

Impacts on the privacy of neighbours were also considered. The Inspector considered that the relationship of the proposed building with the neighbouring Richmond House and Hill

House would be satisfactory in terms of privacy, light and visual impacts.