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27th May 2020

Dear Shelley

**20/01047/FULL Swan Lodge Charters Road Sunningdale Ascot SL5 9QF**

**Garage conversion, new entrance canopy, single storey side lean-to extension, first floor side extension, part single part two storey rear extension, removal of render and exposed timber framing, new render and part timber panelling to front elevation, new front and part side boundary wall with replacement and repositioned vehicular and pedestrian entrance gates.**

The Parish Council **objected** to the previous application, 20/00273 FULL as the proposed front rendered wall conflicted with **NP/DG2.2** and **NP/DG3.1.**

Using established walls, railings or hedges where such features are important to the area as well as using green hedges wherever possible was to be encouraged as stated under the planning guidelines.

The photographs included in the Parish Councils letter objecting to 20/00273 clearly showed the existing green hedge along the front boundary of Swan Lodge was typical of the road and in this very public location could justifiably be seen as an important feature of the area.   
  
The rendered wall proposed under 20/00273 has now been substituted in this application with a timber board fence (at the same height as the rendered wall) with planting proposed in front.

It might be argued that the timber board fence is a slight improvement on the rendered wall but this still conflicts with **NP/ DG2.2** and **NP/ DG3.1** as the existing green hedge (which must be viewed as an important feature) is again proposed for complete removal.

The timber fence also appears to be very close to the front boundary giving little space for the proposed ‘*dense planting infront’* asproposed.

An earlier application on this site (17/00084) went to Appeal for approval of a car port in front of the house. The Inspector concluded that **the effective front boundary screening (ie the existing hedge) allowed the car port to be permitted at Appeal as it was an effective screen.** The implication therefore is that without the hedge being present 17/00084 would have failed at Appeal

Hence, removal of the front boundary hedge was partly responsible for the refusal of 20/00273 and 17/00084 was approved at Appeal mainly because the Inspector judged the front boundary hedge to be an effective screen.

The Parish Council therefore fail to understand why the applicant has again recommended removal of this hedge. Substituting it with a rendered wall as in 20/00273 or a timber boarded fence (even with planting in front) as in 20/01047 is not a substitute for removal of the hedge.

The Parish Council request this application is **REFUSED**

Regards

Yvonne Jacklin and Michael Burn

Co-Chairs of Planning