



SUNNINGDALE PARISH COUNCIL

The Pavilion, Broomhall Lane, Sunningdale, SL5 0QS

☎ 01344 874268

Email: info@sunningdaleparish.org.uk

www.sunningdale-pc.org.uk

Clerk: Ruth Davies

Briony Franklin
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Town Hall, St Ives Road
Maidenhead, Berks SL6 1RF

16th December 2020

Dear Briony,

**20/03102 Hill House Cross Road Sunningdale Ascot SL5 9RX
Erection of 9 no. apartments with basement parking, cycle and bin stores following demolition of existing dwelling**

The Planning Committee considered this application at its meeting on 15 December 2020 and **STONGLY OBJECTS** to this application.

This is the sixth application for a flatted development on this site. Of these six, only one application for a block of 5 flats (17/00120) has been approved. The other four were all refused, and some dismissed on Appeal, as shown below.

- 13/02972 - Refused and Dismissed on Appeal
- 14/01029 - Refused
- 18/00624 - Refused and Dismissed on Appeal
- 20/00780 – Refused

This latest application is now for a block of 9 flats. Whilst we acknowledge that an attempt has been made to reduce the footprint and bulk of the block (from these previously refused schemes), many of the reasons for refusal made by Planning Officers and Planning Inspectors with respect to these refused applications still apply. These are set out below:

1. Scale and Character

The scale of the proposed apartment building would make it appear dominant within the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The changes proposed within this application are not sufficient to address the issues raised under the previous applications and appeals with regards to scale and character.

Quoting the Inspector from Appeal (APP/T0355/W/19/3221751),

“The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and as such would conflict with saved Policies H10, H11 and DG1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (Local Plan) the relevant parts of which require new development to display high standards of design and be of a scale and design that is compatible with the character and amenity of the area. The development would also conflict with the part of saved Policy N6 of the Local Plan which requires new development to allow for the retention of existing suitable trees. The scheme would also conflict with the parts of Policies NP/DG1, NP/DG2 and NP/DG3 which require new development to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, be of a similar density, footprint, separation, scale

and built form to surrounding buildings, and in areas designated as 'leafy residential suburbs' retain and enhance the sylvan, leafy nature of the area. Similarly, the scheme would not reflect the provisions made in Policies NP/EN2 and NP/EN3 of the Neighbourhood Plan which requires that proposals for new dwellings on private residential gardens should not result in an unacceptable impact on the landscape and environmental value of the site and should seek to retain mature or important trees".

2. Trees

Trees on the site are subject to a TPO. We note that this design at the rear of the proposed building is narrower than the front and as such moves the rear section of the left flank away from the tall mature oak (T17). However, this change has had the effect of moving the rear section of the right flank closer to the bank of trees and hedge forming the boundary with Sunningdale Heath Golf Club. This shift now means that trees T42 and T43 are still compromised by such close proximity to the building. T43 is directly East of the windows of three bedrooms on all three floors, effectively screening the direct morning sunlight from these rooms. It is inconceivable that these trees would not cause issues over time to the occupants of these flats, due to their close proximity. There would also be a 'pinch point' here as all construction traffic would pass this narrow point to gain access to the rear of the building directly over the tree RPA.

Quoting the Inspector from Appeal (APP/T0355/W/19/3221751),

"The design of the scheme before me would also not overcome the pressure to prune the trees that would be generated by the perceived nuisance generated by issues such as blocked gutters from falling leaves, roosting birds and fears associated with dominance. This would result in a detrimental impact on the verdant character and appearance of the area given the positive contribution made by the trees. The presence of the TPO designation would not overcome the pressure that would be placed on the trees."

We also have major concerns about the close proximity between the underground parking area access ramp and the row of hedging and trees which runs alongside it. The Planning Statement emphasises the importance of retaining this hedging and trees as it states: *'The development retains the tall conifer hedge G3 (14 metres high) on the Eastern boundary... screening the building from view from Cross road'.*

The current Hill House property is almost hidden when viewed across the golf course from Cross Road. The Parish Council cannot see how the proposed new turning circle and the ramp to the basement can be constructed (when they are shown to be positioned so close to this Eastern boundary) without harm to the tree RPA's and important hedgerow located along all this boundary. We were also unable to see any detailed reference in the application to the trees or hedgerow in this location or to the proposed construction method of the ramp given that excavation of the ramp sides must surely be at an angle to avoid any collapse.

3. Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

The site is located within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, however, outside of the 2km catchment area for Allen's Field.

The applicant would need to provide contributions toward the Council's costs in mitigating the effect of the development on the SPA.

We urge you to **REFUSE** this application.

Yvonne Jacklin and Michael Burn
Co-chairs of Planning