



# SUNNINGDALE PARISH COUNCIL

The Pavilion, Broomhall Lane, Sunningdale, SL5 0QS

☎ 01344 874268

Email: [info@sunningdaleparish.org.uk](mailto:info@sunningdaleparish.org.uk)

[www.sunningdale-pc.org.uk](http://www.sunningdale-pc.org.uk)

Clerk: Ruth Davies

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

8<sup>th</sup> February 2021

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.

When **REFUSING 20/00273** you wrote (Section 5.4):

***'The proposed wall (and posts) shown on the submitted plans would be out-of-keeping with the character and appearance of the local area. In terms of impact on the street scene, the existing green hedging would be replaced by a 2.2m high rendered wall (with 2.7m high posts) and gates of similar height. This would erode the general feeling of the leafy suburb and its sense of openness. As such, the proposed boundary wall would be contrary to Policy DG1 of the Local Plan and Policy DG1.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.'***

The revised scheme **20/01047** proposed a timber board fence to substitute the rendered wall.

In the Parish Council's letter of May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020 responding to **20/01047** we commented that:

***'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 in front' as proposed.'***

In your officer delegated report for **20/01047** you kindly responded to the Parish Council's observations about the treatment of the front boundary when you wrote under section 5.4:

***A proposed wall (and posts) was refused along the front boundary under the previous planning application. It was considered out-of-keeping with the character and appearance of the local area. A proposed 2m high timber fence is considered more in-keeping. Dense planting is also proposed in front which would comply with Policy DG3.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan which advocates using green hedging for highway boundaries wherever possible and in keeping with the existing streetscape. Access gates (with posts) are also proposed, and these are also considered acceptable.***

In addition, the planning application **20/01047** was granted with a specific condition (No. 3) which states *“The proposed fence shall not be erected until full details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved within the first planting season following the erection of the fence and retained in accordance with the approved details.”*

As can be seen from the photographs below taken in February 2021 the applicant has taken down the hedge and substituted this with a solid wall instead of a timber fence.

No planning application has been submitted to address Planning Condition 3 – which clearly requested details of the soft landscaping in front of the ‘timber fence’.



This is therefore in complete contradiction to the approved plans and, we would have thought frustrating, given the time that you had obviously spent refusing the solid brick wall and then agreeing the timber fence for the front boundary which the applicant would have been fully aware of.

The Parish Council, and I am sure yourself, would feel aggrieved if the applicant were now to submit a retrospective variation to substitute the timber fence for a brick wall which was then subsequently approved. Such an action would make a mockery of the planning procedure especially as you had judged this proposed boundary wall to be contrary to Policy DG1 of the Local Plan and Policy DG1.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. As the brick wall is a stand-alone feature its demolition should be relatively straightforward.

We also do not understand how it will be possible for the applicant to find sufficient space in front of the brick wall to carry out the **‘dense planting in front’** as proposed under **20/01047**. As can be seen in the photograph above, the gap for such planting is minimal.

Below is the original boundary hedge. It is unfortunate this was removed.



We have also copied this letter to RBWM Planning Enforcement.

Kind regards,

Yvonne Jacklin and Michael Burn

Co-Chairs, Planning Committee