

## Significant Decisions December 2023

23/01535	Silver Springs Fishers Wood Ascot SL5 0JF	T1 - Oak - reduce five large limbs to re balance crown by up to 50%, G1 - Willow - reduce overhanging limb back to fence line, T4,T5,T6 and G1 (excluding Willow) Crown lifting to 10 metres from the ground level. (076/2004/TPO	<a href="https://sunningdale-pc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/23_01535-Silver-Springs-Fishers-Wood.pdf">https://sunningdale-pc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/23_01535-Silver-Springs-Fishers-Wood.pdf</a>	Partial refusal 15 November 2023	The proposed work to crown lift the Oak trees the oak trees by up to 10m and reduce 5 limbs on T3 by up to 50% is considered excessive and would have a detrimental impact on the future health and appearance of the trees. GRANTS CONSENT T1, T2, T3 (lift to a hight of no more than 5m over ground level retaining the primary branch structure ), G1, T4, T5 & T6
23/02160	56 - 78 Beverley Court Cedar Drive Sunningdale Ascot	Application for prior approval for construction of one additional storey to the building to provide x4 additional dwellings	Objects <a href="https://sunningdale-pc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/23_02163-and-23_02160-Beverly-Court-Cedar-Drive.pdf">https://sunningdale-pc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/23_02163-and-23_02160-Beverly-Court-Cedar-Drive.pdf</a>	Prior approval required and refused 17 November 2023	Prior approval is refused as the external appearance of the resulting building, by reason of its height, mass and scale, would appear unduly prominent in the street scene and would be inconsistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and out of keeping with the locality in general and would fail to add to the overall quality of the area, contrary to the design objectives set out in the paragraphs 120e) and 130 of the NPPF (2023).

## Significant Decisions December 2023

23/02163	26 - 54 Beverley Court Cedar Drive Sunningdale Ascot	Application for prior approval for construction of one additional storey to building to provide x5 additional dwellings.	Objects <a href="https://sunningdale-pc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/23_02163-and-23_02160-Beverly-Court-Cedar-Drive.pdf">https://sunningdale-pc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/23_02163-and-23_02160-Beverly-Court-Cedar-Drive.pdf</a>	Prior Approval Required and Refused 17 November 2023	Prior approval is refused as the external appearance of the resulting building, by reason of its height, mass and scale, would appear unduly prominent in the street scene and would be inconsistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and out of keeping with the locality in general and would fail to add to the overall quality of the area, contrary to the design objectives set out in the paragraphs 120e) and 130 of the NPPF (2023).
23/01953	1 Pinecote Drive Sunningdale Ascot SL5 9PS	x1 Detached six bedroom dwelling with associated garaging following the demolition of the existing dwelling	The parish council objects to this application. The reasons for objection are set out in the letter below. <a href="https://sunningdale-pc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/23_01953-1-Pinecote-Drive-Sunningdale.pdf">https://sunningdale-pc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/23_01953-1-Pinecote-Drive-Sunningdale.pdf</a>	Application refused 20 November 2023	Please see below : Extra Information 1
23/02410	Silverwood Grange And Laggan House Lady Margaret Road Sunningdale Ascot	(G1) Lime trees - Crown lift to 4.5-5m. (G3) Lime trees - Pollard back to previous points. (021/2003/TPO)	The parish council concerns that the application states that the trees proposed for reduction are TPO trees, but no significant information (such as an Arboricultural report) has been provided. Sunningdale Parish Council requests that RBWM refer this application to the Borough's Arboricultural Officer to examine the trees in detail.	Application permitted 20 November 2023	

# Significant Decisions December 2023

## Extra Information 1 :

Reasons for Refusal for 1, Pinecote Drive

Refuse planning permission.

## Reasons

1. The proposed development by virtue of its siting, scale, massing, form and resultant appearance would be discordant with the prevailing character of the area. The proposal is therefore of poor design and would cause significant detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Section 12 of the NPPF (2023), Borough Local Plan Policy QP3 (2022) and the Borough Wide Design Guide SPD (2020).
2. The application site and surroundings may contain priority habitats and habitats that are suitable for use by protected and priority species, and surveys to confirm their presence or absence will need to be undertaken. These surveys and any mitigation plan would need to be submitted prior to the determination of the application. In this case, no surveys or plans have been submitted and therefore there is insufficient information has been provided for the council to determine the likely impact of the proposals upon protected species. The proposal is therefore contrary to para. 180 of the NPPF (2023) and Borough Local Plan Policy NR2 (2022).
3. The application fails to demonstrate that the proposal would secure a net gain in biodiversity. The proposal therefore fails to comply with para. 180 of the NPPF (2023) and Borough Local Plan Policy NR2 (2022).
4. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an adequate financial contribution towards the Council's carbon off-set fund, the likely adverse impact on climate change has not been satisfactorily overcome. The proposal is therefore contrary to para. 157 of the NPPF (2023), Borough Local Plan Policy SP2 (2022) and the Council's Interim Sustainability Position Statement (2021).

# Significant Decisions December 2023

**Extra Information requested following the November Meeting regarding Application 23/02035 - The Buckingham 14 Holly Hill Drive Ascot SL5 0FF being Permitted.**

**SPC had objected due to the building being in the Green Belt.**

**RBWM Planners wrote:**

## **Green Belt**

The proposed development lies within an area of Green Belt. Section 13 of the NPPF states: 'As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.' Section 13 of the NPPF advises that local planning authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate; however, there are a limited number of exceptions to this general rule. One of the exceptions under Para 149(c) of the NPPF includes 'the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building'. Based on previous decisions for extensions and alterations to buildings in the Green Belt, proposals which increase the original floor space of a building by more than 50% are generally deemed disproportionate. However, the bulk and scale of the proposed extensions and their effect on the openness of the Green Belt must also be assessed.

The proposed development relates to a single storey extension to a two-storey dwelling. The existing dwelling has yet to be extended or altered, therefore, its existing floorspace remains as originally built. The floorspace % increase attributed to the proposal relative to the original building's floorspace at ground and first floor level amounts to an approximate figure of 35%, which would be well below the 50% figure that is generally deemed acceptable for this nature of works in the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposal will only be at ground floor level and its height will not exceed 4 metres, therefore, limiting the amount of bulk and massing that will be added to the original dwelling.

Overall, the development works are considered to be proportionate additions to the original building, thus constituting appropriate development in the Green Belt.

## **Design and impact on site and local character**

The appearance of a development is a material planning consideration and the National Planning Policy Framework, Section 12 (Achieving Well-Designed Places) and Local Plan Policy QP3, advises that all development should seek to achieve a high quality of design that improves the character and quality of an area. The materials used would match the existing dwelling and locality.

The proposed development would be predominantly located to the rear of the host dwelling. Whilst the side element of the extension will be visible from the front elevation, it will be set back from the main front wall and the host dwelling itself is significantly set away from the main access road and

## Significant Decisions December 2023

street setting, thus, reducing the visual prominence of this proposed side element. Furthermore, the extension's height will also not exceed 4 metres, further diminishing its visual prominence.

The rear/side extension will have a flat roof design, which is not an uncharacteristic feature for single storey extensions especially those predominantly located to the rear of a host dwelling. Overall, the proposed development considering that the host dwelling is a two-storey property is considered to be a subordinate addition to the site.

The proposed materials for the development are also considered to relate well with the existing materials along the host dwelling.

Overall, the proposal is overall considered to be acceptable from a character and design standpoint.

**Recommendation : SPC continues to “note” in comments that applications in Green Belt are contravening the Green Belt policy also noting that it is less than 50% where appropriate.**