

**PLANNING COMMITTEE  
2 DECEMBER 2021  
5.30 - 6.30 PM**



**Present:**

Councillors Brossard (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair), D Birch, Green, Mossom and Virgo

**Apologies for absence were received from:**

Councillors Angell, Dr Barnard, Bhandari, Brown, Gbadebo, Mrs Hayes MBE, Heydon, Mrs Mattick, Mrs McKenzie, Mrs McKenzie-Boyle, Parker and Skinner

**Also Present:**

Councillor Dudley

**84. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2021 were approved as a correct record.

**85. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**86. Urgent Items of Business**

There were no urgent items of business.

**87. PS 20/00571/FUL Land R/O 89 Locks Ride Ascot Berkshire**

**Construction of 7no. dwellings (1no. three-bedroom and 6no. four-bedroom detached houses) with associated garages, parking, access and landscaping.**

**The Committee noted:**

- The supplementary report tabled at the meeting.
- The comments of Winkfield Council objecting to the proposal as detailed in the agenda.
- The 93 letters of objection received as summarised in the agenda.
- The additional letter of representation as detailed in the supplementary report.
- The representations from the two public speakers who joined the meeting.

A motion to endorse the recommendation in the officer report was proposed but fell at the vote.

Therefore an alternative motion to refuse the application was proposed and seconded, and on being put to the vote was **CARRIED**.

**RESOLVED** that application 20/00571/FUL be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The site is located outside of the settlement boundary, comprising an undeveloped greenfield site and this proposal would result in a significant backland development

not considered appropriate to this unsustainable location with no local services and would adversely impact on the open, rural and undeveloped character of the site and the wider area. The scale of the proposal would also erode the existing boundary screening comprising hedgerows and trees. Therefore, this proposal would result in harmful urbanising impact eroding the undeveloped character of the area, in an unsustainable location which would significantly outweigh the benefits of providing housing on this site. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies EN1, EN8 and H5 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan and Policies CS1, CS2 and CS9 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

2. In the absence of a planning obligation to secure suitable avoidance and mitigation measures and access management monitoring arrangements, in terms that are satisfactory to the Local Planning Authority, the proposal would be contrary to Regulation 63(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan, Policy EN3 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan, Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

88. **21/00743/FUL 7 York Way Sandhurst Berkshire GU47 9DE**

**Proposed erection of a single storey side and rear extension to expand the existing Dental Practice (Class E)**

**The Committee noted:**

- The supplementary report tabled at the meeting.
- The comments of Sandhurst Town Council with objection to the proposal as detailed in the agenda.
- The 3 letters of objection received as summarised in the agenda.
- The additional letter of representation as detailed in the supplementary report.

A motion to approve the recommendation in the officer report was proposed but not seconded.

Therefore an alternative motion to refuse the application was proposed and seconded, and on being put to the vote was **CARRIED**.

**RESOLVED** that application 21/00743/FUL be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would increase parking demand for the property which cannot be accommodated on site. This would lead to additional on street parking which would increase the likelihood of illegal, inconsiderate or obstructive parking, which would in turn have an adverse effect on the free flow of traffic and highway safety. As such, the proposed development is contrary to 'Saved' Policy M9 of the BFBLP, Policy CS23 of the CSDPD, BFBC Parking Standards SPD and the NPPF.

2. By reason of its size, bulk and proximity to the neighbouring property 5 York Way, the proposed development would be considered an unneighbourly form of development resulting in adverse overbearing impacts to the detriment of the amenities of the occupants of the 5 York Way, contrary to 'Saved' Policy EN20 of the BFBLP, Policy CS7 of the CSDPD, the Design SPD and the NPPF.

**CHAIRMAN**