

Old Windsor Parish Council

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ONLINE ON WEDNESDAY 7th OCTOBER 2020 AT 7.30 P.M

PRESENT: Cllrs. J.K. Dawson, M.V. Beer, M.P. Bennett, J. Bhabra, D. Boresjo, W. Chan, A. Horner, P.D. Jacques, L.C. Jones, N.J. Knowles, J. Minot and J. Tweedy

John Lee – Clerk to the Council

APOLOGIES: No apologies were received at the meeting as all members were present

63.20 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Clerk had no announcements for this meeting.

64.20 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no members of the public at this meeting.

65.20 MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT

Cllrs Jones and Knowles declared personal interests in relation to all the applications to be considered at this meeting as a member/deputy member of the Windsor Development Control Panel of the Borough Council, and declared that they would not vote or make a final decision on any of them at this meeting.

66.20 MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON THE 12th AUGUST 2020

The minutes were approved as a true record and were signed by the Chairman. Proposed by Cllr. Mynott and seconded by Cllr. Chan.

67.20 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE ABOVE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from these minutes.

68.20 POLICY & FINANCE

- The Payments List was approved by members. Proposed by Cllr. Jones and seconded by Cllr. Mynott with all members in favour.
- Cllr Horner agreed to inspect the bank records monthly/quarterly as time allowed.
- Members agreed a £300 contribution towards the case against the RBWM Borough Local Plan. Proposed by Cllr. Jones, seconded by Cllr. Knowles with all members in favour.

69.20 ESTATES AND ENVIRONMENT

The Clerk made members aware that the half yearly audit was booked in for 3rd November 2020. A brief discussion was had by members on the Christmas Fayre where it was agreed that it would be cancelled this year due to the Covid situation as it would be impossible to follow the social distancing requirements that we have to follow. Alternatives are being looked at.

70.20 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Ward: Old Windsor
Parish: Old Windsor Parish
Appn. Date: 9th September 2020 **Appn No.:** 20/02340
Type: Full
Proposal: Single storey front/side extension.
Location: 48 Ashbrook Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2NB
Applicant: W Brookes c/o Agent: Mr Prabh Singh Asset Lofts 30 High Street Harefield Uxbridge UB9 6BU
Determination Date: 4 November 2020

Members had NO OBJECTION to this application

Ward: Old Windsor
Parish: Old Windsor Parish
Appn. Date: 11th September 2020 **Appn No.:** 20/02278
Type: Permitted Development Extended
Proposal: Single storey rear extension no greater than 3.38m in depth, 3.31m high with an eaves height of 2.39m.
Location: **28 Cell Farm Avenue Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2PD**
Applicant: Mr Ward **c/o Agent:** Mr David Osborne SEHBAC 1 Olympus Close Ipswich IP1 5LJ
Determination Date: 23 October 2020
ZZH

Members had NO OBJECTION to this application

Ward: Old Windsor
Parish: Old Windsor Parish
Appn. Date: 11th September 2020 **Appn No.:** 20/02366
Type: Full
Proposal: Single storey front extension, x2 new front bay windows, single storey side/rear extension, x2 front dormers, x2 rear dormers and alterations to fenestration, following removal of the existing front dormer and chimney breast.
Location: **10 Orchard Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2RZ**
Applicant: Mr S Sekhon **c/o Agent:** Rob Nursey Robert Davies John West Ltd The Courtyard 59 Church Street Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4XS
Determination Date: 6 November 2020

Members OBJECTED to this application

The application was felt to be overbearing and oppressive to the neighbour resulting in a loss of amenity to them as well. RBWM design guide supplementary planning document June 2020 also states:
10.14 In many areas of the Royal Borough gaps between buildings are important components of street scenes and the character of the area. Locality specific design documents for the borough should also be consulted when designing side extensions as they will often identify and detail the nature of important gaps in residential areas. Gaps between buildings are also important for amenity reasons. Typically, a gap of 1m from a building side to the boundary is needed to allow for adequate light, servicing and rear access.

Ward: Old Windsor
Parish: Old Windsor Parish
Appn. Date: 16th September 2020 **Appn No.:** 20/02412
Type: Full
Proposal: Two storey side/rear extension, single storey rear extension with roof lantern, alteration to fenestration, x2 new windows to first floor side elevation and x1 new window to first floor rear elevation,
Location: **34 Albany Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2QA**
Applicant: Mrs Claire Darbon-Morris **c/o Agent:** Mr Alexander Gill Aspire Architectural Services Ltd Unit 3 Foxhills Farm Business Centre Longcross Road Chertsey KT16 0DN
Determination Date: 11 November 2020

Members wished to make the following comments

The RBWM design guide supplementary planning document June 2020 states:

10.22 It is important that additional parking can be accommodated without a negative impact on the character and streetscene. The new use should be provided with adequate amenities, including outdoor space and it should not compromise the amenities of adjoining development. The newly created units will also need to comply with guidance on internal space standards as set out in Chapter 7.

SIDE EXTENSIONS

10.12 Amenity issues and impact on the street scene and local character are both important considerations for the design of side extensions.

10.13 Side extensions should remain subservient to the main building and maintain the design of the original main building.

10.14 In many areas of the Royal Borough gaps between buildings are important components of street scenes and the character of the area. Locality specific design documents for the borough should also be consulted when designing side extensions as they will often identify and detail the nature of important gaps in residential areas. Gaps between buildings are also important for amenity reasons. Typically, a gap of 1m from a building side to the boundary is needed to allow for adequate light, servicing and rear access.

BACKLAND DEVELOPMENT

6.41 New development that occurs at the back of plots and blocks can have a detrimental impact on character, amenity and functionality if not treated sensitively. Such development can result in the loss of trees and vegetation, affect the amenity of surrounding development and disrupt the rhythms and character of the street scene, particularly if access ways are wide.

6.42 It is therefore important that backland development remains subordinate to existing buildings on the street frontage and is not overly prominent in the character and appearance of the area. It is also important that backland development does not result in a net loss of green or blue infrastructure, and that it enhances biodiversity and connects well into the surrounding area.

In addition please refer to Old Windsor Neighbourhood Plan OW4 Residential infill and backland development.

Ward: Old Windsor
Parish: Old Windsor Parish
Appn. Date: 17th September 2020 **Appn No.:** 20/02436
Type: Telecom Dev Determination 56 days
Proposal: Proposed 15.0m AGL Phase 8 monopole c/w wrapround cabinet at base and associated ancillary works.
Location: **Telecommunications Mast In Front of Toby Carvery 14 Straight Road Old Windsor Windsor**
Applicant: MBNL c/o Agent: Mr Damian Hosker WHP Telecoms Limited Troy Mills, Helena House Troy Road Horsforth Leeds LS18 5GN
Determination Date: 11 November 2020

Members STRONGLY OBJECTED to this application

The plans are wrong and do not reflect the area which they are meant to. The crane/cherry picker would be on the road immediately next to the pedestrian crossing blocking half of the A308 Straight Road which is the busiest single carriageway in RBWM with around 30,000 vehicle movements a day. The resultant appearance and siting of the proposed development, by virtue of its excessive height and the width of the attached equipment and its siting in a prominent corner location close to residential properties with lack of vegetation to soften its impact is considered to constitute a visually incongruous and prominent feature, which would be harmful the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the proximity to the existing mast would also result in an unacceptable amount of clutter in this part of the street scene.

Members wished to know what criteria was used in selecting this site and if any other, less impacting, sites had been considered.

Ward: Old Windsor
Parish: Old Windsor Parish
Appn. Date: 17th September 2020 **Appn No.:** 20/02417
Type: Cert of Lawfulness of Proposed Dev
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the proposed x1 rear dormer and x1 second floor window to enlarge the existing roof accommodation is lawful.
Location: **34 Albany Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2QA**
Applicant: Mrs Claire Darbon-Morris c/o Agent: Mr Alexander Gill Aspire Architectural Services Ltd Unit 3 Foxhills Farm Business Centre Longcross Road Chertsey KT16 0DN
Determination Date: 12 November 2020
MM

Members wished to make the following comments

The RBWM design guide supplementary planning document June 2020 states:

10.22 It is important that additional parking can be accommodated without a negative impact on the character and streetscene. The new use should be provided with adequate amenities, including outdoor space and it should not compromise the amenities of adjoining development. The newly created units will also need to comply with guidance on internal space standards as set out in Chapter 7.

BACKLAND DEVELOPMENT

6.41 New development that occurs at the back of plots and blocks can have a detrimental impact on character, amenity and functionality if not treated sensitively. Such development can result in the loss of trees and vegetation, affect the amenity of surrounding development and disrupt the rhythms and character of the street scene, particularly if access ways are wide.

6.42 It is therefore important that backland development remains subordinate to existing buildings on the street frontage and is not overly prominent in the character and appearance of the area. It is also important that backland development does not result in a net loss of green or blue infrastructure, and that it enhances biodiversity and connects well into the surrounding area.

In addition, please refer to Old Windsor Neighbourhood Plan OW4 Residential infill and backland development.

Ward: Old Windsor
Parish: Old Windsor Parish
Appn. Date: 23rd September 2020 **Appn No.:** 20/02431
Type: Full
Proposal: Single storey front infill extension, garage conversion and alterations to fenestration.
Location: **Casa Nostra Church Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2JW**
Applicant: Debbie Edwards **c/o Agent:** Mr Nathanael Hill Benjamin Hill Designs 12 Chazey Close Chazey Heath RG4 9ET
Determination Date: 18 November 2020
ZZH

Members wished to draw attention to the lack of a Flood Risk Assessment with it being in a flood zone and part of the property having a change of use.

Ward: Old Windsor
Parish: Old Windsor Parish
Appn. Date: 22nd September 2020 **Appn No.:** 20/02487
Type: Telecom Dev Determination 56 days
Proposal: Proposed 20.0m AGL High EE/H3G Phase 8 Street Pole on Concrete Base and associated ancillary works.
Location: **Telecommunications Mast At Junction of Walpole Road And Straight Road Old Windsor Windsor**
Applicant: MBNL **c/o Agent:** Mr Damian Hosker WHP Telecoms Limited Troy Mills, Helena House Troy Road Horsforth Leeds LS18 5GN
Determination Date: 16 November 2020
AZJ

Members STRONGLY OBJECTED to this application

The resultant appearance and siting of the proposed development, by virtue of its excessive height and the width of the attached equipment and its siting in a prominent corner location close to residential properties with lack of vegetation to soften its impact is considered to constitute a visually incongruous and prominent feature, which would be harmful the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the proximity to the existing mast would also result in an unacceptable amount of clutter in this part of the street scene. Members wished to know what criteria was used in selecting this site and if any other, less impacting, sites had been considered.

71.20 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Members gave their thanks to Cllr. Tweedy for his hard work on compiling the Climate Change Response from the council. Members were told that responses were being prepared for the A0308 Study, the government White Paper and the Community Governance Review. Members were updated on the Tapestries situation.

72.20 BOROUGH COUNCILLORS REPORTS

Cllr. Jones updated members on the RBWM and concerns about loss of services. Cllr Knowles updated members on developments on the Borough Local Plan Examination.

73.20 COUNCILLORS QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Members had no comments at this meeting.

74.20 NEXT MEETING

The next Meeting of the Council will be held on online on the 4th November 2020 at 7.30pm.

CHAIRMAN

THE MEETING CLOSED AT 9.00PM