



# Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 10 to 13 February 2009

Site visit made on 23 February 2009

by **David Hogger** BA MSc MRTPI MIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Decision date:  
17 March 2009

**Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/A/08/2089309**

**1-3 High Street and part of 1 School Road, Sunninghill, Berkshire SL5 9NN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Tesco Stores Limited against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
- The application Ref 08/02350, dated 23 September 2008, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2008.
- The development proposed is the reconfiguration and minor extension of ground floor retail floorspace at 1-3 Sunninghill High Street and the creation of a dedicated service/car parking area on part of land at 1 School Road and associated minor works.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Preliminary Matters

2. I was provided with an executed Unilateral Obligation dated 11 February 2009. Among a number of contributions it includes one towards the promotion of Traffic Regulation Orders for that part of School Road near the site. I am satisfied that it meets the requirements of Circular 05/2005: Planning Obligations and, bearing in mind the Council support the contents of the Obligation, I have taken it into account in reaching my decision.
3. At the start of the Inquiry I was asked by the appellant to consider amended plans that showed a number of changes to those plans that were considered by the Borough Council. Whilst I accept that some of the changes could be considered to be relatively minor they had not been subject to public consultation.
4. Bearing in mind the very high number of objections to the proposal and the significant amount of public interest in the scheme (as evidenced by the high number of people attending the Inquiry), I decided that interested parties could be prejudiced if I agreed to the consideration of the amended plans. My decision is therefore based on the plans on which the Council took its decision.

## Main Issues

5. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on:
  - highway safety, particularly with regard to parking provision and the proposed servicing; and
  - the living conditions of neighbours, particularly with regard to noise.

## **Reasons**

6. The appeal premises lie on the corner of High Street and School Road, Sunninghill. There is currently a narrow vehicular access between the property and No 5 High Street leading to a small number of parking spaces to the rear. On the first floor of the building are a vacant flat, a vacant office and a chiropractor's surgery.
7. The premises, which have been vacant for over a year, lie within the defined Sunninghill village centre, where a good range of retailers can be found. To the north, on the other side of School Road, lies St Michael's Primary School and to the west/north west lie predominantly residential properties.

### ***Highway Safety - Parking Provision***

8. The site currently has 7 marked car parking spaces in the courtyard to the rear, although because of their configuration, both the appellant and the Council considered that only 5 of them are usable. The spaces are accessed by a comparatively narrow drive to the side of the property.
9. The proposal would result in the loss of this parking area and the provision of 3 spaces – none of which would be allocated for use by shoppers. There would be 2 spaces within the servicing area (accessed off School Road), one for the use of an employee and the other for the resident of the flat. A single space between the appeal premises and the access to the private car park to the rear of 5 High Street would be provided for use by the chiropractor's surgery. There would therefore be a net loss on the site of 2 parking spaces.
10. There would also be a loss of about 7m of parking space in School Road if the proposed Traffic Regulation Order was implemented, which for the purposes of the calculations I shall describe as 1 parking space. Thus a total of 3 parking spaces would be lost.
11. Section 7.4 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (LP) specifically identifies the inadequacy of parking provision as one of the main issues in Sunninghill. It advises that the intensification of commercial uses would increase the existing serious problems of parking, traffic congestion and pedestrian/vehicle conflict and that Sunninghill does not have potential for retail expansion as this would exacerbate the traffic problems.
12. I was told by the Council that the bus service along High Street is not frequent and I was provided with no substantive evidence to demonstrate that a significant number of customers would cycle to the proposed shop. The appellant agreed that Sunninghill is poorly served by public transport.
13. I saw from the DVD that was submitted by the Sunninghill Community Action Group that traffic does not always run smoothly in the vicinity of the appeal site. In my opinion the Council correctly identifies Sunninghill as an area of poor accessibility and from my observations I consider that the LP provides an accurate assessment of the situation in the village.
14. A number of parking availability surveys were undertaken by the appellant, the Council and by Mr Deason. The findings were not identical because different methodologies were employed. The appellant's survey basically recorded areas where parking is not illegal and what was observed at the time, whereas both

- the Council and Mr Deason appear to have assessed the capacity based on the number of cars that could be safely accommodated.
15. I undertook three visits to the site and surrounding area, at different times of the day, and from my observations it is clear that the 3 main public car parks in Sunninghill were utilised to near full capacity – on one occasion there were no vacant spaces. I also saw significant amounts of on-street parking and only a few spaces available within 300m of the site. A large number of dwellings near the site do not have off-street parking provision.
  16. Mr Deason considered that the appellant's assessment over-estimated the number of available spaces by 10% and the Council suggests that the over-estimate is even greater, as shown on Plan 2350: Parking Availability Within 300m of Application Site. There were, however, some inconsistencies in the surveys. For instance parking was identified by the appellant in locations where there are access protection markings and parking areas were identified where parking does not occur.
  17. An example was the parking identified in Sunninghill Road to the north of the site (between Kings Road and Kingswick Drive). On my visits I saw no parking in this area and local residents confirmed that it is not used for parking because it is on the brow of a hill and visibility is poor. Whilst I accept that legally parking could take place there, I have no evidence to demonstrate that it does.
  18. In terms of available capacity the surveys reveal a range of availability in the potential supply of parking. For example, the appellant identifies an available supply of 53 spaces on a December Saturday, whereas the worst scenario is provided by Mr Deason who identifies a maximum deficit of 16 spaces, although that is within 150m of the site (plus the School Road and Bowden Road car parks).
  19. These surveys can only provide a snapshot of the situation and a pragmatic approach has to be taken to a situation such as this, where it is not possible to take into account every eventuality that could occur or reconcile the results of the different approaches that have been adopted. Similarly, although I have taken into account the likelihood of linked trips taking place, I have not been given any substantive evidence which would enable me to accurately assess the proportion of all trips that would be linked.
  20. In my opinion it is appropriate to take a precautionary approach towards the figures that have been presented to me because I consider that any restrictions to parking should be taken into account. For example although I acknowledge that access protection markings are not enforceable they do serve to highlight that any vehicle parking there is causing an obstruction, which could be dealt with by the police.
  21. Therefore based on the information I have before me, including my own observations, I find that particularly at peak times there is little spare parking capacity in the vicinity of the appeal site. A situation which would be exacerbated by the net loss of 3 spaces which would occur should the proposal be implemented.

22. Having concluded that there are times when there is very little spare parking capacity, I turn now to consider the additional demand for spaces that would be generated by the Tesco Express store.
23. The appellant considers that between 08.00 and 19.00 on a Friday, the number of vehicles attracted would vary from between 9 to 23 per hour. Mr Deason, who considers a number of scenarios, concludes that the number could be significantly greater – possibly reaching as high as 43 an hour.
24. Mr Lyons confirmed that the calculations in his table RL4 (Traffic Attraction Calculation) were based upon the methodology used in the Bathwick Hill appeal (Ref APP/F0114/A/06/2033644), which was for a Tesco Express. Indeed the appellant places some reliance on this decision in other respects but in my opinion the circumstances are different.
25. It appears that Bathwick Hill is an area that includes student accommodation and is served by frequent bus services. The Inspector concluded that the bulk of the store's custom would come from shoppers who have travelled by foot, bicycle or public transport and that a large proportion of customers would not travel by car.
26. She agreed that there was no requirement to provide any dedicated parking and concluded that the lack of on-site parking would not have significant implications for road safety. It would appear from her decision that there is parking available close to the premises – "immediately outside the existing shops in the local centre and on the opposite side of the road".
27. I do not consider that there are strong similarities between the two appeals and consequently I have not come to the same finding. In any event I must consider this appeal on its own merits and therefore, in all respects, I have given only limited weight to the Bathwick Hill decision.
28. The evidence regarding traffic generation is conflicting because different methodologies have been used and again only a snapshot of the situation has been provided. Nevertheless I am satisfied that additional traffic would be generated by the store, from customers and employees, and that at peak times it is likely that demand for parking spaces in the village would exceed supply.
29. I have set out above the situation as I see it but before I reach any conclusions on the first issue with regard to parking, I must consider the policy framework because I must determine this appeal in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Saved LP policy P4 requires all development to provide car parking in accordance with the adopted standards. These are, however, maximum standards and in the case of a retail use in an area of poor accessibility, the maximum provision would be 1 space per 14 sqm of floorspace.
30. The Council argued that because of the circumstances in Sunninghill, the maximum provision would be justified and this would result in the need for 8 spaces to be provided for the development. However, only 1 space would be provided - for an employee of the store. The shortfall in provision would therefore be 7 spaces. On this basis the Council considers that, in terms of parking provision, the proposal is contrary to policy and a danger to highway safety would result.

31. One of the objectives of PPG 13: Transport (PPG 13) is to reduce the demand for travel by car. One mechanism for achieving this is to make travel by car less attractive, for example by restricting the availability of car parking. Thus in paragraph 51 it advises that developers should not provide more parking spaces than they themselves wish, other than in exceptional circumstances. PPG13 gives the example of an exceptional circumstance being where a proposal would result in significant implications for road safety which cannot be resolved through the introduction or enforcement of on-street parking controls. The nub of the matter, therefore, is whether or not any exceptional circumstances exist in Sunninghill.
32. In my opinion there would be more traffic on the local streets, the availability of on and off-street parking would be significantly reduced or indeed at times would be lost (to the detriment of many residents), there is a risk of further congestion and parking in front of accesses (which I was told already occurs) and highway safety for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists would be prejudiced.
33. Taking into account also the current level of demand for parking, the predicted level of additional traffic generated by the proposed store, the relatively poor accessibility to the premises by public transport, the lack of dedicated cycle routes or cycle priority measures and the fact that the proposal would result in a reduction of car parking spaces, I conclude that, in combination, those exceptional circumstances that I refer to in paragraph 31 do exist.
34. Paragraph 49 of PPG13 advises that reducing parking provision should be as part of a package of planning and transport measures. I consider that such a package is not being proposed in this scheme. The provision of cycle racks and a contribution towards a table-top crossing in High Street do not, in my opinion, constitute a package. No measures are proposed that would specifically encourage the use of public transport.
35. Paragraph 53 of PPG13 requires local authorities to reflect local circumstances when setting levels of parking for schemes such as this and I consider that this is the approach that has been taken by the Borough Council. I consider that the Council is therefore right to seek 1 space per 14 sqm of floorspace in accordance with its policy.
36. PPG13 does refer to the resolution of parking problems by the introduction or enforcement of parking controls. The Council's witness was not aware of any imminent changes to parking controls in the area but did confirm that enforcement was undertaken. On the evidence before me I consider that there is little likelihood in the near future of the existing or the future road safety problems which would be caused as a result of this proposal, being resolved through the introduction of parking controls or the implementation of additional enforcement measures.
37. Paragraph 56 of PPG13 advises that a balance has to be struck between encouraging new investment in town centres by providing adequate levels of parking and potentially increasing traffic congestion caused by too many cars. In my opinion this proposal would not achieve an appropriate balance because it would be weighted too heavily towards increasing traffic congestion.
38. The Council's Parking Strategy (2004) includes the objectives to "achieve a balance between the supply of car parking and the needs and priorities of

users” and “to ensure that on-street parking does not create congestion or danger for other road users”. In my opinion the appeal proposal would not contribute to meeting those objectives.

39. On the first issue, in relation to parking, I therefore conclude that the net reduction in parking provision would be detrimental to highway safety primarily because of the impact on the free flow of traffic caused by the additional traffic generated by the proposal. The requirement of LP saved policy P4, which seeks to ensure that car parking is provided in accordance with the adopted standards, would not be met.

### ***Highway Safety - Servicing***

40. For the avoidance of doubt I have based my assessment on the premise that the Traffic Regulation Order (as set out in the Unilateral Obligation) would be in place, which would include extending the yellow lining along School Road thus making more space available for the turning manoeuvre. This would, however, result in the loss of a parking space, to which the Council objects.
41. The proposed access and service yard would lie close to the junction of School Road and High Street. The swept path analyses for the servicing manoeuvres demonstrate that the use of both lanes in School Road would be required for reversing into the yard. It is clear that there would be no margin for error as the body of the vehicle would pass very close to the kerb on the northern side of School Road. Indeed one of the photographs submitted as evidence by the Council shows a delivery vehicle overhanging the footway during the trial.
42. It is proposed to employ the services of a banksman in order to ensure that the safety of pedestrians and other road users would be protected during these manoeuvres. Appropriate training would be provided for the banksman and a commitment to this provision would be enshrined in the Servicing Management Plan, which forms part of the Unilateral Obligation. In my opinion, however, the need for such a measure is an indication that the manoeuvres, per se, would not be safe. There is also no way of requiring the suppliers of other goods to the premises (i.e. other than Tesco) to adhere to the Servicing Management Plan.
43. I am mindful that School Road forms part of the route for school children walking from St. Michael's Primary School to the playing field which lies to the south of the village centre. I was told that there were no restrictions on the time of day when the movement of children could occur. I also saw that the library is located in School Road and that there is a Nursery School in The Terrace. These activities are all likely to generate pedestrian activity in School Road, along the footway that is adjacent to the proposed service yard. There would be over 35 deliveries a week and the vehicles would have to reverse across this footway, to the detriment of the safety of pedestrians.
44. The access to the proposed service yard would be relatively close to the junction of School Road and High Street. Vehicles turning left into School Road from the High Street would not be aware of any servicing manoeuvres until they were at the junction, causing a potential highway safety hazard.
45. I have given very careful consideration to the swept path analyses. Whilst I accept that they provide an indication of the likely movement of the vehicle,

they are only a technical assessment and do not necessarily reflect what would happen in reality. For example they show that the vehicle could be accommodated within the servicing area without straying on to the area described as a footpath (the access to the entrance to the first floor). However, the appellant did concede that in the trial the vehicle over-ran but it was suggested that because it would be a shared space (such as might be found in a pedestrianised town centre) this would be acceptable. I disagree.

46. This is a very cramped area where it is proposed to accommodate vehicle parking, servicing and the needs of pedestrians seeking access to the first floor of the premises. The LP in Appendix 7 refers to the Freight Transport Association publication entitled Designing for Deliveries. This advises that sufficient safety margins should be included in any analyses but based on the evidence provided I am not satisfied that all 3 activities could be accommodated safely in this area.
47. One of the suggested conditions would prevent the arrival/departure of weekday delivery vehicles between 8.30 and 9.30 and 14.45 and 16.45 (during the school run). However, this would increase the likelihood of deliveries taking place during the evening rush hour, which would be likely to disrupt traffic, particularly in High Street, during an already busy time.
48. The supporting text to LP saved policy T5 refers to the need to prevent congestion. In my opinion, for the reasons given above, the proposed servicing arrangements would not achieve that objective.
49. On the first issue, in relation to servicing, I conclude that the manoeuvring of the servicing vehicles would have a detrimental effect on highway safety both for vehicles and pedestrians. The requirement of LP saved policy T5 which requires development to meet the Council's highway design standards, would not be met.

### ***Impact on Living Conditions of Neighbours***

50. The site adjoins the garden of No 1 School Road and the rear gardens of properties in The Terrace. The elevation of No 1 that faces the appeal site includes a large patio door and at first floor level the principle window serving a bedroom. The distance between the side of the property and the proposed boundary of the servicing area would be just under 3m.
51. To the rear of No 22 The Terrace, immediately adjacent to the site, is an area of decking which, from the photographs provided, appears to be used by the occupiers of the property for their enjoyment.
52. PPG 24: Noise requires local planning authorities to ensure that development does not cause an unacceptable degree of disturbance and advises that a difference of around 10dB or higher indicates that complaints are likely. The appellant undertook a noise assessment which concluded that if delivery times were restricted, the increase in noise levels at No1 School Road from deliveries would only be about 5dB, although the appellant agreed that it would be significantly higher in the gardens of both No 1 School Road and No 22 The Terrace, where noise levels would be doubled.

53. The appellant also conceded that a number of noise sources, for example the vehicle's radio, door banging, the collision of rollcages, refrigeration units on a vehicle, the voices of the operatives and the vehicle's reversing bleeper were not taken into account in the noise assessment. The appellant confirmed that such noises could be intrusive and paragraph 11 of PPG 24 advises that sudden impulses and irregular noise will require special consideration. There is therefore a degree of uncertainty over the thoroughness of the assessment.
54. The Servicing Management Plan includes a requirement for vehicle engines to be switched off during deliveries but this would not be applicable to other suppliers. Although I am satisfied that Tesco would respect the living conditions of neighbours, it cannot be assumed that other suppliers would show the same courtesy.
55. The proposal would introduce a new source of noise and although properties that are located next to commercial premises may expect to experience some disturbance, it is my opinion that the frequency and duration of some of the deliveries and their associated sources of noise, would all contribute to a significant deterioration in the living conditions of neighbours, particularly in the gardens.
56. I have considered whether the imposition of appropriate conditions relating to noise attenuation measures and the timing of deliveries would satisfactorily mitigate the nuisance caused. However, although for example the provision of acoustic close boarded timber fencing along the boundary would help to ameliorate the situation by reducing noise levels by up to 5dB, this would not alleviate any noise from vehicles manoeuvring in the road.
57. It is proposed that the timing of deliveries would be restricted but I note that deliveries could occur between 8.00 and 16.00 on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays – the very time when many residents would wish to make use of their gardens for leisure purposes.
58. On the second issue I conclude that the requirement of LP saved policy NAP3, which seeks to protect the living conditions of neighbours in terms of noise, would not be met.

### ***The Fallback Position***

59. The premises enjoy a lawful use as an A1 shop and if this appeal is unsuccessful the appellant has indicated that a Tesco One Stop store would open in the premises. On the evidence before me I have no reason to doubt that the fallback position would be implemented. The issue is whether or not it would be more harmful than the appeal scheme.
60. A Tesco One Stop would, for example, have no restrictions regarding opening hours, delivery times or the location of the servicing. However, it is likely to attract fewer customers than a Tesco Express (because it would have a smaller floorspace and consequently stock fewer goods), would not result in the loss of the existing parking spaces and would involve fewer deliveries.

### ***Fallback - Parking***

61. In terms of parking there would be fewer customers to a One Stop store and consequently the demand for parking would be less than for a Tesco Express.



The pressure for the limited availability of both on and off-street parking would therefore be less and the needs of the residents who are obliged to park in the street would be more likely to be met. The parking space in School Road, adjacent to the site, would not be lost.

***Fallback - Servicing***

62. I was told that a Tesco One Stop would be likely to attract up to 3 service vehicle trips a day (for newspapers, bread and milk) plus 3 or 4 deliveries a week for refrigerated/frozen and ambient goods. This would compare to up to 5 service vehicle trips a day for the Tesco Express (for newspapers, bread, milk, refrigerated/frozen and ambient goods). Other deliveries, for example for mail or high value goods, would be similar for both operations. There would therefore be fewer deliveries each week to a Tesco One Stop.
63. The service vehicles, the size of which would not be restricted, could park partially or fully on the High Street footway outside the premises or reverse into the side access as shown on Mr Lyon's figure RL-9. In my opinion this could result in reduced visibility for motorists. However, as I saw on my visits, this type of manoeuvre already takes place elsewhere in High Street because many of the retail units do not have rear servicing facilities.
64. This approach to servicing could therefore be considered to be the norm in Sunninghill and whilst I acknowledge that this does not necessarily make it acceptable because it may reduce visibility for motorists and pedestrians, it is the reality of the situation.
65. In my opinion many motorists would be local to the area and regular users of the route. Consequently they would be aware of the potential for delivery vehicles to be present in High Street and adjust their driving accordingly. Similarly many pedestrians would be familiar with the manoeuvres that take place in High Street. In my opinion such servicing arrangements are likely to continue if the health of the village centre is to be maintained. A balance has to be struck between highway safety and the retention of the vitality and viability of High Street. The fallback position would follow what appears to be accepted practice, which from what I saw is enabling the village to remain vibrant.
66. The Council could potentially enforce against such servicing operations. One alternative therefore, in respect of the appeal site, would be for vehicles to turn into School Road, either in forward gear or reverse, and park adjacent to the premises to unload. Once the servicing was complete the vehicle would have to manoeuvre into High Street or possibly continue along School Road in order to return to the B3020.
67. The Council agreed with the appellant that in highway safety terms the servicing as currently proposed would be preferable to any of the options in the fallback position. In my opinion, however, there is little to choose between the alternatives because none of them are without risk. There would be fewer deliveries with the fallback position and it would be a reflection of what already takes place in High Street. On the other hand, for example, there would be no restrictions on the size of vehicles or the times when servicing was undertaken.

68. Therefore in terms of servicing I conclude that there is an equal balance between the fallback options and the appeal proposal.

***Fallback -Noise***

69. With regard to noise there would be less intrusion for the nearby residents in School Road and The Terrace if servicing were to take place in High Street because in general terms the distance between the source and the receptor would be greater.
70. If deliveries were to take place in School Road it is likely that the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 would be impaired but those of the occupiers of The Terrace would not be so significantly affected because they would be further away. There would still be noise from, for example, the rollcages and the voices of the operatives but in my opinion because of the lower number of deliveries, the impact of the School Road fallback position would, in overall terms, be less than for the appeal proposal.

***Fallback - Conclusion***

71. In terms of the fallback position I consider that its effect in terms of parking and noise would not be as detrimental as the appeal proposal before me. With regard to servicing it is my opinion that all options contain elements of risk which are equally balanced. I conclude that overall the fallback position would be less harmful than the appeal proposal.
72. Should the fallback position be implemented I would expect the advice in paragraph 46 of PPG13 to be heeded. This seeks to ensure that all parties work together in order that a more efficient and sustainable approach is taken to deliveries in sensitive locations. I therefore do not agree with the appellant that the fallback position would inevitably result in the realisation of what Mr Lyons described as the "worst-case scenario".

**Other Matters and Conclusion**

73. The views of interested parties are a material consideration and there was significant local opposition to this proposal. Although it is not a matter on which my decision on this appeal has turned, the amount of public objection adds weight to my conclusions on the main issues.
74. There were some representations of support from local residents and I agree that in terms of the vitality and viability of High Street and making use of premises that have been vacant for some time, then in principle the proposal would be acceptable. I also acknowledge that there may be some residents who do not have access to a car and would therefore benefit from a Tesco Express nearby. Off-street servicing would be provided, the size of vehicles, hours of use and times of deliveries could be restricted and cycle parking would be provided. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
75. In accordance with the definition in Annex A of PPS6: Planning for Town Centres, I would describe Sunninghill as a local centre. Paragraph 2.58 of PPS6 advises that a positive approach to strengthening local centres should be adopted but that this should be achieved using Development Plan Documents or if appropriate other local strategies. I was given no evidence to show that

any such documents relating to Sunninghill are in the course of preparation and therefore I have based my determination of this appeal primarily on the policies of the Development Plan.

76. A number of other appeal decisions were submitted by both main parties. Although there were some similarities with the proposal before me, none of the circumstances were identical and so are not comparable. In any event I must determine this appeal on its own merits. I have therefore given only little weight to those decisions.
77. I have given careful consideration as to whether any of the suggested conditions could satisfactorily overcome the harm that I have identified but conclude that they would not lead to a satisfactory development.
78. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*David Hogger*

Inspector

## APPEARANCES AT THE INQUIRY

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Josef Cannon of Counsel	Instructed by the Borough Solicitor, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
-------------------------	--

He called John Brewster BSc IEng(CEI) FIHIE	Highway Development Control Team Leader
---	---

Linda Arlidge JP BSc DipUP MRTPI	S106 Special Projects Officer
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Hereward Phillpot of Counsel	Instructed by CgMs Consulting Morley House, 26 Holborn Viaduct, London EC1A 2AT
------------------------------	--

He called Rupert Lyons MSc CMILT	Pinnacle Transportation Ltd. Mercury House, Broadwater Road, Welwyn Garden City, AL7 3BQ
--	---

Rhys Scrivener MSc MIOA	KR Associates (UK) Ltd, International House, George Curl Way, Southampton SO18 2RZ
----------------------------	---

Matthew Roe BA(Hons) MTP MRTPI	CgMs Consulting
-----------------------------------	-----------------

### FOR THE SUNNINGHILL COMMUNITY ACTION GROUP

Andrew Beresford	9 Norton Park, Sunninghill SL5 9BW
Peter Deason BSc(Hons) CEng MICE MIHT	27 The Terrace, Sunninghill SL5 9NH

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr Alison Knight	Cllr. for Sunninghill and South Ascot
Robert Bayne	Fircroft House, Dawnay Close, Ascot SL5 7PQ
Cllr Barbara Hilton	Chair Sunninghill and Ascot Parish Council Planning Committee
Valerie Woods	Headteacher St. Michael's CE Primary School, Sunninghill
Brian Finch	The Oak, St Mary's Hill, Sunninghill SL5 9AS
Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs
Pauline Teale	55 Cavendish Meads, Sunninghill SL5 9TB
Gillian Shaw	Cedar Lodge, Bagshot Road, Sunninghill SL5 9JL

#### DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- 1 Notification of Inquiry
- 2 Statement of Common Ground
- 3 Executed Unilateral Obligation
- 4 Statement of Mr Deason (including Parking Survey Analysis)
- 5 Summary of Mr Beresford's Proof of Evidence
- 6 Extract relating to Wheatcroft Ltd v S of S for Environment
- 7 Parking Strategy 2004 (RBWM)
- 8 Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (RBWM)
- 9 Late Observations Windsor DC Panel 11 June 2008
- 10 Extracts from User Manual for Autotrack
- 11 Extract from Council's Design Guide
- 12 Extract from Manual for Streets
- 13 Comments on the application from the Council's Environmental Protection Officer dated 10 December 2008
- 14 Copy of Appeal Decisions at 163-167 Mill Road, Cambridge (2066756 and 2073579)
- 15 Technical Assessment of the Planning Application by Mr Deason
- 16 Extract from Designing for Deliveries (FTA)
- 17 Tables relating to types and capacities of urban roads
- 18 Summary and Key Findings of Shopping and Transport Survey (Feb 2009) undertaken by Sunninghill Village Action Group
- 19 Statement of Cllr Allison Knight
- 20 Statement of Robert Bayne
- 21 Statement of Cllr Barbara Hilton
- 22 Statement of Valerie Woods
- 23 Statement of Brian Finch
- 24 Statement of Peter Standley
- 25 Statement of Pauline Teale
- 26 Submission from Ian Jacobs
- 27 Submission from Mr M A Brown
- 28 Submission from Mary and Pat Morris
- 29 Closing statement of Mr Bayne (not presented verbally)

#### PLANS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- A Parking Availability within 300m of application site
- B Route between St Michael's Primary School and the playing field

#### PHOTOGRAPHS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- 1 Photographs of a number of the surrounding streets