

## Planning Applications Committee

Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

#### Index

	<u>Page</u>
Item No. 4 Page 9 Potential Site Visits for Committee Items	1
Item No. 7 Page 27 180358 & 180359 Bristol & West Arcade, Market Place	2 - 5
Item No. 8 Page 75 180800 South Court, Broad Street Mall	6 - 11
Item No. 9 Page 94 180823 & 180824 Broad Street Mall, 47 Oxford Road	12
Item No. 11 Page 163 181035 The Heights Primary School, 82 Gosbrook Road	13 - 16
Item No. 12 Page 205 180802 Meadow Park Academy, Norcot Road	17 - 18
Item No. 14 Page 225 161507 2-6 Water Road & 158 Dee Road	19 - 21
Item No. 15 Page 241 180849 Land adjacent to Thorpe House, Colliers Way	22 - 25
Item No. 16 Page 267 180144 25 Redlands Road	26 - 27

## **Applications for Committee Determination since previous Committee Report**

**Printed: 17 July 2018**

**Ward:** Abbey

**Application reference:** 180909

**Application type:** Full Planning Approval

**Site address:** Clarendon House, 59-75 Queens Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 4BG

**Proposal:** One storey roof extension, part six, part ten storey side/rear extension and mews houses comprising 4,108 sqm (GEA) of new development, providing 46 residential units together with associated services enclosures, parking and landscaping

**Reason for Committee item:** Major Development

**Ward:** Abbey

**Application reference:** 181056

**Application type:** Full Planning Approval

**Site address:** Crowne Plaza Reading, Richfield Avenue, Reading, RG1 8BD

**Proposal:** Redevelopment of former Crowne Plaza Hotel car park and construction of new 132-bed hotel (Use Class C1), with associated access, car parking and landscaping.

**Reason for Committee item:** Major Development

**Ward:** Battle

**Application reference:** 180798

**Application type:** Regulation 3 Planning Approval

**Site address:** Land Adjacent, 94 George Street, Reading, RG1 7NT

**Proposal:** Erection of a two-storey (and roofspace accommodation) building comprising 4 (2x1 & 2x2-bed) residential units (Class C3) with associated bin and cycle storage, landscaping and associated works.

**Reason for Committee item:** RBC application

**Ward:** Peppard

**Application reference:** 180752

**Application type:** Regulation 3 Planning Approval

**Site address:** War Memorial, Reading Crematorium & Henley Road Cemetery, 55 All Hallows Road

**Proposal:** Extension to cemetery to provide an additional 1376 burial plots

**Reason for Committee item:** RBC application

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018

ITEM NO. 7

**Ward:** Abbey

**Application No:** 180358 FUL and 180359 LBC

**Address:** Bristol & West Arcade 173-175 Friar Street and 27- 28, 29-31 and 32 Market Place, Reading.

Proposal for Full and Listed Building Consent for:

Demolition of vacant former Bristol & West Arcade (173 - 175 Friar Street) and erection of an eight storey mixed -use building (plus basement) to provide 35 residential units, 4,208 sqm of B1 office floorspace, and 5 retail units (A1/A2/A3); demolition of rear parts of 29 - 31 and 32 Market Place, the change of use of the retained units at 27 - 28, 29 - 31 Market Place at first, second and third floors to provide 8 residential units, change of use at ground and basement level of 32 Market Place from A2 to flexible retail use (A1/A2/A3), retention of 260.4 sqm of A4 use at ground and basement at 29-31 Market Place, change of use at ground and basement of 27 - 28 Market Place to flexible retail use (A1/A2/A3), and associated internal and external works to the Listed Buildings, landscaping, refuse, plant, cycle stores and substation at basement level.

**Applicant:** Sonic Star Properties Ltd

### RECOMMENDATIONS

#### **180358 FUL**

Delegate to the Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services to (i) **GRANT** full planning permission subject to completion of a S106 legal agreement or (ii) to **REFUSE** permission should the legal agreement not be completed by the 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018 (unless the Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services agrees to a later date for completion of the legal agreement),

Affordable Housing Provision:

- a) Provision of 13 on-site residential units as affordable housing, comprising of 1bed x 8, 2bed x 4 and 3bed x 1 as shown on the submitted plans (9 units for social rent and 4 units for shared ownership).
- b) In the event that a Registered Provider is not secured for the provision of the Affordable Housing, the Units to be offered to the Council to be provided by the Council as Affordable Housing.
- c) In the event that an Affordable Housing provider is not secured. The developer to pay to the Council the sum equivalent to 12% of the Gross Development Value of the development for provision of Affordable Housing elsewhere in the Borough. To be calculated (the mean average) from two independent RICS valuations to be submitted and agreed by the Council prior to first occupation of any Market Housing Unit.  
To be paid prior to first occupation of any Market Housing Unit and index-linked from the date of valuation.

Amended condition 24. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme detailing the locations and specifications of biodiversity enhancements (including bird nesting and bat roosting features on or around the buildings) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

**Additional conditions**

38. No works hereby permitted shall commence until a licence for development works affecting bats has been obtained from the Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (Natural England) and a copy has been submitted to the council.

Reason: To incorporate biodiversity enhancements in and around developments in accordance with paragraphs 109 and 118 of the NPPF.

39. Boundary treatment

**Additional informative:**

**Stopping Up Highway**

The area of land on Town Hall Square to the direct frontage of the site is currently Public Highway therefore prior to the applicant implementing this permission the land in question must be stopped up under S247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

## **1.0 Ecology**

1.1 The results of all three bat surveys have now been provided and reviewed by the Councils consultant ecologist. The surveys have been undertaken to an appropriate standard and the report (CSA Environmental, July 2018) concludes that there are up to 7 common pipistrelle day roosts within 27-32 Market Place. The submitted report provides a mitigation plan to ensure that bats are not harmed and that replacement roosting sites are provided and if it is implemented the favourable conservation status of bats will be maintained. Therefore there is no objection on ecological grounds subject to this mitigation.

1.3 As such, the proposal is considered acceptable subject to the additional conditions noted above and in accordance with policies CS36 of the Core Strategy. The officers' recommendation to Committee has been amended above to reflect this.

## **2.0 CIL**

2.1 The CIL calculations on this site are complex due to a number of differing land uses proposed within the buildings to be refurbished on Market Place and the newly constructed element on at Friar Street. The floor area of the proposed new building on Friar Street was also slightly reduced as a result of the alterations to the frontage of this building. The figures at paragraph 2.4 of the main report should therefore be altered to show the revised total floor figures given by the applicant : Unit 1 = 423.6 sqm and Unit 2 = 316 sqm. The liability as checked by officers, before any social housing relief which can be applied for by the applicant, is £518,110.74.

### 3.0 Plan List

<b>Existing</b>	
EX.101	EXISTING BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN
EX.102	EXISTING GROUND FLOOR PLAN
EX.103	EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN
EX.104	EXISTING SECOND FLOOR PLAN
EX.105	EXISTING THIRD FLOOR PLAN
EX.106	EXISTING ROOF PLAN
EX.201	EXISTING 27- 32 MARKET PLACE BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN
EX.202	EXISTING 27- 32 MARKET PLACE GROUND FLOOR PLAN
EX.203	EXISTING 27- 32 MARKET PLACE FIRST FLOOR PLAN
EX.204	EXISTING 27- 32 MARKET PLACE SECOND FLOOR PLAN
EX.205	EXISTING 27- 32 MARKET PLACE THIRD FLOOR PLAN
EX.301	EXISTING SECTION AA
EX.303	EXISTING SECTION DD
EX.304	EXISTING SECTION HH
EX.307	EXISTING SECTION GG
EX.308	SECTION HH
<b>Proposed</b>	
P.100	SITE PLAN
P.101 C	BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN
P.102 F	GROUND FLOOR PLAN
P.103 F	FIRST FLOOR PLAN
P.104 D	SECOND FLOOR PLAN
P.105 D	THIRD FLOOR PLAN
P.106 C	FOURTH FLOOR PLAN
P.107 C	FIFTH FLOOR PLAN
P.108 E	SIXTH FLOOR PLAN
P.109 C	SEVENTH FLOOR PLAN
P.110 C	ROOF PLAN
P.111 A	OUTDOOR LIGHTING FOR GROUND FLOOR
P.112	OUTDOOR LIGHTING
P.113 C	ROOF PLAN - GREEN ROOFS
P.114	GREEN ROOF DETAILS
P.201 A	27- 32 MARKET PLACE BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN
P.202 A	27- 32 MARKET PLACE GROUND FLOOR PLAN
P.203 A	27- 32 MARKET PLACE FIRST FLOOR PLAN
P.204 A	27- 32 MARKET PLACE SECOND FLOOR PLAN
P.205 B	27- 32 MARKET PLACE THIRD FLOOR PLAN
P.311 E	SECTION AA
P.312 E	SECTION BB

P.313 B	SECTION CC
P.304 B	SECTION DD
P.305 B	SECTION EE
P.304 A	SECTION FF
P.307	SECTION GG
P.318 B	SECTION HH
DE.101	DEMOLITION BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN
DE.102	DEMOLITION GROUND FLOOR PLAN
DE.103	DEMOLITION FIRST FLOOR PLAN
DE.104	DEMOLITION SECOND FLOOR PLAN
DE.105	DEMOLITION THIRD FLOOR PLAN
DE.106	DEMOLITION ROOF PLAN

Case Officer: Susanna Bedford

UPDATE REPORT:

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 18 July 2018

ITEM NO. 8

Ward: Abbey  
App No.: 180800/FUL  
Address: Broad Street Mall, Broad Street, Reading  
Proposal: Erection of a temporary three-storey building (constructed using shipping containers and timber frames/cladding) to create a mixed-use Urban Market comprising Shop, Restaurant/Cafe, Bar and Hot Food Takeaway Uses (Class A1/A3/A4 Use), including shared circulation and external seating spaces; refuse store, cycle parking and associated works. (Amended description).

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE for reasons as set out in the main Agenda report.

1. ADDITIONAL RESPONSE FROM CRIME PREVENTION DESIGN ADVISOR

1.1 The CPDA already supports the RBC Licensing objection in the main report, but has also now raised the following four design issues relating to the application, with officer responses are in *italics*:

- Access /egress in the north east corner creates a concealed area; this should be omitted by bringing the entrance forward flush with unit S4. *This could be covered by condition*
- Additional information as to who has access to the double doors leading off this space will be required. *It appears that BSM security would patrol the area, but not clear that the doorway would be manned. The applicant has advised that these connecting doors would be closed to coincide with the Mall's closing times*
- No information regarding the proposed lighting has been provided, asks that detailed lighting plans be submitted and approved prior to planning permission being granted. *This could be covered by condition*
- This location lacks any active frontage. Where an area lacks natural surveillance, formal surveillance (CCTV) will be required. From the plans provided I cannot identify if CCTV will be incorporated, or if this will be monitors or simply recording. I therefore ask that detailed plans identifying CCTV system be submitted and approved prior to planning application being approved. *Noted, but this lack of natural surveillance indicates to officers a fundamental concern with the design, which officers do not feel can be accepted by using CCTV.*

1.2 The CPDA has also sought the views of the Police's Licensing Officer, who also objects to the application and raises similar views to RBC Licensing, in that the application would not comply with Licensing's Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP) Statement and increase the concentration of late-night drinking in the town centre, without sufficient evidence of any exceptional circumstances to indicate otherwise.

## 2. LETTER FROM APPLICANT SENT TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- 2.1 Committee Members will have seen the letter of 13 July from the applicant and for information, the letter is appended to this updated report. The CGI image referred to is the one already provided in the report on the main Agenda. Officers would like to add some commentary to the points made in the letter.
- 2.2 At point 3, it is stated that A4 uses would be 'contained'. Your officers feel that this is the opposite to what should occur, if the development is to be, as the applicant describes it, "*...a vibrant mix of local independent retailers and traders...*". Interested independent retailers are mentioned. It is not clear how these would be accommodated, though, as the layout and form of the proposal appears geared towards A3/A4 use, rather than A1.
- 2.3 It should be noted the containers themselves are small and officers would not anticipate uses being solely 'contained' within them. Given the floorspaces involved, A3 uses may even have trouble operating from within them were a bar area to be introduced as well. Officers have considered the ability to condition that it is the containers only themselves which would be covered by any permission, but the size of the units and potential ability of enforcement against any such approach would seem to suggest that this would be unworkable.
- 2.4 The applicant advises in their letter that A4 bars would comprise, "*...a minority of the scheme (34% by area) of approximately 81 sq.m*". 81 sq.m. would be the area of a reasonable local convenience shop, or the same area as about three double garages. However, this assumes that the A4 would only take place within these units. These units on the second floor are typically around 14 sq.m. This is therefore roughly the size of a single garage. As discussed above, it is considered unlikely that such a floorspace would function viably within such a small area and it would appear that the intention is for patrons to 'spill out' onto the terrace deck. If minded to approve, Members may wish to consider whether they would wish to condition the containers only to be subject to the retail/A4 uses and not the deck area (and for which levels), but officers would advise that such a restriction need not extend to, say A3 uses.
- 2.5 RBC Licensing also query the provision of 'standing tables' shown on the submitted Second Floor Plan as these tend to indicate a bar, not a restaurant. The normal (sitting) tables shown are 60cm deep. This is not indicating a generous dining environment.
- 2.6 The applicant has asked that plans presented on the architect's website should not be relied on because they do not form part of the application. The plan below/overleaf is taken from the architect's website for 'The Yard'. Notwithstanding that it does not form part of the application, Members may wish to note the following.
- 2.7 Unit S2 appears very small (only 6.25 sq.m.) and officers question if this would be viable unit at all. The architect's website plan calls this a 'Store'. The applicant says that this would be a retail unit.



- 2.8 Unit S4 is labelled 'performance stage' and the 18 rectangles in front of it are labelled 'deck chairs'. The applicant is asking you to disregard this notation from the architect's website. Unit S5 is labelled 'cocktail bar' (12.5 sq.m.). There is a large clear space, some three times bigger than the unit itself in front of it. Again, you are being asked to ignore this.
- 2.9 Unit S6 on the submitted plans is a long bar (7.5m length) with the long side open to the north (to the roof terrace). The only intention of this unit would seem to be to serve drinks onto the terrace, as there is no area within the container(s) except the bar and the bar store. The architect's coloured CGI visualisation leads your officers to believe that the primary purpose of the terrace desk is as a performance/outdoor entertainment and bar space.
- 2.10 The CGI shows an over-counter window running across Unit S6 and then the open terrace sides either side, therefore the animation of the second floor being exposed to Hosier Street/Dusseldorf Way is of bars only. Stair 1 and Stair 2 allow easy by-passing of the retail areas, to access the roof terrace. In fact, if you were shopping on the ground floor and wanted to access the second floor on foot, you would have to physically exit the building to access either of the stair cores. This is further indication to officers that the second floor is a physically contained area and not a *vibrant mix of local independent retailers and traders*.

### 3. FURTHER CLARIFICATIONS

- 2.11 Whilst the architect's website mentions that there would be connections to the basement for various community and cultural purposes, the applicant advises that the connections via this application are for servicing only.
- 2.12 Officers advise that whilst a decision needs to be taken on the submitted application plans and material, it is interesting to note the indications given to areas of the application site on the applicant's architect's website and Members may decide to take a view on these aspects.

### 4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1 Overall, officers are not satisfied with the information provided by the applicant and continue to recommend refusal of this application for the two reasons set out in the main Agenda report.

Case Officer: Richard Eatough



13 July 2018

To all Members of the Planning Applications Committee  
Reading Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
Bridge Street  
Reading  
RG1 2LU

Dear Councillor

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 18 JULY 2018  
ITEM 8 – SOUTH COURT, BROAD STREET MALL, BROAD STREET, READING  
APPLICATION NO. 180800**

I am writing to you regarding our application for temporary planning permission for a three storey Urban Market, due to be considered by the Committee on 18 July 2018.

As background, we acquired Broad Street Mall in August 2015 and we have invested in the region of £3 million in refurbishing and upgrading the existing centre. We have also spent around £2 million upgrading the Fountain House offices on Queens Walk. We bought Broad Street Mall as a long term investment. We regard it as a key part of Reading town centre providing local shops and services and leisure uses to compliment the town centre's attractiveness.

The proposals for a temporary Urban Market are a key aspect in regenerating Broad Street Mall and the Hosier Street area enhancing footfall and repositioning the centre to provide a distinct offer to compete with the likes of Bracknell, Oxford and Slough who have ambitious town centre improvement programmes. This will constitute a further £1 million investment and catalyst for our wider masterplan vision for substantial further development.

You may recall you granted consent for a similar proposal following the receipt of further information to clarify the nature of the intended uses on 17 January 2018 (Ref. 171230/FUL).

I wanted to take this opportunity to reassure you on specific aspects of the proposal to address some concerns raised in the officers' report to Committee, as follows:-

1. Since our initial planning permission was granted in January 2018 we have received significant interest and enthusiasm from local traders and retailers in taking space in the proposals including from Warings Bakery, Tilehurst Village Butchers, Vintage Roots, Mortimer Chocolate, Village Made Cheese, Rebel Rides, Tamp Culture and a number of barbers and hair dressers.
2. Fundamentally the Urban Market is a Class A1 retail proposal where we expect the overwhelming proportion of uses to be retail sales. To compliment these independent traders we are seeking an element of Class A3 restaurant and A4 drinking establishment to encourage shoppers to dwell; the concept being to provide an experience for an afternoon out where you might eat, drink and shop, all in the town centre.



3. We do not propose a "vertical drinking establishment". We propose a vibrant mix of local independent retailers and traders who would occupy small outlets created by converting and adapting shipping containers. We proposed to restrict any Class A4 drinking establishment use to be located only on the second floor level which is clearly contained, identifiable and distinct from the ground floor shopping centre entrance and Hosier Street. This comprises a minority of the scheme (34% by area) of approximately 81 sq.m. However, we do anticipate Class A1 retail use on the second floor as well.
4. We have supported the Council in addressing anti-social behaviour issues in this area including by acquiring the former Eva's nightclub and reaching agreement to terminate the lease and close the premises. We have made an application to demolish the nightclub which we intend to carry out once we have secured your approval to do so.
5. The Urban Market is proposed to be managed by our team who run Broad Street Mall. We want to provide activity and generate footfall to enliven this part of the town centre in a safe and outward facing environment. It is intended as a wide retail offer and not focussed on drinking. We have already prepared a management and operations plan which has been submitted to the Council for approval under the January 2018 permission.
6. I am enclosing a copy of the computer visualisation that we have produced (included in the officer's report at paragraph 6.22) showing the frontage to Hosier Street. We feel this is inviting, permeable and outward looking and provides surveillance to the street. It is in our interests as owners and operators of Broad Street Mall to encourage footfall on Hosier Street and draw people into the Mall.

We are investing in Reading and to progress our plans for the improvement of Broad Street Mall and its environs working in partnership with the Council.

I hope that you can support our application for temporary consent so that we can continue this programme enlivening, enhancing and diversifying the town centre retail offer.

Yours faithfully

  
PP Gary Lewis  
Managing Director  
Moorgarth Group Limited

Enc.

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018

ITEM NO. 9  
Page: 94

Ward: Abbey

Application No's.: a) 180823/FUL & b) 180824/ADV

Address: Former Argos Unit, Broad Street Mall, 47 Oxford Road, Reading, RG1 7QG

Proposals: a) Subdivision of three-storey retail unit (Class A1) and change of use to form: 1x retail unit (Class A1) at part basement / part ground floor; 2x flexible retail or restaurant units (Class A1/A3) at ground floor level; and 2x assembly & leisure units (Class D2) - 1 at part basement / part ground floor & 1 at part ground, part first floor level, together with shared access and means of escape; associated replacement shopfront works and associated external alterations on Oxford Road and Queens Walk frontages.

b) Display of 4 canopy awnings with tenant names on Queens Walk.

### Recommendations:

a) 180823/FUL - As in main report, with the exception of condition 4 (additions shown in **bold**; omissions denoted by a ~~strike through~~):

4. ~~Pre-commencement~~ **Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved construction method statement**

b) 180824/ADV - As in main report.

1. **SUBMISSION OF CONSTRUCTION METHOD STATEMENT** (Further to paragraphs 4.6 and 6.16 of the main report)
  - 1.1 Subsequent to the publication of the main report the applicant has submitted a construction method statement (CMS) for assessment (Ref. Argos - CMS by Moorgarth Rev 0, dated July 2018, as received 13/07/18). This has been assessed by the Transport Development Control section and been confirmed to be acceptable. Most substantially, all works/deliveries will be accessed via the basement level service route, thereby enabling the majority of the works to be implemented without affecting pedestrian / customer areas. The exception is an external hoarding being required to facilitate the shopfront works on Oxford Road and Queens Walk. The submitted CMS includes an acceptable level of detail in respect of all matters which would have been secured by pre-commencement condition, as recommended in the main report. Now that such information has been submitted, the condition can be altered to a compliance condition. More specifically, this will state that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the CMS hereby approved.

Case Officer: Jonathan Markwell

## UPDATE REPORT:

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 18 July 2018

ITEM NO. 11

Ward: Caversham  
App No.: 181035/FUL  
Address: The Heights Primary School, 82 Gosbrook Road, Caversham, Reading  
Proposal: Fencing off an area of the Westfield Park Recreation Ground for educational use during school hours for use by the Heights Primary School.

### RECOMMENDATION AMENDED TO:

GRANT Planning permission.

## 1. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1.1 The Council's Ecologist has advised that there are no objections to the application.

1.2 CADRA, GLOBE, the CPDA: no responses to advise of at the time of writing.

1.3 It is not clear from the plans (as the gates are a dull colour), but for confirmation, three access gates are shown on the plans. The enclosed area will be fully accessible to the public, if they wish, outside of the stated times, as set out in the main report. Signage to indicate this would be supplied.

## 2. UPDATE ON OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

2.1 The final number of objections and other representations received will be reported to your meeting. The table below seeks to provide a response to all other objection points which are not considered to have been responded to in the main report.

Objection	Officer response
How long will the grass last? What then, lay tarmac?	This is a detailed maintenance consideration for the applicant and the Leisure and Recreation Service, no tarmac is proposed.
Have all associated costs been borne in mind, eg. maintenance and child supervision?	Not a planning consideration
Why can't the area just be used for the School without fencing at all? School use the park for PE already occurs and this takes up a much greater area anyway, so do not see the point of this	A school playground is required within a contained area
This is a business that runs a school and	This is a Free School and has requirements

should not take open space	for a playground space to be provided, which cannot be provided at the 82 Gosbrook Road site.
We need more open space in Caversham when the air quality is so poor.	The Council's Environmental Protection team does not identify a reduction in air quality attributable to this planning application
Should have a fence which is used for the school and removed at the end of each school day	This is not understood to be a suitable solution for the school and a demarcated, retained area is required.
It will lead to an increase in traffic	No concerns for additional traffic generation from the Highway Authority
Object to using the park for purposes which are not what the paid upkeep of the park is for	Park maintenance is not a direct planning consideration
Concerned that the proposal will create arguments or uncomfortable nature of children playing near to where people are relaxing	This is a usual occurrence in a public park
Was there not a covenant on this land?	Not a planning matter
The School is acting selfishly and is trying to make up for the planning errors they have made	No response
Other options have been considered and rejected and the public have not had a chance to see these	Consultation took place with Ward Councillors before application submission
The fence will create an alleyway at the side of the park	A 1.6m high temporary mesh fence is not considered to create an alleyway
There would be an adverse effect on biodiversity	No objection from the Council's Ecologist
Would not object if the school was permanent and serving the local catchment	No response
Spend more time formalising the site in Caversham heights	Planning permission is close to being issued
You should consider also the 300+ objections to the previous proposal	Each planning application is to be considered on its individual planning merits and objections to each application considered accordingly
Brings the area closer to traffic fumes on Gosbrook Road	No objection from the Environmental Protection team on air quality grounds and this is already a public park
An archaeologist has indicated that there is a cropmark in this area which is of significance	Berkshire Archaeology are considering this matter and officers will provide a verbal update at your meeting.
Tree canopies and roots would be affected	No objection from Council's Natural Environment Team (Tree Officer) to the proposal
Instead you should impose a 20 mile per hour speed limit, introduce a pelican crossing and instruct the school to use the already fenced off Christchurch Meadow	A contained playground is required next to the school site.
All those with children at the school knew there was no outside space when they chose	Not a planning matter

the school for their children and the school knew they had inadequate outside space when they offered places for 2018 entry.	
There is sufficient space in other local schools to take children for the 2018 entry without having to spend more public money on extending this school.	This is not the position of the LEA, as set out in the previous report on application 180552.
This application is totally unacceptable and goes against the Reading 2050 charter that councillors have signed up to.	Not a planning document and therefore not considered to be relevant to the planning assessment.
Not a shady area and site can become waterlogged	Considered to be suitable for the intended purpose by the School and the LEA.
It is also a shame that you are not as open to providing funds to the local Schools that actually need the additional funding rather than wasting money on temporary solutions for The Heights.	No response.
If this planning application goes ahead it is imperative that it is written into the documentation that the fencing is taken down and the park restored to its current state by 1st October 2020	Condition recommended.
The Environment Agency is trying to reduce flood risk in the area. Replacing grass with tarmac will contradict this.	There is no tarmac proposed and there is no objection from the Environment Agency
The new school buildings have already taken green space away from St. Anne's School.	Noted and the purpose of this application is partly to re-provide pitch space.
Concerned for future use of the site and what that means for the park	The report for planning application 180552 advises that the 82 Gosbrook Road site enjoys an established education use. Any future proposals would be considered on their individual merits.
Should consider relative costs of removable fencing	Not a planning requirement.
Lack of compliance with 160676/APPCON (tree conditions), does not trust the applicant to abide by conditions	That decision also notes that as no harm was caused, no further action was being considered. Not relevant to the consideration of this planning application, which does not cause harm to trees and must be considered on its merits.
There appears to be no times or limitations of exclusive use detailed in the application.	Covered in the main report.
Not clear where the gates are	There are three gates in the fencing, as shown on the proposed plans.
There is a lack of detail in the planning statement with regard materials and methods of construction. For example, is there any capacity to recommend fencing specified with anything to absorb sound and prevent rattling of the fence from ball play etc? For example specify rubber mountings	No noise concerns from EP Team RBC Parks and Recreation satisfied that this is standard construction fencing to BS Standards, suitable for the intended use.



buffering the fencing connections with fence post connections? Or is this standard construction practice for play space fencing?	
Concerns for noise situation: -how many pupils assumed to use the space? -how was the sound level decided on? -questions the assumed height of children -The noise data appears to be modelled using a library function for the software -full impacts on all surroundings not given -should provide a follow-up noise survey.	EP Team content with noise report and does not object.
The fence may attract graffiti which will make the park looked uncared for. May have a negative effect on crime.	Plain galvanised steel unlikely to attract graffiti.
Losing our parks and green spaces can have an immeasurable negative effective on the physical and mental health of local people.	Noted, but purpose and open space function retained.
A them and us culture, not present at the outset of this project, is likely to ensue as a direct consequence of permission because it will be taken to indicate the committee pays a higher regard to those who are not local.	Not a planning consideration.
More staggering of break times would negate need for this area.	School/LEA advise that this would not solve the issue.
The school should suffer the inconvenience of not having the space; not the residents having the inconvenience	Officers give relative weight to this community need and note the temporary nature of the proposal.
The application has been done under 82 gosbrook Road, no doubt to avoid any objection.	Addresses are for information only and the application site is clear from the local plan supplied.
The school already has a fenced off area, which caused two lovely Silver Birch trees to be felled.	This may refer to Leisure and Recreation works to the tarmac area near the present children's play area; this is not relevant o the consideration of the current application.
From a visual point of view this will disrupt the pleasant open views , and spoil the appearance of the park.	Visual effect of the fence covered in main report.

Case Officer: Richard Eatough

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018

ITEM NO. 12

**Ward:** Kentwood

**App No.:** 180802/FUL

**Address:** Meadow Park Academy, Norcot Road, Tilehurst, Reading

**Proposal:** Erection of a single storey detached timber outbuilding to be used as an additional classroom.

**Date received:** 16<sup>th</sup> May 2018

**Minor Applications:** 8 week target decision date: 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018. An extension of time has been agreed to 20<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Grant - as per the main agenda and to include the following conditions:

1. Landscaping - details to be submitted
2. Landscaping implementation
3. Standard Landscaping Maintenance

Informative:

1. Pre-commencement condition

### 1.0 Trees and Landscaping

1.1 As two existing trees and landscaping on the site had previously been removed the applicant was asked to provide soft landscaping in and around the proposed classroom to improve the amenity around the building to include two additional replacement trees in a suitable location elsewhere within the school site to ensure there is no net loss of tree cover.

1.2 The applicant provided a planting plan proposing hedging along the east and north east corner of the proposed classroom (shown on the plan below). Natural Environment Trees are satisfied that this is acceptable subject to relevant conditions. The applicant has not been able to provide details of the replacement trees however this matter can also be dealt with by way of a condition.

1.3 As such, the proposal is considered acceptable subject to the additional conditions noted above and in accordance with policies CS7 and CS33 of the Core Strategy.

Case Officer: Claire Ringwood.

Planting proposal



UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 18 July 2018

ITEM NO. 14  
Page: 225

Ward: Norcot

App No.: 161507/OUT

Address: 2-6 Water Road and 158 Dee Road

Proposal: Demolition of 4 existing dwelling houses 2, 4, 6 Water Road and 158 Dee Road and erection of 6 no.4 bedroom and 5 no. 3 bedroom dwellings and car parking.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant as on main report but with additional conditions:

- PD rights to add dormers, rear extensions and out buildings removed
- Visibility splay provided for the Water Road access before occupation.

1. AMENDED PLANS

1.1 The applicant was asked by officers to confirm the depth of the proposed rear gardens and whether the impression of overlooking from the rear facing dormer windows proposed for the 3 bedroom properties could be mitigated.

1.2 The applicant has checked the proposed layout and found that when adding communal bin stores to the layout drawing, as requested by officers, individual bin stores at the front of the houses remained. By deleting these individual bin stores it has been possible to move the terrace towards Water Road sufficiently to confirm that all rear gardens will be at least 10 metres in depth.



Amended layout drawing Rev H

1.3 The merit of relocating the dormer windows on the 3 bedroom dwellings to the front elevations has been considered to reduce the impact on the outlook for neighbours. In terms of appearance the proposed dormers look in proportion with the houses and provide interest to the street facing elevation. Removing

the dormers from the garden facing elevation has clear benefits in reducing the impression of being overlooked. The nearest properties on the opposite side of Water Road and Dee Road are a substantial distance away so occupants here are not going to be disadvantaged by this change.

1.4 The plans below show what this change would look like and officers consider it an acceptable design approach to overcome residential amenity concerns.

1.5 Neighbours have been notified of this proposed change.



- 1.6 Given this change it makes sense to remove permitted development rights to extend or add buildings or dormers at the rear of the properties.
- 1.7 It has also been noted that the visibility splay across the access drive to 8 & 10 Water Road needs to be safeguarded with a condition requiring that this visibility is provided before the new houses on this terrace are occupied and thereafter maintained.

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 With these changes the recommendation remains to approve with a S106 and planning conditions as set out in the main report.

Julie Williams

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018  
ITEM NO. 15

**Ward:** Norcot

**App No:** 180849/OUT

**Address:** Land Adjacent Thorpe House, Colliers Way, Reading

**Proposal:** Outline application for residential redevelopment to provide a maximum of 14 dwelling units. Demolition of dwelling at 16 Kirton Close to provide access. (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale reserved for future consideration).

**Applicant:** Thames Valley Retirement Homes

**Date valid:** 6 June 2018

**Application target decision date:** 5 September 2018

**26 week date:** 5 December 2018

### RECOMMENDATION

As per the main agenda.

#### **1. Additional Representations**

- 1.1 Two letters of support have been received since the main agenda was finalised. The text of these is attached at Appendix 1 below.
- 1.2 It is considered that the matters raised are adequately addressed in the main report.
- 1.3 For completeness, the letters have been forwarded to the Council's Anti-social Behaviour Team and Thames Valley Police for comment. Both confirm that the area is not a known hot spot for crime or anti-social behaviour.

Case Officer: Steve Vigar

## Appendix 1: Additional letters of support received:

1.

To whom this may concern,

I am writing this letter in order to give my account into what it is like to live in front of the current wasteland at the back of Kirton close and at the end of Colliers Way. I have been living at 16 Kirton Close, Reading, West Berkshire RG30 2NS from 1997 to 2013. My mother currently owns the property and I regularly visit. I am 26 years old and I work in the Metropolitan Police Force as a Trainee Detective Constable.

I believe that the redevelopment on the land behind my mother's house would be a positive addition to the community. The location of the proposed development is between Dee Road estate and the roads, which lead directly off Oxford Road, both of these areas, are notorious crime hotspots. Firstly, I would like to discuss the current crime rates and the anti-social behaviour in the area. Secondly, I will portray the safety of the alleyway at the back of 16 Kirton Close along the alleyway leading from Water road/Colliers way to Waverly Road. Finally, environmental issues will be explored focusing on what the land is currently being used for.

(Crime rates is the area behind our house). Throughout my childhood, we would constantly have bicycles tools and anything of value stolen from our back garden. We never reported this to the police, due to the realisation that the property or suspect will be unlikely to be found or retrieved. A few years ago, in the early hours of the morning I caught a male walking on our kitchen roof until he spotted me and quickly ran off. Living in a house that backs onto a large open space whereby it is used as a cut through from many people every day is very scary at times. Anti-social behaviour is common, drinking and drug use on the wasteland is not unusual. This means that disturbances and noise pollution occurs a lot more regularly than desired.

The alleyway is not safe. There is no lighting at all particularly in the path behind Verney Mews. This leaves people feeling very vulnerable. I would not walk down the alleyway on my own in the dark. There are many blind spots. When I do return to Reading, I avoid using this alleyway at all costs during dusk and dark hours, which completely contradicts the purpose of an alleyway. I would like to see an alleyway, which is safe to use by everyone in society. The development will provide a modern uplift to the area. If the new builds were actually secured with, the CCTV cameras covering the alley this would be a major re vamp which will re assure the local residents. Since the development in Dee Road estate, the crime rate has lowered and the community are happier.

The fire brigade are no strangers to the area during building work being completed to my mother's house, we hired a skip, a few days later we noticed a huge black cloud of smoke in our back garden. Someone had set the tip on fire. Fly tipping and littering occurs often there were constantly mattresses and other various furniture items being dumped and set on fire. This incident actually discoloured the brickwork at the back of our house. Used condoms and dirty needles will not take too long to find. The only rubbish bins down the alleyway are dog poo bins and not for general waste. There have been a few occasions whereby I have seen men use the wooded area as a lavatory, which is disgusting! Our property and neighbours at 15 and 17 have also had numerous amounts of graffiti sprayed on the walls facing the alleyways.

I would advise the council to turn this scary dark unkept dirty alleyway into a passage way which all members of society will be happy to use and walk through freely without having to run through it or constantly looking behind them. The redevelopment with CCTV will improve the community, increase value to the neighbouring houses and modernise our much-loved area. The re development is likely to attract young professionals to the area which will also aid the re generation of the area.



2.

Planning Application Number 180849

I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opinion on the redevelopment at the back of Thorpe House.

I have lived on the ally for the last thirty years and I feel that this area is in desperate need of redevelopment.

This area is a frequent walk through for a lot of unsavoury people who participate in anti sociable behaviour. The area has been used by people who participate in drug taking, drinking and dumping their rubbish.

I feel that there needs to be regeneration in the area as the alley is a very dark and dangerous place especially in the winter. There is not sufficient lighting which makes it a very unsafe place for people walking through the estate and especially young children who use the walk way.

Over the years there have been copious amounts of rubbish dumped on the land and these have been very large house hold good including white goods.

The last planning permission was turned down due to a variety of different reasons which seemed to be incorrect especially parking provisions. The road we live in has ample room and with the development of the flats this will open up the area and provide a better space for all residents.

The close will remain a cul de sac with the erecting of the new apartments. I feel that this will enable a nice area around the alley which will be well lit and be a deterrent for those who wish to use the area for drugs, sex, drinking, dumping rubbish and allowing dogs to defecate on the grass.

In turn this will then give the area a more pleasant outlook and I do not see that the passing of this application will have an adverse effect on the area, I do however feel it will cut down on the amount of crime and the constant helicopters and drain of resources due to the fact that it is a very dark area full of alleys which are frequently used to escape from police. The alley is a notorious escape area due to it being used as a through way to the Dee road and Oxford Road

The building of a new play will enhance the area for the young people and with more people around the area and the additional people living in the apartments this will also make it a safer place for all concerned.

With regards to the Labour officials stating that it will set precedence, I feel that this is absolutely untrue as there is not another piece of land in the area that is privately owned and has the capacity for the same kind of development. I also feel that the only precedence that it will set is that the apartments will bring a new fresh look to the area, which may also encourage neighbours to bring the outside of their properties in line. If we look at the planning permission that has been give to three houses at the end of Kirton Close to adapt their garages, this is unsightly as they are not in line with the other houses and also the planning permission given has not had any stipulation that there needs to be a uniformed outlook maintained which unfortunately makes the houses look unflattering.

I love my house and have lived here for nearly 30 years and I feel that the reason for the refusal of the previous planning application appeared to be politically led rather than what is good for the

area. I feel that the majority of people have been persuaded by the minority who do not live on the back of the alleys and are predominantly oblivious to what happens at the back of them in the dark of the night.

There is also the thought that as Reading do not have any financial resources for regeneration of this area that it would be a good idea for the local people to have a nicer place to live.

The two main houses at the end of Kirton close which is number 16 and 17 have experienced a lot of difficulties over the years with this unused piece of land such as:

Fires leading to the back of the house being burnt

bins being set on fire.

Constant graffiti

Dog poo area for people allowing their dogs to defecate and not pick it up

Consistent rubbish being put on the land.

Numerous items thrown over the back walls

Drug and sex objects found on the ally

Drug taking and drinking.

Advantages for planning being approved will be a safer place for all residents and regeneration of an area which is in desperate need of it.

I hope you take these matters into consideration as this is a true reflection of the things that happen around the land which has been an open space for far too long. I feel that if this application is not given the go ahead the area will become a criminal hotspot for all kinds of anti sociable behaviour and I feel this will escalate further.

Case Officer: Steve Vigar

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 18 July 2018

Page 267

ITEM NO. 16

Ward: Redlands

App No.: 180144/FUL

Address: 25 Redlands Road, Reading

Proposal: Demolition of a single-storey rear projection, followed by the construction of a single-storey rear extension, internal modifications and refurbishment to facilitate change of use from a single dwelling house with detached garage (C3a) to 5no. self-contained flats (C3a) with associated car parking, bin and cycle storage.

Applicant: Mr Paul Kilshaw

Minor Application 8 week target decision date: 21 March 2018. Extended to 27 July 2018

### RECOMMENDATION

Grant as on main agenda but with amendments to C13 to include other external decorative features :

#### 1. CONSULTATION

1.1 Neighbours and those who commented on the original planning application were consulted on the proposed change to the front boundary from close boarded fence to a wall with close barded timber insets.

1.2 The responses have been:

- On behalf of Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee  
We are very pleased to see that the revised plans (of 9 July) show a wall to match the neighbouring property, as requested at the planning committee. This will be a benefit to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

From neighbours:

- Unfortunately their suggestion for brick and fence to match No 2 Marlborough Avenue is not typical of the Conservation area. As you approach No 25 from Elmhurst Road the majority is brick or brick and railings. As you look down Redlands from No 25 you will see brick and railings, and the same along Marlborough. A combination which gives enhancement and flexibility through the use of foliage too. Across the road from No 25 is the sweeping wall of the flagship No 72 (in need of TLC). To have a wall of plain brick would be in keeping with many in Redlands Road, further down by Southern Hill for example, and at the bottom of the road, recently renovated. Or reflecting in infill angled bricks so typical of Reading, or the 'X' pattern which is such a typical Reading mark. To get this boundary right would enhance the area and would make a statement of the value of the conservation area. And walls and railings need far less maintenance than fencing panels. Could we persuade the owner through condition that it's a wall and railings of wall, and we are really happy to help?

Please make the keeping of and continued maintenance of the fish scale tiles a condition.

- As per the new perimeter wall design. The brick design of the wall is much more favourable. However, the CAAC comments regarding there being railings with hedges has been ignored. The introduction of railings and hedges should be stipulated (rather than fencing) and will enhance the conservation area and will be environmentally beneficial.
- Whilst the objections I raised as a nearby resident still stand, the applicant's proposed amendment respects some of the qualities of the Redlands Conservation Area and this is appreciated.

1.3 The officer response is that there is a variety of boundary treatments within vicinity of the application site and what is now proposed is in keeping with these and the character and appearance of the main house.. The officer recommendation remains to grant planning permission with the additional planning conditions aimed at ensuring appropriate materials are used and listing existing important features on the house, which could include the fish scale tiles.

Julie Williams