



Reading
Borough Council
Working better with you

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2021

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO
<u>UPDATE AGENDA</u>			
4.	PLANNING APPEALS	Information	5 - 10
7.	201619/FUL AND 201620/LBC - READING INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS PARK, A33	Decision WHITLEY	11 - 12

This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE SHEET AND ORDER OF CONSIDERATION

Planning Applications Committee - 3rd February 2021

Item No. 4 Page 15

Planning Appeals:

- Update to appendix 2
- Update to appendix 3 - 03c - Appeal Note - 40-68 Silver Street

No public speaking

Item No.	6	Page 29	Ward	Battle
Application Number	201686			
Application type	Full Planning Approval			
Address	Site Adjacent The Globe, 12 Portman Road, Reading, RG30 1EA			
Planning Officer presenting	David Brett			

Item No.	7	Page 43	Ward	Whitley
Application Number	201619/FUL & 201620/LBC			
Application type	Full Planning Approval & Listed Building Consent			
Address	Reading International Business Park, Land to the South of A33 Relief Road			
Planning Officer presenting	Ethne Humphreys		*UPDATE*	

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES**

TO:	PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE		
DATE:	3 FEBRUARY 2021		
TITLE:	PLANNING APPEALS - UPDATE		
AUTHOR:	Julie Williams	TEL:	0118 9372461
JOB TITLE:	Planning Manager	E-MAIL:	Julie.Williams@reading.gov.uk

APPENDIX 2

Appeals Decided:

WARD: Peppard
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/W/20/3251966
CASE NO: 190087
ADDRESS: "Land at", Autumn Close, Emmer Green
PROPOSAL: Construction of a 4-bedroom dwelling, garage, and associated works
CASE OFFICER: Connie Davis
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: DISMISSED
DATE DETERMINED: 07.01.2021

This page is intentionally left blank

APPEAL DECISION REPORT

Ward: REDLANDS

Appeal No: APP/E0345/W/20/32486

Application Ref: 190449

Address: 40-68 Silver Street, Reading, RG1 2ST

Proposal: Erection of part 1, part 2 and part 4 storey (plus basement level) buildings to provide 79 student studio rooms (sui generis use class) with associated ancillary space and landscaping works.

Case officer: Alison Amoah

Decision level: Committee. Refused 11th September 2019

Method: Written Representations. Decision: Appeal dismissed

Date Determined: 15th January 2021

Inspector: Guy Davies BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

1 Background

- 1.1 The application site is on the western side of Silver Street. The site was previously occupied by two commercial buildings, now demolished and has most recently been used as the site compound for the construction of no. 79 Silver Street, the now built student scheme. The site is surrounded by residential development.
- 1.2 The site has been the subject of previous now lapsed permissions (40 Silver Street - 150885 for 15 flats; 62-28 Silver Street - 110915- 16 student units) and a refused and dismissed appeal for '*Demolition of existing building and erection of a part 3 and part 4 storey (plus basement level) building to provide 62 studio rooms (sui generis use class) with associated ancillary space and landscaping works*', which was refused and appeal dismissed 29/10/18 (planning ref:172218; Appeal ref: APP/E0345/W/3199747)
- 1.3 The summary grounds for refusal under this most recent application 190449 were: 1) Overdevelopment and harmful addition to the streetscene; 2) Loss of amenity from overlooking, loss of light and noise and disturbance; 3) Affect on amenity of proposed residents from the use of the external courtyard in terms of overlooking, and noise and disturbance; 4) A concentration of student housing leading to a detrimental impact on a mixed and balanced community; 5) Not demonstrated how the site would meet an identified need that could not be met on those sites identifies within the Local Plan or sequentially preferable sites; 6) Insufficient information to demonstrate that the scheme would be acceptable in the Air Quality Management Area; 7) Layout does not comply with respect to vehicle parking; 8) No completed S106 agreement to secure: employment, skills and training contributions; travel plan and highway alterations; restriction on student occupancy; and student management plan.
- 1.4 As part of the appellant's appeal submission an air quality assessment and a UU were submitted. Officers were satisfied that these addressed the reasons for refusal 5 and 7.

2 Summary of the decision

- 2.1 The Inspector considered the main issues to be:
 - The need for student accommodation;
 - Highway safety and the free flow of traffic on Silver Street;
 - The living conditions of neighbouring occupants with regard to privacy, light, and noise;
 - The living conditions of future occupants with regard to privacy and noise;
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - The mix and balance of the community.

- 2.2 Policy H12 requires new student accommodation to be provided on or adjacent to existing campuses, or as an extension or reconfiguration of existing student accommodation. There is presumption against proposals for new student accommodation on other sites unless it can be clearly demonstrated how the proposal meets a need that cannot be met. The Appellant sought to demonstrate that the underlying student housing need assumed for adopted Policy H12 represents an under provision. However, the Inspector stated that they had not been provided with evidence that demand for student accommodation has significantly changed since the adoption of the Local Plan. Although the Inspector accepted that there is clearly a demand for student accommodation in the area there is also a demand for general market housing and that *“The Local Plan seeks to balance these competing demands in part by directing new student accommodation to sites on or adjacent to existing education campuses, leaving other suitable sites within the built up area to meet general housing needs. Policy H12 has been recently adopted following scrutiny as part of the Local Plan examination. It is therefore justified and up-to-date and I give it significant weight.”* In concluding on this matter, the Inspector considered that the *“.. student accommodation on the appeal site would conflict with the requirements of Policy H12 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 in that the site is not on or adjacent to a further or higher education campus, is not an extension or reconfiguration of existing student accommodation and it has not been clearly demonstrated that the proposed student accommodation could not be met on a site that accords with Policy H12.”*
- 2.3 The Inspector also agreed with the LPA’s position on highway safety stating that *“Although disruption caused by students arriving or departing at the beginning and end of term would be limited to a few occasions a year, given the role that Silver Street plays as part of the primary road network, the limited availability of on-street parking and the restrictions on loading and unloading, I conclude that were such disruption to occur it would have a significant and adverse impact on the free flow of traffic on Silver Street, resulting in a harmful impact on highway safety.”*
- 2.4 The Inspector agreed that the proposed scheme, specifically the proximity of the proposed front block, would have a harmful effect on the outlook and loss of light to the windows in the side of Platinum House.
- 2.5 Although the Inspector concluded that for most of the proposed development the living conditions of future occupants would be satisfactory, he agreed that the proposed student warden unit on the ground floor (north) would suffer from *“excessive noise and disturbance, to the detriment of the living conditions of its occupant. For that reason, this part of the development would conflict with Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019..”*
- 2.6 In terms of the scale and massing the Inspector found the scheme to be acceptable with respect to its effect on the character and appearance of the area and would not harm the mix or balance of the community in the wider area.
- 2.7 The Inspector concluded that the Council’s reasons for refusal 2, 3 (in part), 5, 7 should be supported and dismissed the appeal (6 - highway safety and 8 - S106 were addressed during the appeal process).

3 OFFICER COMMENTS

- 3.1 Officers are very pleased that the Inspector has endorsed the conclusion reached by Officers and in particular the decision upholds the Local Plan’s approach to student accommodation through Policy H12 and is the second recent decision on this policy.

(Following that under APP/E0345/W/19/3242252 - Alexander House, 205-207 Kings Road, Reading RG1 4LS reported in December 2020).

Case Officer: Alison Amoah

This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 3rd February 2021

ITEM NO. 7

Ward: Whitley

App No.: 201619/FUL and 201620/LBC

Address: Reading International Business Park, A33

Proposal: Upgrade of existing office building comprising the construction of a new entrance, reconfiguration of the car parking and basement level employee ancillary facilities (provision of new gym and end of journey facilities) and improvements to the hard and soft landscaping (including provision of meeting pods), consolidated waste management area, external alterations to 'The Dot' and internal works to the Listed Little Lea Cottage and the recolouring of the existing terracotta tiles under Permitted Development Rights

Applicant: Tristan Capital Partners

Determination Date: 4th March 2021

RECOMMENDATION:

As per the main Agenda report, with the addition of the following conditions attached to application 201619/FUL:

- Pre-commencement details of relocated bus stop;
- Pre-commencement details of hard and soft landscaping;
- Pre-commencement details of Arboricultural Method Statement;
- Pre-occupation provision of vehicle access as specified;
- Pre-occupation provision of cycle parking;
- Pre-occupation provision of EV charging points

1. RBC Transport Strategy Comments

- 1.1 Since the publication of the committee agenda, the Transport Strategy officer has confirmed that the principle of the proposed reconfigured parking layout is acceptable and that overall the proposal provides an improvement over the existing situation. No objection subject to conditions (noted above).

2. RBC Natural Environment Comments

- 2.1 Since the publication of the committee agenda, the applicant has confirmed that there are no proposed tree losses adjacent to the Dot as part of this application. The Natural Environment Officer has confirmed that there is no objection to the proposals subject to additional conditions (noted above).

3. Corrections/Clarifications

- 3.1 There is a typographical error on page 55 of the main agenda report, under RBC Transport Strategy which is corrected as follows:

“The Transport Statement advises that 9 59 Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points are to be provided (5% of total) and this is to be welcomed as the parking levels are not changing.”

- 3.2 For further clarification, the applicant’s sustainability measures include integrated Air Source Heat Pumps to serve the heating and cooling requirements of the buildings.

3.3 The above clarifications do not materially change the assessment of the scheme made as discussed within the main committee report; moreover, it confirms the sustainability aspirations of the applicant.

4. Conclusion

4.1 The officer recommendation remains to grant planning permission as in the main report subject to the conditions as outlined in the main report and the further conditions included above.

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys