



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

24 APRIL 2019

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO
4. POTENTIAL SITE VISITS FOR COMMITTEE ITEMS	Decision	BOROUGHWIDE	3 - 4
8. 182196/FUL - THAMES QUARTER, KINGS MEADOW ROAD	Decision	ABBEY	5 - 10
11. 180543/FUL - FORMER SALES & MARKETING SUITES, DRAKE WAY	Decision	WHITLEY	11 - 12

This page is intentionally left blank

Reading Borough Council

## Applications for Committee Determination since previous Committee Report

Printed: 18 April 2019

**Ward:** Abbey

**Application reference:** 182252

**Application type:** Outline Planning Approval

**Site address:** 80 Caversham Road, Reading, RG1 1AA

**Proposal:** Outline application considering access, landscaping, layout and scale involving the demolition of all existing buildings and structures (Classes B1a & B2) and erection of new buildings ranging between basement and 2 - 25 storeys in height, providing 658 (79 x studio, 227x1, 335x2 & 17x3-bed) residential units, office accommodation (Class B1a), flexible ground floor Class A1-3 uses, a community centre (Class D1), health centre uses (Class D1) and various works including car parking, servicing, public and private open space, landscaping, highways, pedestrian and vehicular access and associated works. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

**Reason for Committee item:** Major application

**Ward:** Abbey

**Application reference:** 190465

**Application type:** Approval of Reserved Matters

**Site address:** Plot E, Friar Street & Garrard Street, Reading, RG1 1DX

**Proposal:** Application for the approval of reserved matters (access, scale, appearance, layout and landscaping) and submission of details (Conditions 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, and 34) for Plot E within development site known as Station Hill, submitted pursuant to the Outline Planning Permission ref. 151426 (as proposed to be amended). The proposals comprise the construction of a 12 storey building (plus basement storey) comprising 370 Build to Rent residential units, 1,151sqm (GEA) of flexible retail (A1-A5) floorspace, cycle storage, car parking, servicing, plant areas, landscaping, new public realm and other associated works.

**Reason for Committee item:** Major application

**Ward:** Abbey

**Application reference:** 190441

**Application type:** Variation of Condition

**Site address:** Station Hill, Reading

**Proposal:** Application under s.73 for amendments to Outline Planning Permission ref. 151427, including alterations to the wording of Conditions 3, 5, 7, 8, 17, 19, 54 and 57. [Plot F 'Station Hill']

**Reason for Committee item:** Major application

**Ward:** Abbey

**Application reference:** 190442

**Application type:** Variation of Condition

**Site address:** Plot E, Friar Street & Garrard Street, Reading, RG1 1DX

**Proposal:** Application under s.73 for amendments to Outline Planning Permission ref. 151426, including alterations to the wording of Conditions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 21, 37 and 50.

**Reason for Committee item:** Major application

**Ward:** Kentwood

**Application reference:** 190591

**Application type:** Full Planning Approval

**Site address:** 127a Loverock Road, Reading, RG30 1DZ

**Proposal:** Demolition of 2 number existing single storey buildings, removal of telecoms plant. Replacement with new single unit for B1c, B2 and B8 use classes with ancillary offices including associated service areas, car parking and landscaping. Modified access onto Wigmore Lane.

**Reason for Committee item:** Major application

**Ward:** Peppard

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

**Printed: 01 January 0001**

**Application reference: 190466**

**Application type: Approval of Reserved Matters**

**Site address: Station Hill, Reading, RG1 1NF**

**Proposal:** Application for approval of reserved matters (access, scale, appearance, layout and landscaping) and submission of details (Conditions 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 52) for Plot F within development site known as Station Hill; pursuant to Outline Planning Permission ref. 151427 (as proposed to be amended). The proposals comprise construction of a 12 storey (plus basement storey) building comprising 168 Build to Rent residential units (Class C3), 390sqm (GEA) of flexible retail (A1-A5/D2) floorspace, 656sqm (GEA) of leisure floorspace (D2), cycle storage, car parking, servicing, plant areas, landscaping, new public realm and other associated works.

**Reason for Committee item: Major application**

## UPDATE REPORT

<b>BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES</b> <b>READING BOROUGH COUNCIL</b> <b>PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 24 April 2019</b>	<b>ITEM NO. 8</b>
---	-------------------

**Ward:** Abbey

**App No.:** 182196/FUL

**Address:** Thames Quarter, Kings Meadow Road, Reading (AKA Former Cooper BMW, Kings Meadow Road, Reading)

**Proposal:** Erection of a part 13-storey, part 23 storey building comprising 338 apartments in a mix of studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom and three-bedroom units, residents' lounges, tech-hub, dining room, and cinema room, various rooftop outdoor amenity spaces, concierge/reception with coffee meeting area, gym, residents' storage facilities, postroom, ancillary back-of-house facilities, 338 secure cycle parking spaces, car parking spaces, landscaping, and associated works (revision to planning permission 162166 dated 23/11/2017) (Part Retrospective).

**Applicant:** MG RPF Limited Partnership Thames Quarter Ltd and Lochailort Thames Quarter Ltd

**Date received:** 29 January 2019

**13 Week target decision date:** 30 April 2019

## RECOMMENDATION

As on main report.

### REVISED PLANS RECEIVED

1. The Applicant has submitted revised drawings since the main committee report was published. These involve removal of three flats within the top-hat extension part of the proposals, adjacent to the tower element of the scheme in an attempt to reduce the apparent bulk and improve the vertical emphasis of the tower. Officers do not consider that submission at this late stage is appropriate as there is insufficient time for public/other consultation on the revised proposals and this would cause unnecessary delay to the application's consideration. In any case it is not clear that the changes would overcome the concerns already expressed in the main report. The drawings have not therefore been considered and the application is assessed on the basis of the original drawings. Officers consider that it would be more appropriate for the Applicant to discuss alternative design options using the Council's pre-application enquiry service.

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING UPDATE

2. Since the publication of the committee report, the Applicant has advised that they are prepared to improve their affordable housing offer; however, this offer is in relation to the revised drawings which now propose 20 additional units. The Council's Valuer advises that the revised offer equates to approximately 30% Affordable at a figure of £8.1m. However the £8.1m would only be forthcoming in certain circumstances under the proposed terms of the agreement. For instance, if a second surrogate site were found the value of the commuted payment would be lower (at £5 million plus the value of the land, whatever that might be).

3. It is important to note that this revised offer has not been subject to detailed viability assessment and therefore the Council's Valuer has not had the opportunity to assess the overall viability implications. It is not considered to be necessary to go into further detail at this stage as this revised offer relates to the revised proposals which have not been accepted and therefore your officers advise that this should not affect the Recommendation currently before the Committee for determination.
4. For clarity and for future reference, it is considered that *complying* with Affordable Housing policy does not necessarily give considerable extra weight in terms of benefits which might outweigh harm in design terms. Such a proposal would simply be 'policy compliant' in relation to Policy CS16.
5. The following is a comparison discussion on the current affordable housing offer, as set out in the main report, when compared to the affordable housing package secured in the extant (under construction) permission.

#### **CONSULTANT VALUER'S DETAILED REVIEW OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OFFER**

6. The following provides further clarification of that set out at paragraph 6.48 of the main report:
7. The **extant** permission 162166/FUL, currently under construction, secured the following as Affordable Housing (summarised):

Scenario A - With the Weldale Street Surrogate site provided - a commuted sum of £4m (the equivalent percentage is discussed below) or

Scenario B - Without the Weldale Street Surrogate site - a commuted sum of £5.9m.

8. Under the **current** application 182196/FUL proposals the affordable housing package proposed can be summarised as follows:  
**Scenario A** - Provision of the Weldale Street site (land only) as a surrogate site with a consent in place for 47 units (all affordable housing); plus provision of additional land (a second surrogate site) for delivery of 54 further units; or  
**Scenario B** - Provision of the Weldale Street site (land only) as a surrogate site with a consent in place for 47 units (all affordable housing); plus £4.05m payment in lieu of a second surrogate site.
9. The previous offer, which was considered acceptable in the overall planning balance under the extant permission 162166/FUL was considered to equate to approximately 18% affordable housing. In terms of how much affordable housing this represents, this is not a simple matter to advise; as it depends on whether the second surrogate site is provided, or whether an increased commuted sum is paid in lieu of a second site.
10. As for the current offer, assuming no additional (second) surrogate site is provided, then the total package is:  
£4m for Weldale Street (56 units @ £71,428 per unit)  
£2.69m commuted cash sum (26 units @ £105,000 per unit)  
=£6.45m in total  
This gives 82 units which is: 21% affordable delivery i.e.  $82 \div (338 + 47=385)$ . There are slightly different ways that this could be calculated, but none amounting to 30%. If an

additional surrogate site were to be provided, this would change the percentage but it would not be higher than 21%.

11. A second surrogate site has not been identified to date and therefore it is not clear as to the number of units this would deliver.

### **CONCLUSION**

12. The level of affordable housing provision secured under permission 162166 was considered acceptable by the Council in the context of the wider acceptability and benefits of that scheme. However, the visual and policy harm identified in respect of the new (current application) design must also be considered and the question is therefore the extent to which the proposed affordable housing package is a public benefit which outweighs the harm (taking into account the other benefits of the scheme). A fully policy compliant, on-site provision would carry greater weight, but would not in any case outweigh the other aspects of harm outlined in the committee report. The concerns identified in respect of affordable housing in the current scheme confirm that the proposals do not fully comply with Policy CS16 and would not provide sufficient affordable housing to meet housing needs when measured against Policy CS16. The Affordable Housing element of the proposal therefore carries limited weight.
13. The recommendation set out in the main agenda therefore remains unchanged.

### **14. LIST OF PLANS SUBMITTED**

- 152067-STL-19X10 PL1 Location Plan
- 152067-STL-19X11 PL1 Block Plan
- 152067-STL-20X01 PL1 North Elevation
- 152067-STL-20X02 PL1 South Elevation
- 152067-STL-20X03 PL1 East Elevation
- 152067-STL-20X04 PL1 West Elevation
- 152067-STL-20X05 PL1 East Elevation East Bay
- 152067-STL-20X06 PL1 East Elevation West Bay
- 152067-STL-20X07 PL1 West Elevation East Bay
- 152067-STL-20X08 PL1 West Elevation West Bay
- 152067-STL-10X50 PL1 Ground Floor Plan
- 152067-STL-10X51 PL1 Level 1 Plan
- 152067-STL-10X52 PL1 Level 2 Plan
- 152067-STL-10X53 PL1 Level 3 Plan

152067-STL-10X54 PL1 Level 4 Plan  
152067-STL-10X55 PL1 Level 5 Plan  
152067-STL-10X56 PL1 Level 6 Plan  
152067-STL-10X57 PL1 Level 7 Plan  
152067-STL-10X58 PL1 Level 8 Plan  
152067-STL-10X59 PL1 Level 9 Plan  
152067-STL-10X60 PL1 Level 10 Plan  
152067-STL-10X61 PL1 Level 11 Plan  
152067-STL-10X62 PL1 Level 12 Plan  
152067-STL-10X64 PL1 Level 13 Plan  
152067-STL-10X65 PL1 Level 14 Plan  
152067-STL-10X66 PL1 Level 15 Plan  
152067-STL-10X67 PL1 Level 16 Plan  
152067-STL-10X68 PL1 Level 17 Plan  
152067-STL-10X69 PL1 Level 18 Plan  
152067-STL-10X70 PL1 Level 19 Plan  
152067-STL-10X71 PL1 Level 20 Plan  
152067-STL-10X72 PL1 Level 21 Plan  
152067-STL-10X73 PL1 Level 22 Plan  
151638-STL-XX-00-DR-L-ZZZZ-09000 PL08 Landscape General Arrangement Ground Floor  
151638-STL-XX-03-DR-L-ZZZZ-09001 P01 Landscape General Arrangement Floor 3  
151638-STL-XX-10-DR-L-ZZZZ-09002 P01 Landscape General Arrangement Floor 10  
151638-STL-XX-11-DR-L-ZZZZ-09003 P01 Landscape General Arrangement Floor 11  
151638-STL-XX-12-DR-L-ZZZZ-09004 P01 Landscape General Arrangement Floor 12  
151638-STL-XX-22-DR-L-ZZZZ-09005 P01 Landscape General Arrangement Floor 22  
151638-STL-XX-00-DR-L-ZZZZ-09140 P05 Soft Landscape Works Ground Floor  
151638-STL-XX-03-DR-L-ZZZZ-09141 P01 Soft Landscape Works Floor 3  
151638-STL-XX-10-DR-L-ZZZZ-09142 P01 Soft Landscape Works Floor 10  
151638-STL-XX-11-DR-L-ZZZZ-09143 P01 Soft Landscape Works Floor 11  
151638-STL-XX-12-DR-L-ZZZZ-09144 P01 Soft Landscape Works Floor 12  
151638-STL-XX-22-DR-L-ZZZZ-09145 P01 Soft Landscape Works Floor 22



Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

151638-STL-XX-00-DR-A-ZZZZ-09301 PL03 Service Entry Zones

151638-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-ZZZZ-09400 PL02 Typical Tree Pit in Soft Landscape

151638-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-ZZZZ-09401 P01 Tree Within Planter

151638-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-ZZZZ-09402 P01 Step Details

151638-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-ZZZZ-09403 P01 Paving Details

This page is intentionally left blank

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES READING BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 24 <sup>th</sup> April 2019	ITEM NO. 11
--	-------------

Ward: Whitley

App No.: 180543

App Type: FUL

Address: Sales and Marketing Suite, Drake Way, Kennet Island

Proposal: Proposed construction of 12 apartments (1 x 1 bed, 11 x 2 bed) with associated car parking, landscaping and open space, and infrastructure provision.

Applicant: Berkeley Homes (Western) Limited

Date valid: 4/4/2018

Major Application: 13 week target decision date: 4/7/2018

Agreed Extension of time date: 31/5/2019

Planning Guarantee: 26 week date: 3/10/2018

## RECOMMENDATIONS

As on main report.

### 1.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

#### Further Consultation Response

- 1.1 A late objection was received, following the preparation of the main committee report and the recommendation for approval. This is as follows:

*I live on Kennet Island and would like to register an objection.*

*I note that only properties in the vicinity of the marketing suite were actively consulted with this application. This application will result in the loss of what was a meadow before this building was erected that was well used by residents.*

*The alternative open space proposed is not equal to what was there before. Given the developers are closing the gym and placed a commercial business into a unit under the guise of community space, there is little real offering of community space offered to residents. The Residents Association when it existed was approached about this space being used as a community centre when it was seeking planning permission for it to be built originally then the developers subsequently submitted an application for a temporary structure. To approve this application would be to against the conditions of the original application which are to return the space to its original use - the meadow - which was the largest piece of green open space available on the development - enabling older children to play where as other open spaces on the development are targeted to a much younger age group.*

*It appears that the developers have not given proper consideration to the full demographics of this development when considering the community space and open space required: a nursery/creche and three play parks only meet the needs of some of the residents who live here. Whilst a meeting room does exist on the development, it does not have the facilities, space or a suitable cover charge to meet most needs of residents. I understand that developers build houses and not communities but without full proper consultation with all residents, Kennet Island will continue to become a bland landscape without facilities or sense of*

*community. Residents can only do so much with the available resources and I would hope that even though the planning meeting will take place this week, that you are able to take this comment into consideration given that this planning application was 'hidden' to many of the residents that it would affect.*

- 1.2 It is acknowledged that the proposed flats would result in the loss of open space, and the justification for this is as documented in the main report section vi, paras 6.27-6.37. The area of the application site was originally intended to provide a landscape buffer/ area of grassland and planting rather than a formal play area. This loss is being compensated by an enhanced open space further into the development at Whale Avenue, under application reference 190308, which has now been approved, and its delivery will be a requirement as part of the proposed Section 106 legal agreement under this application.
- 1.3 With regards to play space for older children, the loss of open space resulting from this proposal would have no effect on this, as the space was not intended for this use. The applicant has confirmed that there is a large grassed area off Greenham Avenue, which provides a flexible space that can be used for a wide range of activities and play for all ages.
- 1.4 The objector also makes reference to the Kennet Gym. This does not form part of this application, however, the applicant has confirmed that residents were recently written to with regard the gym and its closure and that the gym space is bound by an earlier S106 agreement to be used as community space. It is the applicant's clear intention for the unit to be brought into alternative community use following engagement with local residents.
- 1.5 The objector refers to the application not being advertised widely enough. The consultation undertaken was in accordance with statutory requirements with both letters to nearest residents and a site notice.
- 1.6 It is considered that the issues raised have been addressed within the main report and the recommendation for approval remains as set out in the main report.

Officer: Alison Amoah