

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020

ITEM NO. 15

Page: 239

Ward: Norcot

Application No.: 182114/OUT

Address: Land adjacent Thorpe House, Colliers Way, Tilehurst

Proposal: Outline application for proposed residential redevelopment to provide 6 no. 3-bedroom dwellinghouses

### Recommendation:

As per main report.

## 1. Additional Representations Made

1.1 Following the publishing of the committee agenda and associated report, a residents' petition (26 signatures) and 8 additional letters of objection have been received, including a number sent directly to Members.

1.2 The additional objections largely relate to matters covered in the main report. New issues not covered in the main report are addressed below:

- Proposal does not align with the Government's Environment Bill 2020 Policy Statement (30th Jan 2020). *Officer Note: this is a Bill and is not law. It should be noted that no objection has been raised to the scheme by the Council's Ecologist or Tree Officer. In the event that the application was recommended for approval (or the Committee resolves to grant permission), conditions would have been/would be attached/recommended in respect of tree protection, soft landscaping and biodiversity enhancements.*
- No details regarding Skills Training commitment. *Officer Note: As noted in para 6.60 of the original committee report, the previous requirement is no longer applicable to this scheme, as it is below the policy threshold for this requirement.*
- Details required regarding Carbon Off-Setting. *Officer Note: application 180849 was required to achieve zero carbon homes standards due to the application being in the 'Major' Category. This current application is not a 'Major' application and the previous requirement is no longer applicable. Sustainability is discussed at para 6.55 in the original committee report.*

1.3 Officers are satisfied that all matters have been appropriately addressed within the original committee report.

## 2. Corrections

- 2.1 There is a typographical error in paragraph 6.11 of the main agenda report which is corrected as follows:

*“The current indicative proposal omits the second floor accommodation shown previously and indicates ~~two buildings separated by a small gap~~ one building in place of the two previously proposed.”*

- 2.3 The above error does not materially change the assessment of the scheme made as discussed within the original committee report and the recommendation remains as currently published.

**Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys**