

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

ITEM NO. 10

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 29<sup>th</sup> April 2020

Ward: Norcot

Application No.: 191757/FUL

Address: 10 Pegs Green Close

### RECOMMENDATION

Same as Committee report (Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions and informatives)

#### Conditions:

Same as Committee report apart from removing condition 4 as new amended plan deals with information required.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### Public Representations

1.1 Five statements have been submitted by local residents, which they ask to be taken into consideration. This is in lieu of public speaking, which is currently suspended.

1.2 The statements have been received from the following neighbouring households:

- 3 Pegs Green Close - Debra Little
- 5 Pegs Green Close - Malcolm & Carole Taylor
- 6 Pegs Green Close - Annie Gedye
- 8 Pegs Green Close - Yalini Neguleashwaran & Ashley Cooper
- 9 Pegs Green Close - Richard Picken

1.3 The comments mainly repeat their earlier objections made during the consultations stage of the application, although a few addition points are noted:

- Granting planning permission now will allow for a larger extension to occur in the future
- The footprint is increasing by over 100% of the existing
- The changes compared to the previous application are minimal, and therefore if approved, this contradicts the Planning Committee Member's objections in the last Planning Committee in regard to the loss of gap (creating a terraced appearance), and also contradicts the dismissed Appeal.

### Amended plan

1.4 Since the Committee report was written an amended block plan has been received which changes the front driveway layout to improve access to the two parking spaces. (see attached plan). This has been confirmed by Transport officers to be acceptable. Whilst it is appreciated that some of the objections suggest that two spaces is insufficient, this is as required under Policy, and therefore the proposed parking is sufficient. A parking space remains on the road in front of the garden.

## Planning conditions

- 1.5 It should be noted that there is a condition recommended to remove permitted development rights to prevent the property from being increased in size in addition to what is currently proposed. This means that planning permission will need to be sought for any development in addition to what is currently proposed. This condition is considered to meet the tests for imposing planning conditions, in that it is necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.
- 1.6 However, to impose a condition to prevent a change of use to a small HMO (C4 Use), as some objectors have requested would not meet these tests. It is understood that a C4 use has already started so we would not be able to enforce against this use and the condition would not be relevant to the development sought

## Conclusion

- 1.7 As set out within the Committee report, it is considered that the changed proposal, when compared to the previously refused and dismissed scheme has overcome the concerns previously raised. The recommendation is to grant planning permission.

**Case Officer: James Overall**

