

UPDATE REPORT

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

ITEM NO. 12

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 3rd March 2021

Ward: Minster

App No.: 200979

Address: 18 Parkside Road, RG30 2DB

Proposal: Demolition of detached house and annex and erection of 3 storey building for 3x3, 3x2, and 6x1 bed flats, with undercroft parking, landscaping and bin stores

Applicant: Colony Developments

Deadline: 27/11/2020

Extended Deadline: 30/4/2021

Planning Guarantee 26 week target: 26/2/21

RECOMMENDATION:

As on main report, but with the following amendments:

The Section 106 Legal Agreement to Secure the Following:

Affordable Housing

- £150k AH contribution paid on occupation of 10th Unit, ~~or three no. shared ownership units. together with a Deferred Payment contribution with a 50/50 share in excess of 12% GDV on an open book basis capped at a total policy compliant sum of £521,000 to be calculated on the occupation of the 11th unit.~~

OR

- Three on-site shared ownership units or equivalent in terms of habitable rooms ~~together with a Deferred Payment contribution with a 50/50 share in excess of 12% GDV on an open book basis capped at a total policy compliant sum of £521,000 to be calculated on the sale of the 11th unit, or policy compliant 30%. equivalent to 30% calculated on the occupation of the 11th unit.~~

Additional Condition:

28. Obscure glazing to first floor full height windows on the southern side.

1. AMENDED INFORMATION

Transport

- 1.1 Following consultation on the amended plans and further discussion between the Officer and the agent an amended ground floor plan was submitted (*received 03-10 Rev P2, received 18th February 2021*), which increases the overall parking provision to 14 no. on site car parking spaces. The Transport officer provided further comments on these amendments and confirmed:

“In accordance with the adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD the proposed development would be required to provide off road parking of 1 Parking space for each 1 and 2 bedroom flat and 1.5 for a 3 bedroom flat, therefore equating to a total of 14 (rounded) parking spaces. In addition to this, visitor parking should also be provided at a ratio of 1 per 10 dwellings, therefore the whole development would require 15 (rounded) parking spaces. After reviewing car ownership data the proposed provision of 14 parking spaces as illustrated in the amended plan 3-10 P2 is acceptable.”

- 1.2 Transport has reiterated that cycle storage would need to be covered secure storage. A condition requiring such details is already included in the recommendation in the main report.
- 1.3 A further revised drawing has been submitted by the applicant (3-10 P3), which shows proposed and future electric vehicle charging points as required by Policy TR5.
- 1.4 Further details for bin storage are required and a condition as on the main report is maintained.
- 1.5 The amended scheme is considered to be acceptable in transport terms, subject to attaching conditions, and would therefore accord with requirements of policies TR2-TR5.

Site Levels

- 1.6 Following further resident submissions and disagreement over the site levels as presented, the applicant’s agent has revisited the topographical survey data and has prepared the following statement and amended drawings (see Appendix 1) as follows:

“Concerns have been raised during the consultation process that there is a significant increase in building height and ground levels. The initial explanation offered to the planning officer was that there would be no significant adjustments, but as a result of ongoing residents’ concerns, the officer has sought further clarification. It is correct that the general site levels to the rear gardens would remain similar to the existing. Whilst the driveway and undercroft parking would be raised slightly to lessen the overall gradient for the parking area and to allow disabled access. The raised levels would mainly be to the Parkside Road aspect and less so to the rear amenity, where the levels would be generally equal or less than the neighbouring properties.

Further topographic data has been provided to clarify the exact level changes and comparisons with context and all elevation sections have been updated to reflect this, alongside elevation gridlines to aid the understanding of height variations. Any indicative levels of the neighbouring properties have been refined, in particular the garden to No. 29 which now reflects a better

illustration of the relationship to the site and proposal.

With respect to the floor levels and building heights the existing house has a ground floor level of 57.32. The proposed building would have a car park/external level of 57.75 and ground floor level of 57.90, raising the levels by only 430mm and 580mm respectively. It is estimated that the building ground floor level would be very similar to that of No.29 if not slightly lower.

The tallest part of the proposal is 66.35, with the two wings, addressing No. 29 Westcote Road and no. 16 Parkside Road, lowered to 65.95. When compared to No.29 at 65.43, and No.16 at 64.52 the increase in height would be 550mm and 1455mm respectively, which is reasonable given the taller element of the proposal would be ca 14m from the boundary to no. 29 Westcote Road and the slight increase on the corner plot could be accommodated.”

- 1.7 Officers are satisfied that sufficient information has been presented to demonstrate what the effect of the proposed development would be with respect to its overall height and in its context, and does not change the assessment as set out in the main report.

Residential Amenity

- 1.8 Additional points have been raised, specifically by the residents of number 16. Parkside Road, which include reference to an inaccuracy within the report with respect to windows present on the northern side of their property (see comments and photos in Appendix 2; photos from no. 29 Westcote Road are included in Appendix 3). The officer confirms that this was an error, and as the application was received during Covid restrictions, had utilised information such as streetview, and other mapping systems, which allow a range of views. The side windows were not clearly picked up. In light of the confirmation that there are side facing windows at no. 16 Parkside, the officer has re-reviewed the effect of the proposed scheme with respect to overlooking/ loss of privacy in terms of those side facing windows.
- 1.9 The residents have advised that there are four no. windows: 2 at first floor serving a bedroom, and two at ground floor serving a study (see photo below).



- 1.10 It is considered that the main issue would be with respect to the effect of the proposed windows at first and second floor levels within the wing nearest no. 16. The latest proposed southern side of the building (05-12 Rev P2, rec 18/2/21) includes 4 no. high level windows and two full height windows at first floor and two slim windows at second floor (see below).



- 1.11 As the rooms these windows serve also have windows on the east and west elevations (front and back - from Parkside Road) the applicant has confirmed that the first floor full height windows would be obscured glazed, and a further condition is included in the recommendation above. In terms of the second floor windows these are very slim windows at ca 9m from the nearest point of no. 16, and it is considered that the level of direct overlooking/ loss of privacy would be minimal, and combined with landscaping along this boundary it is considered that this would not cause significant detrimental harm to the amenity of no. 16 in accordance with Policy CC8.

Section 106 obligations - Affordable Housing

- 1.12 Since the completion of the main report there has been further negotiation between the applicant and the Council's Valuer with respect to the Affordable Housing Contribution. It has been agreed that in the case of delivery of the option of three on-site shared ownership units, that this could be based on an equivalent number of habitable rooms, i.e. 9 habitable rooms. This could mean the delivery of fewer, but larger units as shared ownership, which is considered acceptable by RBC's Housing Team, who have confirmed that they would prefer larger units.
- 1.13 This is still considered to accord with the relevant Policies CC9 and H3 and the recommendation for approval is maintained, subject to some minor changes to the Heads of Terms in the recommendation as above.

Ecology

- 1.14 For further clarification, further bat surveys would be undertaken between mid-May and August 2021 and the results of these would inform the licensing process and the type of license that would be required (condition 8 of the main report).
- 1.15 The applicant has provided an updated report (*Update Preliminary Roost Assessment, High Level Inspection and Mitigation, rec 2/3/21*) Report, which makes it clear that the proposed mitigation measures, which include bat roosting features, bird boxes, bee bricks, hedgehog gaps, and wildlife beneficial landscaping scheme would provide biodiversity net gains to meet Policy EN12. The amended mitigation plan is included in Appendix 4. The measures within the amended document would be specifically referenced within recommended condition 9 as set out in the main report.

Sustainability

- 1.16 The applicant has submitted an updated Energy Assessment, which relates to the 12 unit scheme. This confirms that the proposed scheme would continue to achieve an overall reduction in Co2 of 36.97% with the proposed use of heat pumps and photovoltaic panels in accordance with Policy H5.

Written Statements

- 1.17 Written statements have been submitted by those members of the public who are registered under 'public speaking' and are included in Appendix 5. below.

Conclusion

- 1.18 Having reviewed the additional information the officer recommendation is not altered, save for the amendments to the S106 heads of terms, and an additional condition regarding windows, as above.

Officer: Alison Amoah

APPENDIX 1: SITE LEVELS/HEIGHTS PLANS



APPENDIX 2: FURTHER COMMENTS AND PHOTOS FROM NO. 16 PARKSIDE ROAD - provided by Mark Ashton & Lisa French

We have been shocked to see the committee report today ahead of the committee meeting on Wednesday in regards to the re development of 18 Parkside Road. Despite multiple objections from ourselves and many of the local residents the main objections all seem to have been ignored or given an unsatisfactory response and in some cases blatant lies.

We purchased our property just over 8 years ago when at the time we were up against 2 local developers and the family selling the house chose to sell to us as we wanted to renovate the property as our forever home. We love the fact that the houses on the road are all different shapes and sizes and full of character in this historic Reading Road. 16 Parkside Road is a lovely plot size and the garden is very private. We are nearing the end of our renovation after 8 long years but it now feels like the joy it once brought is about to be destroyed.

Please see below in particular the points on the committee report we feel we need to comment on *[Planning officer note: extracts from the committee report in red]*

6.14 The area comprises detached and semi-detached 2 storey housing, bungalows, care homes and blocks of flats. Some of these are large buildings with some surrounding setting/ garden space and are up to 4 storeys. These include 19 Westcote Road, Parkside Care Home, and YMCA, a large modern corner building (marked with red stars on the plan below).

The application keeps making reference to Parkside Care Home and that this proposed development is in some way comparable. The site on which that building sits is 4 times the size and in keeping in design with the houses in the area. Please see below photo of Parkside Care Home next door in line with our home. The building is set back with the 2nd floor in the pitched roof, the windows on the 1st floor are considerably smaller than the ones proposed at 18 Parkside Road and the windows on the 2nd floor are tiny, covered with shutters and hold some sort of generator room. There simply is not the feeling of being overlooked by this building as the developers have been considerate and careful with their design. The one big thing to point out that this is a very quiet care home - not a residential block housing over 30 occupants. The developers have built a fitting amenity as opposed to maximizing profit on the site at 18 Parkside Road forsaking local character and residents privacy and well being.



6.15 Although different in design to the adjacent buildings the overall layout of the proposed scheme would provide effective redevelopment of the plot, whilst maintaining sufficient distance to neighbouring properties. It would have a plot coverage consistent with other plots within the area, whilst ensuring sufficient landscaping and amenity setting to serve the proposed residents and to retain the verdant nature.

Please see below photos of all the houses on Parkside Road next to and adjacent to 18 Parkside Road - these are all residential and all of the same character and charm of Parkside Road. How in anyone's mind can these proposed plans think that this "office block" style of building will be a visual benefit to the area?





6.16 The height of the proposed scheme would be higher than the adjacent houses but would reflect heights of other buildings within the wider area. Due to the site levels, it is considered that it would be less dominant and overbearing in the street scene than other similar scale buildings. The agent has confirmed that the proposal would not involve raising the height of the land above the current ground level as suggested by an objector.

As you can see from the below photos this proposed development will undoubtedly tower over our back garden ensuring we will lose all privacy which was one of the reasons we purchased our home.



6.27 The character of the surrounding area is an important factor and the proposal would be comparable to the density of existing flatted developments in the area, for example no. 19 Westcote Road, which equates to a density of ca 100 DPH. The site is also considered to be a sustainable location being sited within close proximity of frequent premier bus routes on Bath Road and Tilehurst Road that run to and from the town centre and Reading West Railway Station to the east. In itself, the proposed density is not considered to be a reason to object to this application.

This proposed development also keeps comparing itself to the flats at 19 Westcote Road. As you can see from the photos, I took this morning this building is most defiantly in keeping with other buildings near by, the 2nd floor within the gable roof line and sympathetically designed along with consideration to neighbours by having no windows on the side. We would welcome a development along these lines.



6.36 The proposed scheme includes windows looking towards adjacent sites. With respect to the windows on the southern side (to no. 16 Parkside Road) within the wing of the building closest to the boundary, the majority of these would be facing the side of the no. 16 where there are no windows. There would be some limited oblique views into the rear amenity space. However, windows within the southern elevation of the other wing (parallel to Westcote Road), would be at ca 15.3m (ground/first floors) & 16.2m (second floor) from the boundary with no. 16 and it is considered that this distance, combined with tree and landscaped boundaries, would be sufficient to not cause significant detriment to the amenity of no. 16.

Please see below a photo of this side of our house (excuse render - we are mid renovation) where there are in fact 4 windows - one being our home office where Lisa works all day and the other being our bedroom - to say there are no windows on this side of our house is a lie.



6.37 With respect to no. 29 Westcote Road, similarly the closest east facing windows, would largely look directly towards the side elevation of no. 29, where there are no windows. It is considered that the remainder of the windows on the eastern side of the proposed scheme, which would be at a distance of ca 14.7m (ground & first) and 16.4m (second), combined with the retained and proposed landscaping, would also be sufficient to ensure that there would be no significant detriment to amenity and privacy. **There are existing similar relationships, for example the relationship between Parkside Care Home and no. 16 Parkside Road.**

This is the side aspect of our house from Parkside Care Home - how is this similar when they have been respectful and have only one window facing our house - which is infact just a stair well window.



6.24 The supporting text (para 4.4.7) states that, “*wherever possible, residential development should contribute towards meeting the needs for the mix of housing set out in figure 4.6, in particular for family homes of three or more bedrooms. As a minimum, on new developments for 10 or*

more dwellings outside the central area and defined district and local centres, planning decisions will ensure that over 50% of dwellings will be of 3 bedrooms or more, having regard to all other material considerations.”

6.25 The amended proposal includes 3 x 3 bed units, which represents 25% of the total number of units. However, the proposal also includes 3 x 2 bed units, i.e. 50% 2 and 3 bed units. Para 4.49 of the RBLP explains that “*taken as a whole .. homes with two or more bedrooms, capable of accommodating families, represent the majority of the need*”. It is considered that this combined with the overall accessibility of the site, the need to make effective use of the site and the existing range of housing types and mix within the area, make this mix of units acceptable in this case.

Sorry, but this requirement is not being met, no amount of arguing can change that. If the developer was serious about offering quality family accommodation, then the 50% target would be met. If developers can offer the explanation above and get planning approval, then what is the point in having the regulations in the first place? If this guidance is not adhered to then there is no incentive for developers to offer decent family sized dwellings.

One more point on this and just a general observation. Reading is bursting at the seams with flats, everywhere you drive there are new developments popping up, some of which are massive in size such as the Thames Quarter complex and the ongoing construction of Kennet Island. Is there truly still that much demand for flats in Reading? I find it hard to believe when you can see multiple for sale and to let signs outside many existing developments throughout Reading. A quick search on the internet on Rightmove shows 1935 flats available to rent in Reading and 1215 flats available for sale as of 1st March 2021. Add other sites into this and that is a pretty big number.

Reading is desperate for quality family housing. A development that concentrated on high quality homes would be far more suitable for the plot and location than yet more flats.

6.41 A total of 14 no. car parking spaces are proposed. This would comply with parking standards with respect to the provision for the units themselves. In terms of visitors the Council’s parking standards require one space per 10 flats, and as there is some unrestricted parking on Westcote Road and some limited time bays on Parkside Road, it is considered that this visitor parking could be accommodated on street, without significant detriment to highway safety.

This is, an incredible assumption that it will be okay for visitors to park on Westcote Road. As local residents, Mark walks to work everyday via Westcote Road and there is always large number of cars parked along here on both sides of the road, including up on pavements. With Covid restrictions currently in place the parking issue isn’t as bad but I can guarantee that once Covid restrictions are lifted we will see people who

don't live in the area dumping their cars and walking to Reading West Station or in some case all the way to Reading town centre. Believe me, this happens an awful lot as I see it with my own eyes.

Many households have more than one car so even with 14 car parking spaces planned this will not be enough for the number of occupants in the building. Add in visitors and it will result in a significant number of cars parked along Westcote Road.

The parking bays on Parkside Road are already full at night as time restrictions do not apply so that rules that out as an option for visitors to park in. In summary, the parking issue has not been addressed, in my opinion can't ever be as the development is simply too big and dense for the plot size. If this is approved, Westcote Road will become an absolute nightmare for the residents living along there. The road will also be extremely difficult and dangerous for motorists to navigate along.

In closing we want to add that we are not against the development of the site, in fact welcome it. But please try to ensure we preserve the beautiful charm of this old Reading road and be respectful to all the neighbouring properties and their privacy.

APPENDIX 3: PHOTOS FROM 29 WESTCOTE ROAD AND 16 PARKSIDE ROAD
- provided by Mr. Dodson

Site Photos – 29 Westcote Road & 16/18 Parkside Road RG30 2DL



Road entrance into 18 Parkside Road – note steep angle – too steep to be able to park across the slope hence new ground level has to be raised for proposed development.



Looking at the south end wall of 18 Parkside Road from across entrance to 16 Parkside Road. Note fence line which is constant along the boundary to where it joins 29 Westcote Road fence line.



View from road entrance of 29 Westcote Road looking across to boundary with 18 Parkside Road. Both buildings in worked out gravel pit.

Note summer house in 18 Parkside Road garden behind silver car cover.



View from 29 Westcote Road showing retaining wall of level car parking area and corner of roof of summer house in garden of 18 Parkside Road





This picture has the laser level line transferred and projected from top of the fence along the boundary between 18 Parkside Road and 16 Parkside Road shown projected onto the back of the summer house.



This picture has the laser level line from the front door threshold of 29 Westcote Road projected onto the rear of the summer house showing that it is ~0.5m below the 18/16 Parkside Road fence line.

The Colony drawing number '500 05-11 1:200 Westcote Road elevation' shows the ground level of the new development to be ~0.5m above the threshold of the front door of 29 Westcote Road.

Thus the proposed new site level is approximately at the same level as the top of the boundary fence between 18 and 16 Parkside Road.

This is also approximately in line with the top of the retaining wall seen in the picture below that runs right across the north of the 18 Parkside Road site.



Retaining wall
running across
north/Westcote
Road side of site

APPENDIX 4: UPDATED BIODIVERSITY MITIGATION PLAN



APPENDIX 5: WRITTEN STATEMENTS

A) Chris Dodson OBE - 29 Westcote Road

A need for an appropriate development at 18 Parkside Rd is recognised. However, this is not an appropriate development because:

- It would make a negative contribution to the character of the immediate area with inappropriate scale, overall bulk and density of occupation.
- The design density of the proposed development is overwhelmingly out of keeping with the immediately surrounding properties and nothing less than an eyesore. The fact that other developments nearby have such a density - 'two wrongs do not make a right'.
- The proximity to neighbouring properties categorically does not minimise exposure to such an overbearing and architecturally inappropriate structure.
- When new drawings were submitted to the planning portal on 18th February 2021, it was the first time they showed site lines for no 16 Parkside, it became clear that they proposed the whole site be lifted ~2m above the existing ground level - this will exacerbate the intrusive sight lines into surrounding properties and gardens (the new ground level is at the height of the top of fences of surrounding properties and gardens) and effectively 'adds a floor' in terms of appearance from adjoining properties and the street scene. The drawing 'Overlooking Section 500 02-50' with Section A-A does not show the 2m lift of the site and so the overlooking sightlines shown are not real, they are a great deal worse. An engineer has used a laser level to determine the existing building ground level (>1.5m below our front door threshold at 29 Westcote Road) and compared that with the new proposed sections which show the ground floor of the new development throughout to be some 0.5m above our front door threshold level. We therefore suggest the committee is being totally misled under 6.16 of the Committee Report in front of you.
- We feel strongly that the drawings were trying to hide from us the fact that the intent was to lift the building and the land that surrounds it over 2metres, above standard fence height. This would result in people effectively walking at the top of our fence height looking down on our property and gardens. At the same time it lifts the building and effectively reinstated the floor they said that they had removed in response to our objections.
- The residents of surrounding properties consider this proposal to be a blight on our immediate area which leads us to question why this application has any support within Reading Borough Council. This is a clear attempt to build as many units as possible to maximise profits with no regard to design quality and our immediate neighbourhood's character, unique assets and current density.

We ask you to reject this application and seek an appropriate more family friendly development on this site **built from the existing ground level.**

B) Mark Ashton & Lisa French - 16 Parkside Road

We are extremely disappointed that we are still objecting to the proposed redevelopment of 18 Parkside Road for the same reasons that we have submitted now on several occasions. Minimal concerns raised by ourselves and local residents have been addressed, to the point of actually being ignored. We want to clarify again that we are not against the redevelopment of 18 Parkside Road, but not in its current form.

Below is why we are objecting to the proposed development including breaking several key planning committee policies.

- It is clearly too large and dense for the plot size. Little consideration has been given to the size and quality of the dwellings. This is presumably to maximise developer profit. Squeezing 12 flats (possible 33 occupants) onto a plot that has for many years been a single family house is excessive to say the least.
- The southern boundary will now sit much higher so in effect the bottom of the new building will be in line with the top of our fence line. This isn't demonstrated on the plans at all which we feel is underhand and quite deliberate.
- The privacy of our property and surrounding buildings will be destroyed by the sheer size and overbearing nature of the development. This issue is amplified by the size of the windows and the glass balconies that are planned to overlook all adjacent properties. The architectural features proposed do not lend themselves to the rhythm of surrounding buildings as outlined in planning committee policies. A few trees and some trellis are not going to solve the issues with privacy on any of the boundaries.
- The design is ugly and not in any way in keeping with other surrounding buildings. The building offers nothing positive to the landscape and character of this prominent Reading area. How is this design even being considered in this location when the houses in this area feature pitched and gable roofs and brick and render finishes? This development is more in keeping with an office block suited to the town centre. Other recent developments in the area such as Westcote Road, specifically 5 & 19 have been designed sensitively and importantly with no over looking windows on both sides of the building to protect the privacy of nearby neighbours. The complete opposite is true of 18 Parkside Road.
- This size development will in turn create issues with traffic and parking. Parkside Road already has limited parking and is used as a rat run. It is already recognised that parking is a problem on Westcote Road, with cars parked on pavements both sides already. This will just add to the problem, especially when you factor in visitor traffic. Speed restrictions along both roads in recent weeks already slows there are traffic issues. The development offers only

- 13 parking spaces when a minimum of 14 are required. The fact this allows just one space for all visitors to 12 flats is a major concern.
- Under current policy a building with over 10 dwellings must have 50% of properties with 3 beds. This is not the case with this development, currently only 25% of units will be 3 beds. There is clearly little emphasis here for the provision of family-sized housing which again is another key part of planning policy.

C) Sue Spooner - 9B Parkside Road

The amended plans do not in any way make the design of the proposed development appropriate for Parkside or Westcote Roads. The flat-roofed boxy style of the design is completely out of keeping with nearby properties which all have pitched roofs and gables. Other recent developments of houses, flats and care homes on both roads have been exemplary in following the local design style, and have therefore blended in to and enhanced the appearance of the street. This rectangular, office-block style of development might be appropriate for a city centre, but is completely out of place in the middle of traditional Victorian-style housing. Having such an ugly, large development on a prominent corner plot will greatly detract from the appearance of both streets and will completely dominate neighbouring houses.

I am also very concerned about the impact that such a dense development will have on traffic and parking on Parkside and Westcote roads. Clearly there will not be sufficient parking provided within the precincts of the property itself for such a large number of flats, which will mean that residents of the flats and their visitors will have to park on Parkside or Westcote roads. These roads are too narrow to have cars parked on both sides, so this is likely to greatly inconvenience existing residents as well as make driving down the streets very difficult. It is also likely to result in cars parking on the pavement which will be dangerous for pedestrians.

I appreciate that redevelopment of this plot is reasonable, but I really hope that the Council will reject these plans to conserve the beauty and character of the area.

D) Dr. J A ("George") Nowacki and Mrs Helen Nowacka - 4 Parkside Road

The proposed design is completely out of keeping in a long-established road with many houses around 100 years old and the newer properties (Bewley Homes development) carefully designed to blend in with the older houses.

1. Reading Local Plan Policy CC7: Design and the Public Realm.

High design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located, (with respect to: density and mix, scale, height and massing and architectural details and materials.

NOT MET

2. H11, Development of Private Residential Gardens:

Relationship with surrounding area, integration with surrounding area, the arrangement of doors, windows and other principal architectural features and their rhythm between buildings.)

NOT MET

Just look at the elevations showing adjacent buildings, Drawing no. 500-05-10 and new buildings opposite. No attempt at blending or integrating.

3. Revised Parking Standards and Design (SPD Oct 2011)

The Standard for flats in Zone 2 stipulates 1.5 car spaces for 3-bedroom flats and 1 car space for 1 and 2 bedroom flats plus 1 visitor's space. This comes to $3 \times 1.5 = 4.5$ plus $9 \times 1 =$ plus 1. A total of 14.5 spaces. There should also be parking provision for 9 bicycles. The developers offer 12 car parking spaces only.

NOT MET

Parking in Parkside Road is restricted and cars are already parked on both sides of the road (and pavements) in Westcote Road. These roads are used as a rat-run in non-lockdown times.

4. Local Plan for Housing

50% of new-build developments of 10 or more dwellings outside Central Reading to be family units (i.e. 3 or more bedrooms) The proposal offers 25%

NOT MET

The proposal is trying to cram too many dwellings into a plot occupied by one family house with no regard to blending with adjoining properties. It is surprising that the Planning Officer recommends Approval when the proposal does not meet the criteria set by the Planning Committee. It would save a lot of Committee time if the Planning Officer guided developers to present proposals that met Planning Committee Policies and Guidelines. If the Planning Committee does not enforce its policies, there is no incentive for developers to comply.