

Planning Applications Committee: 6 August 2015

Updates to report

Application no: 15/00593/F - 20-22 Bridewell Alley Item 4(A) page 15

Correction to report:

Paragraph 21 reads:

Some consideration was given to planting or a taller obscured balustrade but the implications for overlooking or design would outweigh the relatively low level of amenity loss.

It should read:

Some consideration was given to planting or a taller obscured balustrade but the implications for overshadowing or design would outweigh the relatively low level of amenity loss.

Application no: 15/00256/F – 111 Adelaide Street Item 4(B) page 23

Additional letter of representation

The main problem is two rear windows facing directly onto our garden of which the wall is the bottom boundary, only around 3m from the bench we use. With the windows open this would lead to noise and conversation being heard both ways. This would be exacerbated if the windows were bathrooms and not kitchens.

Officer response

See main issue 3. Reasonable use of the proposed flats is not considered to cause any particular conflict with neighbouring properties or the enjoyment of their gardens, particularly considering its current lawful use is an unrestricted pub.

**Application no: 15/00915/NF3 - Garages Adj. 13 Riley Close
Item 4(D) page 55**

Correction to report

The extent of the application site indicated on page 56 of the report is incorrect. The correct site boundary excludes the Riley Close highway and grassed area (except for the proposed three parking spaces). The correct plan is as shown on the location plan in the corner of page 68.

Additional representations

Two additional representations have been received citing the following concerns:

- The development would impact my rear boundary fence and the access to my property (13 Riley Close)
- Would it be possible to increase the additional parking spaces from 3 to 4 as there seems to be plans to make parking spaces available on the existing grassed area. Which local residents, I'm sure will be grateful for. The reasons being is that there is already high volumes of traffic on Riley Close and fear that any additional properties will just increase this. Yes the new homes are having parking allocated to them but it seems unfair that existing residents struggle to park their vehicles. This seems like an ideal time to address the problem and lead the way with any new development. Any additional cost could be incurred by the developers and at no cost to the council.

Officer response

- The proposal provides appropriate replacement fencing along the east boundary. In regards to access, no. 13 has two points of access to their property i.e. via Riley Close and via the garage site. The application will not affect the former, with the latter being a civil matter between the two landowners. Although, it is understood that the applicant (the council) has already embarked on separate discussions to resolve the matter.
- Providing 2 parking spaces for each of the new dwellings is the maximum allocation for dwellings of this size and location. The provision of 3 unallocated spaces on the turning head is already a generous addition and in excess of the council's parking policy. Furthermore, the application site does not have the capacity to accommodate an additional space. Whilst there may be parking pressures in the local area, this development is not required to resolve any perceived parking pressures in the wider area.

Additional comments from consultee

The local highway authority would like the applicant to be aware of the highway authority requirements for the adoption of part of the forecourt area and unallocated parking spaces, preferring

Officer response

An informative will be added to the approval reminding the applicant of the need to be aware of the adoption process.

Clarification of current policy status re. affordable housing

Following a High Court judgment (about a case in Reading) made on 31st July 2015 paragraphs 012 to 023 of national Planning Policy Guidance, relating to the exemption of small developments from affordable housing contributions and the vacant building credit, have been quashed. This means that JCS policy 4, requiring housing developments of 5 to 10 dwellings to provide affordable housing, once again fully applies. As a result of this, parts of the adopted affordable housing supplementary planning document (SPD) no longer apply. The version on the website has now been amended by striking out section 4.

In this particular application there are 10 units and therefore the previous exemption from the requirement for a proportion of affordable housing will not now apply. However, as stated in the summary in para 4 and the comments from housing strategy in para 9, 100 per cent of the proposal will be affordable dwellings for social rent. There is no need for a section 106 agreement as the council will have full control over the development as landowner and developer.

**Item 5 – performance report
Updates to appendix 3 (page 115):**

33 Grosvenor Road – now satisfactorily completed and the window replaced. It will be removed from the update at the next quarterly review.

9 Edward Jodrell Plain – enforcement notice now served