

# Planning Applications Committee

Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

### Index

	<u>Page</u>
Item No. 4 Page 7 Potential Site Visits for Committee Items	1
Item No. 7 Page 27 QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT - - Quarters 1 2 and 3, 2018/19	2 - 3
Item No. 9 Page 39      171808 18 Waylen Street	4
Item No. 13 Page 111      180591 Mulberry House, 1a Eldon Road	5 - 7

**Applications for Committee Determination since previous Committee Report****Printed: 7 January 2019****Ward: Abbey****Application reference: 181930****Application type: Full Planning Approval****Site address: 29 Station Road, Reading, RG1 1LG****Proposal:** Demolition of the existing vacant 6-storey retail and office building and erection of a replacement basement and part 4, part 22 (with rooftop plant above) storey building to provide flexible retail (Class A1, A2, A3, A4 or A5) use at part ground floor level, a 135-bedroom hotel (Class C1) at 1st to 16th floors and offices (Class B1a) at 17th to 21st floors, associated servicing from Garrard Street and other associated works (amended description).**Reason for Committee item: Major Application****Ward: Abbey****Application reference: 181991****Application type: Regulation 3 Planning Approval****Site address: Isis Court, De Montfort Road, Reading****Proposal:** Conversion of redundant bin store, common room, back-office and lobby area to create a two-bedroom apartment**Reason for Committee item: RBC Application****Ward: Caversham****Application reference: 182031****Application type: Regulation 3 Planning Approval****Site address: Land adjoining 5, Ian Mikardo Way, Caversham, Reading****Proposal:** Construction of new three-bed dwelling and associated parking and access.**Reason for Committee item: RBC Application****Ward: Thames****Application reference: 182060****Application type: Certificate of Lawfulness - Proposed Use or Development****Site address: 15 Balmore Drive, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8NL****Proposal:** Single storey side extension**Reason for Committee item: Applicant is RBC staff****Ward: Whitley****Application reference: 182139****Application type: Certificate of Lawfulness - Proposed Use or Development****Site address: 19 Bennet Road, Reading, RG2 0QX****Proposal:** Erection of a flat roof steel framed canopy. Replacement of existing single glazed steel windows with double glazed PPC items. Blocking up of several window and door openings. Possible lift over-run enclosure. Modification to below ground drainage. Provision of PV panels behind the parapets at roof level.**Reason for Committee item: RBC Application****Ward: Mapledurham****Application reference: 182200****Application type: Variation of Condition****Site address: Mapledurham Playing Fields, Upper Woodcote Road, Reading, RG4 7LH****Proposal:** Erection of 2FE primary school (350 pupils) with associated landscaping, multi-use games area (MUGA), car and cycle parking, and servicing; without complying with conditions 2 (approved plans), 9 (landscaping scheme) and 10 (details of hard and soft landscaping of the MPF Community Car Park) of planning permission 171023/FUL.**Reason for Committee item: Major Application**

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES READING BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 9 January 2019	ITEM NO. 7 Page 27
---	-----------------------

### QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT - DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE - Quarters 1 2 and 3, 2018/19

Quarter 3 (October - December) has been updated to reflect the whole quarter to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2018.

In a couple of areas, the performance figures have changed. In particular the first indicator relating to major applications has improved significantly although that is partly as a result of a correction to one application that had been recorded as decided without an extended period agreed with the applicant when such an extension of time had been agreed.

Table 1 RBC Planning Service Quarterly Performance Indicators for 2018/19.

Description	Target	16-17	17/18	Q1 18-19	Q2 18-19	Q3 18-19	Q4 18-19
Percentage of major applications decided within: (i) statutory 13/16 weeks, or (ii) the extended period agreed with the applicant. (NB note that a risk of designation occurs where 40% or fewer of their decisions on major applications are made within the statutory determination period or such extended period as has been agreed in writing with the applicant).	60%	89% (42/47)	80% (24/30)	100% (6/6)	100% (7/7)	90% (9/10)	
Percentage of minor applications decided within (i) statutory 8 weeks or (ii) the extended period agreed by the applicant.	65%	74% (166/ 223)	88% (205/ 234)	90% (43/ 48)	86% (48/ 56)	95% (40/ 42)	
Percentage of other applications decided within statutory 8 weeks	80%	59% (457/ 769)	68% (478/ 699)	59% (104/ 176)	63% (109/ 172)	50% (84/ 169)	
Percentage of other applications decided within (i) statutory 8 weeks or (ii) the extended period as agreed by applicant.	80%	85% (657/ 769)	96% (669/ 699)	96% (169/ 176)	95% (163/ 172)	91% (153/ 169)	
Percentage of householder applications (not for prior approval) decided within (i) statutory 8 weeks or (ii) the extended period agreed by the applicant.	80%	62% (308/ 499)	92% (429/ 464)	96% (113/ 118)	94% (121/ 129)	91% (99/ 109)	
Percentage of householder applications (not for prior approval) decided within statutory 8 weeks.	80%	86% (430/ 499)	69% (321/ 464)	66% (78/ 118)	65% (84/ 129)	56% (61/ 109)	
Planning Enforcement: % of enforcement complaints resolved within appropriate deadline according to priority	60%	82% (244/ 299)	79% (199/ 252)	96% (67/ 70)	96% (67/ 70)	86% (65/ 76)	
Appeal performance - % allowed as a total of all appeals (a lower % figure is better)	30%	20% (8/41)	43% (16/37)	50% (2/4)	33% (4/12)	7% (1/14)	
Major application appeal performance - % allowed as a total of all appeals (NB note that a risk of designation occurs where more than 20% of major applications decisions are overturned on appeal. (a lower % figure is better)	20%	0% (0/0)	0% (0/2)	100% (1/1)	100% (1/1)	25% (1/4)	

**UPDATE REPORT:**

**BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES**  
**READING BOROUGH COUNCIL** **ITEM NO. 9**  
**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 9 January 2019**

**Ward:** Abbey  
**App No.:** 171808/FUL  
**Address:** Central Jamme Mosque, 18/18a Waylen Street, Reading  
**Proposal:** Retrospective planning application for the demolition of a pre-existing extension and the construction of a two storey rear extension, and the erection of a boundary wall adjacent to the highway (amended description).  
**Applicant:** Bangladesh Association of Greater Reading (charity number 1039747).

**RECOMMENDATION AMENDED TO:**

**DEFER** for further information.

**1. REASON FOR DEFERRAL**

- 1.1 The Main Agenda report discusses various matters which officers had hoped would be confirmed/resolved by the time of your meeting. These primarily concern the mechanism to control the capacity of the mosque, but also the control of the travel plan and the detailed wording of conditions. Unfortunately, it has become clear that these matters have still not been addressed to officers' satisfaction and in the circumstances, it is recommended that that Members again defer this Item to allow officers to continue to work with the applicant and relevant consultees.

Case Officer: Richard Eatough

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019

ITEM NO. 13  
Page: 111

Ward: Redlands

Application No.: 180591

Address: Mulberry House, 1a Eldon Road, Reading, RG1 4DJ

Proposal: Demolition of Mulberry House (Class D1) and erection of part 3, part 5 storey building providing 7 (3x1 & 4x2-bed) residential units (Class C3), 5 parking spaces, landscaping and associated works.

### Recommendation:

As in main report, barring:

- the date for the legal agreement to be completed by being **23<sup>rd</sup> January 2019** (rather than the 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018 date specified in error in the main report)
- An additional informative is recommended stating that the applicant is strongly advised to liaise with nearby occupiers/landowners prior to the submission of details for conditions 4 (demolition & construction method statement) and 8 (waste management plan).

## 1. Further public consultation responses

1.1 Subsequent to the publication of the main report, 8 further objections have been received from nearby occupiers (7 from 'new' respondents and 1 from an individual who has commented previously). The further responses are from: properties in Hanover House - 1 at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level, 1 at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, 1 at 6<sup>th</sup> floor and 3 from unspecified occupiers; 2 from Eldon Road. A further response has also been received from the Hanover House Residents Management Company. Many of the same issues (already set out at section 4) of the main report are raised, but are detailed below for completeness:

### 1.2 Design / Impact on the Conservation Area

- This will be an even worse eyesore than Hanover House currently is.
- The design looks totally not in keeping with the look and feel of the road and will eliminate what is an attractive grass lawn area in front of the current dentist practice.
- The proposed property will materially worsen the appearance of the road. Given its visual and historical value, only more modest period-style properties should be considered for new construction. Please do not proceed with this awful design.
- The proposed concrete minimalist design for the new Mulberry House could not be more offensive to the historic Victorian properties which sit on Eldon Road and Eldon Square.
- A conservation area is supposed to be enhanced and protected. Not at constant risk of cheap infill property development opportunities for profit.
- 5 storey structure cannot be considered in keeping with the period properties.

- The fact that it sits next to Hanover House should not be used as an excuse to warrant the construction of concrete-based block style building in a conservation area.
- Please stop this monstrosity from going ahead and reconsider a design which is more in keeping and respectful to the area.

### 1.3 Amenity

- The lengthy construction works will be very painful for the occupiers of surrounding properties. Another objector also mentions this and the need to revise for university exams.
- It would be awful to have the minimal amount of sunlight Hanover House flats get limited even further due to this building. Another occupier of a third floor flat on the south side of Hanover House says it will block all the sunlight to their flat.

### 1.4 Transport

- Building a property of this size will only cause additional traffic problems in the area
- The Council would add to the problem by issuing additional parking permits to the new residents and their guests.
- New tenants will presumably try and take advantage of parking at Hanover House.

### 1.5 Procedural issues regarding being informed about the proposals being considered by the Planning Applications Committee:

- Given the incredibly short notice of this news I find it staggering to receive this over the festive period.
- This manner of process is simply unfair, rushed and not in keeping of looking after the current residents of this area.
- Dissatisfaction that this has taken place over Christmas and New year, when most residents are on holiday

### 1.6 Issues raised by the further response of the Hanover House Residents Management Company (HHRMC):

- Serious concerns regarding some of the statements made by the applicant regarding the waste management and refuse collection. Consider that such matters should be resolved via a pre-commencement condition, rather than the recommended pre-occupation condition. Such an approach in effect allows construction to be completed before any serious thought is given to how the waste collection will work for Mulberry House.
- Issues around access during demolition and construction will be resolved / covered by the pre-commencement demolition & construction method statement. HHRMC assume that either the applicant or RBC will be required to liaise with us before the method statement is approved - it would be better if this was to be formally included in the conditions.
- Serious doubts regarding the applicant's statements concerning their rights of access through the car park.

### 1.7 Officer response: As per the main report (sections 6ii, 6v, 6vi & ix in particular) the proposals are considered to be appropriate subject to conditions. An additional informative is recommended in relation to

encouraging the applicant to liaise with nearby occupiers/landowners prior to the submission of details for conditions 4 (demolition & construction method statement) and 8 (waste management plan). Regarding procedural concerns about being informed about the proposals being considered by the Planning Applications Committee over Christmas/New Year, this followed standard protocol on such matters.

**Case Officer: Jonathan Markwell**