

STATEMENT IN RESPECT OF POLICIES
EN7 LOCAL GREEN SPACE & PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

AND

EN8 UNDESIGNATED OPEN SPACE

Land to the rear of 303-315 Oxford Road, Reading

1. This Statement has been prepared in support of a planning application for the redevelopment of the site with a flatted development comprising 13 apartments and a building for use within Class E_g offices. This report should be read in conjunction with all of the other supporting reports.
2. At the outset, it is worth noting that the site falls within the existing built up area of Reading in an established residential area. Chapter 11 of the NPPF reiterates the well known objective of making effective use of land. In particular, paragraph 122 states:-

“Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

- a) **the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;**
- b) **local market conditions and viability;**
- c) **the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;**
- d) **the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and**
- e) **the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.”**

3. This site is allocated for residential development and provides an opportunity to increase the amount of residential development in a highly sustainable location which would help meet the Council's overall housing provision. It represents a 'windfall' site which the Council seeks to rely upon in meeting its housing provision. It also represents a more efficient and effective use of land.
4. Policy EN8 deals with undesignated open space but there is no such open space within the application site particularly as it is identified for housing development. Accordingly, the proposals are not in conflict with this policy and it is not a reason for resisting redevelopment of the site.