

199-207 Reading Road, Caversham

Design, Access and Planning Statement

March 2018

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
2	The Site	2
3	Design and Planning Assessment	5
4	Access	13
5	Conclusions	14
	Appendix 1: Previous Refused Application (161842)	15

1 Introduction

1. 1 This Design, Access and Planning Statement accompanies an application for planning permission for the demolition of nos 199-203 Henley Road and erection of 42 dwellings at 199-203 Henley Road and to the rear of 205-207 Henley Road with associated access and landscaping.
1. 2 This is a resubmitted application following a previous application (170959/FUL) that has a resolution to grant that is currently waiting the finalisation of the S106 agreement. This application only differs from the previous one in so far as provision for affordable housing has been removed and a Viability Report is submitted in support of this change. All other principles of the development that were established with the previous application remain unchanged.
1. 3 This Statement is structured in accordance with the advice in National Planning Practice Guidance. It also takes account of the local requirements of the Council as well as setting out the appropriate planning background to the proposals.
1. 4 The statement is set out as follows:
 - Assessment
 - *Physical*
 - *Social*
 - *Economic*
 - *Planning Policy*
 - *Planning History*
 - Design and Planning Assessment
 - *Proposals*
 - *Use*
 - *Development of Residential Gardens*
 - *Affordable Housing and Viability*
 - *Flooding*
 - *Arboriculture*
 - *Sustainability*
 - *Air Quality*
 - *Transport*
 - Access
 - Conclusion
1. 5 Details of the application site are set out in Section 2 while details of the proposals and an analysis of the planning case for the proposals are in section 3.

2 The Site

- 2.1 This section of the report considers the site's immediate and wider context in terms of physical, social and economic factors as well as the relevant planning policy context.

Physical

- 2.2 The application site is on the B4155 (Henley Road) which links to Reading to the south west and Henley to the north east. The site is within Reading Borough Council.
- 2.3 The site has an area of 0.96ha and comprises the house and gardens of nos 199-203 and the rear gardens of nos 205-207.
- 2.4 Henley Road is predominantly residential in character with the original form of development comprising large detached properties with long back gardens. Recent developments have involved building on the rear gardens of the properties in the vicinity of the site. In particular, the site is adjacent to a large development at Ruskin Court which extends from Henley Road into the rear of the site.
- 2.5 The site is well located for access to facilities and services in the local area as well as for public transport access into Reading Town Centre.

Social

- 2.6 The key social impact to consider is the need to protect the amenity of future residents of the dwellings and the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.
- 2.7 The amenity of residents is considered in Section 3.

Economic

- 2.8 The key economic factor influencing this scheme is the need to make use of an underused site and enable its redevelopment for additional residential dwellings.

Planning Policy

National Planning Policy

- 2.9 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 which established a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.

-
2. 10 In making decisions, Local Planning Authorities should approach decision taking in a positive way and should look for solutions rather than problems. They should, at every level, seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
 2. 11 The NPPF sets out the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice for the planning system and it encompasses three distinct areas; economic, social and environmental.
 2. 12 The NPPF also sets out the need to 'boost significantly' the supply of housing land and this is complementary to the ethos of planning for positive growth which is the golden thread running through the document.
 2. 13 The NPPF sets out that the development plan should be the starting point for decision making, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out a number of core planning principles that are to underpin decision making. These include encouraging the effective use of land by re-using land that has already been developed.

Local Planning Policy

2. 14 The Council's current planning policy context of relevance to this site is contained within the Core Strategy (January 2008, altered January 2015) and the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (October 2012, altered January 2015). Policies that are relevant to these proposals include:
 - CS7: Design and the Public realm
 - CS14: Provision of Housing
 - CS15: Location, accessibility, density and housing mix
 - CS16: Affordable Housing
 - DM4: Safeguarding Amenity
 - DM5: Housing Mix
 - DM6: Affordable Housing
 - DM10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space
 - DM11: Development of Private residential Gardens
2. 15 Other relevant documents to these proposals include:
 - Revised Parking Standards and Design (October 2011)
 - Affordable Housing SPD (January 2013)
2. 16 In addition to these planning policies, it is noted that the Council has recently published an Issues and Options document (January 2016) for the new Local Plan. This document includes an increased annual housing target up from 572 to 699 to meet objectively assessed housing need; a substantial increase in housing requirements in the Borough.
2. 17 The southern part of the site lies within Flood Zone 2 due to its proximity to Berry Brook which runs along the southern boundary.

Planning History

- 2. 18 In January 2007 a planning application was submitted covering 205-219 Henley Road, Caversham. This application sought permission for a 60 bed care home and a further 60 dwellings. This application was refused in May 2007 and subsequently dismissed at appeal in December 2007.
- 2. 19 The principle of residential development in this location was considered acceptable but the detail of the proposals was not felt appropriate for the location.
- 2. 20 Proposals were submitted for the site in September 2016 for 60 dwellings. This application was subsequently refused in January 2017 (planing ref: 161842). Figure 1 shows the site layout of the previous application for comparison purposes.
- 2. 21 The previous application was refused for 15 reasons (see Appendix 1).
- 2. 22 A subsequent application was lodged in June 2017 to address the issues raised

Figure 1: Site layout of previous proposals for 60 dwellings (refused scheme)



by the previously refused application. These proposals were viewed positively by the Council and were subsequently given a resolution to grant in January 2018 and we are currently waiting for the S106 agreement to be finalised.

3 Design and Planning Assessment

- 3.1 This section assesses the planning merits of the proposals in relation to the planning policy context of the site and having regard to relevant site specific constraints and issues. It also describes the scheme in detail and the factors taken into account in the design process.
- 3.2 Clearly, the fact that an identical scheme has a resolution to grant permission indicates that the physical and technical aspects of the scheme have been considered to be acceptable.

Proposals

- 3.3 The proposals seek outline planning permission for the following form of development:

Outline application for the demolition of nos 199-203 Henley Road and erection of 42 dwellings at 199-203 Henley Road and to the rear of 205-207 Henley Road with associated access from Henley Road

- 3.4 The proposed layout of the dwellings at the front of the development will respond to the scale of development along Henley Road while larger dwellings aligned along the rear of the site protects residential amenity for adjacent developments and has a positive impact on flood risk and biodiversity issues on the site which will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sections.
- 3.5 The T-shaped block as you enter provides a good transition into the rear of the site from the frontage development as well as mirroring the long front gardens and building line seen along Henley Road. Due to the level changes on the site, the frontage block will follow the existing ridge heights in this location. The frontage to Henley Road, therefore, is considered to be entirely appropriate and to address reason for refusal 5 and 7 of the first application.
- 3.6 Larger family dwellings are located to the rear of the site to minimise the built development to the rear of the site. This has been done to protect the amenity of existing residents as well as to retain the existing open space to the rear of the site for flooding and biodiversity reasons. Originally a flat block was proposed to the rear of the site which has now been removed to address reason for refusal 5 and 8 of the first application.
- 3.7 The proposed dwelling mix is set out in Table One.

Table One: Dwelling Mix

	Total	
2-bed 4 person flat	24	57%
3-bed 5 person flat	6	14%
4-bed 8 person house	12	29%
Total	42	

3. 8 The proposed layout provides for 74 car parking spaces including provision for visitor car parking. Secure cycle parking will also be provided across the development.

Principle of the Use

3. 9 The site is currently in residential use and lies within a predominantly residential area.
3. 10 The redevelopment of the site for a more dense form of residential use is compatible with surrounding land uses, and other similar developments in the area, and is in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development that is central to the government's National Planning Policy Guidance.
3. 11 Furthermore, Core Strategy Policy CS14 states that the need for housing will be met from, inter alia, development coming forward on large and small previously developed site.
3. 12 Policy DM11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) states that proposals for the development of residential gardens will be acceptable provided that they meet a number of specific criteria. The following section will describe in more detail how this development will meet these specific criteria but overall the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policy DM11.

Redevelopment of Residential Gardens

3. 13 Policy DM11 of the Local Plan sets out the criteria against which proposals for new residential development within the curtilage of private residential gardens will be considered. This sections considers the criteria of this policy in turn.

Positive contribution to the area

3. 14 The proposed development has been designed to reflect the existing form of development along the frontage of the site; see extract of streetscene drawing in Figure 2 and an extract of the proposed layout is shown in Figure 3. The layout and form of the proposals seeks to respond to the very different forms of development that are adjacent to the site's east and west boundaries.
3. 15 The existing arrangement of properties along Henley Road does not create a strong frontage befitting either this main thoroughfare or in response to the adjacent development of Ruskin Court and the houses that front onto Henley Road to the north.

Figure 2: Proposed Streetscene onto Henley Road



Figure 3: Proposed Site Layout



- 3. 16 Policy DM11 requires new residential development to create an appropriate relationship to existing built form which integrates with the surrounding area.
- 3. 17 Significant changes have been made to the proposals in comparison to the previously refused scheme. There has been a large reduction in the numbers proposed from 60 to 42 units, the design and layout and its impact now makes a positive contribution to the character of the area by reducing the scale of the Henley Road frontage block and including only single dwellinghouses to the rear.
- 3. 18 This layout now integrates with the surrounding area with regards to the existing build form, plot frontages, parking areas and existing pattern of openings and boundary treatments on the site frontage, building heights reflect the surrounding area with particular attention given to accommodate good spacing around buildings with well-designed landscaping around the boundary, buildings, access and parking areas and the introduction of good quality amenity space.
- 3. 19 As shown in Figure 3, the design of the proposals have sought to replicate a form of development seen along Henley Road with a large spacious front landscaped area. The proposals include a stronger form of frontage development than that currently seen along Henley Road which, at present, appears as a disjointed rhythm of plot frontages especially at the application site.
- 3. 20 Figure 3 also demonstrates the use of extensive landscaping and planting to 'green' the site and complement the area. Land to the south of the site is included as rear gardens, with some supplemental planting, to ensure that a buffer zone to Berry Brook is retained. This also acts to further enhance the landscaping of the site.
- 3. 21 This site is seen as a transition point between the large dominant buildings of Ruskin Court which face onto Henley Road to the west and the more modest single family dwellinghouses to the east. As such the compatibility with general building heights along Henley Road is maintained.

-
3. 22 In terms of materials the use of brick and render is in keeping with the traditional design and form of dwellings along Henley Road.

Suitability of site layout

3. 23 The site provides good levels of landscaping and an access through the site to the dwellings at the rear. The site layout (see Figure 3) shows the predominance of landscaping proposed on the site creating a good balance between landscaping, amenity areas, access road and hardstanding areas in direct response to the original reason for refusal 5.
3. 24 The inclusion of the larger block of development at the front of the site responds to the adjacent form of development at Ruskin Court. Alongside single dwellinghouses to the rear this provides a good mix of dwellings (as shown in Table 1) on the site that also responds to the form of adjacent developments.
3. 25 The layout of the site has also sought to limit impact on the private rear gardens of properties which back onto the site in particular those properties in Ruskin Court and the long back gardens of no. 209 Henley Road.

Amenity Space

3. 26 The application site, overall, has been designed to provide suitable amenity space for all dwellings in a mix of private rear gardens and shared external amenity space for the apartment block. Policy DM10 requires that sufficient amenity space is provided within developments.
3. 27 Each of the proposed houses would have a private rear garden of approximately 35m long and 6 metres wide providing more than sufficient amenity space for dwellings of 142sqm of sufficient size of approximately. The provision of inadequate amenity space was a criticism of the original application (reason for refusal 9) which has been addressed in this revised layout.
3. 28 All apartments have a private balcony that provide a good quality of external amenity space for future residents in accordance with Policy DM11.

Access

3. 29 The proposal site lies within Zone 3 (Secondary Core Area) as identified in the Council's Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD. This means that the parking requirements for the proposals are 1.5 spaces for 2 bed flats and 2 spaces per 3 bed flat and 4 bed house.
3. 30 This would result in a requirement of 72 spaces for the development as proposed. The provision of 74 car parking spaces on the site, therefore, slightly exceeds this requirement but having regard to the level of car ownership in the local area is considered entirely appropriate.
3. 31 A Transport Statement is submitted with this application to provide further details. This statement confirms that the site is designed to have a fully compliant access which meets appropriate highway standards and concluded that the site access/junction and other criteria can be satisfactorily achieved in accordance with all design standards.

Tandem development

3. 32 Policy DM11 discourages any form of tandem development. The proposals do not constitute a form of tandem development but instead provide for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site.

Amenity of surrounding residents

3. 33 Residential amenity is a key consideration in the acceptability of proposals for the redevelopment of private rear gardens. The proposed layout respects the privacy of adjacent properties and minimises overlooking into rear gardens by reducing the density of development to the rear of the site.
3. 34 The proposed apartment block has minimised openings and balconies on the more sensitive eastern elevation to ensure that it would not be unduly overbearing on neighbouring properties.

Provision of family housing

3. 35 Policy DM11 requires developments to place an emphasis on the provision of family-sized housing. The proposals provide for a good mix of larger family units comprising both apartments and single dwellinghouses. Overall the site provides 43% family accommodation. This change to the dwelling mix from the refused application directly addresses reason for refusal 10.
3. 36 The requirement of Policy DM11 for an arbitrary percentage of family dwellings does not necessarily take account of the specific characteristics of the site. In order to adhere to principles of good urban design a larger form of development, such as the apartment building proposed, is needed to knit the townscape together and to provide a point of transition between the large form of frontage development at Ruskin Court and the smaller single family dwellinghouses at 205-207 Reading Road. Figure 3 demonstrates the proposed street-scene along the front of the site.
3. 37 In addition to providing a transition point at the frontage of the site, the proposals along Henley Road retain and reinforce the existing building line and maintain existing ridge heights. The result is a form of development entirely appropriate in this area. The higher density of development to the front of the site also allows for a less dense form of development to the rear which is more in keeping with this part of the site.
3. 38 Considering the importance that the frontage element has on the site to make it acceptable in urban design terms; the site is effectively split into two parts with the rear of the site having a very different character and role.
3. 39 In site-wide terms the dwelling mix addresses the housing mix in the area local to the site which are predominantly larger family dwellings. The provision of smaller sized dwellings meets a need for these types of properties in this area.
3. 40 Meeting housing need and providing for a mix of housing types is an important consideration in creating sustainable communities. The proposals are therefore considered to meet the principles of sustainable development and those of Policy DM11.

Impact on Biodiversity

3. 41 An Ecological Assessment is submitted with this planning application, the conclusions of which states:
- The majority of habitat currently occupying the site will be removed within the development proposals. Much of this habitat was assessed as having moderate-low ecological value (e.g. amenity grassland, introduced shrub, built structures and hard standing), however some features such as the species-rich hedgerow and the traditional orchard were assessed as having high value. It will therefore be important to adequately compensate for the loss of these habitats in order to comply with local planning policy.
 - The site is used by roosting bats, reptiles, breeding birds and invertebrates. Mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures for these species will be required as part of the development proposal and are detailed in the accompanying ecological assessment.
3. 42 The proposals do not result in fragmented back gardens but instead the layout creates large areas of green space creating well-designed public and private amenity areas and it makes an important contribution to biodiversity and the green network.

Prejudice development of wider areas

3. 43 The proposal does not prejudice the satisfactory development of a wider area in that it is offering a proposal for a comprehensive redevelopment of the site. Furthermore, an appropriate access been design to accommodate further future development to the east of the site in accordance with Policy DM11.

Affordable Housing

3. 44 Affordable housing policy contained in Policy CS16 requires 30% affordable housing to be provided on sites of 15 or more units. Policy DM6 reiterates requirements for affordable housing but also states:

"In all cases where proposals fall short of the policy targets as a result of viability considerations, an open-book approach will be taken and the onus will be on the developer/landowner to clearly demonstrate the circumstances justifying a lower affordable housing contribution."

3. 45 These proposals do not provide affordable housing and this is supported by a Viability Assessment prepared by S106 Management in accordance with the provisions of Policy DM6. This confirms that, due to the difficulties of the site, viability is an issue and as such the proposals cannot support provision for affordable housing.
3. 46 The applicant is prepared to meet the Council's reasonable costs in having this Report assessed by an independent valuer.

Flooding

3. 47 The site lies within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. All development on the site lies in Flood Zone 1.
3. 48 The report contains the following conclusions:
- *The updated model local to the proposed development site shows a slight reduction in flood extents when compared to the original, Environment Agency supplied model. This is likely to be due to the higher grid resolution and incorporation of detailed topographic survey data in this location.*
 - *All properties are free from flooding in the 1 in 100 year event, 1 in 100 year return period flood event plus allowances of 35% and 70% climate change and the 1 in 1000 year return period flood event.*
3. 49 The redesign of the layout of the site has enabled all development to be removed from the flood zone which directly responds to reason for refusal 1 of the previous application. The FRA submitted with this application has been prepared using up to flood risk data and identifies that when making allowances for flood risk and climate change there will be increase in flood risk on this site or elsewhere; therefore, reason for refusal 14 has also been addressed.

Arboriculture

3. 50 An Arboricultural report has been submitted as part of the planning application due to the presence of a number of trees on the site including some with tree preservation orders. The report confirms that the proposals will have no adverse impact on the protected trees on the site.

Sustainability

3. 51 An Energy Statement has been prepared in support of this planning application. The Statement includes an energy demand assessment showing how selected energy efficiency, low carbon and renewable energy measures have been considered and those, which have been incorporated into the scheme.
3. 52 The proposals are to enhance the fabric insulation standards of the homes above the minimum required by the Building Regulations.
3. 53 The analysis within the Statement demonstrates that the fitting of 36kW of solar panels is the best option. This could all be fed to 18 flats, preferably on the upper floors. Some PV could easily be fitted on the south facing roof area of the houses and the remainder allocated to the flats. This is the preferred option.

Air Quality

3. 54 An air quality assessment has been undertaken as the application site lies within an AQMA.
3. 55 The assessment indicates that annual mean NO₂ and PM₁₀ concentrations are below the objectives in the 'without' and 'with' development scenarios. Based on the evidence it is also considered unlikely that there will be exceedances of either short term objective for NO₂ or PM₁₀ under either scenario.
3. 56 The proposed development has been assessed, and found to be compliant the relevant air quality guidance for new buildings.

Transport

3. 57 A Transport Statement is submitted with this planning application. The conclusions of that report are:
- The location of the site is accessible for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users and integrates with the surrounding residential area. Therefore the site is in line with NPPF.
 - A satisfactory priority junction site access is proposed off Henley Road in accordance with Reading Borough Council's Geometric Design Guidance for Residential Accesses. The right turn lane would be designed in accordance with the DMRB.
 - The increase in vehicular flows on the local road network as a result of the proposed development would be a reduction in traffic compared to the previous scheme which was acceptable to the Highway Authority. The traffic of the proposed scheme would not give rise to a material impact on existing traffic and safety conditions.
 - The design of the site would be in accordance with the principles of Reading Borough Council's Geometric Design Guidance for Residential Accesses on to Classified Roads and the Local Plan to achieve a permeable layout for pedestrians and cyclists.
 - The level of car parking proposed for the site is in accordance with the required level of parking indicated in Reading Borough Council's Revised Parking Standards and Design document and is consistent with local Census car ownership levels. The parking provision is therefore consistent with NPPF.
 - The site can be satisfactorily serviced by refuse vehicles which would enter the site, turn around within the development and leave again in a forward gear.
 - Analysis of the proposed site access confirms that the junction would operate satisfactorily and well within capacity in each of the morning and evening peak hours.
3. 58 The previous application was refused on a number of highways grounds as set out in Appendix 1. The three highway reasons for refusal of the previous application have all been addressed by the new scheme.

4 Access

4. 1 The issue of access covers two different aspects, the accessibility of site in its wider sense and the accessibility of the proposed homes.
4. 2 The site has good access to public transport with bus stops directly outside of the site. These bus stops provide 6 different services into Reading and the wider area.
4. 3 The proposed dwellings will be built to Part M building regulation standards to ensure that they are accessible and flexible to meet the changing needs of future residents.
4. 4 Where appropriate, the proposals will also be built to Lifetime Homes standards as required by Policy DM5 (Housing Mix) of the Sites and Detailed Policies Development Plan Document.

5 Conclusions

5. 1 The proposed development for the site at 199-207 Henley Road, Caversham will provide 42 residential dwellings comprising:
 - 24no 2 bed apartments
 - 6no 3 bed apartments
 - 12no x 4 bed houses
5. 2 This is a resubmitted application following a previous application (170959/FUL) that has a resolution to grant that is currently waiting the finalisation of the S106 agreement. This application only differs from the previous one in so far as provision for affordable housing has been removed, all other principles of the development that were established with the previous application remain unchanged.
5. 3 Therefore, the principle of residential development in this location is acceptable with previous proposals for the site being considered acceptable in principle.
5. 4 The main focus of the analysis in this statement is a consideration of the proposals against Policy DM11 which is concerned with the redevelopment of sites within residential curtilages. This policy seeks largely to ensure that such proposals do not have a negative impact on the site and its surroundings particularly in terms of character and residential amenity. The proposals are considered to represent an acceptable form of development that takes account of the character of the site and its surroundings.
5. 5 The proposals provide a mix of housing that complements the area where there is a larger proportion of family sized dwellings and, therefore, the provision of smaller apartments contributes to an improved mix of dwellings in this location.
5. 6 A significant amount of supporting studies have been undertaken to assist the scheme design and support the application for the purposes of this application submission including ecology, arboriculture and flooding.
5. 7 Overall, in planning terms the proposals meet requirements relating to appropriate density, housing mix and exhibit elements of good urban design and site layout.

Appendix 1: Previous Refused Application (161842)



**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
PLANNING AND COMPENSATION ACT 1991
THE TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING
(DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND) ORDER 2015**

APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION

To: Kevin Scott Consultancy Ltd
Kevin Scott Consultancy Limited
Centaur House
Ancells Road
GU51 2UJ

Application No: 161842
Application type: Full Planning Approval

Applicant: Henley Road Ltd

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL as Local Planning Authority **REFUSE** planning permission for the following development.

Proposal: Demolition of nos 199-203 Henley Road and erection of 60 dwellings at 199-203 Henley Road and to the rear of 205-207 Henley Road with associated access from Henley Road and landscaping

At: 199 Henley Road Caversham Reading RG4 6LJ

For the attached reasons

PLEASE READ THE NOTES ISSUED WITH THIS DECISION NOTICE

Date: 18 January 2017

Head of Planning, Development
& Regulatory Services

LEB

Application At: 199 Henley Road Caversham Reading RG4 6LJ

Application No: 161842

Application type: Full Planning Approval

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. It is considered that there are other alternative sites outside Flood Zones 2 and 3a that should be developed in preference to that part of the application site within these zones. Therefore it is considered that the development which fails the sequential test is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 101 and Core Strategy Policy CS35.
2. The proposed access road is unsuitable, due to its substandard junction radii, to accommodate the traffic which would be generated by the proposed development. This would have an adverse effect on road safety and the flow of traffic, in conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS20 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM12.
3. The formation of a junction/access in close proximity to the junction of the A4155 Henley Road with the site access road would result in conflicting traffic movements which would have an adverse effect on road safety and the flow of traffic. This would be in conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS20 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM12.
4. The proposed development does not form part of a comprehensive plan designed to limit the number of accesses on the A4155 Henley Road. Piecemeal development would result in a multiplicity of accesses. This would have an adverse effect on road safety and the flow of traffic, and be in conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS20 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM11 and DM12.
5. The proposed layout and spacing of built form within the site is considered to appear cramped and poorly designed as it results in an unsatisfactory relationship to the Henley Road frontage, contains an excessive amount of hard standing in the form of access roads and surface parking; and the proposed siting of flatted block D to the rear of the site is out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to make a positive contribution to the character of the area or create a place with its own identity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS7 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM11.
6. Due to the absence of site sections to show the gradient of the proposed access road and relative land levels in relation to existing and proposed dwellings, and lack of detail for the proposed retaining walls the proposal has failed to demonstrate that

Date: 18 January 2017



Head of Planning, Development
& Regulatory Services

LEB

proposed land levels, resultant building heights and retaining wall structures are acceptable in terms of their design and visual impact. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS7 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM4 and Policy DM11.

7. The form, height, massing and 'L' shaped footprint of the proposed frontage block is considered to be out of keeping with and to result in a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area which contains predominately large two storey detached and semi detached residential dwellings and is therefore considered contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS7, Sites and Detailed Policies Document DM4 and DM11.

8. The design of Proposed Block D, devoid of windows to habitable accommodation at ground floor, is considered to fail to create an active frontage within the site to the detriment of the character of the area, and fails to create a sense of place within the site contrary to Core Strategy policy CS7 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM9.

9. Inadequate useable amenity space would be provided on the site for the occupants of plots 56-59. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM10 and Policy DM11.

10. The proposed dwelling mix would result in only 18% of the proposed dwellings having 3 or more bedrooms and the majority of the dwellings being flats. Having considered the suburban characteristics of the existing site and wider surrounding area, and other material considerations, this mix is not considered acceptable in this location and the proposal is therefore contrary to Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM5.

11. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the building works will be undertaken without causing significant harm to the landscape character of the area and harm to protected trees (covered by TPO 20/14) to include Beech tree (T23), Horse chestnut (T10) and a Walnut (offsite within Ruskins). As such this application is contrary to the following policies: Core Strategy Policy CS7, Policy CS37 and Policy CS38.

12. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development would protect and maintain existing wildlife habitats and natural features on or adjacent to the site and in addition the ecological report that has been submitted with the application has not been carried out to an appropriate standard and as such the full impact of the proposals on protected species cannot be established. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the NPPF and Policies DM11 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document and CS36 of the Core strategy.

Date: 18 January 2017



Head of Planning, Development
& Regulatory Services

LEB

13. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an Employment and Skills Plan, an appropriate mix of Affordable Housing, and Open Space the proposal will not mitigate its impact on the social and economic infrastructure of the borough, contrary to Policies CS3, CS9 and CS29 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy DM3 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) and the Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents on Employment, Skills & Training (2013) and Planning Obligations under Section 106 (2015).

14. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (Three Counties Flood Risk Assessment, dated September 2016) fails to demonstrate that the development is acceptable on the basis there is no assessment of the impact of climate change using appropriate climate change allowances; the loss of flood plain storage within the 1 in 100 flood extent (with an appropriate allowance for climate change) caused by the proposed development is not demonstrated to be mitigated; and the proposed development has finished floor levels above the 1 in 100 flood level (with an appropriate allowance for climate change). Therefore it is considered that the development would increase the risks to life and property arising from flooding contrary to the NPPF paragraph 103 and Core Strategy Policy CS35.

15. The cumulative impact of the number, height and location of habitable room windows within each floor of the 3-4 storey flank elevation of Blocks B and C orientated toward No 205 Henley Road is considered to result in a significantly detrimental impact in terms of loss of privacy and overlooking to No 205 and its garden area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM4 and Policy DM11.

	Initials	Date
Prepared By	KC	06/03/2018
Checked By	KS	06/03/2018

Kevin Scott Consultancy
 Sentinel House
 Ancells Business Park
 Harvest Crescent
 Fleet
 Hampshire