

**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: JSA Architects Ltd
Tavistock House
Waltham Road
Woodlands Park
Maidenhead
SL6 3NH

Application No: 171219
Application type: Outline Planning Approval

Applicant: Mr Anderson

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

Proposal: Outline application for residential redevelopment to provide a maximum of 18 dwelling units. Demolition of dwelling at 16 Kirton Close to provide access. (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale reserved for future consideration).

At: Land Adjacent Thorpe House Colliers Way Reading

For the attached reasons

PLEASE READ THE NOTES ISSUED WITH THIS DECISION NOTICE

Date: 7 December 2017



Head of Planning, Development
& Regulatory Services

Application At: Land Adjacent Thorpe House Colliers Way Reading

Application No: 171219

Application type: Outline Planning Approval

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of open space that has not been previously developed and which currently makes a positive contribution to the character, appearance and environmental quality of the area due to its visual attractiveness, openness, undeveloped character and green vegetated appearance. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policies CS7 and CS28 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015).
2. The amount of development proposed within the main body of the site would require a scale of building that would appear as an incongruous, jarring and poorly integrated feature within the context of the notably modest scale of development in adjacent streets. The minimal distance that would be likely to exist between the building and northern and southern site boundaries would result in an overly cramped appearance, further adding to the visual harm. For these reasons the development would represent an overdevelopment of the site, fail to respond positively to its local context, and fail to reinforce local character and distinctiveness. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies CS7, CS15 and CS28 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015).
3. The proposed removal of the dwelling at 16 Kirton Close and its replacement with an access roadway and vehicle parking area would result in the loss of continuity and enclosure within the established street scene which is characterised by a regular built form of a distinctive style and appearance. The proposed access would result in a disjointed and visually stark arrangement of access road and vehicle parking to the detriment of the existing streetscene and contrary to Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015).
4. The layout does not comply with the Local Planning Authority's standards in respect of vehicle parking. This could result in on- street parking/reversing movements on the surrounding road network, adversely affecting road safety and the flow of traffic, and in conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS24 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM12.
5. The proposal would generate traffic crossing an existing footpath / cycle path, without giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists. This would result in an increased



Date: 7 December 2017

Head of Planning, Development
& Regulatory Services

risk of accidents to users of the footpath and would be in conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS20 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM12.

6. The application fails to demonstrate that:

- i) the amount of development proposed can be accommodated without harm to existing trees of amenity value, both within and adjacent to the site in terms of direct impacts on their root systems, stems and canopies
- ii) the proposal would not result in a future pressure to prune or fell trees of amenity value due to their proximity to new buildings; and
- iii) the amount of development proposed can be accommodated in combination with appropriate landscaping, including retained trees and new tree planting.

As such the proposal fails to demonstrate that it will preserve and not harm the character and appearance of the site and area within which it is located, including the wider contribution to visual amenity provided by mature trees. The proposals are therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS7 & CS38 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM18.

7. The application fails to demonstrate that the proposed amount of development can be accommodated without harm to the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings caused by a loss of privacy to windows and gardens due to overlooking; overbearing effects resulting from the likely scale and proximity of the building; and disturbance from vehicle movements adjacent to Thorpe House. As such the proposal is contrary to Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM4 and Core Strategy Policy CS15.

8. The application fails to demonstrate that the proposed amount of development can be accommodated in a manner which provides adequate outlook, daylight, sunlight and private outdoor amenity space for future occupiers. As such the proposal would be harmful to the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM4.

9. Due to the absence of an acceptable Sustainable Drainage Strategy, the application has failed to demonstrate its acceptability in terms of sustainable drainage and attenuating localised flooding, contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS35 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM1.

10. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an acceptable contribution towards the provision of Affordable Housing, the proposal fails to contribute adequately to the housing needs of Reading Borough and the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities and as such is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS16, Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2013) and para. 50 of the NPPF.



Date: 7 December 2017

Head of Planning, Development
& Regulatory Services

11. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an acceptable mitigation plan or equivalent contribution towards the provision of Employment, Skills and Training for the construction phase of the development, the proposal fails to contribute adequately to the employment, skills or training needs of local people with associated socioeconomic harm, contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS3, CS9 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy DM3 and the Employment Skills and Training SPD (2013).

INFORMATIVES

1. The Local Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant at pre-application and application stages in order to appraise the development potential of the site and to set out clearly the constraints on development.

2. This decision relates to the following drawings:

PL-100 Site Location Plan, dated March 2017

PL-101 Proposed Site Layout, dated March 2017

PL-400 Proposed Front Elevation, dated March 2017

SK-02 Ground and First Floor dated February 2017

SK-03 Roof Plan dated February 2017

Date: 7 December 2017



Head of Planning, Development
& Regulatory Services

NOTES

APPEALS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

If you are aggrieved by the decision of the Council to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

If this is a decision on a planning application relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as is already the subject of an enforcement notice, if you want to appeal against the Council's decision on the application you must do so within 28 days of the date of this notice.

If an enforcement notice is served relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as in your application and you want to appeal against the Council's decision on your application, you must do so within 28 days of the date of service of the enforcement notice, or within 6 months (or 12 weeks in the case of a householder appeal) of the date of this notice, whichever period expires earlier.

If the above circumstances do not apply, any appeal must be made within the following time limits.

If this is a householder application and you want to appeal against the Council's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice. If this is an advertisement application and you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 8 weeks of the date of this notice. If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision for any other type of application (which is not a householder or advertisement application, or an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness) then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice.

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal. The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to him that the Local Planning Authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order. In practice, the Secretary of State does not refuse to consider appeals solely because the Local Planning Authority based their decision on a direction given by him.

Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Planning Inspectorate at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN, tel. 0303 444 5000, or online at www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs.

Purchase Notices

If either the Local Planning Authority or the Secretary of State refuses permission to develop land or grants it subject to conditions, the owner may claim that he can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted. In these circumstances, the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council in whose area the land is situated. This notice will require the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.