

**EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE  
ON 29<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2014**

**UPDATE REPORT**

**Item No:** (1)      **Application No:** 13/01934/FULD      **Page No.** 9-30

**Site:** Land To The Rear Of, 9 - 15 High View, Calcot, Reading

---

**Planning Officer Presenting:** Samantha Kremzer

**Member Presenting:**

---

**Parish Representative speaking:** N/A

**Objector(s) speaking:** Mr Dominic Rys

**Supporter(s) speaking:** N/A

**Applicant/Agent speaking:** Mr Adrian Best

**Ward Members:** Councillor Bedwell  
Councillor Argyle  
Councillor Gopal

**Update Information:**

**1 ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

1.1 Three further letters of objection have been received in response to the additional information submitted.

- The amended plans do not show any changes addressing concerns raised during the committee site visit. In summary, the additional issues raised include:
- The disabled access to the bungalows is not included within the plans, this should not be left to a Section 278 Highways Agreement as this does not allow residents the opportunity to review and respond on this aspect of the plan.
- The rear gardens of 34 and 36 Royal Avenue were not accessed by the applicant to inform the amended section that has been submitted.
- The garages are acting as retaining structure for the gardens. The rear wall of the garages is directly up against Royal Avenues gardens. There is a retaining wall (approx 1m in

height) that appears to be present in gardens without the garages to the rear, however this retaining wall ends in line with the rear wall of the garages.

- The bins are still located in the area to the south of the site, and the fences are still 1.8m high as shown on the Landscaping and External Works plan.
- The amended sections AA and BB are still inaccurate.
- The area is too small for this type of building and will impact of the privacy and security of the existing residences.

- 1.2 The applicant has confirmed that Isis Surveyors Ltd. of Tadley (who are RICS accredited) surveyed the area on the 16 December 2013 and confirmed the presence of the retaining wall.
- 1.3 The applicants have requested a separate Section 278 Agreement rather than combined agreement (as was present on previous application 10/01441/FULD).

## **2 ADDITIONAL CONSULTATIONS**

- 2.1 Highways officers have made the following additional comment with regard to the Section 278 Agreement:

Concern has been raised regarding the retention of the level pedestrian access into the existing bungalows to the south of the development. Highway Officers consider it imperative that it is retained for disabled persons living in the bungalows. The turning head and parking spaces will be constructed by the developer under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. It is therefore usual process that detailed engineering drawings are produced that would include detail such as the retention of the existing level pedestrian access. Highway Officers see no reason why it could not be retained.

## **3 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION**

- 3.1 **Bins and Fences:** It should be noted that in the main report, section 8.1 (Recommended Conditions) Conditions 7 (Fencing and Enclosures) and 13 (Refuse Facilities) state

“Notwithstanding what is shown on the approved drawings or other approved documents, no development shall commence until details of . . .”

In combination with Adrian Best’s letter dated 16 January 2014, this is considered sufficient to ensure the bin store will be relocated to a more appropriate location, and the height of the fence to the boundary with 9-15 High View is reduced to an acceptable level.

- 3.2 A section 278 agreement will still be required.

## **4 RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1 The recommendation remains unchanged.