

Comment for Planning Application 251396

Submitted by: Peter Robert Carter

Ryhill Way, Lower Earley, Reading, Berkshire, RG6 4AZ

This application replicates an application for Certificate of Lawfulness 250490, that was submitted on 28th February 2025 and refused on 2nd May. The grounds for refusal was that "Garages shall be used as domestic garages and shall not be used for business purposes or any other purpose without the prior written permission of the District Planning Authority.

This application has been made by Craig Tucker who I understand runs a company that provides accommodation to unaccompanied asylum seekers and young people coming out of care aged between 16 and 18 years.

The purpose of the application is to increase the living accommodation at the property by converting the garage. This will enable his company to provide additional accommodation to the agencies that refer young people with a resultant increase in yield.

As I understand it Mr Tucker has no intention of residing at the property himself but has already installed two of his employees (manager and support worker) to run the property on his behalf on a HMO basis. The property will therefore be being used for business purposes by Mr Tucker and his company and not as a private dwelling.

I am in possession of a copy of the Deed of Transfer (DoT) for my property as are a number of other residents from the developers when the estate was built in the mid 80's. There is a clause under the Restrictions and Regulations that states and I quote " not to use the dwelling for any other purpose other than as a private dwelling or to carry on any trade business or manufacturers whatsoever on the property or any part thereof.

Whilst I appreciate that I have not seen the DoT for No.60 there seems no reason why they should be any different to those of the other properties on the estate. I therefore object to this application on the grounds that the premises will not be used as a private dwelling by Mr Tucker, but are already being used to run a business from.

I understand that the impact on the market value of other properties in the area is not grounds for refusing a planning application. However I would like to make a general observation that some residents in the vicinity of No.60 are already seeing a negative impact on the market value of their properties. It therefore seems perverse to me that that the financial implications for long standing residents may be the opposite to those of the applicant (and his company) who if successful will potentially benefit financially from an increased yield that the increased living accommodation area will bring.