

Planning Committee

Supplemental Agenda

Meeting date	4 August 2026
Officer	Linda Sparrow
Agenda Item	33 Julians Road
Proposal	Change of use of 6no. dwellinghouses Use Class (C3) to 6no. five-bedroom Houses of Multiple Occupation for up to six-persons each Use Class (C4)
Reference	26/00216/FP
ADDENDUM INFORMATION	

7.6 Car Parking and Cycle Provision

Following the publication of the committee report, comments were received from No.35 Julians Road regarding the site layout plan and its implications on car parking as approved under previous applications for the existing, retained residential and office uses on the Julians Road frontage of the site.

The comments note that parking space No.4 on the previously approved discharge of condition site layout plan, (application reference 25/00251/FP) would be sited partially over where newly proposed parking space No.14 will be located. See image below for further details. Parking space No.4 is shown in green on both images for ease of reference.



Figure 1: 25/00251/COND on the left and current application 26/00216/FP on the right

The concern raised is that the current proposal cannot be implemented due to the position of the previously approved parking layout.

Whilst this concern is noted, Members are advised that the red line plan, as can be seen in the right-hand image above clearly sets out that the parking to be provided by the current proposal is wholly within their land ownership. The owner of the land covered by application 25/00251/COND, sold some of their land to the current applicant and it would appear that they sold land that was allocated for their own car parking.

However, as is illustrated by both extracts above, there is an area of land measuring 2m wide against the boundary and 2.5m wide at the front that lies between the existing building and parking space No.4 that is not being shown to be used for parking. This area of land has historically been used for car parking (see Officer photograph below) and Officers see no reason as to why parking space No.4 cannot be moved back into this area.



Conclusion

Officers are satisfied that there is sufficient space within the ownership of both landowners that all parking spaces as shown on the various approved plans can be accommodated without prejudice to each other and the concerns raised do not warrant a decision other than the recommendation in the main report.