

DELEGATED REPORT

Application No. 201525/FUL

Site Address: 129 Whiteknights Road

Proposal: Erection of replacement dwelling with integral garage following demolition of existing buildings

Applicant: Yassir Javaid

Agreed Target Date: 29/01/21

Case Officer: Connie Davis

Site Description

The application site sits on the northern side of Whiteknights Road. The University of Reading Whiteknights Campus (Early Gate entrance) is located approximately 50m to the east. At the entrance of the University are a pair of gate houses at the that are Grade II Listed. They are the entrance to the former historic Estate for Erleigh House.

Properties in the vicinity are primarily detached properties with many dating from the 1910-1930s which are of similar size and scale. The existing property was constructed in the 1920s and was a former Vicarage to the Grade II Listed St. Peters Church, Earley.

The property is not within a conservation area, but throughout the course of the application it has gained status as a non-designated heritage asset.



Fig 1. The application site, a former Vicarage, set within a wide open, flat plot.

	
Fig. 2 Residential 2 storey houses, just to the west of the site. Built between 1910 and 1930. They have features associated with Edwardian type houses.	Fig. 3 . To the east, a modern single storey dwelling (no. 131).

Proposal

The proposal comprises the demolition of the existing 1920s dwelling and the erection of a contemporary designed 5 bedroom detached dwelling. The dwelling would have 3 levels (basement, ground floor, first floor). It would have a width of approx. 21.5m which is almost the entire width of the plot. It would have a depth of 16.5m.

The property would have a largely flat parapet roof with a small central pitch. It would have an integral double garage and would be finished in brick and stone with tiles. No further detail is given at this stage, other than the property aims to have a Georgian style.

Plans/Documents Submitted

376-6 - Existing Site Plans, Site Section & Street Scene

376-03 - Proposed Site Plans, Site Section & Street Scene

376-04 - Existing Floor Plans & Roof Plan

376-05 - Existing Elevations

376-01 - Proposed Floor Plans & Roof Plan

376-02 - Proposed Elevations

3994.Whiteknights.Oakbridge.AIP - Arboricultural Implications Plan

Arboricultural Implications Assessment dated 3rd August 2020 prepared by Andrew Belson Arboricultural Consultant

Report No. RT-MME-153229 dated September 2020 - Dusk Emergence and Dawn Re-entry Bat Survey prepared by Middlemarch Environmental

Report No. RT-MME-152004-02 dated August 2020 - Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment prepared by Middlemarch Environmental

Report No. RT-MME-152004-01 dated August 2020 - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal prepared by Middlemarch Environmental

3994.Whiteknights.Oakbridge.TPP - Tree Protection Plan

Planning Statement ref. 20/411 dated October 2020

Received 2nd November 2020

Relevant planning history

None.

Discussions with applicant/agent

The agent was advised of the concerns relating to this proposal (in an email sent 14/01/21); namely the general scale of the development and the principle of demolishing the existing

dwelling given it meets the criteria of being considered a non-designated heritage asset. The agent was given an opportunity (1 week) to withdraw the application, but no response was received. As such, a decision to refuse planning permission has been taken.

Consultations

Internal Consultees

Natural Environment - No objections subject to conditions.

However, the house footprint and driveway layout is different within the Arb documents to that shown on Proposed Site plan, Site Section & Street Scene drawing 376-03. Whilst the arboricultural implications and tree protection requirements will not differ it is appropriate to have an Arb Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) relevant to the proposal under consideration. The TPP should therefore be amended now or it will need to be secured via condition if the proposal is approved.

Ecology - No objections subject to condition.

Transport - No objections subject to conditions.

Heritage/ Urban Design - Objection. The existing house (former vicarage) is considered to meet the criteria of a non-designated heritage asset and so its demolition is not supported. In addition, the size and siting of the proposed dwelling is considered at odds with the prevailing street scene and heritage context of the area.

Public Consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 18/11/20:

127, 131, 149 Whiteknights Road
15, 17 Holmes Road
12 Earley Hill Road

In addition, a site notice was sent to the agent for display at the site on 18/11/20.

4 representations have been received; 2 observations (one of which an objection), one objection and one support. Matters raised were as follows:

Objection

- Would result in the destruction of house with heritage value and one which is in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood
- Design would be out of keeping and unsympathetic with surroundings
- Proposed property would be oversized in relation to the plot

Observation

Stated: Windows facing property on the second floor are fake however we would be keen to ensure that any planning permission is granted with explicit reference to these needing to stay as dummy windows unless further permissions are sought.

Support

- The proposal would allow the upgrade of the site to a functional family home
- Design looks fabulous and would enhance the locality

Officer comment: All matters raised in objections and observations will be discussed as part of the appraisal below. The comments of support are noted.

Planning policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance

Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019)

CC1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction

CC3: Adaption to Climate Change

CC5: Waste Minimisation and Storage

CC7: Design and the Public Realm

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity

CC9: Securing Infrastructure

H1: Provision of Housing

H2: Density and Mix

H3: Affordable Housing

H5: Standards for New Housing

H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space

TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

TR5: Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging

EN1: Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment

EN4: Locally Important Heritage Assets

EN6: New Development in a Historic Context

EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network

EN14: Trees, Hedges and Woodland

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Revised Parking Standards and Design (2011)

Revised Sustainable Design and Construction (2011)

Planning Obligations Under S106, April (2015)

Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2013)

Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Draft October 2020

Appraisal

The main issues to be considered are:

- a) Principle of use
- b) Principle of demolition of the existing dwelling
- c) Design and impact on character of the area
- d) Wider heritage considerations
- e) Residential amenity of proposed and existing neighbouring residents
- f) Transport matters
- g) Ecological matters
- h) Natural environment matters

- i) Sustainability
- j) Affordable Housing, S106 and CIL obligations

a) Principle of Use

The [NPPF](#) states that LPAs should “*encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value*”. The NPPF definition of ‘previously developed land’ excludes private residential gardens in built up areas.

Therefore, it is clear that the priority for development should be on previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings. The site is currently in use for residential purposes, as such the principle of development on site is established and accepted. As such, the principle of replacing a dwelling with a dwelling in pure land use terms is considered acceptable and it would continue to contribute to the provision of family housing in accordance with Policy H1. However, this is subject to other material planning considerations such as matters relating to design, residential amenity, transport and landscaping along with the principle of demolishing the existing dwelling.

b) Principle of demolition of the existing dwelling

Throughout the course of the application it has been identified that the existing property meets the criteria of gaining status as a non-designated heritage asset. Non-designated These are assets that are ‘*buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of their heritage interest but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets*’ (NPPG paragraph 39 Reference ID: 18a-039-20190723). Paragraph 4.2.20 (within Policy EN4) of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) supports that the local significance of assets may become known at any time, which is the case in this instance that the significance of the building was not known or appreciated at the time the application was submitted.

Full details on how the decision to classify the property as a non-designated heritage asset can be seen in Annexure 1 of the Conservation and Urban Design Officer’s consultation memo dated 11/01/21 and is attached to the end of this report (Appendix 1).

In summary, the existing dwelling was built in the late 1920s by local Reading Architect Frederick Ernst Briant Ravenscroft and was used as a new vicarage for the nearby Listed II mid-19th Century St Peter’s Church. In terms of its design, it’s considered a quality inter-war classic building and architecturally has examples of detailed brickwork. Due to being a vicarage, it also has links to the Reading community and so is considered to meet the relevant criteria.

Because of this, adopted heritage policies can be applied to the proposal. Policy EN4 states:

*Planning permission may be granted in cases where a proposal could result in harm to or loss of a locally important heritage asset **only where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development significantly outweigh the asset’s significance**. Where it is accepted by the Local Planning Authority that retention is not important, recording of the*

heritage asset should be undertaken and submitted alongside development proposals. Replacement buildings should draw upon heritage elements of the previous design, incorporating historical qualities that made the previous building significant. This may include appearance, scale and architectural quality.

Policy EN6 also makes reference to how new development should be informed by the historic environment in which it is located.

It is appreciated that the applicant was unaware of the heritage significance of the building at the time the application was submitted. Nevertheless, the applicant has not made contact with the case officer to challenge the assertion or provide any justification for the proposal on heritage grounds, as such, the proposal is being assessed based on the view reached by the case officer and Conservation and Urban Design Officer.

The replacement dwelling is not considered to explicitly incorporate heritage elements of the original property, which is a requirement of Policy EN4, should a locally important building be demolished. The quality features of the existing building, such as its brickwork, is considered a positive feature that contributes towards its designation, and this would ultimately be lost as a result of the demolition. There is no strong justification for losing any of the original fabric of the existing building and no attempt has been presented that retention and reuse of the building has been explored fully and as such, its demolition is not supported. Notwithstanding an in-principle objection to the loss of the dwelling as a considered non-designated heritage asset, the proposal as presented has been assessed against other policy considerations as follows.

c) Design and impact on the character of the area

Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) states: *All development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.*

When considering the components of good design, it is important that the development relates to its surrounding context and identity of the locality, as noted in the National Design Guide. Furthermore, the NPPF (para 124) sets out that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. The recently published National Design Guide identifies 10 key components for good design and of particular note is the characteristic of 'Context' and it states that *"well-designed new development responds positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond the site boundary. It should enhance positive qualities and improve negative ones."*

Neighbouring properties to the north-west (no. 125 in descending order) are 1930s style of property characterised by protruding front pitched gables and bay windows at ground and first floor. Properties are finished in brick at ground floor level with render or pebbledash at first floor, with beam-like architectural detailing above first floor windows; they have features of Edwardian design. However, properties either side of the application site itself are of different architectural design, that to the east, being single storey, although has permission to add a first floor. Plots are of somewhat varying sizes, with the application site being larger than neighbours. Nevertheless, the scale of property is considered to have a

general level of consistency when this portion of Whiteknights Road is viewed as a collective whole, as can be seen on the block plan below:



Whilst the proposed dwelling would be comparable to other two storey dwellings in the vicinity in terms of height, the proposed dwelling would be the greatest in terms of overall scale; noticeably its width, extending over 21m leaving just 1.5m between it and the property boundaries on either side. It is accepted that this site does benefit from a larger plot than neighbouring properties (in terms of width), however this is proposed to be utilized to a point whereby the development would be considered at odds with the overall scale of development found elsewhere within the road. It is noted that no. 127 expands a larger scale in terms of width compared to no. 125 other properties to the north-west (Edwardian style properties) however, this neighbouring property is only extended at single storey on either side of the main house (creating a garage either side). This development differs in that two storey development is proposed stretching from boundary to boundary making it is visually dominant and overly bulky addition to the predominant character of the street scene. Aside from its overall scale, specific elements of the proposed design are also considered at odds with other properties in the vicinity, namely the proposed roof design. The dwelling would have an expansive flat roof other than the central section. This style and approach is not considered to strongly relate or integrate with architectural details found elsewhere in the road, as per the requirements of Policy CC7 that development should respond '*positively to their local context and create or reinforce local character and distinctiveness*'.

In terms of materials, the National Design Guidance states that '*choosing the right materials can greatly help new development to fit harmoniously with its surroundings*'. Surrounding properties are finished in traditional brick at ground floor level and pebbledash or render at first floor level which is common 1930s design. It is stated that materials would be agreed with the LPA; they would be brick and stone. Had the proposal been acceptable in other regards, a condition would have been attached to the permission meaning that further details of materials would have had to be provided to the LPA prior to any development commencing on site.

Overall, it is not considered that that site benefitting from a larger plot automatically means a larger property is acceptable when viewed in relation to surroundings, although this was the justification presented by the applicant in the submitted planning statement. It has resulted in a proposal that is considered an unsympathetic addition to the wider vicinity.

Whilst the LPA is supportive of contemporary and ambitious design, it is not considered that the proposed scheme would accord with the surrounding pattern of development and rhythm of the street scene. It is also not considered that strong justification or explanation has been provided as to how the proposal would suitably integrate with surroundings in terms of size or roof form, and Officers disagree with the view presented in the submitted planning statement that the '*dwelling would not appear unduly prominent in the street scene*'. It is considered it would appear a harmful contrast in the street given the proportions and architectural features of neighbouring dwellings.

As such, by way of its overall scale, particularly by virtue of its width and roof form, it is not considered supportable in the wider context of the area and so conflicts with Policy CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Comments of support were noted, although the conclusion reached by officers differs from the positive views that were expressed by a neighbour regarding the design. The existing dwelling is considered of sufficient size already and in its current state would still provide a generously sized property.

d) Wider Heritage Considerations

As noted earlier in the report, the existing building is considered to have heritage significance in its own right. Turning to the heritage context of the wider area, in particular the Listed gates of the University of Reading entrance. Whilst officers appreciate the significance of these Listed assets, having considered the proposal in accordance with Policy EN1 and with regard to the impact new development would have on the historic context (Policy EN6), it is not considered that the development would harm the setting of these gates to an unacceptable degree. The application site is located some 50m away, and the Listed Gates are set back from the highway by approx. 17m. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of impact on these heritage assets in this instance.

e) Residential Amenity of Proposed and Existing Neighbouring Residents

Policy H5 identifies standards for new housing including internal space requirements. The development would exceed the minimum nationally prescribed space standards for a 5 bedroom dwelling (it would have a square footage of approx. 600sqm).

Policy CC8 requires developments to not “*cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for new residential properties..*” including “...in terms of: Privacy and overlooking; Access to sunlight and daylight; Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; Harm to outlook; Noise and disturbance;...”.

With respect to the future occupants of the proposed dwelling the proposed living accommodation shown at basement level could raise concerns regarding the amount of light that would be enjoyed by occupiers. However, it appears as though the rooms proposed in basement level are those for recreational use (gym/ cinema/ snooker area) and are in addition to main living facilities and so are not considered habitable rooms in the same sense where light is required, and would therefore be acceptable. The remainder of the spaces would have sufficient natural daylight/ and outlook.

In terms of existing dwellings, the neighbouring properties potentially most affected by the development are nos. 127 and 131 Whiteknights Road to the north-west and north-east respectively. Other neighbouring properties are considered to be of sufficient distance so as to not result in a loss of privacy, overlooking, or loss of light.

No. 127

45 degree light angles were taken from multiple points on the approximate locations of first floor windows of neighbouring windows and no breach occurred meaning that the proposal should not affect neighbouring windows by way of loss of light to a substantial degree. The proposed layout of the dwelling brings first floor development off the site boundaries at the rear meaning two storey development would not be located at such a distance to appear overbearing. Side windows are proposed to face this neighbour, however they are described to be dummy windows with no outlook, but have been incorporated to help break up an otherwise blank side elevation. As such, it is not considered that the development would result in a substantial loss of privacy to this dwelling.

No. 131

As with no. 127, the proposal would not breach light angles from neighbouring windows, nor invade privacy by way of side windows. Two storey development does not extend past the rear elevation of this neighbour. It is acknowledged this property has planning permission to add a first floor to the property, and the proposal is not considered to result in substantial harm in terms of loss and light to the dwelling in its current form, or its potential as a larger dwelling due to not extending past the rear elevation, as mentioned.

However, a condition would be attached ensuring that windows with outlook could not be replaced on either side elevations without permission from the Local Planning Authority in the interests of neighbouring amenity. This should also address the observation made by an adjacent neighbour on this matter as set out under the consultation section above.

As such, the proposal, subject to conditions, would have been considered acceptable in terms of Policies H5 and CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) in terms of amenity matters.

Sufficient amenity space would be retained as part of the proposal and despite the increase in footprint, would still be comparable to the size of amenity spaces of neighbouring properties. As such the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of Policy H10 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

f) Transport Matters

As per the consultation response, the proposal is considered acceptable from a Transport and Highways perspective in accordance with Policy TR3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019). Should the proposal have been acceptable in other respects, conditions relating to the following matters would have been secured:

- Construction Method Statement to be submitted
- Vehicular Access as specified
- Cycle parking to be approved
- EV charging points to be approved

Subject to these conditions, the proposal would have been considered acceptable in relation to Policies TR3 and TR5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

g) Ecology

The proposal is considered acceptable from an ecological perspective as the submitted bat survey concludes that the proposal is unlikely to directly affect bat roosts, other protected species or priority habitats. Should the proposal have been considered acceptable, a condition securing biodiversity enhancement such as bird and bat boxes would have been attached in accordance with Policy EN12 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

h) Natural Environment

The proposal was considered acceptable from a Natural Environment perspective subject to conditions. It was noted that the proposed house footprint and driveway layout is different within the Arboricultural documents to that shown on Proposed Site plan, Site Section & Street Scene drawing 376-03. However, this could be addressed via the securing of conditions.

Had the proposal been acceptable in other regards, the following conditions would have been attached to the permission:

- Landscaping to be approved
- Boundary treatment details to be submitted prior to occupation
- Arboricultural Method Statement to be submitted

Subject to these conditions, the proposal would have been acceptable in relation to Policy EN14 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

i) Sustainability

Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) state that construction will be acceptable *‘where the design of buildings and site layouts use energy, water, minerals, materials and other natural resources appropriately, efficiently and with care and take account of the effects of climate change’*. Should permission have been granted,

conditions relating to the following matters would have been required to be attached to conform with Policy H5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019):

- Higher water efficiency standards of 110 litres per person per day; and
- A 19% improvement over building regulations energy requirements

j) Affordable Housing, S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Policy H3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) states that replacing a single dwelling with a single dwelling is exempt from paying an affordable housing contribution. As such, no contribution would be required in this instance.

The proposal would be CIL liable and is charged at a rate of £156.71 per sqm. The proposed sqm is approx. 600 sqm, although this would have been confirmed with the CIL officer should the scheme have been approved.

Equality Act 2010:

In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

Conclusion

In general terms, the principle of replacing a residential property with a residential property is generally acceptable subject to the development respecting the character and identity of its surroundings and not causing adverse impact to neighbouring properties. However, in this instance, the loss of the existing dwelling, which is now considered a non-designated heritage asset, is given substantial weight in the planning balance, particularly as there is not considered to be a strong justification for its demolition. The proposed replacement design is also considered a bulky and unsympathetic addition to the street scene which fails to respect the proportions, particularly width, and architectural details, of properties within the wider Whiteknights Road street scene.

Recommendation: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would result in the complete loss of the dwellinghouse at 129 Whiteknights Road, a Non-Designated Heritage Asset and building of local significance. The proposal fails to demonstrate adequately that retention and reuse of the building has been explored fully. In this regard, the benefits of the proposal are not considered to significantly outweigh the harm caused to the asset's identified significance. Therefore, the development is contrary to Policies EN1 and EN4 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, particularly width and roof form, would fail to respect the prevailing scale and design of development within Whiteknights Road. As such, the proposal would fail to maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene contrary to Policy CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Informatives:

- 1) Refused plans
- 2) Positive and Proactive

APPEXDIX 1

RBC LEP 2019 - APPENDIX 2: CRITERIA FOR LOCALLY LISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES CRITERIA FOR LOCALLY LISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

Exclusions

Buildings and structures will not be considered for the Local List when they are already part of a Conservation Area, Scheduled Monument, or subject to an Article 4 direction relating to historical or architectural interest.

RBC CUDO - None of the above

Principles of Selection for the Local List

This guidance sets out the general principles that Reading Borough Council applies when deciding whether a building, group of buildings or structure should be added to Reading's List of Locally Important Buildings and Structures:

- a. *pre-1840: Any building, structure or group of buildings where its/ their original character and form are clearly identifiable.*
- b. *1840 - 1913: Any building, structure or group of buildings that is/are of clearly-defined significance in the local context and where elements that contribute to its/ their heritage significance remain substantially complete.*
- c. *1914 - 1939: Any building, structure or group of buildings where the elements that contribute to a high level of significance in the local context remain substantially complete.*

RBC CUDO - The existing residence was designed c.1925 and was built in the late 1920s, as the new Vicarage for the nearby Grade II Listed mid-19th century St Peter's Church, Early. The exterior of the building is substantially intact. (See Fig. 1.)

- d. *post-1939: Any building, structure or group of buildings where the elements that contribute to its/ their exceptional heritage significance in the local context are wholly complete and unaffected by inappropriate changes.*

In identifying significance in the local context it must be shown that the building, structure or group of buildings contribute(s) to the heritage of the Borough in accordance with at least one of the significance criteria detailed below:

Historic interest

- a. *Historical Association*
 - i. *The building or structure has a well authenticated historical association with a notable person(s) or event.*
 - ii. *The building or structure has a prolonged and direct association with figures or events of local interest.*

RBC CUDO - 129 Whiteknights was built late c. 1920s (Fig. 1, OS Map c.1932), as a new Vicarage, for St Peter's Church, Church Road, Early. It was designed c. 1925, by local Reading Architect, Frederick Ernst Briant Ravenscroft and built in the late 1920s. It superceded, an earlier Vicarage, shown as "Vicarage" on a property which is to the east and adjoining boundary. (Fig 2, OS Map c.1910).

(Source: Domer p. 72, "The Parish & Church of St Peter's, Early", - A Bibliography of Architects at Reading by Sidney M. Gould. Privately Published 1999.)



Fig 1. Map showing new Vicarage, circled in RED.

Source: OS Maps (National Library of Scotland)

Berkshire XXXVII.8 (Earley; Reading; Woodley and Sandford). Revised: 1932. Published: 1934



Fig 2. . Map showing earlier Vicarage, circled in Light Blue.

Source: OS Maps (National Library of Scotland)

Berkshire XXXVII.NE (includes: Earley; Reading). Revised: 1909 to 1910. Published: 1913

b. Social Importance

The building or structure has played an influential role in the development of an area or the life of one of Reading's communities. Such buildings/structures may include places of worship, schools, community buildings, places of employment, public houses and memorials which formed a focal point or played a key social role.

RBC CUDO - 129 Whiteknights was has a close association with a place of worship (St Peters built in the mid 19th century), since it was built as a Vicarage for a local church. It is a place with a close association of this church (the Vicar's residence) and was built 90 years ago.

c. Industrial Importance

The building or structure clearly relates to traditional or historic industrial processes or important businesses or the products of such industrial processes or businesses in the history of Reading or are intact industrial structures, for example bridges.

RBC CUDO - Not Applicable

Architectural interest



Fig 3. Front faced of 129 Whiteknights Road.

a. Sense of place

- i. The building or structure is representative of a style that is characteristic of Reading.*

RBC CUDO - The building is considered rare, in that it is a quality 2-storey Inter-war simplified classical brick building. It is carefully designed, giving an indication to its social importance, but at the same time is not too ostentatious. It is set on a wide plot, generally larger than other domestic plots in the neighbourhood.

- b. Innovation and Virtuosity
- i. The building or structure has a noteworthy quality of workmanship and materials.

RBC CUDO - The brick facades show examples of detailed brickwork:

- A shallow 500mm plinth, with bespoke cyma reversa capping bricks;
 - Corner quoins c.450mm;
 - Central gable slightly steeped forward 100mm, with decorative brick diamond pattern at top;
 - Red/Brown facebricks have been used on front and side walls, and not just on the front façade, indicating the building is a prominent landmark building of some importance;
 - Brick window cills with timber framed windows;
 - Flat clay tiled roof.
- ii. The building or structure is the work of a notable local/national architect/engineer/builder.
 - iii. The building or structure shows innovation in materials, technique, architectural style or engineering.

RBC CUDO - At this stage the designer is not known, however, the building has been detailed in a simplified classical manner and is a good example of quality brick. There are few buildings if any, of this type in Reading. (Further research of Church records could reveal more).

- c. Group Value
- i. The buildings/structures form a group which as a whole has a unified architectural or historic value to the local area.
 - ii. The buildings/structures are an example of deliberate town planning from before 1947.

RBC CUDO - Not Applicable

Conclusion

RBC CUDO: The building has enough significance and features to be considered a non-designated heritage asset in its own right.

Prepared by:

Bruce Edgar, IHBC, M.Phil (Architectural History), M.PIA, M.ICOMOS (UK), B.Arch
Conservation & Urban Design Officer
Reading Borough Council

Date: 07 January, 2021