

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 200178/FUL

Address: 25 South Street Reading

Proposal: Conversion of existing building to four residential units (C3 dwelling houses use) together with a three-storey rear extension, front and rear dormer windows and associated works

Site Description and Surrounding Area

The site relates to a two-storey end of terrace property with basement accommodation and storage with the roof space located on the north side of South Street. The last lawful use of the building was as a SEN school but the Applicant states that the building has most recently been used as offices. The building is of good aesthetic quality with gable pitch roof, grey brick and detailed brick work arches above windows and doors. The building is set back from the South Street frontage with small railed front yard serving an existing basement light well. To the rear of the property is a garden with pedestrian gate providing access to Livery Close which runs along the rear of this part of South Street.

Immediately to the west of the application site is the site of the former Zoar Baptist Church which has been cleared and has planning permission for a development of a three-storey building (with basement) of eight flats. Further to the west is the South Street Arts Centre. To the east within the same terrace are buildings of a similar scale but of varying appearance and architectural style with buildings of similar aesthetic but also more modern flat roof buildings. Opposite the site are five modern three storey office buildings known as Southern Court. Around 30m to the rear of the site is a large Grade II listed terrace of buildings fronting Queens Road, the rear yards of which back onto Livery Close.

The site is located within the Reading Central Area as defined by the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for conversion and extension of the existing building to four residential units (C3 dwelling houses use) together with a three-storey rear extension, front and rear dormer windows and associated works.

Plans Considered:

Site Location Plan. No. 19077-LO-001 (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Site Plan. No. 19077-CD-001 Rev. A (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Floor Plans. No. 19077-CD-002 Rev. A (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Floor Plans. No. 19077-CD-003 (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Elevations. No. 19077-CD-004 (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Elevations. No. 19077-CD-005 (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Floorplans - Basement. No. 19077-CD-002.1 (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Floor Plans - Ground Floor. No. 19077-CD-002.2 (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Floor Plans - First Floor. No. 19077-CD-003.1 (Pitch Architects)

Proposed Floor Plans - Second Floor. No. 19077-CD-003.2 (Pitch Architects)

Received by the Local Planning Authority on 4th February 2020

Existing Site Plan. No. 19077-SU-001 (Pitch Architects)
Existing Floor Plans. No. 19077-SU-002 (Pitch Architects)
Existing Floor Plan. No. 19077-SU-003 (Pitch Architects)
Existing Elevations. No. 19077-SU-004 (Pitch Architects)
Existing Elevations. No. 19077-SU-005 (Pitch Architects)
Existing Sections. No. 19077-SU-006 (Pitch Architects)
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th February 2020

Proposed Floor Plans - Second Floor No. 19077 - CD - 007 (Pitch Architects) (showing ceiling heights)
Proposed Section - 19077 - CD - 006
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 10th March 2020

Relevant Planning History

181075OPA - Change of use from Class B1(a) (offices) to C3 (dwelling houses) to comprise of 4x1 bed dwellings. Prior Notification under Class O, Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 - Refused.

140772FUL - Change of use from B1 Business - Offices to D1 Non-residential institutions - schools / non residential education - Granted.

091421FUL - Retrospective change of use from B1 (offices) to D1 (Non-residential place of education) (Resubmission of 08/01145/FUL)

Consultations

Transport - No objection subject to conditions to secure provision of proposed parking and bin store layout, submission and approval of cycle parking facilities and to confirm that future occupiers would not be eligible for on-street parking permits.

Ecology - No objection subject to a condition to secure submission and approval of scheme of biodiversity enhancements.

Environmental Protection - No objection subject to application of standing advice conditions to secure submission and approval of a noise assessment and mitigation scheme and air quality mitigation scheme.

Natural Environment - No objection subject to a condition to secure submission and approval of a landscaping scheme.

Berkshire Archaeology - No objection.

Public Consultation:

Neighbour letters were sent to the occupiers of nearby properties 14th April 2020. No objections have been received but one general observation comment has been submitted stating that the cumulative impact of ongoing construction work in the locality is impacting negatively on their mental health.

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.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. For this Local Planning Authority, the development plan is now in one document - the Reading Borough Local Plan (November 2019), which fully replaces the Core Strategy, the Sites and Detailed Policies Document and the Reading Central Area Action Plan.

The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

National Planning Policy Guidance (2014 onwards)

Reading Borough Local Plan 2019

CC1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction
CC3: Adaptation to Climate Change
CC5: Waste Minimisation and Storage
CC6: Accessibility and the Intensity of Development
CC7: Design and the Public Realm
CC8: Safeguarding Amenity
CC9: Securing Infrastructure
EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network
EN14: Trees, Hedges and Woodland
EN15: Air Quality
EN16: Pollution and Water Resources
EM3: Loss of Employment Land
H1: Provision of Housing
H2: Density and Mix
H3: Affordable Housing
H5: Standards for New Housing
H8: Residential Conversions
H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space
TR1: Achieving the Transport Strategy
TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters
TR5: Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging
OU1: New and Existing Community Facilities
CR1: Definition of Central Reading

CR2: Design in Central Reading

CR6: Living in Central Reading

RBC Supplementary Planning Documents

Affordable Housing SPD (2013)

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

Revised SPD on Planning Obligations under Section 106 (2019)

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2011)

Design Guide for House Extension SPD (2003)

Appraisal

Principle

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 proposals seek to provide four residential units by way of conversion and extension of the existing property.

The most recent recorded lawful use of the existing building was as small SEN school (D1/E use) but it is understood that the school has not operated from the site for a number of years and that the building has most recently been used sporadically as office accommodation for the owner.

In land use principle terms Policy OU1 (New and Existing Community Facilities) seeks to prevent loss of existing community facilities such as schools unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need to retain the facility. When retrospective planning permission was granted for the SEN school in 2009 (ref. 091421FUL) there was only one pupil in attendance at the school and due to the small size of the site surrounded by residential properties the capacity of the school was limited to no more than 5 pupils by way of condition. Records also indicate that the school has not operated on the site since 2018 when an application for prior approval change of use of the building from offices to flats was submitted (albeit refused). Given it is apparent the school has not been in operation at the property for some time and its limited capacity it is considered that there is no longer a clear need to retain the existing facility and the proposal would accord with the requirements of Policy OU1.

The office use of the building is referred to above is considered to have been informal and has not been established as a lawful use of the property. There is no objection to the cessation of this informal office use.

With regard to the principle of the proposed use, from purely a land use perspective, a proposal to introduce four additional residential units close to the town centre, would comply with the objectives of Policies H1 (Provision of Housing) and CC6 (Accessibility and Intensity of

Development) by contributing towards meeting the housing needs within the borough in a sustainable location.

Unit Mix

Policy C6 (Living in the Centre) seeks that the residential developments within the town centre provide a range of different sized units, ideally a mix of 1, 2- and 3-bedroom units. Given the size of the proposals for four units only the proposed mix of 2 x 1 bedroom and 2 x 2-bedroom units is considered acceptable.

Therefore, the principle of the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle, subject to other material and policy considerations discussed below.

Design, Heritage Assets and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF 2019 details that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment,

The recently published National Design Guidance 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." Additionally, there is specific reference to 'views inwards and outwards.

Policies CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) seeks to ensure that new development enhances and preserves the local character and Policy CR2 (Design in Central Reading) seeks to acceptable relationships between buildings in the town centre are created.

The existing property is of good aesthetic quality and incorporates a number of character features which contribute to this, including light brown brick works finish, gable pitched roof, string line brick course details below first floor windows, gable pitched roof, timber sash windows with deep window reveals and brickwork arch detailing above windows and doors. The street includes a wide variety of styles of property with a number of modern flat roof office buildings and the application property is considered to contribute more positively than others to the character of the street and area.

Front of the Property

To the front of the property the proposal seeks to introduce a pitched dormer roof extension using brick work to match the existing property in order to facilitate a flat within the roof space of the building. The gable pitched roof for of the dormer is considered to integrate sympathetically with the appearance of the existing property. Whilst the proposed dormer would sit flush with the front elevation of the dwelling and therefore remove the eaves of the

existing roof to the width of the dormer this is reflective of the style of a similar dormer to the adjoining property at no. 27 South Street.

It is also proposed to add a small roof light to the front of the existing main roof which as a modest addition is not considered to result in any visual harm. An existing front access door to the basement is also shown to be converted to a window with access to the basement flat proposed to be obtained from the rear. The replacement window is shown to be sash style window matching the other windows to the front of the building as is considered to be acceptable.

Rear of the Property

The application property is of similar characterful appearance to the rear where a 4.7m wide and 4.95m deep rear three storey flat roof extension is proposed. There is a significant change in levels which slopes down from the front to the back of the site such that whilst viewed as a two-storey property from the street the building is a full three storeys when viewed from the rear. The extension is proposed to be finished in brick work to match existing however the flat roof form of the extension is considered to fail to integrate with the character and appearance of the existing property which incorporates pitched roof forms. The extension would also create an awkward junction with the existing main roof whereby the parapet surrounding the flat roof of the extension would project up above the eaves of the existing main roof. The extension is considered to fail to integrate satisfactorily with the existing property and to result in harm to its character and appearance. This harm is considered to be exacerbated by the large size of the extension.

When viewed from the rear the existing property is of similar appearance to the adjoining property at no.27 and presents a three-storey rear elevation. No.27 incorporates a three-storey rear projection of similar depth to that proposed but incorporates a gable pitched roof reflective of the character and appearance of the main body of the building and is considered to integrate sympathetically with the existing property in contrast to the flat roof form of the proposed extension to the application property. The three-storey rear projection to the neighbouring property is set on site boundary with the application site where the proposed extension would be set only 0.2m from the boundary. This very close relationship is also considered to result in an awkward transition the adjoining properties when viewed from Livery Close to the rear of the site and would emphasise the poor design quality and inappropriate flat roof form of the proposed rear extension. In this respect the proposed extension is also considered harmful to the character and appearance of the adjoining property at no.27.

As discussed, there are a range of styles of property to South Street which back onto and are visible from Livery Close. There is also a modern building of flats at no.1 Livery Close directly to the rear of the adjacent site to the west (site of former Zoar Baptist Chapel) as well as the development of 8 flats recently granted planning permission (ref. 182118) on the former Zoar Baptist Chapel site itself. Whilst these new developments are more contemporary in appearance, they do incorporate some character features and notably no large expanses of flat roof. Whilst the flat roof of the proposed rear extension may, in isolation, be reflective of some of the more modern developments nearby, this is not considered to be an

appropriate design form relative to the characterful appearance of the host and adjoining property at no.27 and would be harmful to and fail to maintain the character and appearance of these properties contrary to Policy CC7.

The proposals also incorporate a large flat roof dormer roof extension to the rear of the main existing main roof. The proposed dormer would be 5.9m in width and would effectively fill the entire rear roof slope. The size of the dormer is considered excessive and to dominate the rear roof slope, whilst the flat roof appearance of the dormer is considered to jar and fail to integrate with the characterful appearance of the property. Whilst the adjoining property at no. 27 incorporates two flat rear dormer projections these are significantly smaller, less prominent visually and do not dominate the roof space. The Reading Borough Design Guide for House Extension SPD states that dormer roof extensions should not dominate the roof space and that two smaller dormer roof extensions are likely to be more appropriate than one large dormer. The proposed flat roof rear dormer is considered contrary to Policy CC7 and the SPD.

Both the proposed three storey rear extension and rear dormer roof extension would incorporate large full width rear windows/doors and also balconies which would project 2.7m from the rear elevation. The size of these rear windows, doors and balconies are considered overly large and out of proportion with the appearance of the host and adjoining dwelling and to contribute to the harm to their character and the conflict with Policy CC7.

Built footprint and Amenity Space

In terms of the overall level of built footprint within the plot the proposed rear extension would retain a 10m separation to the rear of the site. This is reflective of the situation to the rear of the adjoining property at no. 27. A small rear garden area is proposed as well as two vehicle parking spaces and a cycle store area. Whilst this is a high level of hardstanding this is again reflective of the rear of the all the properties to this section of South Street where vehicle parking is common. On balance the level of built footprint within the site is considered acceptable in accordance with Policy CC7, as too is the level of outdoor space which is considered to accord with Policy H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) which seeks that such spaces reflect the character of similar spaces in the surrounding area.

Bin Store

The application also proposes to provide a bin storage area to the front of the property for 8 wheelie bins. Whilst the existing property stores 3 bins at the front of the site the 8 bins required for the proposed flats would result in an unacceptable levels clutter and visual harm to the street-scene and is considered contrary to Policy CC7.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) requires developments to not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing and future occupiers whilst Policy EN16 (Pollution and Water Resources) seeks to protect occupiers from the impacts of pollution.

The use of the site for 4 residential units is not considered to result in any general harm or disturbance to the surrounding area where residential uses are common. The proposed residential use could potentially be less impactful than the lawful SEN school use of the site.

The proposed rear extension would match the depth of the existing three storey projection to the rear of no. 27 which does not incorporate any side window facing the application site. As such the proposed extension is not considered to result in any overbearing impact, loss of light or outlook to the flats at no. 27. Similarly, the siting of the proposed extension relative to the approved development of flats on the former site of the Zoar Baptist Chapel to the west (set 1.5m from the western boundary) and the existing building of the flats to the rear of the site at no.1 Livery Close (set 15m away), is such that there is also not considered to be any overbearing or loss of light or outlook in this respect.

There would be no overlooking from proposed windows within development to no. 27 whilst the separation (17.5m) and offset relationship of the site to the flats at no.1 Livery Close to the rear is considered sufficient to prevent any undue overlooking or loss of privacy.

However, the proposed rear extension incorporates 4 large side facing windows to the west elevation at first and second floor level set only 1.5m from the boundary with the cleared site to the west. The development of 8 flats granted permission (ref. 182188) at the adjacent site includes a communal amenity space to the rear which the four proposed windows would directly overlook. The windows would be secondary windows serving the lounge/dining rooms of flats 3 and 4 of the proposed development. Whilst the windows are shown to be obscurely glazed it is considered that their large size and position set only 1.5m from the boundary would result in a strong perception of being overlooked from users of the rear amenity space to the adjacent permitted development. The proposed large rear balconies to the first, second floors and roof space accommodation of the proposed development, due to their depth, would also allow direct sideways views to western site boundary and rear amenity space of the adjacent development resulting in direct and unacceptable overlooking. This loss of privacy would be detrimental to the residential amenity of future occupiers of the adjacent development and is considered contrary to Policy CC8.

If planning permission were to be granted conditions would be attached to ensure construction works take place only during the Council standard daytime works hours to ensure no undue noise or disturbance to surrounding occupiers in accordance with Policy EN16.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) requires developments to not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing and future occupiers whilst Policy EN16 (Pollution and Water Resources) seeks to protect occupiers from the impacts of pollution. Policy CR6 (Living in Central Reading) states that new residential developments must demonstrate how issues such as noise, disturbance and air quality would be mitigated. Policy H5 (Standards for New Housing) sets the standards that new housing should be built to.

All the proposed flats are considered to be of adequate size. Whilst Policy H5 sets out that residential developments within the Reading Central Area are not strictly required to adhere

to the nationally prescribed space standards, three of the four proposed flats would meet the national standards. Flat 4 in the roof space would fall just short of the standard but not to an extent that is considered to result in unduly cramped standard of accommodation.

Flats 2, 3, and 4 would be dual aspect and served by suitable levels of outlook and daylighting. However, whilst flat 1 (1-bedroom unit), which is set at ground floor level when viewed from the rear of the development but at basement level when viewed from South Street, would also be dual aspect the front bedroom would be served only by a small basement lightwell (2.1m in width) which would be set entirely below ground level. This small lightwell is considered inadequate in terms of outlook and daylighting to the bedroom providing poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers' contrary to Policy CC8. Whilst basement level accommodation is common to surrounding properties where this is the case units are served by larger lightwells such as those evident at no. 27 and no. 29 South Street. Furthermore, it is proposed to provide a bin store area to the front of the property, part of which would be located directly to the front of the front basement lightwell which would further obstruct daylight and outlook to the bedroom of flat 1.

The site is located within the town centre close where noise disturbance from nearby uses, such as the South Streets Art Centre may be an issue. In accordance with Environmental Protection standing if planning permission were to be granted a condition would be attached to secure a noise assessment and mitigation scheme to ensure suitable noise levels within the flats. The site is also located within an air quality management area and a similar condition would also be applied to secure an air quality mitigation scheme.

Transport

Policies TR1 (Achieving the Transport Strategy), TR3 (Access, Traffic & Highway Related Matters) and TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking & Electric Vehicle Charging) seek to ensure there are no adverse transport, highway, access or parking impacts of development.

The site is located within the Zone 2, the primary core area but on the periphery of the central core area which lies at the heart of Reading Borough, consisting primarily of retail and commercial office developments with good transport hubs. This zone is well served by public transport, with buses continuing either into or out of the Central Core Area via this zone. There is currently no parking associated with the site.

In accordance with the adopted Parking SPD, the development would be required to provide 1 parking space per 1-2-bedroom dwelling. The development proposals include a total of 2 parking spaces located at the rear of the site accessed from Livery Close which is below the SPD requirements.

The Council's adopted standards states that a lower provision is acceptable if the site is within a sustainable location and providing a lower provision of parking will not lead to highway safety issues as a result. The site is located within restricted parking zone where pay and display restrictions are in force restricting parking to a maximum period of 2 hours 8am - 8pm Monday - Sunday. Therefore, given the extensive parking controls, it is unlikely that the shortfall in parking will negatively impact highway safety. However, a condition to inform

occupants of the flats that they would not be eligible for a resident's parking permit would be required to be attached to any permission. Given the above parking controls and sustainable location of the site the proposed provision 2 vehicle parking spaces is considered acceptable.

It should be noted that the red line area does not extend to the public highway. As the granting of planning consent does not confer any rights of access, the applicant should establish such rights to ensure the proposed parking area accessed from Livery Close is accessible across third party land.

In accordance with the Borough's Parking Standards and Design SPD, a minimum provision of 0.5 cycle storage spaces should be provided per unit. Cycle storage has been proposed and is located in the parking courtyard. The proposed location of the store is considered acceptable for the SPD requirements and details of the type, number and layout of spaces would be secure by condition if planning permission is granted.

The bin store location to the front of the building is considered acceptable in transport terms and would provide convenient access for refuse collection.

There proposed development is considered acceptable in relation to transport matters subject to the recommended conditions in accordance with Policies TR1, TR3 and TR5.

Natural Environment

Policy EN14 (Trees, Hedges & Woodland) seeks to extend the Borough's vegetation cover and that development should make provision for tree planting, whilst Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) seeks proposal should include appropriate landscaping. Policy EN12 (Biodiversity & The Green Network) seeks that developments should retain, protect and incorporates features of biodiversity.

Trees and Landscaping

There are no trees within or close to the application site. Due to the relatively constrained nature of the site, particularly to the front of the property together with the need to provide outlook and daylight to lightwells, it is accepted that there is limited scope for landscaping. It is noted that the existing building and others along this side of south street are similar in urban character and without soft landscaping. However, the application does propose some limited new planting to the rear of the site which will be a welcome enhancement of the site. If planning permission were to be granted, then further details of this landscape planting would be secured by way of condition.

Ecology

Considering the location of the building close to the town centre and its structure it is considered unlikely that the building will host roosting bats or that there would be other protected species on the site impact by the proposed development.

This part of Reading hosts a population of swifts, a species that nests in buildings, particularly the older terraced houses such as this one. The swift population is declining in part due to the loss of nest sites as buildings are renovated. Therefore, if planning permission were to be granted a condition would be attached to secure provision of 2 swift bricks within the development to maintain and preserve swift habitats.

Subject to conditions it is considered that the proposals would accord with Policies EN12 and EN14.

Sustainability

No specific information has been submitted in relation to the sustainability of the proposed development. The proposed development would be required to meet two separate measures to address Policy CC1 (Sustainable Development) and the Council's climate emergency declaration. The new build elements to the rear would be required to be built to the standards as outlined in Policy H5 (Standards of Housing) in respect of water efficiency and energy reduction and the conversion would be required to meet the BREEAM standards which related to conversions. Should the application have otherwise been considered acceptable, conditions would have been attached in this respect.

Affordable Housing

The proposal seeks to create 4 additional units. Therefore, a contribution towards off-site affordable housing provision is required as part of the application in accordance with Policy H3 (Affordable Housing) of the Reading Borough Local Plan and the Affordable Housing SPD under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

For a scheme of 4 units the policy compliant contribution required by policy H3 equates to 5% of the GDV of the scheme. The Applicant stated that they agree in principle to enter into a legal agreement to secure a policy compliant level of financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing. However, given the proposal is not considered acceptable in other planning terms, the Council has not pursued the S106 legal agreement to secure the financial affordable housing provision and this would therefore represent a further reason for refusal of the application.

An informative will specify that this reason for refusal could be overcome, in the context of an acceptable scheme in all other respects, by entering into a s106 or unilateral undertaking.

CIL

The proposal would be a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable development. The applicant has provided the CIL Additional Information Form. If the scheme had been acceptable an informative would have been attached to the decision notice to advise the applicant of their responsibilities in this respect.

Overall Planning Balance and Conclusion

There are a number of significant shortcomings with the scheme. In weighing up the planning benefits of the proposals (e.g. introducing four additional units to the housing stock in the borough, assisting the local plan target) versus the dis-benefits of the scheme (as detailed at length in the officer assessment above), it is considered that the critical planning balance weighs against the proposals. Having regard to the material considerations and all matters raised, the Local Planning Authority considers that the balance of considerations therefore weighs against the proposal, and instead planning permission is recommended to be refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed three storey flat roof rear extension and flat roof rear dormer roof extension would as a result of their scale, flat roof form and incorporating overly large fenestration and projecting balconies, fail to integrate satisfactorily with the roof form and general appearance of the host and adjoined dwelling (no.27). The proposed rear extension and rear dormer roof extension would fail to maintain and enhance the character and appearance of both dwellings contrary to Policy CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and Design Guide for House Extension SPD 2003.
2. The two proposed bin store areas to the front of the property would result in excessive visual clutter and fail to maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the South Street street-scene contrary to Policy CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.
3. The four large first and second floor level side facing windows to the west flank elevation of the proposed three storey rear extension would as a result of their size and position close to the western boundary of the site, result in an unacceptable perception of overlooking to the rear amenity space of the development that is subject to planning permission (ref. 182210) on the adjacent site to the west. The proposed depth of the rear balconies would also allow for direct sideways views and unacceptable overlooking of the rear amenity space of the same adjacent permitted scheme. The proposals are considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy which would be harmful to future occupiers of the adjacent consented development contrary to Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.
4. The small front basement lightwell to the bedroom of flat no. 1 would fail to provide an adequate standard of outlook or daylight resulting in a poor and unacceptable standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The proposed siting of part of the bin store area directly to the front of the lightwell would further reduce access to the outlook and light to this bedroom to an unacceptable level. The proposals are considered to fail to provide suitable standard of residential amenity for future occupiers' contrary to Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.
5. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure a resultant acceptable contribution towards the provision of Affordable Housing, the proposal fails to contribute adequately to the housing needs of Reading Borough, contrary to Policy H3

and CC9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and the Council's Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2013.

Informatives

Without prejudice to any future application or appeal, the applicant is advised that reason for refusal 5 (affordable housing) could be overcome by entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement or unilateral undertaking for a scheme that was in all other respects acceptable.

The applicant is advised that the refused scheme, had it been able to be approved, would have been a CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) liable development.

The local planning authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way by clearly setting out concerns relating to the proposal and providing an opportunity for the applicant to withdraw the application. However, the applicant chose not to withdraw the application, hence the issuing of this refusal notice within the agreed time period to determine the application by.

Prior to the submission of any future application at the site, the applicant is advised to enter into further pre-application discussions with the local planning authority.