

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 191312/FUL

Address: Land to Rear of 17 Berkshire Drive, Reading

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage block and construction of one X 1-bedroom dwelling

Case officer: Ethne Humphreys

Decision date: 07/10/2019

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site relates to land to the rear of and adjacent to dwellings fronting the north-eastward side of Berkshire Drive. The site comprises three adjoining garages, with vehicular access between 15b and 17 Berkshire Drive. The site topography slopes in a north-westerly direction such that the level of the existing garages is slightly set down from the level of the highway. The garages predate the erection of the dwellings before them and are served by a small area of hardstanding to their frontage. The rear elevation of the garages comprises the rearward site boundary. The site is set down from the neighbouring dwellings, whose rear gardens abut the garage site with their fencing appearing at a relative height in excess of 3m. To the rear of the site extends the Sheppard Court flatted development, with large trees located close to the shared boundary. The garages themselves appear to be currently unused.

Proposal:

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two and half storey building comprising one x one bed flat following demolition of existing garage structure. It would be finished with white render, wood effect pvc and a green roof. One parking space is proposed, by way of an undercroft to the building and a glass roofed enclosed balcony is proposed.

Plans Considered:

Drawing No: Location Plan PL-01

Drawing No: Existing and Proposed Block Plan PL-03

Drawing No: Existing Plans PL-04

Drawing No: Proposed Site Plan PL-06

Drawing No: Proposed Plans PL-07

Drawing No: Proposed Elevations PL-08

Drawing No: Proposed Street Scene PL-08

Received 8th August 2019

Other information submitted:

Drawing No: 3D Images PL-10

Supporting Statement

Received 8th August 2019

Relevant Planning History:

No planning applications, but a pre-application enquiry was made in 2018:

181213 PRE-APP Demolition of garages and erection of single dwelling

Internal Consultation Responses:

Highways Officer: No objection subject to revised plans and conditions. Discussed below.

Tree Officer: No objection subject to conditions. Discussed below.

Ecologist: No objection subject to conditions. Discussed below.

Environmental Protection: Although ideally a phase 1 desk contaminated land survey should have been submitted, such matters could ultimately be secured through condition. Discussed below.

Public consultation responses:

Neighbour letters were sent to the occupiers of nearby properties and a site notice was put up.

8 letters of objection received with a summary of the concerns being:

- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Impact on sewer infrastructure
- Health and safety/asbestos
- Previous application
- Impact on trees
- Out of keeping/overdevelopment

- Poor design/materials
- Increased noise
- Change of use to larger accommodation
- Mains/services/utilities
- Site notice
- Impact on foundations

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

The agent was advised by email 1st October 2019 of concerns relating to overdevelopment of the site/design concerns, quality of accommodation/amenity space, and loss of privacy/overlooking/overbearing impact concerns and lack of affordable housing contribution.

The applicant confirmed that they wished to receive the decision notice with a view to appealing.

No formal pre-application advice was sought prior to the submission of this specific scheme; however, advice was given to the application about the principle of the development.

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'.

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 Development Framework Core Strategy, 2008 (amended 2015)

- CS1 Sustainable Construction and Design
- CS2 Waste Minimisation
- CS7 Design and the Public Realm
- CS9 Infrastructure Services, Resources and Amenities
- CS14 Provision of Housing
- CS15 Location, Accessibility, Density and Housing Mix
- CS20 Implementation of the Reading Transport Strategy (Local Transport Plan 2006-2011)
- CS24 Car/Cycle Parking
- CS34 Pollution and Water Resources
- CS36 Biodiversity and Geology
- CS38 Trees, Hedges and Woodland

Sites and Detailed Policies Document, Oct 2012 (amended 2015)

- SD1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- DM1 Adaption to Climate Change
- DM3 Infrastructure Planning
- DM4 Safeguarding Amenity
- DM5 Housing Mix
- DM6 Affordable Housing
- DM10 Private and Communal Outdoor Space
- DM11 Development of Private Residential Gardens
- DM18 Tree Planting
- DM19 Air Quality

The New Reading Borough Local Plan is at an advanced stage, The Inspector's report into the Proposed Modifications has now been received and the new local plan is proposed to be adopted by the Council on 4 November 2019. Accordingly, it is taken into account as part of the determination of this application.

Reading Borough Submission Draft Local Plan 2018

- 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

H1: Provision of Housing

H2: Density and Mix

H3: Affordable Housing

H5: Standards for New Housing

H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space

H11: Development of Private Residential Gardens

TR1: Achieving the Transport Strategy

TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

TR5: Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging

RBC Supplementary Planning Documents

Affordable Housing SPD (2013)

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

Revised SPD on Planning Obligations under Section 106 (2015)

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2011)

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 NPPF definition of 'previously developed land' excludes private residential gardens.

Therefore, it is clear that the priority for development should be on previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings. However, that does not mean that the development of private residential garden land is unacceptable in principle, rather that previously developed land should be the first choice for housing development.

The Council's LDF SDPD Policy DM11 / H11 Development of Private Residential Gardens requires that new residential development that involves land within the curtilage of private residential gardens will be acceptable where:

- 1) It makes a positive contribution to the character of the area;
- 2) The site is of an adequate size to accommodate the development;
- 3) The proposal has a suitable access;
- 4) The proposal would not lead to an unacceptable tandem development;
- 5) The design minimises the exposure of existing private boundaries to public areas;
- 6) It does not cause detrimental impact on residential amenities;
- 7) The emphasis is on the provision of family housing;
- 8) There is no adverse impact on biodiversity, and
- 9) The proposal does not prejudice the development of a wider area.

Therefore, while the proposed site is not 'previously developed land', the principle of redevelopment is considered acceptable providing the criteria outlined in Policies DM11 / H11 and CS15 / H2 (relating to general location, accessibility, density and housing mix matters) are met.

The existing garage structure is not listed, within a conservation area or locally listed. Nevertheless, it is modest in scale which sits comfortably within the street scene and does not detract from the character of the area. Within this context, there is no in-principle objection to the garage structure being demolished in design terms, but the replacement building must be appropriate in all other aspects (which is detailed further below).

With regard to the principle of the proposed use, from purely a land use perspective, it is considered that a proposal to introduce one residential unit would comply with the principles of Policy CS14 / H1. This is by contributing to the housing needs within the borough.

However, as the remainder of this appraisal shall demonstrate, the proposals fail to meet a number of the Policy DM11 / H11 criteria, in particular elements 1), 2) 4) & 6).

Design, Impact on the Character of the Street Scene

Core Strategy Policy CS7 / New Local Plan Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) and SPDP Policy DM11 / New Local Plan Policy H11 (Development of Private and Residential Gardens) both seek to ensure that new development enhances and preserves the local character. SPDP Policy DM10 / New Local Plan Policy H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) states that the design of outdoor areas will respect the size and character of other similar spaces in the vicinity.

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 existing garage structure, given its position and single storey nature is not overly prominent. Its proposed replacement with a two storey dwelling would add considerable bulk and result in a much more dominant feature. Furthermore, the proposed building would not bear any visual relationship to the existing built form of dwellings in the surrounding area. In contrast, it would arguably be out of scale/plot size with the prevailing pattern of development. Put simply, the site is not considered to be of an adequate size to accommodate a dwelling and this is exacerbated by the location of the dwelling to the rearward site boundary, not allowing for appropriate spacing around the buildings or the provision of suitable private amenity space - as discussed further below. Due to the siting behind dwellings fronting Berkshire Drive, the proposed dwelling would also lead to unacceptable tandem development. The minimal distance that could be achieved between facing elevations would cause a significant and detrimental impact to the amenities of adjacent and nearby properties - as discussed below. The siting and scale of the proposal would create a constrained form of development resulting in an overdevelopment of the site, which would appear poorly integrated with the Berkshire Drive street scene (when seen from a variety of viewpoints, rather than the single location detailed within the street scene

elevation provided in support of the proposals from the applicant) and to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

In terms of detailed design, the proposals fail to respect the context of the site and indeed it is not clear where the design cues have been taken from, and the proposal does little to integrate the design in terms of its form, details and materials. Indeed, the proposed high level first floor windows and oriel windows appear to elongate the building and, as discussed further below, their need is indicative of the overdeveloped nature of the site.

The proposed balcony would, respectfully, have the appearance of a smoking shelter - certainly not a residential balcony element - and indeed, combined with the proposed undercroft, would be a somewhat incongruous component. The proposals would visually jar with the adjacent buildings.

As above, the NPPF acknowledges that planning decisions should not attempt to stifle innovation, originality or initiative; but it too seeks to reinforce local distinctiveness and to integrate new development into the natural, built and historic environment. In this instance, the resultant building would be in stark contrast to the existing character, with the combination of the scale, plot coverage, detailed design and materials resulting in a cramped, uncharacteristic and overdeveloped appearance.

As such the proposal is contrary to Policies CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and Policies DM10 and DM11 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and Policy CC7: Design and the Public Realm of the Reading Borough Local Plan (to be adopted November 2019).

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

SPDP Policy DM4 / New Local Plan Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) is concerned with preventing significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties, including in terms of privacy and overlooking, loss of daylight and visual dominance, amongst other impacts.

Policies DM4 and CC8 both state, *“A back-to-back distance of 20 metres between dwellings is usually appropriate, although the circumstances on individual sites may enable dwellings to be closer without a detrimental effect on privacy”*. In this instance, there would be a distance of approximately 10m between the rearward elevation of 15b Berkshire Drive and

the forward elevation of the proposed dwelling. Whilst the orientation of the oriel window is noted (at an angle to 15b), the proposed high level first floor windows facing the rear of 15b are considered to result in actual and perceived overlooking to the occupiers of this property. Further to this, whilst it is appreciated that the oriel windows would be at an angle, their orientation will still allow views towards 15b. Notwithstanding, the oriel windows would be angled towards No.17 Berkshire Drive, also considered to result in an increased perception of overlooking towards this property.

No first floor windows are proposed in the north east facing rear elevation and as such there would be no material loss of privacy to the occupiers of Sheppard Court. Whilst the increase in the height of the structure from single storey to two storey would be noticed by the occupiers of Sheppard Court, there is some tree screening along the boundary and given the distance, it is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or be so overbearing to the occupiers of Sheppard Court to warrant a refusal on this basis.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).

Amenity of Future Occupiers

The proposed dwelling will have ~35.259 square metres of floor space, which is less than the minimum floor space of a one bedroom two storey property under the national space standards (37m² for a property including shower room rather than bathroom such as that proposed) - and the Council's New Local Plan Policy H4. Accordingly, at this time, this specific element will not form a reason for refusal of the application (as the standards are presently guidance, not adopted policy). However, should an appeal be lodged once the space standards have been adopted within the new local plan, the local planning authority reserves the right to return to consider these concerns at the time of any such appeal.

Further to this, as above, due to the minimal back to back distance (10m) between the proposed dwelling and No.15b Berkshire Drive, there would be an increased perception of overlooking to the dwelling itself (garden area discussed below). Both the ground and first floor would be single aspect and this would be a poor relationship. Whilst it is considered that the dwelling would achieve sufficient light levels, the oriel windows, oriented towards No.17b Berkshire Drive would reduce outlook and their need indicative of the overdeveloped nature of the site.

Linked to the above concerns regarding overdevelopment of the site, it is considered that the useable amenity space for the proposed dwelling would be insufficient and out of keeping with the size of amenity spaces to two storey dwellings in the surrounding area, and to the detriment of the future occupiers of the dwellings. The proposed glassed roof balcony is not considered to be a positive contribution in terms of amenity, given it would be enclosed on all sides, resulting in no outlook and an overly confined space causing a harmful sense of enclosure for future occupiers.

Furthermore the amenity space at the front of the dwelling would have little privacy; again, compromised by the relationship with the neighbouring dwellings with concerns of overlooking. Consequently, given this and the above, the proposals in any event would not allow for an attractive or enjoyable amenity area.

In these regards the numerous individual shortfalls identified, when considered cumulatively, result in an overall conclusion that the quality of accommodation for future occupiers would be contrary to Policy DM4 and DM10 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and emerging Policy H5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).

Transport Issues

The proposed development site is accessed via an existing access point between No15b and No17 Berkshire Drive and is located within Zone 3, Secondary Core Area, of the Council's adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD. Typically these areas are within 400m of a Reading Buses high frequency 'Premier Route', which provides high quality bus routes to and from Reading town centre and other local centre facilities.

In accordance with the adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD, the development would be required to provide parking provision of 1 car parking space for a 1 bedroom dwelling. Submitted plans indicate that undercroft parking for 1 will be provided. The dimensions for this parking space should be 5m long and 3m wide. The proposed provision complies with the Council's current standards for a 1 bedroom development and is therefore acceptable.

The existing access from Berkshire Drive is to be used. Plans indicate that the width of the access road is 2.4m wide which is the minimum required for access to a single dwelling. This is therefore acceptable.

Plans indicate that the site will be gated. Any gates provided should open away from the highway and be set back a distance of at least 5 metres from the nearside of the carriageway of the adjoining highway. This is to ensure that vehicles can be driven off the highway before the gates are opened. The position of the gates illustrated on the submitted plan is acceptable as they are more than 5m away from the access.

In accordance with the adopted Parking SPD, the development is required to provide a minimum of 1 cycle parking spaces for the 1 bedroom dwelling, plans located that this is to be located within the car port area, however this location has open access and therefore not secure. A wall/or floor mounted device to the rear would be acceptable. Had the application otherwise been considered acceptable, revised plans would have been sought to address this matter. Alternatively, this could be dealt with by way of a suitably worded condition and as such does not form a reason for refusal.

Bin storage should not be located further than 15m from the access point of the site to avoid the stationing of service vehicles on the carriageway for excessive periods, and should comply with Manual for Streets and British Standard 5906: 2005 for Waste Management in Buildings to avoid the stationing of service vehicles on the carriageway for excessive periods. Plans illustrate that the bin storage area is located approximately 24m from the access, therefore a collection point would need to be illustrated closer to the access point. Had the application otherwise been considered acceptable, revised plans would have been sought to address this matter. Alternatively, this could be dealt with by way of a suitably worded condition and as such does not form a reason for refusal.

Had the proposals been considered appropriate a construction method statement would have been secured via pre-commencement condition, for highway safety matters and to protect nearby amenity.

Policy DM12 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and Policies CS20 and CS24 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015); Policies TR1, TR3 and TR5 of the emerging New Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).

Natural Environment

The Council's Tree Officer has confirmed that whilst there are trees adjacent the site, they do not make a significant contribution to the amenity of the area. Furthermore, the proposed

dwelling is within the footprint of the existing garage structure and there are no tree/landscape objections. Should the application have otherwise been acceptable, landscaping conditions would have been secured.

The Council's Ecologist has confirmed that due to the location and structure of the garage block, it is unlikely to host a bat roost, and the hardstanding is of low ecological value. The proposals are therefore unlikely to affect bats. Should the application have otherwise been considered acceptable it would have been appropriate to include a condition to ensure that enhancements for wildlife would be provided within the new development.

Notwithstanding the above, there is a risk that nesting birds could be affected by the proposals and should the application have otherwise been acceptable, an informative would have been attached to the decision notice in this respect to ensure that nesting birds are not disturbed or harmed.

Policies CS36 and CS38 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015); Policies EN12 and EN14 of the emerging New Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).

Environmental Health

The development lies on the site of a former domestic garage block which has the potential to have caused contaminated land and the proposed development is a sensitive land use.

In terms of contaminated land, Environmental Protection colleagues recommend the standard four-stage conditions to ensure that the possible presence of contamination is thoroughly investigated and removed/mitigated if necessary (3 of the conditions are pre-commencement). These conditions would have been attached should the application have been recommended for approval.

Other Environmental Health based conditions, had the proposals been supported, would have related to the control of noise and dust during the development phase, working hours and ensuring no materials were burnt on site.

Policy CS34 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015); Policies EN15 and EN16 of the emerging New Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).

Sustainability

The applicant has not provided any specific information relation to sustainable design and construction.

The recent publishing of the Inspector's report in relation to the emerging local plan (Reading Borough Local Plan 2019), emerging Policy H5 'Housing Standards' requires that all new build housing integrate additional measures for sustainability. In light of this, and should the application have otherwise been recommended for approval, then conditions would have been recommended to ensure the development meets the following requirements:

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

Although part of a planning condition, these new requirements would have been administered through the Building Regulations. At the time of writing it is not considered appropriate to include these as standalone reasons for refusal (as the policy is yet to be formally adopted). However, should an appeal be lodged once the space standards have been adopted within the new local plan, the local planning authority reserves the right to return to consider these concerns at the time of any such appeal.

Affordable Housing

West Berkshire District Council and Reading Borough Council applied for a judicial review of the Secretary of State's Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) to Parliament in 2014 on changes to national planning policy. Those changes sought to exempt developments of 10 or less dwellings from planning obligations for affordable housing and social infrastructure contributions and to introduce a new measure known as the Vacant Building Credit.

The High Court handed down its judgment on the case on 31st July 2015. The High Court found in favour of the challenge by the local authorities and quashed the amendments to the NPPG. The Secretary of State appealed the judgment and the Court of Appeal then quashed the decision of the High Court.

At its meeting of the Strategic Environment Planning and Transport Committee on 13th July 2016, the Council discussed the outcome of the Court of Appeal's decision on its challenge (http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/5651/Item09-SEPT-C-Report-on-C-of-Appeal-judgement-05-16/pdf/Item09_SEPT_C_Report_on_C_of_Appeal_judgement_05_16.pdf).

Having considered its options, the Committee agreed the following as the basis for determining planning applications where Policy DM6 of the SDPD is relevant:

To implement Policy DM6 as currently adopted in the SDPD but excluding proposals that solely involve the conversion of an existing property, where the conversion involves the provision of 10 or less dwelling units (i.e. not HMOs), or the replacement of dwellings by the same number of replacement dwellings where there is no net increase.

This planning application does not relate to the conversion of an existing property and therefore would need to accord with the requirements of Policy DM6 (and emerging Policy H3) and make an appropriate financial affordable housing contribution.

The applicant stated they agreed in principle to enter into a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution. However, valuations have not been submitted (it would usually be expected for such information to be submitted at the outset of this application - in any future appeal it would be expected for 3 valuations to be submitted at the outset of the appeal to allow further consideration of this) and as 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.

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.

Other matters raised in representation

All material considerations covered in the above report.

- Water run-off and drainage would be dealt with as part of a Building Regulations application.
- Two site notices were put up by the case officer.
- Any future application would be determined on its merits.
- Planning permission would be required to change the use from flats to an HMO.

- It is not considered that the Council's assessment of the scheme has been prejudiced by the information submitted.

Conclusion

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. More specifically, when providing a critical planning balance, it is considered that the benefits of utilising a garage site and in doing so adding to the housing stock in the borough, are not outweighed by the various deficiencies (e.g. design and related matters; amenity; quality of accommodation; subsequent absence of a s106 to secure an appropriate affordable housing contribution) detailed above.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE

1. The proposed development, by reason of its overall scale relative to plot size, uncharacteristically small garden area and the relationship to existing properties, would be overly prominent within its context, result in a cramped arrangement of building and spaces and be an overdevelopment of the site that would not respect the prevailing pattern of development and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and Policies DM10 and DM11 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and Policies CC7, H10 and H11 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).
2. The proposed development, by reason of its detailed design and use of materials, would appear as an inappropriate and development that would not be of a sufficient high quality design that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015), Policy DM11 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and Policies CC7 and H11 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).
3. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting, and extent, number and close proximity of windows to No.15b Berkshire Drive and No.17 Berkshire Drive,

would cause unacceptable perceived and actual loss of privacy to the occupiers of these properties, resulting in an overall significant detrimental impact to these occupiers residential amenity, contrary to Policies DM4 and DM11 of the Reading Borough Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and Policies CC8 and H11 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).

4. The proposed development, by reason of its limited outlook (to the south) and inadequate provision of outdoor amenity space, will adversely impact upon the level of amenity and provide an unacceptable quality of living accommodation for future occupants, contrary to Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).
5. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an acceptable contribution towards the provision of Affordable Housing, the proposal fails to contribute adequately to the housing needs of Reading Borough, contrary to policy CS9 (Infrastructure, Services, Resources and Amenities) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015), policies DM3 (Infrastructure Planning) and DM6 (Affordable Housing) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015), and the Council's Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2013 and Policies CC9 and H3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (scheduled to be adopted November 2019).

Informatives

1. The decision relates to the following drawings and documents:

Drawing No: Location Plan PL-01

Drawing No: Existing and Proposed Block Plan PL-03

Drawing No: Existing Plans PL-04

Drawing No: Proposed Site Plan PL-06

Drawing No: Proposed Plans PL-07

Drawing No: Proposed Elevations PL-08

Drawing No: Proposed Street Scene PL-08

Received 8th August 2019

Drawing No: 3D Images PL-10

Supporting Statement

Received 8th August 2019

2. 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 statutory time period to determine the application by.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Prior to the submission of any future application at the site, the applicant is advised to enter into pre-application discussions with the local planning authority.
6. The applicant will note that reference is made in the reasons for refusal to the emerging Local Plan, which is scheduled to be adopted in November 2019. Once adopted, these policies will supersede the currently adopted Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015). Please refer to the officer report for details concerning the interaction between the local policy documents and further matters to consider once the new Local Plan is adopted. If you have any queries or questions, please contact the Council.