

71 – 73 CAVERSHAM ROAD, READING

Flood Risk Sequential Test



HLEF74507
Flood Risk Sequential Test
1
September 2019

REPORT

Quality Management

Version	Status	Authorized by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date
0	Draft	GB, RS	AV	AV	09/09/2019

Approval for issue

Anna Velkov



9 September 2019

File/Model Location

Document location:

O:\Environment\Jobs5000\HLE - JOBS\HLEF - Flood\HLEF 73000 Plus\HLEF 74507 - Caversham Road ST\5. Reports\Draft Report\HLEF74507 Seq Test Caversham Road.docx

© Copyright RPS Group Plc. All rights reserved.

The report has been prepared for the exclusive use of our client and unless otherwise agreed in writing by RPS Group Plc, any of its subsidiaries, or a related entity (collectively 'RPS'), no other party may use, make use of, or rely on the contents of this report. The report has been compiled using the resources agreed with the client and in accordance with the scope of work agreed with the client. No liability is accepted by RPS for any use of this report, other than the purpose for which it was prepared. The report does not account for any changes relating to the subject matter of the report, or any legislative or regulatory changes that have occurred since the report was produced and that may affect the report. RPS does not accept any responsibility or liability for loss whatsoever to any third party caused by, related to or arising out of any use or reliance on the report.

RPS accepts no responsibility for any documents or information supplied to RPS by others and no legal liability arising from the use by others of opinions or data contained in this report. It is expressly stated that no independent verification of any documents or information supplied by others has been made. RPS has used reasonable skill, care and diligence in compiling this report and no warranty is provided as to the report's accuracy. No part of this report may be copied or reproduced, by any means, without the prior written consent of RPS.

Prepared by:

RPS

20 Farringdon Street
London, EC4A 4AB

Prepared for:

S2 Caversham Ltd

15 Half Moon Street
London W1J 7DZ

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RPS was commissioned to undertake a Flood Risk Sequential Test to support the redevelopment of 71-73 Caversham Road, Reading RG1 8JA to provide 44 residential units and a ground floor retail unit. The three existing office units in the west of the site will be retained. The Flood Risk Sequential Test relates to the proposed residential use only and has been undertaken as the site is located within the Environment Agency (EA)'s Flood Zone 2, associated with the River Thames.

The Sequential Test is designed to direct development towards the areas at lowest risk of flooding. Potential development sites have been identified within Reading Borough Council (RBC)'s Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). RPS has reviewed each site within the 1km of Reading Train Station which is considered to have a similarly sustainable location in terms of the existence of infrastructure and facilities.

The Sequential Test has demonstrated that there are no reasonably available, sequentially preferable sites within the surrounding area which are at a lower probability of flooding and that would be suitable for the proposed development. On this basis, it is considered that the Sequential Test has been satisfied.

The development is considered to pass the Exception Test as it is providing further residential housing on a brownfield site that has existing transport links and services. The proposed development will provide positive benefits in accordance with the three pillars of sustainability. Additionally, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared demonstrating that the residential units will be safe for their lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere. This demonstrates that elevation of the flats to first floor level and above and the incorporation of flood resilience techniques can mitigate the flood risk at the site (see Flood Risk Assessment report ref. HLEF71415/001R for further details).

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARYI

1 INTRODUCTION1

2 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT2

3 THE SEQUENTIAL TEST3

4 EXCEPTION TEST6

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS9

Tables

Table 1: Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone ‘compatibility’ (PPG to NPPF, Table 3)6

Table 2A: Site Summaries.....13

Appendices

Appendix A Sequential Sites

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 RPS was commissioned to undertake a Flood Risk Sequential Test for the residential element of the proposed development at *71 – 73 Caversham Road, Reading RG1 8JA*.
- 1.2 The development proposes to demolish the existing commercial unit in the east of the site and provide 44 residential flats and a ground floor retail unit.
- 1.3 The purpose of this document is to establish whether the site meets the requirements of the Sequential Test in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The report has been prepared in consultation with a Planning Officer from Reading Borough Council (RBC).

2 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1 The development site occupies an area of approximately 0.16 hectares (ha). The development proposes to demolish the existing commercial unit in the east of the site and provide 44 residential flats arranged over first through sixth floor levels and a ground floor retail unit. The three small commercial units in the west of the site will be retained.
- 2.2 The suitability of the subject site for the proposed development is demonstrated by the following:
- The site is not within the Green Belt;
 - There are no Tree Preservation Orders at the site;
 - The existing building is not listed;
 - The local area is characterised by buildings of mixed styles, meaning the new building would not be detrimental to the character of the area; and
 - The development would make use of a brownfield site with access to existing good transport links and services.

3 THE SEQUENTIAL TEST

Introduction and Scope / Area of Search

- 3.1 The Environment Agency (EA) Flood Map for Planning indicates that the site is located within Flood Zone 2, whereby the annual probability of fluvial flooding is classified as greater than 1 in 1000 but less than 1 in 100 in any given year in the absence of flood defences.
- 3.2 The PPG to the NPPF states that the aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Where there are no *reasonably available* sites in Flood Zone 1 (as defined by the EA), the planning authority should consider *reasonably available* sites in Flood Zone 2.
- 3.3 The scope and approach of this Sequential Test have been discussed with a Planning Officer at RBC. RBC advised that when applying the Sequential Test, sites should be identified from the RBC Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) May 2017 version.
- 3.4 It was suggested that the search area was derived by applying a maximum distance value to key infrastructure or services. On this basis, given the site's location less than 300m from Reading Train Station, it has been proposed to investigate a search radius of 1km from the station. Such sites would be considered to be in a similarly sustainable location with respect to existing infrastructure. The site is located on the edge of Reading Town Centre, therefore all sites within 1km of the train station are either within the Town Centre or on the peripheries of it and benefit from access to existing facilities.
- 3.5 The officer agreed that it is acceptable to exclude all sites that have been identified for a non-residential end use, that are not available within the same timeframe as that which the client is looking to develop in (in this case it is within five years) and those that the HELAA identified to be unsuitable / not available / not achievable.
- 3.6 In summary, in order to meet the requirements of the Sequential Test, it must be demonstrated that there are no *reasonably available* sites with a lower probability of flooding that would be appropriate for the type of development proposed.

Defining *Reasonably Available* Sites

- 3.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated in February 2019, replacing all the previous NPPFs and Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) including PPS 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. The NPPF does not provide a definition of reasonably available. However, the EA's 'Demonstrating the flood risk Sequential Test for Planning Applications' document states that:

In the absence of background documents, 'reasonably available' sites would include any sites that are suitable, developable and deliverable, and where necessary, meet the Local Plan Policy criterion for windfall development.

- 3.8 RBC were content that the Sequential Test can focus on sites identified in the HELAA.
- 3.9 In the absence of any newer, contradictory information, Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk Practice Guide (December 2009) defines *reasonably available* sites as being 'suitable developable and deliverable' and states that 'developable' and 'deliverable' are defined in Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing'*.
- 3.10 Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing' states that for a site to be considered as 'deliverable' they should:

Be available – the site is available now.

Be suitable – the site offers a suitable location for development now and would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities.

Be achievable – there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.

- 3.11 To be considered ‘developable’, sites should *‘be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available for, and could be developed at the point envisaged.’*
- 3.12 RPS has, therefore, used the above definitions of ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ when considering whether alternative sites meet the definition of *reasonably available* within this Sequential Test.
- 3.13 *Note: Although PPS 3 has been withdrawn, the definition of reasonably available contained within this document remains valid.

Borough-wide Considerations

- 3.14 Before considering individual sites, it is important to understand the overall housing position with regard to housing targets in the Borough.
- 3.15 The HELAA initially identifies a total development potential of 28,775 units from 2013 to 2016, however, when the suitability, availability and achievability are considered this decreased to 12,100.
- 3.16 The second stage of the HELAA considers more precisely the timeframe of development for sites which have passed the aforementioned tests. It was stated that 6,486 units could be developed within the next five years.
- 3.17 The Berkshire (including South Bucks) Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) published in February 2016 identifies Reading to have the largest population and number of households within Berkshire, the highest percentage of single person households and the second highest percentage of flats and one bedroom homes. The growth is fuelled by demographic change and also those migrating in, from places such as London.
- 3.18 The SHMA identifies the need for 699 additional new residential units per year in Reading and that the demand is not currently being met. A total deficit of 944 homes has been identified over the period up to 2036.
- 3.19 It is, therefore, important to take advantage of all suitable, available, previously developed sites, including windfall sites, to contribute towards achieving the housing targets.
- 3.20 The RBC HELAA identified that *‘there are not sufficient sites to meet the objectively assessed need for housing in Reading on sites in Flood Zones 1 and 2. It is therefore likely that the sequential test for sites in Flood Zone 3 would be passed. The suitability of these sites for development in terms of flooding will therefore be dependent on other policy tests, notably the Exception Test.’*
- 3.21 The site is located within Flood Zone 2 and therefore is sequentially preferable to any sites within Flood Zone 3. The HELAA infers that it is likely that any site within Flood Zone 2 would pass the Sequential Test.

Consideration of Alternative Sites

- 3.22 As specified by RBC, each site identified within the HELAA within our search radius has been assessed to determine whether it meets the definition of a reasonably available site with a lower probability of flooding that would be appropriate for the proposed development. The full assessment is provided in Appendix A (Sequential Sites). The assessment has considered a range of potential development restrictions including (but not limited to):
- Flood risk classification;
 - Capacity / yield (as identified within the HELAA);
 - Likely development type (based on capacity / yield identified within the HELAA);
 - Suitability, Availability and Achievability (as identified within the HELAA);

- Recent planning applications / construction; and
- Availability Timeframes.

3.23 Discussion of the factors specific to each site is provided within Appendix A.

Summary of Findings

- 3.24 RPS has carried out a local search within the agreed area in order to establish whether there are any sites which meet the above definition of *reasonably available*, which are at a lower probability of flooding and that would be appropriate for the proposed development.
- 3.25 Appendix A contains sites that have been allocated for development by the Local Authority within the HELAA. Table 2A individually assesses all sites in the HELAA identified to be within 1km of Reading Train Station on the basis of the criteria outlined in Section 2.15 above. None of the sites within this appendix can fulfil all these three criteria: within a lower flood zone than the subject site, suitable for the proposed development and *reasonably available* for the proposed development. The vast majority of sites are not suitable as the proposed development would result in an underdevelopment of the site and would therefore be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
- 3.26 **Overall, the analysis set out in Appendix A demonstrates that there are no sequentially preferable sites with a lower probability of flooding within the search area that constitute reasonably available alternatives to the development site. Therefore, the Sequential Test is considered to be passed.**

4 EXCEPTION TEST

- 4.1 The NPPF states that when it is not possible, following the application of the Sequential Test, for a development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exception Test should be applied. This test allows for the consideration of wider sustainable development objectives if the Sequential Test alone cannot deliver acceptable sites.
- 4.2 The proposed development would comprise a ground floor retail unit and 44 residential flats above. According to Table 2 of the PPG the residential element of the development is therefore classified as 'more vulnerable'.
- 4.3 In accordance with the definitions of the flood zones provided in Table 1 of the PPG, the site is located within Flood Zone 2, whereby the annual probability of fluvial flooding is classified as greater than 1 in 1000 but less than 1 in 100 in any given year in the absence of flood defences.
- 4.4 Table 3 of the PPG to the NPPF specifies under which circumstances the application of the Exception Test is required.

Table 1: Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone 'compatibility' (PPG to NPPF, Table 3)

Flood Zones	Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification				
	Essential infrastructure	Highly vulnerable	More vulnerable	Less vulnerable	Water compatible
Zone 1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Zone 2	✓	Exception Test required	✓	✓	✓
Zone 3a †	Exception Test required †	✗	Exception Test required	✓	✓
Zone 3b *	Exception Test required *	✗	✗	✗	✓*

Key:

✓ Development is appropriate

✗ Development should not be permitted.

- 4.5 According to Table 3 of the PPG to the NPPF, 'more vulnerable' developments are considered appropriate within Flood Zone 2 without the requirement to apply the Exception Test.
- 4.6 However, in order to fully demonstrate the suitability of the subject site for the proposed development, the Exception Test has been undertaken.
- 4.7 The Exception Test aims to ensure that more vulnerable property types are not allocated to areas at high risk of flooding. For the Exception Test to be passed:
- It must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared;
 - A site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

- 4.8 With reference to point (a) above the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines the Government's planning policies for England. It provides a framework within which local people and their respective Councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans; reflecting the needs and priorities of their communities. There is now a strong focus on the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The three dimensions of sustainable development have been defined as the economic role, social role and environmental role. All three pillars of sustainability should be equally promoted in all projects.
- 4.9 The first of the 'three pillars' of sustainable development is economic development. This is recognised within the NPPF, identifying the 'economic role' of the planning system to "contribute to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy". New residential developments, if located and designed appropriately, can contribute to the economic prosperity of the region / locality. In the short term, the construction activities will generate employment opportunities for local skilled tradesmen and there is potential for building companies to develop the local skills base through apprenticeships and links with local construction training providers. Where possible, the developer would recruit local contractors. There are also opportunities further down the construction supply chain, with the use of local suppliers for materials and equipment. In the longer term, there are a number of economic benefits, including expenditure from new residents on goods and services in the local area which will provide positive effects upon the economic sustainability of the local economy and the indirect support this provides to new employment and the vitality of area.
- 4.10 The NPPF outlines policies for local authorities to enable them to boost the local housing supply, creating sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. The proposed development is for residential accommodation which will help alleviate pressures on the existing housing stock of the area. As the housing demand constantly increases, due to the increase in population, it is important that there is constant and sufficient supply of housing to meet the needs of present and future generations. The development proposes to demolish a commercial premise and re-provide some retail use in addition to 44 residential apartments. This is in line with NPPF target of increasing house supply.
- 4.11 The proposed development is located within very close proximity of Reading Train Station and would therefore enable residents to walk to the station, decreasing reliance on private transport.
- 4.12 NPPF supports the transition to a low carbon future in climate change. The proposed development will have to comply with current Building Regulations Part L1A 2013. As a result, the energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions of the proposed development will be extremely low. Research has shown that dwellings that have to comply with current Regulations can have up to 80% less energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions compared to existing buildings.
- 4.13 A reduction in surface water runoff will also be achieved through the incorporation of permeable paving and underground attenuation crates. This therefore will provide a reduction in local flood risk, within a wider area that has been indicated by EA mapping to be at an elevated risk of surface water flooding. In addition, the permeable paving will provide water quality benefits as the water percolates through the gravel sub-base.
- 4.14 With reference to point (b) above, the associated Flood Risk Assessment (ref. HLEF71415/001R) demonstrates that the residential units would be at a low risk of flooding, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and will reduce flood risk overall given the reduction in surface water runoff following redevelopment. This has been achieved through:
- The location of all residential uses on the first floor level and above, significantly above the modelled 1 in 100 year plus 35% climate change flood level.
 - The use of flood resilient building techniques in construction of the ground floor levels up to 28.35m AOD (300mm above the 1 in 100 year plus 35% climate change flood level).
 - The provision of safe refuge within all residential units, should fluvial flooding occur. Dry access / egress is available for all events up to and including a 1 in 100 year flood event. A Flood Management Plan is recommended to be produced.

- The recommendation to elevate ground floor levels by 150mm above surrounding ground levels to provide some mitigation against the ingress of floodwaters from non-fluvial sources.
- A reduction in surface water runoff through the incorporation of permeable paving and underground attenuation crates, providing a positive reduction in surface water risk within the area.

4.15 It is considered that the development passes the Exception Test.

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The Berkshire SHMA and RBC's HELAA identify a deficit in the provision of housing within Reading and predict a deficit of nearly 1000 units up to 2036. The HELAA states that there are insufficient sites within Flood Zones 1 and 2 to meet the required housing demand. Potential development sites have been identified within RBC's HELAA. RPS has reviewed each site within the 1km of Reading Train Station which is considered to have a similarly sustainable location in terms of the existence of infrastructure and facilities.
- 5.2 The Sequential Test has demonstrated that there are no reasonably available, sequentially preferable sites within the surrounding area which are at a lower probability of flooding and that would be suitable for the proposed development. On this basis, it is considered that the Sequential Test has been satisfied.
- 5.3 The development is considered to pass the Exception Test as it is providing further residential housing on a brownfield site that has existing transport links and services. The proposed development will provide positive benefits in accordance with the three pillars of sustainability. Additionally, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared demonstrating that the residential units will be safe for their lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere. This demonstrates that elevation of the flats to first floor level and above and the incorporation of flood resilience techniques can mitigate the flood risk at the site (see Flood Risk Assessment report ref. HLEF71415/001R for further details).

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Sequential Sites

Introduction

This Appendix provides a detailed discussion of each of the potential development sites listed within the specified search area within RBC's 2017 HELAA.

Key:



Site not *reasonably available or achievable* for proposed development



Equivalent or worse flood zone

RBC 2017 HELAA – identified sites within the search radius specified in Section 2.1 of this report.

These sites are discussed on an individual basis in Table 2A below. The information relating to the assessed suitability, availability, achievability, when the site will become available and the potential yield of the site (residential dwellings) is as stated within Appendix 1 of the HELAA.

Table 2: Site Summaries

Site Code	Site Title	Max. Flood Zone	Area (ha)	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Resi yield (units)	Delivery estimate (years)		Discounted	Comments
								1 - 5	6+		
AB001	Friar Street and Station Road	1	1.36	Suitable	Available	Achievable	200		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB002	Friars Walk and Greyfriars Road (reduced site)	1	0.37	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	92		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB003	Station Hill (wider site)	1	2.87	Suitable	Available	Achievable	451	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB004	North of the Station	3	6.71	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	681		✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and

											would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB005	Riverside	3	1.24	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	245		✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB006	Napier Road Junction	2	0.49	Suitable	Available	Achievable	200	✓		✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB007	Napier Court	2	1.1	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	176		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB008	Cattle Market	2	2.46	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	369		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site.

REPORT

											The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB009	Great Knollys Street and Weldale Street	2	3.02	Suitable	Available	Potentially achievable	319		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB010	Chatham Street	1	3.04	Suitable	Potentially available	Unachievable	0		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB011	Broad Street Mall	1	2.75	Suitable	Available	Potentially achievable	282		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB012	Hosier Street	1	3.41	Suitable	Available	Achievable	560		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in

											significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB013	Reading Prison	1	1.44	Suitable	Available	Potentially achievable	72		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site.
AB014	Forbury Retail Park	1	6.99	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	1306		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB015	Forbury Business Park and Kenavon Drive	1	2.89	Suitable	Available	Achievable	142	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB017	108-116 Oxford Road, 10 Eaton Place and 115-125 Chatham Street	1	1.12	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	186		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.

REPORT

AB018	143-145 Oxford Road	1	0.14	Potentially suitable	Not available	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB019	Former Reading Family Centre, North Street	1	0.23	Suitable	Available	Achievable	17	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield). The proposed development would result in overdevelopment of the site in terms of unit numbers.
AB020	9-27 Greyfriars Road	2	0.17	Suitable	Not available	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB021	2-8 The Forbury and 19-22 Market Place	1	0.07	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for development.
AB022	3-10 Market Place, Abbey Hall & Abbey Square	1	0.29	Suitable	Availability unknown	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB023	37-43 Market Place	1	0.07	Suitable	Available	Achievable	36	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in overdevelopment of the site.
AB024	Reading Central Library, Abbey Square	3	0.1	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for development.

REPORT

AB025	The Anchorage, 34 Bridge Street	1	0.15	Suitable	Not available	N/A	0	✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB026	The Oracle Extension, Bridge Street and Letcombe Street	1	1.67	Suitable	Availability unknown	N/A	0	✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB028	Kings Meadow Pool, Kings Meadow Road	3	0.12	Suitable	Available	Achievable	0	✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.
AB029	Caversham Lock Island	3	0.45	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	-1	✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.
AB030	Aldwych House, 2 Blagrove Street	1	0.24	Suitable	Available	Achievable	0	✓	✓	The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.
AB031	Energis House, Forbury Road	1	1.4	Suitable	Available	Achievable	0	✓	✓	The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.
AB032	173-175 Friar Street	1	0.14	Suitable	Available	Achievable	27	✓	✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in overdevelopment of the site.
AB034	Land West of Rivermead Car Park	2	0.44	Suitable	Available	Achievable	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.

REPORT

AB035	Summit House, 49-51 Greyfriars Road	2	0.05	Suitable	Available	Achievable	21	✓		✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
AB036	60 Queens Road	1	0.22	Suitable	Not available	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.
AB037	Kings Reach, 38-50 Kings Road	2	0.11	Suitable	Available	Achievable	72	✓		✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site.
AB038	Zenith House, 7 Cheapside	1	0.11	Suitable	Available	Achievable	41	✓		✓	Prior Approval was granted for the change of use of the first through fourth floors of the building to provide 41 residential flats under application reference 15/0146. This consent has been enacted and therefore the site is not considered to be 'reasonably available'.
AB039	Jacksons Corner, 1-9 Kings Road	1	0.98	Suitable	Available	Achievable	26	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site.
AB040	Land at Hodsoll Road	2	1.07	Suitable	Available	Achievable	0	✓		✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.
AB041	Havell House, 62-66 Queens Road	1	0.06	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.

REPORT

AB043	Kings Point, 120 Kings Road	1	0.15	Suitable	Available	Achievable	93	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB044	Kings Lodge, 194 Kings Road	1	0.06	Suitable	Available	Achievable	13	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
AB045	118 Chatham Street	1	0.06	Suitable	Available	Achievable	14	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
AB046	139-141 Oxford Road	1	0.04	Suitable	Available	Achievable	10	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
AB047	42 Kenavon Drive	1	2.49	Suitable	Available	Achievable	138	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB048	120 Oxford Road	1	0.08	Suitable	Available	Achievable	6	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
AB050	57 Castle Street	1	0.02	Suitable	Available	Achievable	12	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
AB051	116-117 & 119 Broad Street & 19-22 Minster Street	1	0.21	Suitable	Available	Achievable	0	✓		✓	The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.
AB052	The Oracle Shopping Centre, Yield Hall Place	1	0.04	Suitable	Available	Achievability unknown	0		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.

REPORT

AB053	27-32 Market Place	1	0.04	Suitable	Available	Achievable	14	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
AB054	Primark, 32-42 West Street	1	0.41	Suitable	Available	Achievable	0	✓		✓	The site is not identified for redevelopment for a residential use.
AB055	Former Cox & Wyman site, Cardiff Road	2	1.31	Suitable	Available	Achievable	81	✓		✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB056	Former Gas Works Building, Gas Works Road	3	0.064	Suitable	Available	Potentially achievable	18	✓		✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site.
AB057	Central Swimming Pool, Battle Street	1	0.55	Potentially suitable	Potentially available	Achievable	87		✓	✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.

REPORT

AB058	78 Oxford Road	1	0.03	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB059	149-153 Oxford Road	1	0.1	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB060	38-40 Oxford Road & 3-7 Cheapside	1	0.3	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB061	17-23 Queen Victoria Street	1	0.05	Suitable	Available	Potentially achievable	12	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
AB062	1-5 King Street	1	0.08	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	16		✓	✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB063	Manrose Manufacturing, Meadow Road	2	0.34	Potentially suitable	Availability unknown	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB064	159 Oxford Road	1	0.033	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB065	Queens Arms PH, Great Knollys Street	2	0.065	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB067	Brunel Arcade, Station Approach	1	0.58	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	108		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.

REPORT

											This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB068	Apex Plaza, Forbury Road	1	0.93	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	143		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site and would be detrimental to meeting housing targets.
AB069	37-43 Blagrave Street	1	0.04	Suitable	Not available	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB070	Land at Richfield Avenue and Tessa Road	2	3.66	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB071	Rising Sun 18 Forbury Road	1	0.024	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB072	The Butler PH, Chatham Street	1	0.11	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB073	28-30 Richfield Avenue	2	0.78	Potentially suitable	Availability unknown	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.

REPORT

AB074	7 Blagrove Street	1	0.015	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB075	115-117 Caversham Road	2	0.35	Potentially suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	26	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site.
AB077	20-22 Richfield Avenue	2	0.37	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB078	Land at Regent Court, Great Knollys Street	2	0.021	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB079	1-3 Greyfriars Road	1	0.026	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB080	Land adjacent Crowne Plaza Hotel, Richfield Avenue	2	0.45	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.

REPORT

AB081	Shurgard Self Storage, 75-77 Caversham Road	2	0.57	Potentially suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	51		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
AB082	Tesco, Napier Road	3	5.51	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB083	131-215 Cardiff Road	2	1.233	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB084	140-146 Cardiff Road	2	0.69	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB085	Trafford Road	2	0.99	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB086	100-124 Cardiff Road and Bennet Court	2	3.19	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB087	Weighbridge Row	2	0.35	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.

REPORT

AB088	2-12 Richfield Avenue	2	1.235	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB089	1-3 & 13-14 Cremyll Road	2	0.81	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB090	18 Richfield Avenue	2	0.33	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB091	24-26 Richfield Avenue	2	0.66	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB092	Milford Road	2	1.61	Unsuitable	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not considered to be suitable for redevelopment.
AB093	2 Ross Road	2	0.28	Potentially suitable	Availability unknown	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
BA001	211-221 Oxford Road, 10 & rear of 8 Prospect Street	1	0.3	Suitable	Available	Achievable	6	✓	✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.

REPORT

CA002	72 George Street	3	0.45	Suitability unknown	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
CA003	St Martin's Precinct, Church Street	2	1.71	Suitable	Potentially available	Potentially achievable	36	✓	✓	It is in the same flood risk zone as the proposed development site. The site not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site.
CA004	383 Gosbrook Road	3	0.17	Suitability unknown	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
CA005	View Island	3	1.62	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The suitability of the suitable for redevelopment is unknown. The site not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
CA006	Reading University Boat Club, Promenade Road	3	0.56	Potentially suitable	Potentially available	Achievable	19	✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and

											therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site.
CA007	Cantay House, Ardler Road, Caversham	3	0.33	Suitability unknown	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
CA008	3 Send Road	3	0.16	Suitability unknown	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
CA009	4-6 Send Road	3	0.13	Suitability unknown	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
CA011	Former Caversham Nursery, 82 Gosbrook Road	3	0.16	Suitability unknown	N/A	N/A	0		✓	✓	It is in a higher flood risk zone than the proposed development site. The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
KA001	25-31 London Street	1	0.1	Suitable	Not available	N/A	0		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
KA002	Corner of Crown Street and Southampton Street	1	0.08	Suitable	Available	Achievable	14	✓		✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.

REPORT

KA003	Corner of Crown Street and Silver Street	1	0.38	Suitable	Available	Achievable	51	✓	✓	The site is currently being redeveloped following the consent for an 80-unit residential scheme under application reference 17/0794. Therefore, the site is not considered to be reasonably available.
KA004	21 South Street	1	0.14	Potentially suitable	Not available	N/A	0	✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
KA005	83-85 London Street	1	0.06	Suitable	Potentially available	Achievable	10	✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
KA007	34-36 Crown Street	1	0.034	Suitable	Available	Achievable	13	✓	✓	This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
KA008	Enterprise House, 89-97 London Street	1	0.15	Suitable	Potentially available	Achievable	8	✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.
KA012	75-77 London Street	1	0.18	Suitable	Not available	N/A	0	✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'.
KA030	Central Club, London Street	1	0.05	Potentially suitable	Potentially available	Achievable	8	✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the proposed development would result in significant overdevelopment of the site.

MI018	Yeomanry House, Castle Hill	1	0.44	Suitable	Available	Potentially achievable	11		✓	✓	The site is not expected to be deliverable within five years and is therefore not 'reasonably available'. This site is not considered to be 'suitable' as the expected housing type is likely to be different to that proposed at Caversham Road (based on site area and unit yield) and therefore the proposed development would result in significant underdevelopment of the site.
-------	--------------------------------	---	------	----------	-----------	---------------------------	----	--	---	---	---