

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT - Application Nos: 172255/FUL & 172256/LBC

Address: 50 Crown Street (Red Cow PH), Reading, RG1 2SE

Proposal: 172255/FUL - Change of use of public house (Class A4) to restaurant (Class A3) at ground floor and erection of a single storey rear/side extension; conversion of upper floor into three (2x studio & 1x 1-bed) self-contained flats (Class C3) including a first floor side extension plus associated refurbishment of windows and internal changes; erection of ancillary cycle and refuse stores and rebuilding of boundary wall to rear courtyard.

172256/LBC - Internal and external alterations associated with change of use of public house (Class A4) to restaurant (Class A3) at ground floor and erection of a single storey rear/side extension; conversion of upper floor into three (2x studio & 1x 1-bed) self-contained flats (Class C3) including a first floor side extension plus associated refurbishment of windows and internal changes; erection of ancillary cycle and refuse stores and rebuilding of boundary wall to rear courtyard.

Case officer: Jonathan Markwell

Target date: Originally 09/02/2018. Decisions subsequently agreed to be issued by 20/07/18.

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site comprises of a two storey building, formerly the Red Cow Public House and currently vacant, located at the junction of Crown Street with Southampton Street to the south of the A4 and the main Reading shopping centre.

Although not located within a conservation area (it is 25m to the south-east of Market Place / London Street Conservation Area), the buildings is an early 18C Grade II listed building (63 Southampton Street) with a later mid-18C addition (50 Crown Street) situated in an area of mixed character comprising residential, commercial and business uses. The site falls within the Reading Central Area boundary and is part of an air quality management area and area of archaeological potential.

The full listing entry is as follows:

SOUTHAMPTON STREET 1. 5128 (East Side) No 63 SU 7172 NE 4/571 II Including No 50 Crown Street. No 63 is an early C18, small, 2½ storey house of grey brick headers with red brick quoins and dressings. Tiled roof with catslide to rear with tall chimney. 1 gabled dormer. On 1st floor a tripartite casement window to left and panel to right. On ground floor a segmental-headed former door and flanking windows. Flanking red and grey brick set back rusticated quoin pilasters (altered on right hand side). Rounded corner extension to Crow Street (No 50) probably 1860s, possibly circa 1840. 3 windows with hipped tiled roof. 2 window extension to north. A good example of early C18 brickwork.

Proposals:

Both planning permission and listed building consent are sought for this conversion to residential use (three self-contained flats - 2x1-bed and 1 x studio) on the upper floor and use of the basement/ground floors as a restaurant.

As part of this it is proposed to erect a single storey rear/side extension and a first floor side extension on the Southampton Street frontage. Furthermore, the associated refurbishment of windows and internal changes are also proposed.

Within the car park, accessed off Crown Street, it is proposed to erect ancillary cycle and refuse stores, together with the rebuilding of the boundary wall to the rear courtyard.

The proposals are similar to a permission/consent granted at the site in August 2017 (the application has been submitted as a re-submission proposal). However, the applicant considers that it is not possible to actually implement the approved scheme (due to building regulations) and is therefore returning with this separate scheme which the applicant considers would be possible to implement. The applicant has specified the proposed changes (in comparison with the August 2017 approved proposals) are as follows:

Ground Floor

- a) The addition of two windows in dining room 1;
- b) Retention of large window W11 in dining room 1, requiring half hour fire protection;
- c) Removal of staff and store wall and door and rebuilt;
- d) Rebuilt of front elevation to staff room;
- e) Existing floorboards investigation in dining rooms 2,4 and 5;
- f) New floor and new floor to part of first floor;
- g) Perimeter wall insulation ground and first floor;

First Floor

- h) Removal of all skirting boards and taking up of all floorboards;
- i) Removal of all corridor walls, doors and frames to ceiling beam;
- j) Removal of low ceiling to room No.4 and centre beam;
- k) Removal of low ceiling and timber beams in the corridor near the roof lights;
- l) Removal of stairs to second floor and walls (the previously approved scheme included the stairs to the second floor level, but the space was a void; this proposal shows this whole area as a void space - stairs removed).
- m) Strip existing slat roof over dining room 3 and retile to match existing;
- n) Strip part of existing barn roof finish, retain where possible and reuse after repair;
- o) Clay caps to all chimney pots.

Accordingly the applicant has submitted existing, approved and proposed plans as part of the assessment of the applications.

During the course of the application significant correspondence / additional information has been submitted seeking to justify the appropriateness of the works from a listed building perspective. In addition, information has also been submitted to clarify various transport based matters and to reduce the level / nature of matters required to be secured via pre-commencement conditions (due to approval of details applications approved in the intervening time in respect of permission 170291/170292 - see relevant history section below).

Plans / Documents Considered:

Existing

16.2060/001	Existing Building Site Location Plan and Site Plan
16.2060/002	Existing Building Basement Plan
16.2060/003	Existing Building Ground Floor Plan
16.2060/004	Existing Building First Floor Plan
16.2060/005	Existing Building Second Floor Plan
16.2060/011	Existing Building Southampton Street Elevation
16.2060/012	Existing Building Crown Street Elevation
16.2060/013	Existing Building Rear Elevation
16.2060/014	Existing Building Side Elevation

Received 15/12/2017

Approved Plans by permission 170291 / consent 170292 (submitted for information purposes)

16.2060/101	REV A	Proposed Building Site Location Plan and Site Plan
16.2060/102		Proposed Building Basement Plan
16.2060/103	REV B	Proposed Building Ground Floor Plan
16.2060/104	REV A	Proposed Building First Floor Plan
16.2060/105	REV A	Proposed Building Second Floor Plan
16.2060/111	REV A	Proposed Building Southampton Street Elevation
16.2060/112	REV A	Proposed Building Crown Street Elevation
16.2060/113	REV A	Proposed Building Rear Elevation
16.2060/114	REV A	Proposed Building Side Elevation

Received 15/12/2017

As now proposed plans

WD-200 Rev A - Location Plan, Existing Site and Basement Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-201 Rev A - Existing Ground Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-202 - Existing First Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-203 - Existing Second Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-204 - Existing Roof Plan Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-205 Rev D - Proposed Location, Site Plans and Basement Plan, as received 27/03/18

WD-206 Rev A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-207 - Proposed First Floor Plan, as received 15/12/17

WD-208 - Proposed Second Floor Plan, as received 15/12/17

WD-209 Rev A - Proposed Roof Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-210 Rev B - Proposed Ground Floor & Cellar Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-211 Rev B - Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-212 Rev B - Proposed Second Floor Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-300 - Existing Section A-A & B-B (including demolition/proposed works), as received 04/07/18

WD-301 - Proposed Section A-A & B-B, as received 15/12/17

WD-400 - Existing Front and Side Elevations (including demolition/proposed works), as received 04/07/18

WD-401 Rev A - Existing Rear and Side Elevations (including demolition/proposed works), as received 20/02/18

WD-402 Rev A - Front and Side Elevations, as received 20/02/18

WD-403 Rev A - Proposed Rear & Side Elevations, as received 20/02/18

WD-600 - Typical Sash Window Details, as received 15/12/17

WD-601 - Door Details, as received 15/12/17

WD-602 Rev B - Floor and Wall Details, as received 20/02/18

WD-604 - Typical Conservation Roof Light Details, as received 04/07/18

RL17562/01 - Foundation & Ground Floor Layout & Details, as received 20/02/18

RL17562/02 Rev P1 - Ground Floor Layout Showing Proposed Roof Structure Over, as received 20/02/18

RL17562/03 Rev P1 - Part First Floor Layout Showing Proposed Structure Over, as received 20/02/18

Letter from Bell Cornwell Ref 8058, dated & received 15/12/17

Design and Access Statement by Boyer Ref 16.2060 Issue 1 dated 30/01/17, as received 15/12/17

Noise Impact Assessment by KP Acoustics Ref 15263.NIA.01 dated 13/12/16, as received 15/12/17

Planning and Heritage Statement by Bell Cornwell dated February 2017, as received 15/12/17

Air Quality Assessment, as received 09/01/18

Archaeology Assessment, as received 15/12/17

Letter from Riddwood Consulting Engineers, dated & received 18/01/18

Email from Bell Cornwell Ref 'FW: The Red Cow', dated & received 20/02/18

Letter from JSA Architects Ref DMFP/9a dated 08/02/18, as received 20/02/18

Letter from Riddwood Consulting Engineers, dated & received 20/02/18

RL-17562-CA-01 - Structural Calculations by Riddwood Consulting Engineers, dated December 2017, as received 20/02/18

Riddwood Consulting Engineers Steel Calculations (x10 pages), dated 13/12/17, as received 20/02/18.

Riddwood Consulting Engineers Timber Calculations (x19 pages), dated 13/12/17, as received 20/02/18.

Letter from Riddwood Consulting Engineers, dated & received 27/03/18

Email from Bell Cornwell Ref 'RE: The Red Cow, 50 Crown St, Reading (172255 / 172256)', dated & received 27/03/18

Construction Method Statement by JSA Architects, Rev A dated 30/05/18, as received 04/07/18

Door Schedule, Ref PCSR, as received 04/07/18

Window Schedule, Ref PCSR, as received 04/07/18

Relevant Planning History:

160176 - Restaurant on the ground floor, alterations to the front, double storey extension to the rear, flats on the first and second floor. Withdrawn 22/04/16.

170291 - Change of use of public house (Class A4) to restaurant (Class A3) at ground floor and erection of a single storey rear/side extension; conversion of upper floor into three (2x studio & 1x 1-bed) self-contained flats (Class C3) including a first floor side extension plus associated refurbishment of windows and internal changes; erection of ancillary cycle and refuse stores and rebuilding of boundary wall to rear courtyard. Granted 30/08/17.

170292 - Internal and external alterations associated with change of use of public house (Class A4) to restaurant (Class A3) at ground floor and erection of a single storey rear/side extension; conversion of upper floor into three (2x studio & 1x 1-bed) self-contained flats (Class C3) including a first floor side extension plus associated refurbishment of windows and internal changes; erection of ancillary cycle and refuse stores and rebuilding of boundary wall to rear courtyard. Granted 30/08/17

180342 - Partial discharge of conditions 2 (removals and repairs) and 3 (proposed works details) of listed building consent 170292. Partially discharged 3/5/18 - the

submission specifically excluded internal works associated with the first and second floors of the existing building.

180657 - Discharge of condition 9 (Construction Method Statement) of planning permission 170291. Discharged 31/05/18.

Consultation Responses:

Berkshire Archaeology:

Do not recommend that any archaeological work is required in this instance. The proposed new extensions would only create small areas of new below ground impact, and it is probable that these areas have been disturbed previously.

RBC Historic Buildings Consultant:

Initial observations (January 2018):

The Red Cow Public House, 63 Southampton Street, including No. 50 Crown Street is Grade II Listed. No 63 is an early 18th century, small, 2½ storey house of grey brick headers with red brick quoins and dressings. A good example of early 18th century brickwork. It has a tiled roof with catslide to rear with a tall chimney. There is one gabled dormer on the front elevation. The first floor has a tripartite casement window to the left and a panel to the right. On the ground floor is a segmental-headed former door and flanking windows. Flanking the red and grey bricks are set-back rusticated quoin pilasters (altered on right hand side).

A rounded corner extension to Crow Street (No 50) probably dates from the 1860s, possibly circa 1840. Three windows with hipped tiled roof. Two window extension to north.

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Recent legal cases relating to issues around the setting of listed buildings have established that under section 70(3) the general power to grant planning permission under section 70(1) is expressly subject to sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Section 66(1) provides that the local authority has a statutory duty in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting to:

.....have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, fixtures and curtilage buildings, that is any object or structure which is fixed to the building or is within the curtilage and forms part of the land and has done so since before July

1948, are also treated as part of the building for the purposes of listed building control.

In the case (2014) of *East Northamptonshire District Council v. Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* (known as the 'Barnwell Manor' case) the Court of Appeal held that section 70(1) was expressly subject to section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and that decision-makers should give 'considerable importance and weight' to the desirability of preserving setting of a listed building.

In the Barnwell Manor wind-farm case it was established that it did not follow that, if harm to a listed building was found to be less than substantial under the balancing exercise in policies HE9 and HE10 (NB: under PPS5 which was then in force), that a decision-maker could ignore the overarching duty imposed by section 66 (of the Act).

National Planning Policy Framework

In March 2012, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which replaced the National Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG). The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and a key dimension of 'sustainability' is defined as '...protecting and enhancing our...historic environment' (DCLG et al, 2012, para 7).

The NPPF identifies heritage assets as:

A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

Paragraph 132 states:

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.

Significance is defined by the NPPF as 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest'. This significance or value may be related to a heritage asset's archaeological, architectural and artistic or historic elements and can derive not only from its physical presence but also from its setting (DCLG et al, 2012, para 56). The NPPF details the main policies regarding heritage assets in Section 12, Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (DCLG et al, 2012).

Under paragraph 128, applicants for planning permission are required to describe the value of any heritage assets affected by a development, including any contribution made by their setting, at a level of detail proportionate to the assets' importance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal (positive and negative) on their value (DCLG et al, 2012, paras. 128); this information is provided in a heritage statement.

The paragraph 134 of the NPPF, requires any 'less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset' to be 'weighed against the public benefits of the proposal', which is a 'specific policy' for these purposes.

Under paragraph 135, the effect of an application on the value of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application, making a balanced judgement with regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the value of the heritage asset (DCLG et al, 2012, paras. 135).

All heritage assets have a setting. The NPPF defines the setting of a heritage asset as: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

Planning Practice Guide (PPG)

The Planning Practice Guide (PPG) (2014) clarifies this additional requirement under 'What is the main legislative framework for planning and the historic environment?' where it states that:

In addition to the normal planning framework set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.....the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides specific protection for buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest. Any decisions relating to listed buildings and their settings and conservation areas must address the statutory considerations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (see in particular sections 16, 66 and 72) as well as satisfying the relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan. (See ID 18a-002-20140306)

The PPG states under 'What is the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account?' that:

The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance. When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract

from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its on-going conservation.

The PPG states under 'Why is 'significance' important in decision-taking?' that: Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.

Under the discussion of 'How to assess if there is substantial harm?' the PPG offers: What matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

Historic England Good Practice Advice

Historic England has produced new guidance on the interpretation and implementation of the NPPF and PPG with regard to the historic environment in the form of:

- Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 1: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management (Historic England, 2016);*
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking (Historic England, 2015a);*
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2015b); and*
- Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 4: Tall Buildings (Historic England, 2015c).*

The Setting of Heritage Assets

Historic England's published document The Setting of Heritage assets includes their methodology for the assessment of the impact on the settings of Listed Buildings from development proposals. They suggest the following process:

- Step 1: identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;*
- Step 2: assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s);*
- Step 3: assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance; and*
- Step 4: explore the way maximising the benefits*

Historic England's guidance in Seeing History in the View (Historic England, 2015) states:

English Heritage's experience with development proposals has shown the need for guidance on how to apply a consistent and transparent approach to:

- *identifying heritage significance within views;*
- *assessing how development proposals may impact upon heritage significance within views.*

Reading Borough Council Planning Policy

Reading Borough Council Core Strategy CS33: Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment states:

Historic features and areas of historic importance and other elements of the historic environment, including their settings, will be protected and where appropriate enhanced. This will include:

- *Listed Buildings;*
- *Conservation Areas;*
- *Other features with local or national designation, such as sites and features of archaeological importance, and historic parks and gardens.*

Planning permission will only be granted where development has no adverse impact on historic assets and their settings. All proposals will be expected to protect and where appropriate enhance the character and appearance of the area in which they are located and for the purpose of ensuring that work is appropriate to the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

Within para. 11.8 of the Core Strategy it also specifies that:

The Borough Council is committed to protecting and where appropriate, enhancing the Borough's historic environment. This includes ensuring that buildings and features of Local architectural and historic interest (which are not necessarily recognised components of the historic environment) are taken fully into account and safeguarded..."

Proposals

The proposals consist of:

Ground Floor

- *1. The addition of two windows in dining room 1;*
- *2. Retention of large window W11 in dining room 1, requiring half hour fire protection;*
- *3. Removal of staff and store wall and door and rebuilt;*
- *4. Rebuilt of front elevation to staff room;*
- *5. Existing floorboards investigation in dining rooms 2,4 and 5;*
- *6. New floor and new floor to part of first floor;*
- *7. Perimeter wall insulation ground and first floor;*

First Floor

- 8. Removal of all skirting boards and taking up of all floorboards;
- 9. Removal of all corridor walls, doors and frames to ceiling beam;
- 10. Removal of low ceiling to room No.4 and centre beam;
- 11. Removal of low ceiling and timber beams in the corridor near the roof lights;
- 12. Removal of stairs to second floor and walls;
- 13. Strip existing slate roof over dining room 3 and retile to match existing;
- 14. Strip part of existing barn roof finish, retain where possible and reuse after repair;
- 15. Clay caps to all chimney pots.

Discussion

Whilst the requirements to improve the structure of the floor is accepted, this cannot be at the cost of substantial harm to the fabric of the Listed Building. The proposed alterations to the structure would include large-scale interventions including the addition of new floor joists, raising the first floor level and leading to the removal of all first floor corridor walls and ceilings and removal of a historic stairway. The corridor walls would be replaced with new stud partitions to engineer's drawings.

Part of the justification was stated at the site meeting was the requirement to meet Building Regulations. As stated in English Heritage's Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings: Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historic and traditionally constructed buildings (English Heritage, 2009, 14):

Certain classes of historic buildings are expressly exempted from the need to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance. These are listed in Regulation 21(2),(c) and Regulation 21(3), and comprise buildings which are: Listed Buildings at Grades I, II and II. Listed in accordance with section 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.*

Listed buildings are those included on the statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. Controls apply and Listed Building Consent is required for any works of alteration or extension - both external and internal - which would affect a building's character. Fixtures and curtilage buildings - any objects or structures which are attached to the building, or are within the curtilage (and have been so since before July 1948) - are treated as part of the listed building. The same controls apply whatever the grade of listing.

Therefore, Listed Buildings are exempted from Part L (L1A: Conservation of fuel and power in new dwellings) if compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance.

As noted in the supporting noise assessment (KP Acoustics), as a listed building, it should be noted that in the case of some historic buildings undergoing a material change of use, it may not be practical to improve to the standards set out in Approved Document E. The need to conserve the special characteristics of such historic buildings needs to be recognised, and in such work, the aim should be to improve sound insulation to the extent that it is practically possible, always provided that the work does not prejudice the character of the historic building, or increase the risk of long-term deterioration to the building fabric or fitting (Noise Assessment, KP Acoustics, p.4).

In addition, no structural engineer's assessment report has been provided to justify the approach proposed and the various alternative options examined. The supplied architect's drawings show new floor joists along the front range at first floor level to be in accordance with structural engineer's details; however, the structural engineer's drawings are not supplied. A letter in support of the proposals from Riddwood Consulting Engineers (18/01/18) does not provide any detailed supporting evidence and refers to a design drawing (RL17562/02 P1) which is not provided in the documentation supporting the Listed Building application.

The proposals would effectively add a new floor, at first floor level, above the existing floor, which would lead to substantial damage to the historic structure, effectively leading to the removal of all the internal first floor walls along the corridor and elsewhere. It would also require removal of the ceiling to allow for the additional height.

It should be noted that the current principal beams (bressumers) exposed on the ground floor, supporting the ceiling joists, have previously been subject to extensive reinforcement from iron strapping. However, it should also be noted that the end of the main (central) bressumer, with stop chamfer detail, is supported on a single, relatively small, cross-beam. Therefore, irrespective of the size of floor joists, some flex in the floor may be due to the lack of support for the main beams. Any upgrading of the scantling of the floor joists needs to work within the historic fabric and be sensitive to the need to retain fabric as a statutory requirement.

The proposals to remove the corridor ceiling, walls and insert a new floor are considered to harm the Listed Building for which no justification is provided.

Conclusions

Currently there is insufficient information provided to support the proposals for structural reinforcement of the floors, which would result in harm to the Listed Building. It is therefore recommended that the application is refused, due to the harm to the Listed Building which is not justified.

Revised comments (the applicant was provided with an opportunity to respond to the original comments and submit further information with view to seeking to address the various matters raised. Further information was submitted on 20th February) from RBC Heritage Consultant (March 2018):

Additional information has been submitted in response to queries regarding what are considered to be substantially harmful the works to the Listed Building. The supporting information includes:

- *Email from Mr. Nick Cobbold of Bell-Cornwell dated 20.2.18*
- *Letter from Mr. David Moro of JSA architects dated 8.2.18*
- *Email plus drawings plus calculations from Mr. Piers Byron-Moore, Principal Engineer with Riddwood Engineers dated 23.2.18*

In response to Mr Cobbold's email he states that I consider the works to cause less than substantial harm to the Listed Building. This is incorrect. My consultation of letter of 18.1.18 in relation to the current application states that:

'Whilst the requirements to improve the structure of the floor is accepted, this cannot be at the cost of substantial harm to the fabric of the Listed Building.'

In addition, Mr. Cobbold misunderstands the ramifications of the Barnwell case. This conclusion of Barnwell, in relation to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that decision-makers should give 'considerable importance and weight' to the desirability of preserving setting of a listed building. By extension, under Section 66, decision-makers must also give 'considerable importance and weight' to the desirability of preserving the building orany features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, under section 66.

It also states that undertaking the under the balancing exercise, if harm to a listed building was found to be less than substantial, did not mean that that a decision-maker could ignore the overarching duty imposed by section 66 (of the Act), that is the statutory protection of the Listed Building and any features of special interest it possesses.

However, in this case the harm to the Listed Building is substantial and therefore paragraph 133 of the NPPF applies which states:

Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

JSA Architects do not appear to be members of RIBA's Conservation Register. It is RIBA policy to promote architectural conservation as an integral part of the practice of architecture. The RIBA has developed an accreditation system to recognise differing levels of specialist expertise. Mr Moro, is a member of MCIAT which supports Architectural Technologists which does not support a conservation accreditation.

Mr Moro's letter is based on the approach of the structural engineer, Mr. Byron-Moore. However, the main issue of contention is the substantial harm which would be caused by this over-engineered approach which is not sympathetic to retention of the maximum amount of historic fabric. This would have serious knock-on consequences resulting in the loss, according to Mr. Moro's email, of 50% of existing first floor walls, and 25% of second floor ceilings.

Mr Moro's argument is that based on the structural engineer's report, the insertion of softwood timbers (C24) of large cross-section reinforcement would not be possible within the structure and this necessitates raising the first floor height with harmful knock-on effects consisting of removal of the first floor landing walls and first floor ceilings within the most historic part of the Listed Building. They have also mentioned arguments regarding fire compartmentation and accommodation of additional services.

Mr Moro makes reference to a conversation with John Mitchell of RBFRS Fire Inspector in which he hints 'a much more stringent compliance would be required to Approval Document B Fire Safety' than was previously provided by the previous user class and that can be provided (sic) by the existing fabric of the building'. When did Mr. Mitchell inspect the property and what are the more stringent regulations referred to? Having discussed this with Building Control another solution would be to apply a fully engineered Fire System which would achieve the required fire safety standards.

The submitted information from Mr. Piers Byron-Moore, Principal Engineer with Riddwood Engineers, is in the form of 3 drawings together with a number of hand-written pages of structural calculations and print-outs of further calculations (presumed to be from software, but not stated).

This is a standard structural engineers approach, but this would usually be supported by a report explaining the process, design philosophy, any assumptions, methodology and details of alternative options appraised, with the calculations merely provided as a supporting appendix.

The material presented is not in the form of a cohesive report supporting a planning application and is therefore impenetrable without any interpretation for the non-structural engineer.

Nevertheless, there are a number of queries which the information provided raises, regarding the covering letter and supporting drawings.

1. As stated in Mr Byron-Moore's letter, the structure is non-standard and the timbers '...spacing is uneven, which makes it more difficult to assess the strength of the floor'. Historic buildings require a bespoke structural assessment. Are either Riddwood Engineers or Mr Byron-Moore accredited members of the Institution of Structural Engineer's Conservation Accreditation Register for Engineers (CARE), specially set up for such professionals? A conservation is a specialist area differing in scale from standard engineering solutions.
2. Mr Byron-Moore's email refers to 'it is not possible to assess the integrity of these (timber) beams to the satisfaction of today's BS EN 1912:2004'. BS EN 1912:2004 refers to structural timber strength, but has been superseded and has been replaced by BS EN 1912:2012.
3. The email refers to the proposed new floor joists being shown on drawing RL17562/02 P1. This drawing appears to show the proposed new C24 63x225 timbers located over the existing windows, rather than the solid walling between.
4. The general notes on the drawing refer to 'structural timbers all in accordance with BS5628 graded C16 and C24'. BS 5628 is a standard applied to masonry; should this be BS 5268? Unfortunately, BS 5268 has also been superseded by BS EN 1995 for timber grading?
5. The proposals examine reinforcement with standard C24 grade softwood timbers, which is a standard engineering approach, but not a conservation approach; the existing ceiling is hardwood timber. Has the case for reinforcement with stronger hardwood timber been examined which could reduce the size of the reinforcing timbers required?
6. Have the loadings of the existing timbers and floors been calculated on the basis of standard methodology for softwood timbers or aged hardwood timbers?
7. Has the case of reinforcement with stronger laminated timbers being examined which could reduce the size of the reinforcing timbers required?
8. Mr Byron-Moore's email refers to the 'barn' having a sagging roof. To prevent this and any wall-spread a structural steel within the roof to support the historic roof structure is proposed. This is a standard and over-engineered approach not applicable to this building when more traditional approaches could be used. Has reinforcement of existing joints been examined as an alternative?

Conclusions

The proposed approach is considered highly intrusive and does not appear to take into account the protection of the Listed Building and its special features under the law.

Whilst some requirements to improve the structure of the floor can be accepted, this cannot be at the cost of substantial harm to the fabric of the Listed Building. The proposed alterations to the structure would include large-scale interventions including the addition of new floor joists, raising the first floor level and leading to the removal of all first floor corridor walls and ceilings and removal of a historic stairway. The corridor walls would be replaced with new stud partitions to engineer's drawings.

The proposals would effectively add a new floor, at first floor level, above the existing floor, would lead to substantial damage to the historic structure, effectively leading to the removal of all the internal first floor walls along the corridor and elsewhere. It would also require removal of the ceiling to allow for the additional height. Having discussed this with Building Control there are likely to be further knock-on effects to the Listed Building.

Latest comments from RBC Heritage Consultant (the applicant was provided with an opportunity to respond to the March 2018 observations by the RBC Heritage Consultant. Further information was submitted by the applicant on 27th March):

Initial response (April 2018): *Having further considered the extent of the works proposed, it is considered necessary to formally consult Historic England on the proposals (owing to the requirements of Circular 01/01: Arrangements for handling heritage applications - notification and directions by the Secretary of State for notification of Historic England as the works potentially consist of (bb) the demolition of all or a substantial part of the interior of the principal building).*

Final response (subsequent to receipt of Historic England comments - see separately below) (June 2018):

In view of the lack of alternative proposals for the structural reinforcement of the Listed Building it is reluctantly agreed that the Listed Building application is consented subject to conditions. The same conditions attached to 172255 are recommended.

RBC Transport DC Officer (final comments, incorporating changes made during the course of the application following initial officer feedback):

The building is a grade II listed public house and is located on the junction of Crown Street and Southampton Street. Crown St and Southampton St are main transport corridors.

The development consists of the change of use of the public house to a Class A3 restaurant including conversion of the upper floors into 3 x 1-bedroom self-contained flats.

The site is located within the Zone 2, the primary core area but on the periphery of Zone 1, the central core area, which lies at the heart of Reading Borough, consisting primarily of retail and commercial office developments with good transport hubs. The site is very well connected, being a five minute walk to the Oracle shopping with a high level of public transport accessibility and access to public car parks.

In accordance with the adopted SPD, 1 parking space for each of the flats should be provided, therefore equating to a total of 3. The Design and Access Statement states that due to the close proximity of town and established transport links the residential element will not be provided with any on-site parking. Crown Street and Southampton Street and the surrounding road network all have parking restrictions preventing on-street parking. Given the site's location to the town centre and the ability to monitor unauthorised on street parking via the parking restrictions and CPZ that operates in the area, a car free development for residents of the flats is acceptable in this instance. The appropriate conditions and informatives will be applied to prevent any future occupants of the new flats from obtaining residents or visitor permits for the surrounding residential streets where parking is under considerable pressure.

The A3 element of the development would be required to provide parking provision of 1 space per 7.5m² for A3 use. The total floor space is stated as 272 m², 5 parking spaces are proposed to be allocated, located within the courtyard service area which will be accessed via the access from Crown Street (Gates are currently in place). This provision is deemed acceptable.

Bin storage area for the A3 use is also located within service court yard accessed from Crown Street. As previously advised in Transport Comments for application 170291, it is highly unlikely that refuse vehicles will venture into the service yard, therefore, refuse collection will take place from the highway as per the current arrangements. Confirmation has been provided and has also been illustrated on submitted plans that the gates are to remain but will be electronically operated (automated) to ensure vehicles can access the parking area without delay from the public highway. (Gates illustrated on plan WD 205 D open inwards). This is therefore deemed acceptable.

In accordance with the Borough's Parking Standards and Design SPD, a minimum provision 0.5 cycle storage spaces should be provided per flat located in a conveniently located, lockable, covered store. Amended plans submitted indicate that the residential cycle storage is accessed off Crown Street via key code access and will provide storage for 4 cycles which exceeds the Councils current standards. The refuse storage for the residential element of the development is housed in the same building as the cycle storage however is kept separated. This is deemed acceptable.

Separate cycle storage for 6 cycles for the A3 element of the development is also proposed and illustrated on plan WD 205 D, housed within this area is the bin storage. This is deemed acceptable.

Given the prominent location of the site, a Construction Method Statement is required. The Construction Method Statement will not be approved until all details regarding the management and construction of the project is submitted to and agreed by the Local Highway Authority. However, it is common that a Construction Method Statement is conditioned and determined separately of the planning application.

There are no Transport objections to this application subject to the conditions and informatives stated below.

Conditions:

- Pre-commencement construction method statement*
- Pre-occupation compliance (in accordance with approved plan) vehicle parking spaces
- Pre-occupation compliance (in accordance with approved plan) bicycle parking spaces
- Pre-occupation compliance (in accordance with approved plan) bin storage provision
- Parking permits x2 (notification of addresses and no automatic entitlement)

Informatives:

- Highways
- Parking Permits

* Subsequent to the final Transport observations being received the applicant submitted the same Construction Method Statement details as were approved as part of permission 170657 on 31/05/18 (in respect of application 170291 - see relevant history section above). Accordingly, this condition will be altered from a pre-commencement condition to a compliance condition.

RBC Environmental Protection:

The changes proposed don't appear to directly affect any EP concerns. Therefore I have no additional comments to make over and above what we have commented previously about this site, notably comments of 16 March 2017 which I understand have been incorporated into the consent for the approved application 170291. These comments (and conditions) still stand with this new application.

EP observations at the time of application 170291:

Has raised concerns and makes the following comments regarding the proposals

- *A noise assessment has been submitted which proposes a secondary glazing system in conjunction with passive acoustic wall vents, which is stated can meet the*

recommended internal noise levels. The noise levels outside during the day and night are very high therefore if residents open their window for ventilation they will be exposed to high internal noise levels 25 dB in excess of the recommended levels therefore do not believe that passive ventilation will be sufficient.

- Mechanical ventilation is proposed for kitchen and bathrooms therefore recommend that this system is designed to also provide ventilation for the whole flat to minimise the need for occupants to open their windows. In addition, a detailed scheme should be submitted which shows the actual glazing scheme that will be installed to demonstrate that it will meet the standards specified in the noise assessment. Recommend refusal or condition re. noise assessment for new residential dwellings.*
- A number of practical recommendations are made in the noise impact assessment as to how the insulation between the proposed A3 use and the proposed flats above should be improved in order to meet 'required standards'. However, an assessment has not been carried out to show what the resulting noise levels will be within the flats as a result of the A3 use, or what standard of insulation will be met in terms of amount of noise transfer between the floors, so unable to confirm whether the internal noise levels will be acceptable. Further information is requested regarding this.*
- Concerns about the potential for noise disturbance due to deliveries and waste collections from the A3 use on occupants of nearby residential properties, particularly late at night and early morning, so a restriction on permitted hours for deliveries is recommended.*
- Applications which include noise generating plant when there are nearby noise sensitive receptors should be accompanied by an acoustic assessment carried out in accordance with BS4142:2014 methodology. No information has been submitted regarding any proposed mechanical plant to be installed for the A3 use (e.g. kitchen extraction, air conditioning, external refrigeration condensers). This is important particularly as there are proposed to be residents above.*
- A noise assessment of mechanical plant has not been submitted with the application and therefore cannot determine the likely noise impact of the proposal and whether the proposals are acceptable. Recommend refusal unless a noise assessment can be submitted and considered by us before the application is determined. Alternatively a condition could be attached (however it is possible that the criteria would be met with the plant specifications proposed in this application and a new application may need to be made at a later date for alternative plant / location).*
- In addition to concerns about noise (as discussed above), cooking odour is often a significant problem in commercial kitchens and therefore the applicants must*

provide an assessment of the likelihood of odours based on the proposed cuisine and a statement of how the proposals will ensure that odour nuisance will be prevented. Reference must be made to the Defra Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (January 2005). A condition could be attached to consent, however it is possible that the criteria cannot be met with the plant specifications proposed in this application and a new application may need to be made at a later date for alternative plant / location.

- The proposed development is located within an air quality management area that we have identified with monitoring as being a pollution hot-spot (likely to breach the EU limit value for NO₂) and introduces new exposure / receptors. An assessment and/or mitigation measures should be provided as part of the application. The applicant will need to demonstrate sufficient mitigation measures are implemented to protect the residents from the effects of poor air quality. The applicant has submitted an air quality statement that states that no measures are possible due to the building being listed and that it would not be desirable to put in place any mitigation measures as this would harm the character of the listed building. No account has been taken of the harm that is caused to residents being exposed to poor air quality, which is of at least equal importance. If no mitigation is possible then it should be considered whether this is a suitable site for residential use, particularly given the high noise levels also present at all the facades.*
- The applicant states that as the first floor was previously ancillary residential use to the pub that there is no introduction of receptors. However, the proposal is for three new properties therefore this is an intensification of the residential use at the site. Where the development involves converting an existing building and allowing a buffer zone is not an option then it may be that other mitigation can be applied. In the first instance this would be to implement measures to reduce the level at the facade of the property by creating a barrier between the property and the carriageway, such as close boarded fencing or planting vegetation. If this is not possible then locating habitable rooms away from the source of pollution or the use of mechanical ventilation with the inlet on the clean side of the property may be acceptable. This list of potential measures is by no means an exhaustive list. The measures in bold above should at the very least be considered by the developer.*
- Reading Borough Council's Air Quality Policy DM19 requires that developments have regard to the need to improve air quality and reduce the effects of poor air quality through design, mitigation and where required planning obligations to be used to help improve local air quality. Until a mitigation plan has been submitted and approved by the Environmental Protection Team it is impossible to determine*

*whether the proposed development is appropriate for the proposed location, therefore until the above has been received I would recommend **refusal** on air quality grounds or if this is not possible then I recommend securing a condition.*

- *We commonly receive complaints about noise and dust caused by construction and demolition works, particularly working outside reasonable hours and about smoke from bonfires associated with the burning of waste on site of minor developments.*

RBC Waste Operations:

For the 3 flats there needs to be sufficient space for at least 3x240 general waste and 3x240 recycling, which will be collected fortnightly.

Historic England

On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments.

Neighbour Notification:

24 nearby occupiers (and those who previously commented on applications 170291/170292) were formally consulted as part of the application. Site notices were displayed on 09/01/18, expiring on 30/01/18. A press notice was published on 18/01/18, expiring on 08/02/18. One response has been received, specifying objection to the proposals. However, the actual comments received suggest the nearby occupier is actually in support of the proposals:

I welcome the proposed use of the building, the more conservative approach to the windows, and the proposed enhancements at the side entrance.(comments apply to both lbc and pp applications).

Reading CAAC and Reading Civic Society were formally consulted on the application; no responses have been received.

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'. However the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making (NPPF paragraph 12).

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special interest which it possesses.

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority in the exercise of its functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

In this regard, the NPPF states that due weight should be given to the adopted policies of the Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy, Central Area Action Plan and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

Accordingly, the National Planning Policy Framework and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy January 2008 (Altered 2015)

- CS1 Sustainable design and construction
- CS2 Waste Minimisation
- CS4 Accessibility and the intensity of development
- CS5 Inclusive Access
- CS7 Design and the Public Realm
- CS14 Provision of housing
- CS15 Location, accessibility, density and housing mix
- CS20 Implementation of the Reading Transport Strategy
- CS24 Car/Cycle parking
- CS25 Scale and Location of Retail, Leisure and Culture Development
- CS26 Hierarchy of centres
- CS29 Provision of open space
- CS33 Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment
- CS34 Pollution and water resources

Sites and Detailed Policies Document - (Adopted October 2012, Altered 2015)

- SD1 Presumption In favour Of Sustainable Development
- DM1 Adaptation to Climate Change
- DM4 Safeguarding Amenity
- DM5 Housing Mix
- DM6 Affordable Housing
- DM10 Private and Communal Amenity Space
- DM12 Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters
- DM19 Air Quality

Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009

- RC5 Design in the centre
- RC6 Definition of the centre
- RC7 Leisure, culture and tourism in the centre
- RC9 Living in the centre

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Other relevant documents

- Revised Parking Standards and Design (2011)
- Revised Section 106 Planning Obligations (2013)
- Affordable Housing (2013)
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2011)
- DCLG Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard (2015)
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking (Historic England, 2015a)
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2015b)

The main issues to be considered are assessed below.

a) Principle of mixed use

The proposal would result in the loss of a Class A4 use. The site is located within the Reading Central Area, which means the proposal is not able to be considered in the context of policy DM15, which affords some protection to public houses. However, paragraph 70 of the NPPF is also relevant, whereby the loss of valued facilities are guarded against. In this case, no objections have been raised on these grounds in the public consultation (and those raised at the time of application 170291 were not considered to be of a level or nature to resist the proposals on that basis). Furthermore, the period of vacancy and the protection of the listed building also count in favour of the proposals. The proposals were not resisted on this basis in the 2017 and the same conclusion is separately reached at this time too.

In terms of the proposed Class A3 use, this is a “centre use” (as is the existing Class A4 use), with additional restaurants being specifically referenced in paragraph 8.12 of the RCAAP (associated with policy RC7). In addition, the principle of a Class A3 use is supported, with it being considered it could function and operate viably without the existing upper floors (presently ancillary Class A4 accommodation). The interplay between the proposed Class A3 and C3 uses are discussed further below. The principle of Class C3 units at upper floor level is supported, aligning with policy CS14.

More specifically in terms of the listed building, the proposals have been accepted in principle as a means of ensuring that the listed building, which was vacated for sale by the end of 2014 (or April 2015 according to the CIL form submitted), can be maintained in good condition. The combined restaurant with residential use above is considered to be an appropriate mixed use of the building that will minimise the impact on its layout given the open plan area of the former public house at ground floor level which is preferable to the further divisions that would be necessary for flats or offices for instance. This is subject to an acceptable impact of the proposed extensions upon the heritage status of the building.

b) Impacts on listed building

Core Strategy Policy CS33 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment) specifies that planning permission will not be granted where development has no adverse impact on historic assets and their settings.

In 2017 (as part of 170291/170292) it was considered that whilst the lack of an existing use does not, in itself, justify any change of use or harmful impacts which are poorly based or ignore NPPF guidance, the proposals nonetheless represented an opportunity to bring the vacant building back into some form of use. There are other possible alternative uses for both floors (such as offices) however the proposals - which retained as much of the open plan of the ground floor as was previously occupied by the main customer bar and lounge area - was considered to represent the nearest fit in terms of the original structure and layout of the building and given its age. Therefore, at the time of the 2017 permission/consent it was considered by the RBC Historic Buildings consultant that the use, layout and associated alterations proposed in connection with the restaurant and residential uses were appropriate in listed building terms. Subject to a number of specific conditions relating to the refurbishment, the proposals for this heritage asset were considered acceptable.

The applicant has outlined that in practice (owing to Building Regulations) it has not been possible to implement the consented scheme. As such, the applicant has returned with a separate proposal which has been prepared with a better understanding of the building and the future building regulations requirements. As noted in the observations from the RBC Historic Buildings Consultant made in January

and March 2018 (see comments in full above), significant concerns were initially raised in relation to the extent/nature of the now intended works. The applicant has submitted further information and commentary in an attempt to address the concerns raised. Subsequent to the submission and consideration of this information, and including a consultation with Historic England, the Historic Buildings Consultant now reluctantly concludes that, in view of the lack of alternative proposals for the structural reinforcement of the Listed Building, the proposal should be approved subject to similar conditions included on 170292.

Whilst noting that there is a statutory requirement to examine the desirability of preserving any features of special architectural or historic interest, it is now concluded reluctantly that the Historic Buildings Consultant now considers that the proposals can be supported. Furthermore, when officers apply the relevant tests the proposals would result in, on balance, less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset and, when weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (most substantially bringing the building into use and providing a mix of A3 and residential uses), the proposals are considered to be appropriate in this respect.

In terms of the specific conditions required, the applicant was provided with an opportunity to submit more details prior to the determination of the application. This was because during the lifetime of this application the applicant separately sought and discharged conditions 2 and 3 of listed building consent 170292 (although this was only partially discharged on 3/5/18, with the submission specifically excluding internal works associated with the first and second floors of the existing building). Accordingly, the applicant was provided with an opportunity to submit details now to reduce the amount of information/details required in this instance. Unfortunately the applicant has only submitted part of the information previously assessed and considered acceptable, with the table below demonstrating the information which is consistent / differs / not submitted in comparison with that approved as part of 180342:

Documents submitted with 180342 and also submitted with this application
WD-200A; -204; -205D; 209A; -400; -402A; -600; -601; -602B; 604; Door Schedule, Ref PCSR; Window Schedule, Ref PCSR;
Documents which differ between 180342 and this application*
Approved as part of 180342: WD-201B; WD-206B; WD-401B; WD-403B
Submitted with this application: WD-201A; WD-206A; WD-401A; WD-403A
Documents approved with 180342 but not submitted with this application
Specification WD-001 Rev C; Physical roof tile sample; Physical facing brick sample; Letter from JSA Architects Ref DMFP/9a, dated 17/04/18

* This is understandable as these plans refer to the ground floor and rear/side elevations where the works differ between what has been discharged at condition stage and what is now proposed.

With the above in mind the conditions included on 170292 are repeated below, with comments detailing any changes specified in green, omissions stated with a ~~strike through~~ and commentary explaining the changes in red:

2. Prior to commencement of any works at the site, details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council:

- a) detailed drawings and schedules showing all those parts of the building to be removed, dismantled or stripped out (including the removal of internal features, floors, and wall or ceiling surfaces); ~~No change - although some details have been submitted (e.g. door schedule, typical sash window door details, floor and wall details) these only relate to some floors/parts of the building and no full schedule or specification has been submitted to cover the whole building. Hence it is considered simpler to seek all details as one via the same worded condition.~~
- b) a detailed schedule of repairs to the listed building - ~~No change - no detailed schedule has been submitted, so will be required in the future~~

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and schedules.

3. Prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the works, details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council:

- a) mortar mix for all brickwork (mortar is to be lime-based with a breathable finish). ~~No change - no specification has been submitted to confirm details~~
- b) new staircases to include details of handrails and balusters - ~~No change - no specific plans submitted in relation to this matter~~
- c) ~~plan, elevation and section drawings, with materials annotated, of new windows (including surrounds) at a minimum scale of 1:10 with typical moulding details at a scale of 1:1. No longer necessary as detailed on WD-600 & in the window schedule.~~
- d) ~~rooflights (conservation type, fitted flush with or below the roof covering). No longer necessary as detailed on WD-604~~
- e) ~~plan, elevation and section drawings, with materials annotated, of all new doors at a minimum scale of 1:10 with typical architrave details at a scale of 1:1. No longer necessary as detailed on WD-601 & in the door schedule.~~
- f) manufacturer details and samples of the roof tiles for the extension and any replacement roof tiles - ~~No change - no details submitted as part of this application~~
- g) manufacturer details and samples of the facing brick for the extension and any replacement bricks ~~No change - no details submitted as part of this application~~

h) type and location of any new service visible externally including pipework, rainwater goods, boiler flues, extract vent grilles, meter cupboards, external lighting, or soil vent pipe terminations **No change - no specification has been submitted to confirm details**

i) internal partition walls including details of the method of construction ~~(new internal partition walls to be constructed of timber studwork and be fully reversible).~~ **No specification has been submitted to confirm details, but element in brackets removed to be less prescriptive.**

c) Effects on character of the area

Core Strategy Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) is a strategic policy seeking high standards of design quality in new development. It sets out how various components of development including layout, urban structure and urban grain, and scale, make a positive contribution to their surroundings and respond positively to their local context.

In terms of the street scene the proposed additions to the main building on the street elevation in Southampton Street and at ground floor to the rear - which could in part be seen from Crown Street - would not be especially dominant or obtrusive and are not therefore considered to be likely to result in adverse effects upon the character of the surrounding area or street scene. A similar conclusion was reached on the 2017 proposals at the site; the now proposed scheme, including the various additional works referenced, raises no substantially different issues and therefore the same conclusion is reached on this matter at this time.

d) Impact on neighbouring occupiers

No. 48 Crown Street to the east (rear) of the site consists of residential use on the upper floors. However, due to the separation distance across the rear of the site to the flank wall elevation of this property it is unlikely that there would be any unacceptable loss of privacy or light and there would be no overbearing impact. A similar assessment can be made for No. 61 Southampton Street which has three storey flank walls with no windows.

It is considered necessary and reasonable to include planning conditions to limit the hours of use and delivery hours associated with the Class A3 use, to protect the amenity of nearby occupiers. Furthermore a variety of environmental protection based conditions are also required, in order to partly protect amenity too (see separate EP sections above / below). These were all secured at the time of the 2017 permission at the site and are considered to be equally relevant/necessary at this time too.

e) Mix of housing units

Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy states that development should provide an appropriate range of housing opportunities in terms of a mix of housing types, sizes and tenures with a density characteristic of the area in which it is located and accessibility.

Given the site location, good level of accessibility and the number of units proposed in addition to the constrained nature of the site and floor layout of the historic building, the provision of one studio unit and two x one-bedroom flats is acceptable in this specific instance.

f) Quality and amenities of residential accommodation

The footprint of the flats, with habitable rooms orientated to face the street, are considered to be of a suitable size (given the constraints of the listed building). There would be sufficient outlook, daylight and ventilation to the individual rooms.

Policy DM10 recommends amenity space provision of 25sqm per flat (1 or 2 bedroom). Given the nature of the historic building (which does not lend itself to conversion to larger family sized units of accommodation), the corner location and the inherent constraints of the site, the limited provision of amenity space for future residents of the units - which is confined to the semi-private rear parking and service delivery courtyard - is considered acceptable in this context.

g) Transport/parking

See Transport Officer comments in the consultation responses section above. In short, the proposals are considered appropriate subject to conditions. During the course of the application the applicant has submitted more details, including a construction method statement (CMS) approved subsequent to the 2017 permission. As such, in this instance a CMS will be secured via compliance (in accordance with the acceptable document submitted) condition, rather than the standard pre-commencement condition.

h) Environmental Health issues

A variety of conditions are considered to be required on a wide range of environmental health based matters (as detailed in the consultation responses section above). It is not considered that the proposals could be resisted on air quality grounds alone and thus a condition will secure more details. These conditions are identical to those included on the 2017 permission at the site, with no further information offered by the applicant in this submission (with view to reducing the requirements secured

by condition). Therefore, similar conditions to those secured in 2017 are considered to be necessary at this time too.

i) 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 fewer 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.

Given that the proposal is for a conversion creating fewer than 10 units, no Affordable Housing contribution is sought in this instance. It is noted that an extension is proposed at first floor level, but this covers the area of only part of one of the flats proposed and is not capable of being a unit in itself. As such, this is not considered to be liable to seeking an affordable housing contribution for on its own merits. Accordingly, no s106 legal agreement is required either.

j) Archaeology

As per the Berkshire Archaeology comments above, no condition is necessary in this instance.

k) Sustainability

Given the nature of the proposals a sustainability statement, incorporating a BREEAM domestic refurbishment pre-assessment, should have been submitted with the application, to demonstrate how the proposals would seek to comply with policy CS1 and SPD requirements. Instead, the applicant has submitted commentary detailing that *“these requirements are unnecessarily onerous and it is almost impossible to retro-fit BREEAM requirements into a modern building, let alone a listed historic building. The building is what it is. The new windows will enhance the sustainability credentials but ultimately there is little else that can be done without being unduly harmful to the historic fabric of the listed building”*.

These comments are duly noted by officers, who recognise that there will be likely to be inherent difficulties in meeting the usual sustainability standards. However, the level/nature of information / justification provided by the applicant is not considered sufficient and it is also considered that a variety of other measures could be introduced fairly simply without causing harm to the listed building. As such, in this specific instance, a pre-occupation condition will secure a sustainability statement (not specifically set to achieve a specific BREEAM standard), which will seek to confirm the exact measures the applicant proposes and commits to introducing to assist in the sustainability credentials of the residential units created. This is considered to strike an appropriate balance between the development plan sustainability policies and the constraints of the site, as specified by the applicant in this specific instance, and the overarching planning balance to ensure the heritage asset is brought back into use. Such a condition was included in the 2017 permission at the site and is considered to be equally relevant at this time too.

l) CIL

The applicant has submitted the CIL liability information requirement form. The applicant has stated that the building was last occupied for its lawful use on 04/04/15. Based on this information denoted by the applicant, the building has not been occupied for its lawful use for 6 months in the last 36 months (this is the case when a decision is issued in July 2018 - this was also the case when the application was submitted in December 2017). As such, unlike at the time of the 2017 permission when a discount was able to be applied to the first floor space where a change of use to residential was proposed, this cannot be applied on this occasion at this time. Therefore the CIL liability will relate to the entirety of proposed residential floorspace, which is 119sqm (as stated on the CIL form submitted). There is a £0 charge for the Class A3 element, as per the charging schedule. The CIL liability (based on a 2018 indexation rate of £147.2941176470588 per sqm of residential accommodation) is £17,528. Accordingly the standard CIL informative will be included on the decision notice and a Liability Notice will follow shortly after the decision notice is issued.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Conditions (172255/FUL):

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this planning permission.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions, and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

WD-200 Rev A - Location Plan, Existing Site and Basement Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-201 Rev A - Existing Ground Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-202 - Existing First Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-203 - Existing Second Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-204 - Existing Roof Plan Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-205 Rev D - Proposed Location, Site Plans and Basement Plan, as received 27/03/18

WD-206 Rev A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-207 - Proposed First Floor Plan, as received 15/12/17

WD-208 - Proposed Second Floor Plan, as received 15/12/17

WD-209 Rev A - Proposed Roof Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-210 Rev B - Proposed Ground Floor & Cellar Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-211 Rev B - Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-212 Rev B - Proposed Second Floor Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-300 - Existing Section A-A & B-B (including demolition/proposed works), as received 04/07/18

WD-301 - Proposed Section A-A & B-B, as received 15/12/17

WD-400 - Existing Front and Side Elevations (including demolition/proposed works), as received 04/07/18

WD-401 Rev A - Existing Rear and Side Elevations (including demolition/proposed works), as received 20/02/18

WD-402 Rev A - Front and Side Elevations, as received 20/02/18

WD-403 Rev A - Proposed Rear & Side Elevations, as received 20/02/18

WD-600 - Typical Sash Window Details, as received 15/12/17
 WD-601 - Door Details, as received 15/12/17
 WD-602 Rev B - Floor and Wall Details, as received 20/02/18
 WD-604 - Typical Conservation Roof Light Details, as received 04/07/18
 RL17562/01 - Foundation & Ground Floor Layout & Details, as received 20/02/18
 RL17562/02 Rev P1 - Ground Floor Layout Showing Proposed Roof Structure Over, as received 20/02/18
 RL17562/03 Rev P1 - Part First Floor Layout Showing Proposed Structure Over, as received 20/02/18
 Door Schedule, Ref PCSR, as received 04/07/18
 Window Schedule, Ref PCSR, as received 04/07/18

Reason: Because permission is granted in respect of the development as detailed in the approved plans only.

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building unless where otherwise stated.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the building and wider streetscene, in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and Policy RC5 of the Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009.

4. Prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted the Council shall be notified in writing of the full postal address of the units. Such notification shall be addressed to the Council's Planning Manager quoting the planning application reference specified in this Decision Notice.

Reason: In order that the Council can update its records to ensure that parking permits are not issued to the occupiers of the new residential units hereby approved, and thus ensure that the development does not harm the existing amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties by adding to the already high level of on street car parking in the area in accordance with Policy CS24 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM12 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document Policy 2012 (Altered 2015).

5. Prior to any agreement being entered into for a new occupation of, or transfer of any interest in, the residential flats hereby approved the prospective occupier/transferee shall be informed that there is no

automatic entitlement to a car parking permit for any existing residential parking permit schemes and future schemes on adjacent and surrounding streets. All material used for advertising or marketing the residential unit(s) for letting or sale shall make it clear to prospective tenants and occupiers that they will not be automatically entitled to a parking permit, but any application for a parking permit will be considered on its merits.

Reason: In order that the prospective occupiers are made aware of the fact that while they can submit an application they will not be automatically entitled to an on-street car parking permit. In the interests of the proper management of parking, and to ensure that the development does not harm the existing amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties by adding to the already high level of on street car parking in the area, in accordance with Policy CS24 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM12 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

6. The Class A3 restaurant hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all vehicle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with approved plan WD-205 Rev D -Site Plan, as received 27/03/18. The spaces shall be kept available for parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be a danger to other road users in accordance with Policy CS24 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM12 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

7. No residential unit hereby permitted shall be occupied until the bicycle parking facility for that residential unit has been provided in accordance with approved plan WD-205 Rev D -Site Plan, as received 27/03/18. The facility shall be kept available for bicycle parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for travel to and from the site by sustainable alternatives to a motorcar, in accordance with Policies CS22 and CS24 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM12 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

8. No residential unit hereby permitted shall be occupied until the bin storage facility has been provided in accordance with approved plan WD-205 Rev D - Site Plan, as received 27/03/18. The bin storage facility shall be retained

thereafter for use by occupiers of the residential units and Class A3 restaurant at all times.

Reason: in the interests of the visual amenity of the area, to ensure that bins can be easily accessed when required and to safeguard the amenity of existing nearby / future occupiers / road users from potential disturbance and/or smells and highway safety, in accordance with Policies CS2 and CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policies DM4 and DM12 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

9. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the measures hereby approved in the Construction Method Statement by JSA Architects, Rev A dated 30/05/18, as received 04/07/18, and shall be adhered to throughout the development process unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of safety, protecting the amenity of local land uses, neighbouring residents and highway safety in accordance with Policies CS20 and CS34 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policies DM4 and DM12 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

10. No development shall take place until a detailed scheme for protecting the dwellings from the external noise environment of the area and the ground floor use has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme itself shall be designed, specified and constructed to meet the specifications set out in the Noise Impact Assessment by KP Acoustics Ref 15263.NIA.01 dated 13/12/16, as received 15/12/17. Where opening windows will lead to an internal noise level increase of 5 dBA or greater above BS 8233:2014 recommended internal levels, the scheme shall include provision of alternative mechanical ventilation with minimum performance equivalent to a mechanical heat recovery (MVHR) system with cool air bypass as an alternative means of cooling and ventilation. Noise from the system should not result in BS8233 internal levels being exceeded. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved scheme which shall be completed before any part of the accommodation hereby approved is occupied, unless the Local Planning Authority otherwise agrees in writing.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupiers from noise and disturbance associated with the ground floor use and the area generally, in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC9 of the Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009 and Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

11. No externally located mechanical plant shall be installed until a noise assessment of the proposed mechanical plant has been submitted and approved by this Council. The assessment shall be carried out for in accordance with BS4141:2014 methodology. The predicted specific sound level ($L_{Aeq,TR}$) as measured at a point 1 metre external to sensitive facades shall be at least 10dB below the existing background sound level, $LA_{90,T}$ when all plant/equipment (or any part of it) is in operation. The predicted rating level, $L_{A,r,Tr}$ (specific sound level plus any adjustment for the characteristic features of the sound) as measured at a point 1 metre external to sensitive facades shall not exceed the existing background sound level, $LA_{90,T}$ when all plant/equipment (or any part of it) is in operation.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally, in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC9 of the Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009 and Policy DM4 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

12. Prior to the first occupation of any use hereby approved, an odour assessment and a detailed odour management plan to include scale plans, odour control specifications and a maintenance plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Reference shall be made to the Defra Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (January 2005) when assessing potential odours and selecting appropriate odour control methods. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved scheme unless the Local Planning Authority otherwise agrees in writing.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally, in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC9 of the Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009 and Policy DM4 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

13. The hours of noisy construction, demolition and associated deliveries shall be restricted to the hours of 0800hrs to 1800hrs Mondays to Fridays, and 0900hrs to 1300hrs on Saturdays, and not at any time on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays without prior approval from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of existing nearby properties from noise and disturbance from works connected with implementing this permission, in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

14. No materials or green waste produced as a result of the clearance of the site, demolition works or construction works associated with the development hereby approved shall be burnt on site.

Reason: In the interests of air quality, the amenity of neighbours, and to promote more sustainable approaches to waste management in accordance with Policies CS34 (Pollution and Water Resources) and CS2 (Waste Minimisation) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC9 of the Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009 and Policies DM4 and DM19 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

15. Prior to the first occupation of any residential unit hereby approved, details of the mitigation measures to protect the residential units from poor air quality shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved mitigation measures.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupiers from poor air quality, in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015), Policy RC9 of the Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009 and Policies DM4 and DM19 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

16. Prior to the first occupation of any residential unit hereby approved, details of the sustainability measures to be provided for the residential units shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved measures.

Reason: To ensure that the development contributes adequately towards environmental sustainability, in accordance with Policy CS1 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM1 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

17. Hours for deliveries and waste collections serving the A3 use are restricted to 08:00hrs to 22:00hrs Monday to Saturdays and 10:00hrs to 18:00hrs on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally, in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM4 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

18. The Class A3 use hereby permitted shall not operate outside of the hours of 0800 - 2300 on any day.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally, in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM4 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

Informatives:

1. Your attention is drawn to the requirement for submission of a Building Regulations application for the proposed development. Please contact Building Control on 0118 937 2449 for advice.
2. The Local Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant to resolve relevant matters to allow permission to be granted within the agreed extended timescale for the decision to be issued.
3. Your attention is drawn to the terms and conditions of this permission. Any development which is carried out but which differs materially from the approved plans and details, or does not comply with any condition(s) or planning obligation(s) attached to the permission may result in the Council taking action to remedy the breach of planning control. If you are in any doubt please contact the Council.
4. Complaints are commonly received about noise and dust caused by construction and demolition works, particularly working outside reasonable hours and smoke from bonfires associated with the burning of waste on site. The developer is reminded that construction and demolition associated with the approved development will be subject to environmental health law.
5. The attention of the applicant is drawn to Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to damage caused by extraordinary traffic.
6. The occupiers of the residential unit(s) will not be automatically entitled to an on-street car parking permit. Current and new occupiers should be informed of this and be advised to find out more about parking permits on

the Council's website. There is already a high level of on street car parking in the area and the site is located close to local facilities, with frequent public transport services on nearby roads.

7. To minimise the disturbance by noise of future residential occupiers of the flats and its effect on neighbouring residents, residential accommodation must be designed and constructed or converted so as to achieve the insulation requirements set out in Building Regulations Approved Document E.
8. During the course of construction, the developer should take care to ensure that no part of this development (foundations, eaves, guttering, etc.) would encroach on, under or across the boundary line with the adjoining property, as the requisite Notice has not been served on the owner of that property. This permission does not confer any right of access onto land that is not under the developer's control. The developer should also be mindful of the obligations and requirements of the Party Wall Act (1996) details of which can be found at:
www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/partywall
9. The Council introduced the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 1st April 2015. CIL is a way of securing financial contributions towards infrastructure from new development, and partially replaces the Section 106 planning obligation regime. It is a set charge per sq m of floorspace for different uses, and, unlike Section 106, it is non-negotiable. It applies to developments which result in at least one dwelling; where the space has not been in lawful use for 6 months within the last 3 years or 100 sq m of new floorspace. For this approved development the CIL status is chargeable. You will be sent a CIL Liability Notice with the calculated amount soon. CIL becomes payable on commencement of the development or by instalments. For more information go to:
http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/2791/Community-Infrastructure-Levy-Advice-to-Applicants/pdf/CIL_Advice_to_Applicants.pdf

Conditions (172256/LBC):

1. The works hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: In accordance with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Prior to commencement of any works at the site, details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council:

- a) detailed drawings and schedules showing all those parts of the building to be removed, dismantled or stripped out (including the removal of internal features, floors, and wall or ceiling surfaces);
- b) a detailed schedule of repairs to the listed building

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and schedules.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the building in accordance with the requirements of Policy CS33 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015).

3. Prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the works, details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council:

- a) mortar mix for all brickwork (mortar is to be lime-based with a breathable finish).
- b) new staircases to include details of handrails and balusters.
- c) manufacturer details and samples of the roof tiles for the extension and any replacement roof tiles.
- d) manufacturer details and samples of the facing brick for the extension and any replacement bricks.
- e) type and location of any new service visible externally including pipework, rainwater goods, boiler flues, extract vent grilles, meter cupboards, external lighting, or soil vent pipe terminations.
- f) internal partition walls including details of the method of construction-

The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the building in accordance with the requirements of Policy CS33 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015).

4. Adequate protection to the building shall be provided to the satisfaction of the local planning authority at all times during the approved work. Sufficient care shall be taken in the design and execution of all work, including any demolition and the preparation to ensure that no damage is incurred to the historic fabric of the building. Particular attention is drawn to the need to

protect the windows, fireplaces and timber frame from damage during construction.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the building in accordance with the requirements of Policy CS33 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015).

5. Unless such work is clearly and specifically referred to on drawings or other documents hereby approved, no timber framing members/structural roof timbers may be cut, replaced or removed in whole or in part without the written approval of the local planning authority. This includes the chasing of timbers to facilitate service runs.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the building in accordance with the requirements of Policy CS33 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015).

6. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

WD-200 Rev A - Location Plan, Existing Site and Basement Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-201 Rev A - Existing Ground Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-202 - Existing First Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-203 - Existing Second Floor Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-204 - Existing Roof Plan Demolition Plan, as received 04/07/18

WD-205 Rev D - Proposed Location, Site Plans and Basement Plan, as received 27/03/18

WD-206 Rev A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-207 - Proposed First Floor Plan, as received 15/12/17

WD-208 - Proposed Second Floor Plan, as received 15/12/17

WD-209 Rev A - Proposed Roof Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-210 Rev B - Proposed Ground Floor & Cellar Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-211 Rev B - Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-212 Rev B - Proposed Second Floor Fire Strategy Plan, as received 20/02/18

WD-300 - Existing Section A-A & B-B (including demolition/proposed works), as received 04/07/18

WD-301 - Proposed Section A-A & B-B, as received 15/12/17

WD-400 - Existing Front and Side Elevations (including demolition/proposed works), as received 04/07/18

WD-401 Rev A - Existing Rear and Side Elevations (including demolition/proposed works), as received 20/02/18
WD-402 Rev A - Front and Side Elevations, as received 20/02/18
WD-403 Rev A - Proposed Rear & Side Elevations, as received 20/02/18
WD-600 - Typical Sash Window Details, as received 15/12/17
WD-601 - Door Details, as received 15/12/17
WD-602 Rev B - Floor and Wall Details, as received 20/02/18
WD-604 - Typical Conservation Roof Light Details, as received 04/07/18
RL17562/01 - Foundation & Ground Floor Layout & Details, as received 20/02/18
RL17562/02 Rev P1 - Ground Floor Layout Showing Proposed Roof Structure Over, as received 20/02/18
RL17562/03 Rev P1 - Part First Floor Layout Showing Proposed Structure Over, as received 20/02/18
Door Schedule, Ref PCSR, as received 04/07/18
Window Schedule, Ref PCSR, as received 04/07/18

Reason: To ensure that the works carried out are fully in accordance with the approved drawings and details in order to protect the special historic and architectural character of the listed building, in accordance with Policy CS33 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015).

Informatives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant to resolve relevant matters to allow consent to be granted within the agreed extended timescale for the decision to be issued.
2. For the avoidance of doubt, no other works are approved except those as authorised by this Consent. Any other works required to the Listed Building may require a separate application for Listed Building Consent and/or an application for Permitted Works to a Listed Building.