

**DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORTS - Application No's: A) 180625/FUL & B) 171816/LBC**

**Address:** Fishermans Cottage Public House, 224 Kennet Side, Reading, RG1 3DN

**Proposals:** A) Partial demolition of rear projection and roof, and erection of a new 2 storey extension to form 6 ancillary guest accommodation rooms, reconfigured parking, landscaping and associated works.

B) Internal and external alterations associated with partial demolition of rear projection and roof, and erection of a new 2 storey extension to form 6 ancillary guest accommodation rooms, reconfigured parking, landscaping and associated works.

**Applicant:** Fishermans Cottage Ltd

**Case officer:** Jonathan Markwell

**Date received (valid from):** 02/05/2018

**Target decision date:** 27/06/2018

## **1. Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

- 1.1 The application site contains the Grade II Listed Fisherman's Cottage Public House with external seating, a disused garden area to the south (rear) and to the east the associated car park.
- 1.2 The site is boarded by the Kennet River to the north, residential dwellings Lock Place, to the east; Kennetside (to the west fronting the watercourse) and Canal Way, to the south. The land level surrounding the Listed building including the existing car park differs significantly (by approximately 3.5m) from the front to the rear of the site. The front elevation and ground floor of the existing building and area to the rear, sought to be developed, are level with the tow path. The land level within the site is then stepped up with the car park and Canal Way which it joins set at the upper level.
- 1.3 There are two footpaths located to the east and west of the site linking the higher land level of Canal Way to the tow path. The northern portion of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 and the site forms part of an ecological Green Link. Although listed, the building is not located within a conservation area.

## **2. Proposals:**

- 2.1 The proposal involves an application for planning permission and listed building consent for the partial demolition of the rear projection and roof, and erection of a new 2 storey extension to form 6 ancillary guest accommodation rooms, reconfigured parking, landscaping and associated works (such as bin / cycle storage).
- 2.2 These rooms to be used as ancillary accommodation to the existing public house would therefore be considered the same use class A4 'Drinking Establishments'. The rooms are divided between four rooms at lower ground level and two rooms at upper ground floor level. The proposed extension would have an external rendered finish with a low pitched slate roof and rooms within the roofscape (hipped dormers) on the west elevation.
- 2.3 Prior to the registration of the application a number of additional / revised plans (fully showing the proposals / consistent comparisons between existing and proposed / comparing the proposals with the dismissed at appeal proposals) were submitted.

## **3. Plans Considered:**

1803(EX)00 Rev P1 - Existing Block Plan, as received 02/05/18

1803(EX)01 Rev P2 - Existing Site Plan Lower Ground, as received 02/05/18

1803(EX)02 Rev P2 - Existing Site Plan Ground / Car-park, as received 02/05/18  
1803(EX)03 Rev P2 - Existing Site Plan Roof Level, as received 02/05/18  
1803(EX)04 Rev P1 - Existing Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(EX)05 Rev P1 - Existing Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(EX)06 Rev P1 - Existing Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(EX)07 Rev P1 - Existing Site Elevations, as received 02/05/18  
1803(EX)10 Rev P1 - Existing Site Location Plan, as received 02/05/18

1803(PL)10 Rev P2 - Proposed Lower Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)11 Rev P2 - Proposed Upper Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)12 Rev P2 - Proposed Site Plan Roof Level, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)20 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)21 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)30 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Elevations, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)31 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Elevations, as received 02/05/18

1803(PL)50 Rev P1 - Site Sections Comparison with previous scheme, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)51 Rev P1 - Site Sections Comparison with previous scheme, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)52 Rev P1 - Site Elevations Comparison with previous scheme, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)53 Rev P1 - Site Elevations Comparison with previous scheme, as received 02/05/18

2492-5-2 DR-0001 Rev S3-P3 - Landscape Proposals, as received 11/04/18

Car parking survey technical note by rgp Ref: BELC/2015/2874/TN01REVA dated March 2018, as received 11/04/18

Covering letter Planning and viability statement by A Gooch, as received 11/04/18

Design and Access Statement by FlowerKittle Architects, dated April 2018, as received 11/04/18

Heritage Assessment by Forum Heritage Services, Revised April 2018, as received 11/04/18

Ecological Appraisal and Internal / External Bat Building Inspection by Ecological Planning & Research Ltd, ref P16/25-1B, dated 27/07/16, as received 11/04/18

Green Link Appraisal by David Jarvis Associates Limited Ref 2492-4-4-5 T1 Rev P2, dated 11/08/16, as received 11/04/18

Flood Risk Assessment by Simon Jones-Parry BSc CEng MICE, dated 06/07/2016, as received 11/04/18

Planning Statement Ref 7695/RJ by Bell Cornwell, dated August 2016, as received 11/04/18

Information submitted on a private and confidential basis:

Accounts (year ended 31/07/16)

Accounts (year ended 30/04/17)

#### **4. Relevant Planning History:**

- 4.1 161742/FUL & 161743/LBC - Partial demolition of rear projection and erection of a new extension to form ancillary guest accommodation. Refused 8/12/16.

Reason for refusal of 161742/FUL: The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk, appearance and siting, is considered to be overdevelopment of the site that would cause substantial harm to the Grade II Listed Fisherman's Cottage Public House and its setting contrary to Policies CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) and CS33 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Reason for refusal of 161743/LBC: The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk, appearance and siting, is considered to be overdevelopment of the site that would cause substantial harm to the Grade II Listed Fisherman's Cottage Public House and its setting contrary to Policies CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) and CS33 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Appeals lodged and subsequently dismissed (Refs APP/E0345/W/17/3177374 & APP/E0345/Y/17/3177376) 07/12/17: *"I therefore conclude that the proposal would not preserve the special architectural and historical interest of the Grade II listed building. The proposal would conflict with the Framework, and the Core Strategy Policies CS7 and CS33. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised including the letters in support of the planning application, I therefore conclude that the appeals should fail"*.

- 4.2 06-01505-FUL (061315) - Replacement of temporary awning with permanent freestanding covered shelter. Withdrawn 15/02/07.

## **5. Public Consultation:**

- 5.1 Consultation letters were sent to nearby occupiers on 04/05/18. Site notices were erected on 18/05/2018, expiring on 08/06/2018. A press notice was published on 10/05/18, expiring on 31/05/18.
- 5.2 Three objections have been received; two received anonymously and one from a Lock Place occupier. The issues raised in the responses received are summarised as follows:
- Considerable harm to the listed building and its setting.
  - Proposal is not modest; it will be clearly visible on both sides of the pub making the building far less attractive.
  - Viability case not true; the pub is now a very busy business with both regular and new customers visiting daily.
  - Unnecessary development as the guest rooms would not be very well used, especially in winter months.
  - Disturbance to nearby residents during the construction process from builders blocking accesses and using resident's parking spaces.
  - Noise disturbance during construction will chase the beautiful wildlife away and impact negatively upon the surrounding environment and tranquillity of the location.
  - Use of the residents shared car park at the back of the property will be abused, by guests and construction works.

Officer response: Please see the appraisal and consultation responses from environmental protection, historic buildings consultant and transport.

## **6. Consultation Responses:**

### **6a. Environmental Protection:**

Environmental Protection 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.

EP recommends the following informative is attached to help prevent complaints.

#### Recommended Informative

Noisy construction, demolition and associated activities should be restricted to between the hours of 08:00hrs to 18:00hrs Mondays to Fridays, and 09:00hrs to 13:00hrs on Saturdays, with no noisy works taking place at any time on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays.

There should be no burning of waste on the site.

#### 6b: RBC Heritage Consultant:

##### Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

##### The Setting of Listed Buildings

Recent legal cases relating to issues of 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 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Section 66(1), in the determination of applications affecting the setting of a Listed Building, states that:

‘in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall 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.’

In the recent 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).

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.

##### Reading Borough Planning Policies

The Core Strategy 2008 (with further alterations January 2015), Policy 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 paragraph 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...”.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
Paragraph 132 of the NPPF 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. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

The NPPF (paragraph 128) requires applicants:

‘to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance’.

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that, local planning authorities should take into account:

‘the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation’.

Paragraph 133 states that:

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, or all of the following apply:

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Paragraph 134 states that:

Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Paragraph 135 states that:

The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Planning Practice Guide (PPG)

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 'How to assess if there is substantial harm?' that:

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.

Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning

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).

Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking (Historic England, 2015a) considers under 'cumulative change' that:

The cumulative impact of incremental small-scale changes may have as great an effect on the significance of a heritage asset as a larger scale change. Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development to the asset itself or

its setting, consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset in order to accord with NPPF policies. Negative change could include severing the last link to part of the history of an asset or between the asset and its original setting. Conversely, positive change could include the restoration of a building's plan form or an original designed landscape (Historic England, 2015a, p.8).

#### Assessing the Significance of Heritage Assets

Before any changes are considered to a place it is essential that the cultural and heritage values, its history, fabric and character are understood. The standard approach to providing a balanced assessment of the value of a heritage asset is contained in Historic England's standard methodology for assessing our understanding of the significance of heritage assets is Principles of Conservation (Historic England, 2008). This identifies four key aspects of a place that can influence our understanding which are:

- Evidential Value - the value a place derives from the potential it has to yield evidence about past human activity.
- Historical Value - the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present.
- Aesthetic Value - the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- Communal Value - the ways in which a place relates to people in their collective experience of memory.

#### Fisherman's Cottage Inn

Fisherman's Cottage Inn is an early 19th century, asymmetrical Gothic building of two storeys of painted ashlar under a slate hipped roof with picturesque two brick chimneys and flat eaves with corner pendants. It is three bays in width and the centre breaks forward with canted and crenellated bay, which is wider on ground floor. Above is a moulded stone barge boarded gable with apex pendant. The first floor left hand window a square oriel with chamfered sides. The canted bay and the oriel have decorative corners to cornice. It has two light, metal glazing bar casements with hood moulds. One light over the door to right also with hood mould. There is a Royal Fire Insurance Mark. There is a large, inappropriate modern glass conservatory extension to the side of the building.

#### Setting of the Heritage Assets

The historic setting of the Fisherman's Cottage Inn has been much eroded through the demolition of surrounding 19th century housing and construction of unsympathetic late 20th century two-storey houses and three-storey blocks around the public house. There is a large, unsympathetic, modern glass conservatory extension to the side of the building.

These inappropriate developments have led to a cumulative visual impact on the building and its setting.

#### Proposals

Following Appeal of application 161742 and 161743 the current application proposes a new one and half storey extension located to the rear of the public house in an area where the land slopes down from the road and parking area to the rear of the site. The proposed extension would be attached to the existing rear extension and consist of a new block with six rooms divided between four rooms at ground level and two rooms at the upper floor level. The proposed extension would have an external rendered finish with a low pitched slate hipped roof.

#### Conclusions

In view of the reduced mass and height of the proposed extension, it is considered on balance that any harm to the Listed Building would be balanced against its future sustainability.

Having consideration of the local authority's statutory duty 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 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area Act) 1990 there is no objection in principle subject to the following conditions:

#### COMMENCEMENT OF WORKS - TIME LIMIT

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To accord with s.18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and to allow the Local Planning Authority to reconsider the desirability of the proposal if it is not carried out within that time.

#### DETAILS - NEW WINDOWS

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.

Reason: To accord with Reading Policy CS33 and to protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building

#### DETAILS - ROOFLIGHTS

Details of the type of rooflights are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of related work. Rooflights are to be conservation type, fitted flush with or below the roof covering.

Reason: To accord with Reading Policy CS33 and to protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building

#### DETAILS - NEW DOORS

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.

Reason: To accord with Reading Policy CS33 and to protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building

#### ROOF TILES

No related works shall be undertaken until samples of the roof tiles for the extension and to make up for any deficit of roof tiles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To accord with Reading Policy CS33 and to protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

#### 6c: Transport:

The site is located in Zone 2, Primary Core Area, of the Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD. This zone directly surrounds the Central Core Area and extends to walking distances of 2 kilometres from the centre of Reading. Typically this zone is well served by public transport, with buses continuing either into or out of the Central Core Area via this zone.

The property is a grade II listed building facing the River Kennet. In accordance with the adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD, the development would be required to provide a parking provision of 1 space per bedroom. Currently there are 8 car parking spaces associated

with the pub and restaurant; the Design and Access statement states that this will be increased to 1; an additional. A parking Survey was undertaken in 2016 which illustrated that the highest level of parking occurs in the evening with an average of 7-8. 6 parking spaces would be required to comply with the adopted parking standards, therefore the proposed provision falls short of the Councils current standards when the pub/restaurant are busiest. However it is acknowledged that it is likely that some customers will use the restaurant.

The development site is located in an area where a Residential Parking Permit Scheme operates preventing unauthorised on street parking. Therefore a lower car parking provision is acceptable in this instance given that parking can be controlled through the administration of the scheme and regular patrols of the area.

Bin storage has been illustrated on submitted plans housed in a permanent structure, located at the front of the site. Bin storage should comply with Manual for Streets and British Standard 5906: 2005 for Waste Management in Buildings and should be located no further than 15m from the access point of the site to avoid the stationing of service vehicles on the carriageway for excessive periods. This provision is deemed acceptable.

Cycle storage for 6 cycles is provided in a series of Sheffield stands within the car park area in a sheltered enclosure. This is deemed acceptable.

There are no transport objections to the proposal subject to the conditions and informatives stated below.

#### CONDITIONS:

##### CO2 Construction Method Statement

No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to provide for:

- space on site where vehicles of site operatives and visitors can be parked with details of how site operatives and visitors will be required to make use of the parking area provided
- location on site for storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- the erection and maintenance (including removal of any graffiti or fly posters) of security hoarding around the site
- any footpath closures or road closures needed during construction
- wheel washing facilities on site
- a scheme for recycling waste resulting from the construction works

The measures within the approved Construction Method Statement shall be maintained and adhered to throughout the course of the development unless changes are agreed in advance and in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of local land uses or neighbouring residents, the character of the area and highway safety. In accordance with Policy DM12.

##### DC1 Vehicle parking space provided in accordance with approved plans

The dwelling(s)/building(s) hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all vehicle parking space(s) have been provided in accordance with the approved plan. The space(s) shall be kept available for parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers and reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be a danger to other road users to accord with Policy CS24 & CS24 and Policy DM12.

DC3 Bicycle parking space provided in accordance with approved plans

No dwelling/building hereby permitted shall be occupied until the bicycle parking facility for that dwelling/building has been provided in accordance with the approved plan. The facility shall be kept available for bicycle parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To encourage travel by sustainable alternatives to driving a motorcar in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's approved transport policies CS23 and CS24.

DC6 Bin storage

No dwelling/building shall be occupied until the bin storage facility shown on the approved plans has been provided and the bin storage facility shall be retained thereafter for use by occupiers of the dwelling/building at all times.

Reason: in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to ensure that bins can be easily accessed when required in accordance with Policy CS7.

INFORMATIVE:

IF3 Highways

i) 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.

ii) Any works affecting the Highway shall be in accordance with Reading Borough's Council's document "Guidance Notes for Activities on the Public Highway within the Borough of Reading". The applicant should note that compliance with this document is mandatory and licences to work on the Highway will only be issued if the requirements contained within it are met. A copy can be obtained from the Council's website.

6d: Ecology:

The application site comprises a public house next to the Kennet & Avon Canal. It is proposed to extend it and re-landscape the rear garden. An ecological assessment has been submitted with the application (EPR dated 27 July 2016). It is considered unlikely that the site has changed significantly since the time that the ecological assessment was undertaken.

The ecological assessment has been undertaken to an appropriate standard and concludes that the risk of the proposals adversely affecting bats or other protected species is minimal, however there was a stand of Japanese Knotweed in the rear garden. Japanese Knotweed is an invasive species listed on Schedule 9, Section 14, of The Wildlife and Countryside Act and can have an adverse effect on biodiversity by outcompete native species. For this reason, it is illegal to cause its spread in the wild. It is therefore recommended that a planning condition is set to ensure that this species is eradicated from the site.

In summary, subject to the condition below there are no objections to this application on ecology grounds.

Condition: No development hereby permitted shall commence until a Japanese Knotweed eradication strategy has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the council. The strategy shall include details of and timescales for knotweed eradication, and, if the knotweed has not been eradicated at the time of commencement of works, details of the measures to be put in place to ensure that works do not cause its spread. The eradication strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless the local planning authority gives written approval for any variations.

Reason: Japanese knotweed, is an invasive weed that can have a significant adverse effect on biodiversity - this condition will ensure that it is controlled and not spread.

#### 6e: Natural Environment:

There are no tree or landscape objections to this application. If planning permission is granted please include the following landscaping conditions:

##### Landscaping implementation

The hard and soft landscaping of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out, in accordance with the approved landscaping plans and documents. The soft landscaping shall take place no later than during the first planting season following the date when the development hereby permitted is ready for occupation or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interests of the character and appearance of the new development and in accordance with Policy CS7

##### Standard Landscaping Maintenance

All planted materials shall be maintained for five years and any trees or plants removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Reason: in the interests of the character and appearance of the new development and in accordance with Policy CS7

#### 6f: Environment Agency:

The proposed development lies within Flood Zone 2 as defined in table 1 of the Technical Guide to the National Planning Policy Framework and is therefore at risk of flooding. We have produced a series of standard comments for local planning authorities and planning applicants to refer to on 'lower risk' development proposals where flood risk is an issue to replace direct case by case consultation with us. This planning application sits within this category.

This application falls under our Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA) and we advise you to review the application using this guidance available on the GOV.uk website. We do not need to be consulted further on this application on flood risk grounds.

#### **7. 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.

#### **8. Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance**

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.

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).

In this regard, the NPPF states that due weight should be given to the adopted policies of the Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy, 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 (2012), Planning Practice Guidance (2014 - ) and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

**Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy (Adopted January 2008) (Altered 2015)**

CS1 (Sustainable Construction and Design)  
CS2 (Waste Minimisation)  
CS4 (Accessibility and the Intensity of Development)  
CS5 (Inclusive Access)  
CS7 (Design and the Public Realm)  
CS20 (Implementation of the Reading Transport Strategy)  
CS22 (Transport Assessments)  
CS24 (Car/Cycle Parking)  
CS31 (Additional and Existing Community Facilities)  
CS33 (Protection of the Historic Environment)  
CS34 (Pollution and Water Resources)  
CS35 (Flooding)  
CS36 (Biodiversity and Geology)  
CS38 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)

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

DM1 (Adaption to Climate Change)  
DM4 (Safeguarding Amenities)  
DM12 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters)  
DM17 (Green Network)  
DM18 (Tree Planting)

**Other relevant documents/guidance**

Revised Parking Standards and Design (2011)  
Sustainable Design and Construction (2011)  
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)

## **9. Appraisal**

The main issues are considered to be:

- a) Principle of development
- b) Flooding
- c) Design and appearance / impact on the setting of the listed building
- d) Amenity of future occupiers and impact on existing neighbours
- e) Highways and parking
- f) Landscaping and ecology
- g) Other matters

#### **a) Principle of development**

9.1 At the time of the refused/dismissed at appeal proposal in 2016/17 no objections were raised with the principle of the proposed development. This remains the case in this instance. Policy CS31 'Additional and Existing Community Facilities' allows extensions and improvements to community facilities. The applicant has reaffirmed in this application that the reception for the rooms will be in the main bar, all food would be served in the bar and the normal access to the rooms will be via the bar. An out of hours access will be provided for residents once they have checked in for the period when the public house is closed. This use of the proposed rooms ancillary to the existing pub building will be required to be secured by condition.

9.2 Officers are also mindful of paragraph 70 of the NPPF, in that proposed works of development and modernisation are completed in a sustainable manner to the future use of the public house. In this regard the part of the site where the works are proposed has now be unused for a number of years and it is considered that the intended works would not unduly compromise the long term viability of the public house use. Moreover, the applicant has outlined the difficulties the public house has encountered in recent times, with the proposals intended to assist the function of the public house. Furthermore, the Inspector, whilst dismissing the previous proposal as a whole, commented at paragraph 12 as follows:

*"Detailed evidence is submitted of issues concerning continuing viability issues of the pub, the fate of many pubs in the area in recent times and substantial new riverside competition closer to the town centre. I can appreciate and fully accept therefore that the pub has on going viability issues and that the provision of guest rooms would provide a valuable additional income for the business, enabling the heritage asset to remain within its optimum use. I place material weight on such benefits".*

9.3 The provision of overnight accommodation ancillary to and dependent on the existing public house (A4 use class) is therefore considered acceptable in principle land use terms. This is subject to the recommended condition, and is also subject to the design and siting of the proposed development being acceptable in the context of the setting of the listed building, amenity of neighbours, flood plain and ecological green link. These are the material considerations that the proposal must be carefully weighed against, as set out below.

#### **b) Flooding**

9.4 It is first acknowledged that the previously dismissed at appeal proposal was not refused by the local planning authority on flood risk grounds. At the time of the previous application a flood risk assessment was submitted, which concluded that the development would not be flooded in the event of flood and that the ground floor level of the development is set above the predicted flood level; access to the development from outside the site (via Canal Way) is generally unaffected by flooding; and the

development will not cause flooding elsewhere. At the time of the previous proposal officers and members were content that the proposal accorded with Policy CS35. For this application the applicant has re-submitted the previous FRA considered appropriate previously. The prevailing policy and local context has not changed and neither has the footprint of the proposed development. With this context in mind, and on its own merits, the FRA is considered appropriate, with a planning condition not being considered necessary in this specific instance (the standard approved plans condition will secure the levels the development will be built at).

**c) Design and appearance / impact on the listed building**

- 9.5 Considering first the impact on the listed building, the applicant has helpfully provided comparative plans showing the proposed development with an outline of the dismissed at appeal scheme also provided. This is considered necessary in this instance, given the previous appeal was dismissed on the basis of the Inspector considering (as did the local planning authority at application stage) that the height, mass and bulk would “*detract substantially from views of the rear elevation and roofscape of the Fisherman’s Cottage, with lesser, but still harmful effects when viewed from the footpath on the southern side of the site which leads to Anglers Way*” (paragraph 9). Officers are also mindful that the Inspector also commented at paragraph 13 that “it seems to me that it would be entirely possible for a scheme to be brought forward that would secure similar benefits to the current proposal, without causing the same degree of harm”.
- 9.6 With the above in mind it is evident, in comparison with the dismissed at appeal proposal, that the height, mass and bulk of the current proposal has been significantly reduced (most substantially reducing from 3 to 2 storeys, with the mass and building form altered above the lower ground floor level too). It is considered that the proposal has addressed the previous concerns raised by the Inspector, and moreover on its own merits, is now of a suitable height, bulk and mass. The Council’s Historic Buildings Consultant, as outlined in section 6b above, also has no objection to the current proposal.
- 9.7 It is also noted that part of the local planning authority’s previous concerns were in relation to the footprint of the proposed works. However, whilst dismissing the appeal, the Inspector specifically referenced the footprint being reasonable and not representing overdevelopment of the site. Given the footprint in the current proposal is comparable, it would not be sustainable (should the matter be subject to a future appeal) for the local planning authority to seek to resist the proposals on this basis.
- 9.8 The Inspector also raised concerns with the detailed design of the previous proposal, with paragraph 10 stating:

*“I am also not convinced by the detailed design of the building. I can appreciate that the building has not been designed to appear as a pastiche early 19th century outbuilding, but the building appears as a halfway house with some modern elements and some traditional elements to give an appearance of semi-classical coach house. The design of the proposal particularly of the open car parking arches and the overall bulk and weight of the building would draw the eye away from the rear of the pub and cause harm to the setting of the Cottage. In this context I recognise and appreciate that the setting of the pub has already to a certain extent been degraded by other development adjacent and nearby. However, the setting to the front and the rear conversely becomes more important as being the few areas left where it is still possible to appreciate the heritage asset”.*

- 9.9 The now proposed scheme is considered to have also addressed these issues in full. The reduction in height and bulk, together with the proposed roof eaves height being in line with the public house (but the ridge line is significantly below it) are considered to be positive steps. Furthermore, specific elements previously criticised (car parking arches) have been removed and the materials seek to replicate/respect the listed pub (slate roof / rendered walls) and provide a simple but classical form which raises no objection from the Historic Buildings Consultant. Subject to a number of detailed matters being secured via condition, the proposals are considered to have overcome the previous reason for refusal and, moreover, in themselves are considered to comply with Policies CS7 and CS33.

**d) Amenity of future occupiers and impact on existing neighbours**

- 9.10 To provide some context in relation to this matter, the previous proposal was not refused on this basis. In dismissing the appeal the Inspector comment on this specific matter. With this in mind it is noted that policy DM4 seeks that development will not cause a significantly detrimental impact to the living environment of existing and new residential properties.
- 9.11 With regard to existing nearby occupiers, it should be noted that residential dwellings surrounding the application site are set at differing land levels. No. 308 Kennetside is set at the same ground level as the existing public house and would have views of the upper storey of the development. However, the second storey element is set away from the boundary with No. 308 and no significantly harmful loss of amenity is envisaged. The ground level of the properties at Canal Way fronting east and Lock Place fronting west toward the application site are set at a raised ground level to the application site and due to the careful positioning of the proposed accommodation no significantly harmful overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of outlook, daylight, sunlight, overshadowing or sense of enclosure is envisaged. With regard to use of the proposed rooms, which will be accessed from the car park when the pub is closed, the level of activity generated specifically from 6 rooms is not considered to result in unacceptable noise and disturbance to nearby occupiers. No concerns in these regards have been raised in observations from Environmental Protection colleagues, as per section 6a above. Accordingly the proposal is considered to be acceptable in respect of not harming the amenity of existing/future nearby occupiers.
- 9.12 Turning to consider the amenity of the proposed 6 bedrooms, this is considered on balance to be acceptable for short-stay ancillary accommodation to the public house. Although the lower ground floor rooms are single aspect, three of the four will be supplemented with rooflights and thereby an adequate level of outlook and access to day/sunlight will be provided. The two upper ground floor rooms will be triple aspect and provide a suitable standard of accommodation.

**e) Highways and parking**

- 9.13 As per the Transport Planning observations provided above at section 6c above, the proposals are considered appropriate in all highways and parking ways, subject to conditions relating to a CMS and compliance conditions in relation vehicular parking, cycle parking and waste storage.

**f) Landscaping and ecology**

- 9.14 As per sections 6d and 6e of this report, the proposals are considered acceptable from landscaping and ecology perspectives, subject to conditions securing the landscaping

scheme proposed (and its maintenance) and a pre-commencement condition relating to a Japanese Knotweed eradication strategy.

g) Other matters

9.15 Sustainability - In line with the Sustainability SPD (which feeds into adopted policies CS1 and DM1) a BREEAM pre-assessment should have been submitted with the application. No substantial details have been submitted and therefore it is considered necessary to secure two conditions to ensure the proposal contributes sufficiently to the aforementioned policy and guidance. The first, a pre-commencement condition, seeks an interim BREEAM certificate to demonstrate that the development would achieve the required 'very good' rating. The second element, secured prior to first occupation, will secure a copy of the final BREEAM certificate of compliance, which shall demonstrate that a 'very good' rating has been achieved. In correspondence, it is acknowledged that the applicant has raised concerns with these conditions, outlining the potential limitation of the works being to a listed building, meaning certain criteria will not be achievable.

9.16 In response, officers recognise that there may be inherent difficulties incorporating substantial sustainability improvements within schemes such as this, particularly where this application site relates to a listed building. As such, should there be shortfalls in the subsequent discharge of condition submissions (i.e. not in line with the wording of the condition), mitigating factors will be taken into account by officers when subsequently assessing such matters (i.e. a flexible approach to the stipulations of the BREEAM rating will be able to be applied by officers in the event that justifiable reasons for any shortfalls are put forward for consideration by the applicant). As such, the conditions are considered to be necessary in this case (and pass the other tests of a condition too), but a degree of flexibility will be able to be applied by officers (if applicable) in the future at the discharge of conditions stage.

9.17 CIL - As the proposed use is ancillary Class A4 accommodation (and not standalone hotel accommodation) the proposal will not be CIL liable.

9.18 Conclusion

It is considered that the proposals are acceptable for the reasons set out in this report. In summary, the proposal is considered to adequately overcome the previous reason for refusal / reasons for the subsequent appeals being dismissed and, moreover, is considered appropriate on its own merits.

**10. RECOMMENDATION:**

Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions.

Grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions.

**11. Conditions**

**180625/FUL**

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission was granted.

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 approved shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the following drawings/documents:

1803(PL)10 Rev P2 - Proposed Lower Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)11 Rev P2 - Proposed Upper Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)12 Rev P2 - Proposed Site Plan Roof Level, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)20 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)21 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)30 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Elevations, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)31 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Elevations, as received 02/05/18  
2492-5-2 DR-0001 Rev S3-P3 - Landscape Proposals, as received 11/04/18

Reason: To clarify which drawings have been approved and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to provide for:
  - a) space on site where vehicles of site operatives and visitors can be parked with details of how site operatives and visitors will be required to make use of the parking area provided
  - b) location on site for storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
  - c) the erection and maintenance (including removal of any graffiti or fly posters) of security hoarding around the site
  - d) any footpath closures or road closures needed during construction
  - e) wheel washing facilities on site
  - f) a scheme for recycling waste resulting from the construction works

The measures within the approved Construction Method Statement shall be maintained and adhered to throughout the course of the development unless changes are agreed in advance and in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of local land uses or neighbouring residents, the character of the area 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).

4. No room within the extension hereby permitted shall be occupied until all vehicle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with approved plan 1803(PL)11 Rev P2 - Proposed Upper Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18. The spaces shall be kept available for parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers and reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be a danger to other road users to accord 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).

5. No room within the extension hereby permitted shall be occupied until the bicycle parking facility for the building has been provided in accordance with approved plan 1803(PL)11 Rev P2 - Proposed Upper Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18. The facility shall be kept available for bicycle parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To encourage travel by sustainable alternatives to driving a motorcar, in accordance with policies CS23 and CS24 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015).

6. No room within the extension shall be occupied until the bin storage facility shown on approved plan 1803(PL)11 Rev P2 - Proposed Upper Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18 has been provided and the bin storage facility shall be retained thereafter for use by occupiers of the building at all times.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient provision is made for the storage and collection of refuse and recyclables and to safeguard the amenity (including visual 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).

7. No development shall take place until a Japanese Knotweed eradication strategy has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall include details of and timescales for knotweed eradication, and, if the knotweed has not been eradicated at the time of commencement of works, details of the measures to be put in place to ensure that works do not cause its spread. The eradication strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless changes are agreed in advance and in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that Japanese knotweed is controlled and not spread, thereby avoiding a significant adverse effect on biodiversity. More specifically, Japanese Knotweed is an invasive species listed on Schedule 9, Section 14, of The Wildlife and Countryside Act and can have an adverse effect on biodiversity by outcompeting native species. For this reason, it is illegal to cause its spread in the wild. This is in accordance with Policies CS36 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015).

8. The hard and soft landscaping of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out, in accordance with the approved landscaping plan 2492-5-2 DR-0001 Rev S3-P3 - Landscape Proposals, as received 11/04/18. The soft landscaping shall take place no later than during the first planting season following the date when the development hereby permitted is ready for occupation or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interest of ensuring that the landscaping of the development enhances the visual local environment and in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM18 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

9. All planted materials shall be maintained for five years and any trees or plants removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the new development and in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM18 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

10. No development shall take place until a copy of an Interim BREEAM Certificate in accordance with the BREEAM Sustainability Standard demonstrating compliance with a minimum standard of BREEAM Very Good rating has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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), Policy DM1 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) and SPD Sustainable Design and Construction (2011).

11. No room shall be occupied until a copy of a Final BREEAM Certificate in accordance with the BREEAM Sustainability Standard following a post-construction stage review carried out by a licensed assessor has been submitted to and receipt acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority, demonstrating that the development has attained as a minimum the standard set out in the Interim BREEAM Certificate referred to in the above condition.

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), Policy DM1 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) and SPD Sustainable Design and Construction (2011).

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no enlargement, improvements or other alteration to the building hereby permitted shall be carried out and no building or enclosures shall be erected or installed within the curtilage of the building(s) without the express planning permission from the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring properties and to protect and maintain the character of the area in accordance with Policies CS7 and CS33 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015).

13. The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the use of the principal building as a drinking establishment (Class A4). The extension shall not be used or occupied as a separate residential dwelling or dwellinghouse (Class C3), house in multiple occupation (Class C4 or Sui Generis) or standalone hotel accommodation (Class C1) without the express planning permission from the local planning authority.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application, to ensure the extension is not used for unauthorised purposes and to ensure that separate occupation of the extension/building would not detract from the amenities or living conditions of neighbouring residential properties, the character of the locality and/or noise, traffic congestion and excessive on-street parking, in accordance with Policies CS10 and CS24 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policies DM4 and DM12 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

## Informatives

1. i) 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.  
  
ii) Any works affecting the Highway shall be in accordance with Reading Borough's Council's document "Guidance Notes for Activities on the Public Highway within the Borough of Reading". The applicant should note that compliance with this document is mandatory and licences to work on the Highway will only be issued if the requirements contained within it are met. A copy can be obtained from the Council's website.
2. The Local Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant during the assessment of the application, to enable a positive officer recommendation to be made.
3. Noisy construction, demolition and associated activities should be restricted to between the hours of 08:00hrs to 18:00hrs Mondays to Fridays, and 09:00hrs to 13:00hrs on Saturdays, with no noisy works taking place at any time on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays.
4. There should be no burning of waste on the site.
5. In accordance with Article 35 (DMPO 2015) some conditions have been highlighted to make clear that they require approval from the Local Planning Authority before any development begins. This is because the details need to be designed or works implemented before any other works start on the site or are of a nature that it would be impractical to consider after work has started.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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](http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/partywall)

## 180626/LBC

1. The works to which this consent relate shall be begun not later than the expiration of 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 the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The consent relates only to the following plans/drawings/documents, and the works hereby approved shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the submitted application and accompanying drawings:

1803(PL)10 Rev P2 - Proposed Lower Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)11 Rev P2 - Proposed Upper Ground Floor, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)12 Rev P2 - Proposed Site Plan Roof Level, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)20 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)21 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Sections, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)30 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Elevations, as received 02/05/18  
1803(PL)31 Rev P1 - Proposed Site Elevations, as received 02/05/18

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).

3. Prior to commencement of the relevant part of the works, details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council:
  - a) 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.
  - b) Elevation and section drawings, with materials annotated, of new rooflights at a minimum scale of 1:10. Rooflights are to be conservation type, fitted flush with or below the roof covering.
  - c) 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.
  - d) Samples of the render and roof tiles for the extension and any roof tiles to make up for any deficit of roof tiles.

The development shall not be carried out other than 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).

Informatives:

1. Officers have worked positively and proactively with the applicant to determine the application within the agreed timeframes in conjunction with the associated application for full planning permission.
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.