

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT:

179 Oxford Road, Reading
App No: 161430/FUL

Case Officer: Daniel Murkin
Target date: 20.10.2016

Proposal: Rear extension to second floor to enlarge 2x1 bedroom flats on approved application ref: 11/01564/FUL into 2x2 bedroom flats.

INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises of an office to flats conversion on three storeys and is adjoined by a new block of flats to the rear (built under the earlier permission for this site).

It is situated in a mixed use but predominantly residential area just outside of the Reading Central Core Area. No. 179 falls within the Russell Street/Castle Hill Conservation Area and forms part of a terraced row of listed properties (Nos. 149 to 177 Oxford Road). The site has frontages to both Oxford Road and Goldsmid Road which is set back over 30m beyond the new flats and associated car park.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey extension on the rear second floor to enlarge the two approved one bedroom flats on that floor (Ref. 11/01564/FUL) into two bedroom flats. Permission 11/01564/FUL is at the time of writing, considered to be substantially completed.

The extension to the existing flats would occupy the flat roof area of the rear extension on the permitted scheme which is now completed and comprise of approx. 27.6 sq. metres additional floorspace (4.3/4.9m in depth) to provide the flats with a second bathroom with an en-suite bathroom.

The extension would be finished in brick, with window and cornice detail to match the treatment of the remainder of the building facing Goldsmid Road.

PLANNING HISTORY

11/01564/FUL (111484)	Re-modelling of front elevation of 179 Oxford Road & conversion of offices to provide 4 x 2-bedroom flats & 2 x 1-bedroom flats including demolition of modern single-storey rear section. Construction of 2 x 2-bedroom flats & 1 x 1-bedroom flat to the rear fronting Goldsmid Road (Re-submission	PER 27.4.2012
--------------------------	---	---------------

of application 10/01540/FUL)

11/01742/CON Demolition of single storey buildings to the rear of 179 Oxford Road

PER 27.4.2012

140215/APPCON Application for approval of details reserved by condition. (11/01564/FUL) discharged 23/4/15

161736 Erection of a part third floor to provide an additional one bedroom flat to approved application ref: 11/01564/FUL

NO DEC.

CONSULTATIONS

RBC Historic Buildings Advisor: Objection - addition of a third storey would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. It would tend to dominate (and detract from) the significance of the adjacent listed building(s) and their settings through the introduction of an overly dominant new building in close proximity. Thus contrary to S.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990, the NPPF and Policy CS33 of the Core Strategy.

RBC Environmental Health (Protection & Nuisance): No objection with the following comments:

Noise:

- proposal relates to an extension to the rear of the second floor. The façade in question will be fronting onto Goldsmid Road rather than the busy Oxford Road. Therefore, assuming double glazed units are installed, would not expect there to be an adverse noise impact on the flats.

Air Quality:

- 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.
- development is located within an air quality management area that RBC have identified with monitoring as being a pollution hot-spot (likely to breach the EU limit value for NO₂) and introduces new exposure/receptors. On the assumption that suitable scheme/mitigation measures for protecting the residents from the effects of poor air quality was previously submitted and approved with application 11/01564/FUL, and that those measures will

remain intact with the new extension, further details should not be required at this stage.

Advises that the applicant should be aware of other mitigation measures against increased exposure (where converting an existing building and allowing a buffer zone is not an option) including:

- creating a barrier between the property and the carriageway, such as close boarded fencing or planting vegetation.
- mechanical ventilation - inlets from the 'clean' side of the development, long term maintenance needs to be addressed
- habitable rooms - consider placing stairwells, corridors and bathrooms on the façade fronting pollution source
- mixed use - locate any sensitive uses on higher floors, allowing commercial use on lower elevations
- balconies - consider avoiding use in areas of exceedance, especially on ground and first floor level
- non-opening front windows - this should only be considered in certain circumstances, needs to be balanced against loss of freedom for future occupants

Contaminated land:

- The proposal site lies adjacent to the site of a former laundry which was located to the rear of 179 Oxford Road. This may have potentially caused contaminated land however, because the proposal relates to an extension on the second floor, a contaminated land assessment is not required.

Recommends informatives regarding the internal sound insulation requirements (under Building Regulations) and construction hours plus no burning of waste during the demolition and construction period.

RBC Transport Strategy: No objection with the following comments:

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. This zone is well served by public transport, with buses continuing either into or out of the Central Core Area via this zone.

In accordance with the adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD, the development would be required to provide a parking provision of 1 space per 1-bedroom flat or 1 space per 2-bedroom flat. Therefore, the proposed

extension to the second floor to enlarge the existing flats into 2-bedroom units would have no impact on the required parking provision for the site.

Neighbour Notification:

Properties at Nos. 177, 179a and 181 Oxford Road were consulted on 17th October 2016. There have been no responses or other representations received.

RELEVANT 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) published in March 2012 - 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 and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. The closer the policies in the plan are to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given.

In Paragraph 7, the NPPF defines sustainable development and the social role of the planning system in supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations. In Section 6: Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes local planning authorities are advised to boost significantly the supply of housing and that applications for such should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Section 12: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

Paragraph 132 advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, 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.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development

which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority 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 addition, Section 72(1) of the Act provides that the local authority has a statutory duty that with respect of any building or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

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

Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

- CS1 Sustainable Construction and Design
- CS4 Accessibility and the intensity of development
- CS7 Design and the Public Realm
- CS9 Infrastructure, Services, Resources and Amenities
- CS15 Location, Accessibility, Density and Housing Mix
- CS18 Residential Conversions
- CS20 Implementation of the Reading Transport Strategy
- CS24 Car/Cycle Parking
- CS33 Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment

Reading Central Area Action Plan 2009

- RC14 Public Realm

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

- SD1 Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development
- DM3 Infrastructure Planning
- DM4 Safeguarding Amenity
- DM5 Housing Mix
- DM6 Affordable Housing
- DM8 Residential Conversions
- DM10 Private and Communal Outdoor Space
- DM12 Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters
- DM19 Air Quality

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD 2011
- Residential Conversions SPD (2013)

APPRAISAL

PRINCIPAL MATTERS:

Principle of Residential Use and Housing Mix

The Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015), under Policy SD1, reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development with the Council working proactively with applicants to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved where possible and improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

The proposal seeks an intensification of such use that would alter the mix of dwelling units on the site. As a result of the proposal there would be a change in the mix from 4x2bed plus 2x1bed to 6x2bed flats in the extended and converted building fronting Oxford Road. If taken together with the separate block of 3no. new flats (incl. 1x1bed) built to the rear under the same permission this would give 8x2bed and 1x1bed flat in total on the whole development.

The other current application for a 1x1 bed flat on an additional floor above the main building (Ref. 161736), if also granted, would restore one of the one bed units lost under this proposal and provide an overall mix on the site of 8x2bed and 2x1bed flats (or 6x2bed and 4x1bed if 161430 were to be refused).

Policy CS15 (Location, Accessibility, Density and Housing Mix) of the Core Strategy sets out factors that inform an appropriate mix for residential development including other uses in the area, accessibility, the quality of the design and need to minimise the environmental impacts including any detriment to neighbour amenities.

Policy DM5 (Housing Mix) of the SDPD states that 50% of new developments involving 10 or more dwellings are required to have 3 bedrooms or more.

A suitable mix of dwelling types was considered to have been achieved for this whole development site (including the separate block to the rear) under the permission granted in 2012. In terms of intensification of use on the site, the replacement of two one bedroom dwellings with two bedroom dwellings, leaving one 1x one bed flat out of nine in total for the whole site would not alter the predominant form of dwellings available in the vicinity or thus give rise to any specific conflict with Policy DM5. In terms of the flats being extended, it is accepted that they would be generally more pleasant units, notwithstanding that existing bedrooms will be deprived of some sunlight and daylight.

However, there is a separate consideration to be made in terms of its cumulative impact on the physical character of the area. The Council's adopted **Residential Conversions SPD** provides a detailed checklist for self-contained flat conversions.

In order to achieve an appropriate mixed and sustainable community that respects the physical character of the area, it must be demonstrated how proposals contribute to an acceptable housing mix taking Policy DM5 into account even where less than 10 dwellings are proposed.

How the proposed extension would alter the character of the area and whether it would be an undesirable intensification is thus another factor and this is looked at under the separate heading below.

Design, Layout and Residential Amenities

Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Core Strategy seeks that all development is of a high design quality that maintains the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.

Similarly, **Policy CS18** (Residential Conversions) assesses proposals against the impact on the amenity and character of the surrounding area in terms of intensification of activity, loss of privacy etc.

Policy DM8 (Residential Conversions) sets out the general requirements for which proposals to convert to self-contained flats are considered to be acceptable and the Council's adopted **Residential Conversions SPD** provides a detailed checklist for such flat conversions. Proposed external alterations including extensions are considered under checklist 1 & 2, the overall housing mix (checklist 3) and the provision of appropriate outdoor space (checklist 4). The SPD then considers other aspects of the internal conversion including sound insulation (checklist 8), stacking between floors (checklist 9) and habitable room windows (checklist 10). The criteria for external layouts include parking (checklist 13), boundary treatments (checklist 15), cycle and refuse storage (checklists 16 & 17).

Many of these aspects of the proposal relating to the internal floor arrangements and external site layout together with a general assessment of the impacts would have previously been considered in granting permission for the development of 8no. flats (under Ref. 111484) in 2012.

It should be noted that the current application is independent of 161736 (the proposed additional floor to create a 1 bed flat) and neither layouts are dependent on the other with the upper floor flats in the conversion all accessed via a central staircase in the front building that would be continued up to the third floor.

Additional considerations necessary for the current proposal for two bedroom dwellings are thus limited to the size and layout. Whilst one of the rear facing windows serving bedroom 1 in these Flats 4 & 5 would be omitted it is nonetheless

accepted that future occupants would be provided with sufficient daylight and outlook from the habitable rooms and an increased living space that maximised the natural light opportunities. In terms of stacking, the second bedrooms in the extended part would be situated directly above bedrooms on the first floor in Flats 2 & 3 whilst appropriate sound insulation measures between the floors would be achievable.

Policy DM10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) sets out that dwellings will be provided with functional private or communal open space. The design of these should be similar to others in the vicinity, relate to entrances and be perceived as safe to future residents and not overlooked or overshadowed etc.

In this respect the approved layout of the site includes provision of private outdoor space accessed by occupiers of the two 2-bed ground floor flats only. The approved layouts for obvious practical security and privacy reasons means that none of the upper floor flats in this development would have access to this space therefore no intensification issues arise.

Impact on Character of the Surrounding Area and Heritage Assets

Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that development is of a high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.

Policy CS33 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment) states that planning permission will only be granted where development has no adverse impact on historic assets (such as listed buildings and conservation areas) and their settings. All proposals will be expected to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area in which they are located.

Furthermore, checklist 1 of the **Residential Conversions SPD** considers whether the proposal would be an undesirable intensification of use on the property, where such may impact on the physical character of the area.

Firstly, the application has not been presented with a heritage statement, in accordance with the Council's validation requirements for planning applications. This should have been spotted by the previous planning officer, but it means that the application has not been supplied with any supporting information as to the nature of the heritage assets, their significance, or how they would be affected.

The proposed extension would be highly visible and prominently situated in a sensitive location, forming part of the Russell Street/Castle Hill Conservation Area, whilst No. 179 is also adjacent to a terraced row of listed buildings - the end one

of which No. 177 physically abuts and has a double storey (two and half storeys equivalent in height) rear bay projection to less than half the depth of the rear extension granted as part of the conversion and now built at No. 179.

The principal concern in this regard is the appearance of the additional floor when seen in the context of the rear views as experienced from the rear of the development, i.e. from the Goldsmif Road area and how the development is seen through the accessway. Here, there is a clear vista of the rear of the properties along Oxford Road, some of them, Listed.

The Council's Heritage Advisor has confirmed that the proposed addition of a third storey and the additional bulk that would create would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The two storey extension built at No. 179 replaced a collection of unsightly extensions to the rear and thus enhanced the area. However, the prevalent form of the extensions that have been made to the rear of Oxford Road in the Conservation Area do not extend beyond two storeys. A third storey rear extension would therefore be out of keeping with the surrounding Conservation Area and by its proximity, tend to dominate the setting of the adjacent listed buildings - No. 177 its immediate neighbour, in particular.

This feeling of overdevelopment would be exacerbated by not only the proposed height, but also the positioning of the extension forward of the curved double-storey bow extension on the neighbouring Listed Building. This bow is a pleasing and characteristic feature of the Conservation Area and such features should be respected and celebrated in such Areas, not adversely affected by insensitive developments. It is unfortunate that the applicant's plans have included a 3D representation of the proposed development which does not manage to correctly portray the curve of the bow. Whereas at the moment, the parapet height of the two-storey extension (although wide) at the application property is some 2.2m below the parapet height of the neighbouring bow projection, the proposed extension would bring it to the same height. This extension would be coming 2.4m in front of the bow (southwards, towards Goldsmid Road). Therefore, whilst this relationship is just about acceptable when the neighbouring development is one floor below, it becomes unacceptable once at the same height. The extension would therefore appear prominent in the row of buildings, when seen from the rear, causing harm to the views in the Conservation Area (and therefore failing to at least preserve its character); and due to its height, width and forward projection, would be overbearing and therefore harmful to the immediate setting of the adjacent Listed Building.

It is considered that this harm will be substantial and this should form a reason for refusal of permission, primarily due to conflict with policies CS33 and CS7.

Impact on Neighbour Amenities: overlooking and overbearing to flats

Policy DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity) considers whether development will cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or residential properties in terms of privacy, noise and disturbance, lighting, fumes, smell or crime and safety (etc.).

Due to the distance (over 25m) towards the nearest residential dwellings at the rear of the site (including those in the new build block of flats within the same development) the proposals do not give rise to any new concerns about overlooking or loss of privacy to these properties.

The flank walls of the extension would be set in by between 1.5 and 2m from the respective boundaries with the adjoining buildings. The nearest habitable room windows are the centred ground and first floor openings within the shallow bow projection at listed No. 177; and on an upper floor of No. 179a (with fire escape to roof of ground floor addition below). The extension would not interrupt an angle of more than 45 degrees taken from the centre of these windows.

The approved floor layouts for the conversion of No. 179 include rear facing bedroom windows on both the ground and second first floors. These are likely to be completed. These units face south, but the flats are narrow at 4.5-5.1 metres, with the western ones narrower. Of concern is therefore the light which would be received by the 'tunnelback' windows: Bedroom 1 of Flat 1 and Flat 6 on the ground floor, and also Bedroom 1 of Flats 2 and 3 on the first floor. This would be most keenly felt by the occupants of the ground floor flats, where there is considered to be a material difference between a two-storey immediate obstruction and a three-storey immediate obstruction.

Impact on gardens

There is no rear garden to No. 179a - the large ground floor addition occupying the whole of the former garden; whilst for the same reason the height above ground of the proposed second floor would not noticeably affect the amount of daylight or sunlight received from the south to the garden of No. 177. As such, there are no concerns regarding outlook and natural daylight for the occupants of adjoining neighbouring dwellings.

The development would involve an additional storey of development which would produce additional overbearing to the two private rear gardens which are to be provided for Flats 1 and 6 on the ground floor. This would mean an additional and immediate height of development over their small gardens. The gardens

themselves are only 6 metres deep from the back of the 'outrigger'/extension elements; the effect of the development would raise the height of the development to 8 metres, which is considered to produce an unneighbourly impression of overbearing.

Therefore, in amenity terms, the effect this application would have the most impact on the ground floor, two-bedroom family units: in terms of the light they would receive and the enjoyment of their gardens. Therefore a combined reason for refusal on the adverse impact on the ground floor flats is also recommended, as failing to comply with policies DM4 and DM11.

OTHER MATTERS:

Highways and Transport Issues

Policy CS4 (Accessibility and the Intensity of Development) of the Core Strategy relates the scale and density of development to its level of accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport to a range of services and facilities with sites assessed in terms of their accessibility to a defined district or local centre. A good level of accessibility is considered to be that within 400m of a defined centre with a good range of facilities and within 400m by pedestrian routes of a bus stop served frequently (ie. one bus every 20 minutes in each direction between 0700-1900).

Policy CS20 (Implementation of the Reading Transport Strategy) of the Core Strategy considers the contribution that proposals make to a balanced transport network whilst **Policy CS24** (Car/Cycle Parking) applies the maximum car/cycle parking standards applicable in relation to the accessibility of locations within the Borough to sustainable transport facilities in particular public transport.

Policy DM12 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters) considers various implications including the additional trip generation of proposals, which are permitted where there is no detrimental impact on the functioning of the transport network or to the safety of users including pedestrians and cyclists.

The site is within walking distance of Reading Central Area and its full range of shops and other facilities served by regular public transport and thus considered accessible.

The Council's Transport Strategy Development Control Advisor has confirmed that the parking provision requirement for this site would be unchanged by the enlarged flat sizes for which the same standard applies. The applicant has

previously accepted that there will be no parking permit entitlement to the future occupants of the new dwellings.

Refuse bin and cycle storage position and facilities are also satisfactory as previously approved and therefore the proposals accord with the above policies in all these respects.

Affordable Housing

Policy DM6 (Affordable Housing) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) sets out the proportion of affordable housing provision by the number of dwellings per site.

For sites of 1-4 dwellings a 10% provision towards affordable housing will be required, ideally on site (in line with the policy presumption). However, registered providers may not be interested in having a single unit at a site and/or separate servicing/access requirements may prevent this. Scheme viability may also mean it is not possible to provide affordable housing on site. However, the policy presumption is for affordable housing to be secured on site in the first instance, unless it can be demonstrated otherwise.

The affordable contribution made in lieu of affordable homes on site would thus need to be the equivalent of 10% of the gross development value of the new homes in order to reflect the true value of (the financial contribution would actually equate to 5% of the GDV, as per the Affordable Housing SPD). A contribution would be used to grant fund and bring forward affordable homes for nomination by Reading Borough Council. Any form of contribution towards affordable housing (either on or off site) is secured in full via Section 106 Legal Agreement.

At its Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport Committee on 13th July 2016 agreed to implement Policy DM6 as drafted but excluding proposals that solely involve the conversion of an existing property, where the conversion involves the provision of 10 or less dwelling units or the replacement of dwellings by the same number of replacement dwellings where there is no net increase.

The advice of the Council's Solicitor has been sought regarding any further affordable housing contribution Policy DM6 that should be sought for this application which proposes to extend the approved second floor rear addition granted under Ref. 11/01564. The floorspace of the two flats would increase by approximately 28 sqm in total but there would be no change in the overall number or to the layout of any of the dwellings (only the mix) approved under 11/01564 which was for 4x2 bed flats and 2x1 bed flats. Thus, to all intents and purposes, it is effectively the same development and the minor layout change would not warrant such a contribution.

Furthermore, the approved and built scheme under 11/0564 was subject to a S106 agreement with contributions for leisure, education and transport only and there was no affordable housing policy applicable to schemes of this size at that time of the original permission.

In the circumstances, legal advice concurs that Policy DM6 could not be applied retrospectively since the proposed development does not increase the number of residential units but simply enlarges them.

The proposal does not therefore fall within the requirement for a financial contribution towards off-site provision of affordable housing and thus there is no conflict with the relevant policies in this regard.

Environmental Issues

Policy DM19 (Air Quality) of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 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.

The site is within an Air Quality Management Area of the Borough. Accordingly, a condition was imposed on the original planning permission and has since been discharged (under Ref. 140215 in April 2015) by the submission of details of a scheme for protecting residents from poor air quality. On this basis, the Council's Environmental Health Officer has accepted that no further details are required to satisfy the aim of the policy.

Infrastructure

Policy DM3 (Infrastructure Planning) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) confirms that appropriate provision for infrastructure, services, resources and amenities will be made through planning obligations and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy as relevant.

This proposed development is not CIL liable as less than 100 square metres of new floorspace is proposed.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION:

This application to increase the size of these flats at second floor level is in all other respects considered to be acceptable, but this does not outweigh the harm identified that would be caused to Heritage Assets and the amenities of the ground floor flats and for these reasons the application should be refused.

1. Due to its height, width and forward projection in close proximity to the neighbouring building, the extension would be out of keeping with the prevalent form of extensions in the surrounding area and thus fail to preserve or enhance views within, and therefore the character or appearance of the Russell Street/Castle Hill Conservation Area. In addition, the height, width and forward projection would also dominate and therefore cause harm to the setting of the adjacent Listed Building. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the impacts on these designated heritage assets would not cause substantial harm and as such is contrary to Section 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and 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).
2. Due to the additional and unsympathetic harm to the existing ground floor flats on the same site through additional overbearing/visual dominance of habitable rooms and private gardens (and access to sunlight/daylight of habitable rooms), the proposal is considered to result in a significant detriment impact to the living environment of existing /new residential flats. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity) and DM10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012, altered 2015).

1. This application for planning permission has been refused on the basis of the following plans and information:

8652-01	Location Plan & Site Plan
8161-05 Rev. A	Ground Floor Plan and First Floor Plan [existing]
Drawing 8652-06	Proposed Second Floor Plan REAR EXTENSION
Drawing 8652-PL-07 Rev. B	Proposed Roof Plan [presume same as existing]
Drawing 8652-09	Proposed North-Rear Elevation [for information only]

Received by the Local Planning Authority on 29th July 2016

2. The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in dealing with the planning application by advising on matters to make the proposal acceptable and

dealing with the application in a timely manner. However, the application is not supportable by officers and no request to withdraw the application has been received, hence the issuing of this notice of refusal of planning permission.

This planning application was submitted without the benefit of first seeking pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority, which can often result in the avoidance of refusal of planning permission. Please see the following link to the Council's pre-application service here:

http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/1190/Pre-Application-Enquiry-Form/pdf/Pre-app_1_Revised_Nov_2016.pdf

Regarding reason for refusal 1 above, it should be noted that the application was not provided with a Heritage Statement to correctly identify and describe the development and the impact on Heritage Assets, justification, mitigation, etc.

-END-