

Application No: 170574/FUL

Address: 8 Ardler Road, Caversham

Proposal: Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 2 x 2 storey semi-detached houses

Case officer: Ethne Humphreys

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site relates to a bungalow located on the west side of Ardler Road. The properties in the wider area are similar in terms of design and architectural composition, with the bungalow a bit of an anomaly. There are residential dwellings to the south of the site and allotment gardens to the north of the site. The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 as designated by the Environment Agency and is within an air quality management area.

Proposal:

This is an application for one pair of 2 storey semi-detached dwellings following demolition of the existing bungalow. The proposed dwellings would have a depth of 10.58m, width of 4.5m and height of 8.8m. There would be a distance of between 1.5m and 0.6m to the southern boundary and between 1.3m to the northern boundary.

Specific details of the proposed materials have not been provided.

Plans Considered:

Drawing No: Location Plan 17007-0-001 P1

Drawing No: Site Plan Existing 17007-0-002 P2

Drawing No: Site Plan Proposed 17007-0-003 P1

Drawing No: Ground Floor Level Proposed 17007-0-010 P1

Drawing No: First Floor Level Proposed 17007-0-011 P1

Drawing No: Front Elevation Proposed 16007-0-020 P1

Drawing No: Rear Elevation Proposed 17007-0-021 P1

Drawing No: Side Elevation Proposed 17007-0-022 P1

Received 11th April 2017

CGI's

Received 18th May 2017

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

Highways Officer: Revised plans required.

Ecology: Object, insufficient information.

Environment Agency: Object.

No neighbour letters of representation received.

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

Various concerns were raised under Pre-application advice application (which were for a different proposal) 162045; however, this was submitted by a different agent. No pre-app sought for this specific scheme.

The agent was advised by email that the application was attracting a refusal as the proposals were not considered to overcome the concerns raised that the pre-application advice stage, namely with regards to the character of the surrounding area, impact on neighbour amenity, lack of information relating to flood risk, lack of affordable housing contribution and lack of parking/highways information. The agent was also advised of inaccuracies within the plans submitted. The agent confirmed by email 7th July that they wished to receive the decision notice, with a view to appeal any such refusal.

Equality Act 2010:

In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2008 (amended 2015)

- CS1 Sustainable Construction and Design
- CS7 Design and the Public Realm
- CS14 Housing Provision
- CS15 Location, Accessibility, Density and Housing Mix
- CS20 Implementation of the Reading Transport Strategy (Local Transport Plan 2006-2011)
- CS24 Car/Cycle Parking
- CS34 Pollution and Water Resources
- CS35 Flooding
- CS36 Biodiversity and Geology

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

- SD1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- DM1 Adaption to Climate Change
- DM4 Safeguarding Amenity
- DM5 Housing Mix
- DM6 Affordable Housing
- DM10 Private and Communal Outdoor Space
- DM19 Air Quality

RBC Supplementary Planning Documents

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

Supplementary Planning Document: Affordable Housing (July 2013)

Supplementary Planning Document: S106 Planning Obligations (March 2014)

The main issues are:

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Land Use Matters and Flood Risk
- c) Design, Impact on the Character of the Area and Street Scene
- d) Impact on Neighbour Amenity
- e) Amenity of Future Occupiers

- f) Transport Issues
- g) Ecology
- h) Sustainability
- i) Affordable Housing
- j) CIL

Principle of Development

The existing bungalow at the site is not considered to be of any particular architectural merit. The building is not listed, within a conservation area or locally listed. Within this context there is no in-principle objection to the existing building being demolished, subject to a reasonable redevelopment scheme taking its place.

The main policies to be considered are Policy CS35 'Flooding', Policy CS7 'Design and the Public Realm' and Policy DM11 'Development of Private Residential Gardens' in relation to the principle of the development. As set out below, the proposal is not considered to have satisfactorily met these policies.

Land Use Issues and Flood Risk

The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and designated by the Environment Agency. Government Guidance (PPG Flooding) specifies that dwelling houses have a flood risk vulnerability classification of 'more vulnerable'. The application site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Table 3 (para 067) of the PPG states that "some developments may contain different elements of vulnerability and the highest vulnerability category should be used unless the development is considered in its component parts". Therefore as the site falls within Zone 3 the Sequential and Exception Tests are required.

The Sequential Test assesses other potential sites in the borough with the aim of steering new development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding (Zone 1). If the applicant can demonstrate through the sequential process that a site with a lower probability of flood risk is not reasonably available a case can be put forward as to why the development could be considered as an exception. For the Exception Test to be passed (NPPF para 102) it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, and a Flood Risk Assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted; however, the applicant has not submitted a Sequential Test to consider sites in the borough that have a lower risk of flooding. Moreover, the Flood Risk Assessment states that “in light of presence of residential development on the site it is submitted that the sequential test has been passed”. Accordingly, it is considered that the development, in failing to provide a sequential test, is contrary to the NPPF and Policy CS35 that essentially presumes against development in an area identified as being at high risk of flooding and is recommended for refusal.

As the proposal is not considered to pass the Sequential Test, the next steps of an Exception Test and Flood Risk Assessment are not required. However, for completeness, it is not considered that the submission demonstrates that the site provides wider sustainability benefits to pass the Exception Test.

Further to the above, the Environment Agency has raised an objection to the proposals. The EA considers that the Flood Risk Assessment submitted does not comply with the requirements set out in para 30 part 7 of the Planning Practice Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework. The FRA does not therefore provide a suitable basis for an assessment to be made of the flood risk arising from the proposed development. In particular, the submitted FRA fails to demonstrate:

- 1) The loss of flood plain storage within the 1% annual probability (1 in 100) flood extend with an appropriate allowance for climate change caused by the proposed development can be mitigated for.
- 2) The proposed development has finished floor levels above the 1% annual probability (1 in 100) flood level with an appropriate allowance for climate change.
- 3) The exiting building footprint dimensions.

The above information should be provided as a minimum, and the flood risk assessment should demonstrate that the development would not increase flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduces flood risk overall. Specifically, developments within this location should also consider the impact of the proposal in terms of flood risk beyond the application site, such as details of flood water storage, resilience measures, safe egress or flood warning systems. No details of Sustainable Drainage Systems have been provided to demonstrate that the proposals would avoid increasing flood risk to surrounding properties and due to the proposals there would be an increase in surface water displaced. There proposals therefore could result in increased flood risk.

It is considered that the flood risk assessment submitted as part of the application is insufficient and fails to adequately demonstrate that the proposal would not result in an increased risk of flooding, contrary to Policy CS35, the NPPG and NPPF 2012.

Design, Impact on the Character of the Area and Street Scene

Notwithstanding the above in-principle objection to the proposals, there are concerns with the overall scale and design of the proposals, which are considered to appear out of keeping and incongruous with the street scene.

Policy CS7 states that “all development must be of a high design quality that maintains the character and appearance of the area” and Policy DM11 Development of Private Residential Gardens requires that new residential development makes a positive contribution to the character of the area in respect of the layout and spacing of the development; the form, height and massing of buildings; materials and appearance; and landscaping and boundary treatments.

The site was subject to pre-application advice, although it is recognised that the current agent was not party to this at the time. Albeit for a different proposal (addition of first floor to existing bungalow), it was considered that a more modest bungalow style property may be a possible way of extending the property at this site rather than the two storey building then proposed. It was also stated that any proposal would need to be accompanied by a street scene elevation drawing in order to demonstrate how any such proposal relates/responds to the prevailing character. The proposed CGI submitted is not entirely helpful, in that it appears to indicate the proposed dwellings forward of the adjacent row of terraces, and the proposed block plan shows them set further back in the plot. It is also not clear from the CGI's how the ridge height corresponds with this terraced row. It is also noted that the proposed flank elevation drawings do not show the proposed front porch elements. In relation to materials, Section 9 (Materials) of the application form states ‘see plans’ with regards the proposed materials. The proposed elevation drawings have not been annotated with details of materials. Page 13 of The Design and Access Statement submitted states that the appearance of the development ‘mimics the appearance of the adjoined terraced houses in built form, architectural detailing, fenestration and materials’. However, specific material details have not been stated. It is considered that these inaccuracies result in a substandard submission for planning permission and it is not considered that the scheme has had sufficient regard to the concerns raised at the pre-application advice stage.

It is considered that the plot sizes themselves would be in keeping with the characteristics of the area (similar to those to the south and east of the site. However, in terms of design, the proposed dwellings would not mimic the appearance of the adjacent terraced houses in built form, architectural detailing or fenestration as stated in the Design and Access Statement - nor would the design mimic other dwellings within the immediate vicinity as can clearly be seen in the CGI's. This in itself is not unacceptable, given the mixed design styles of the existing street scene. Whilst some indicative external materials have been submitted, details provided are not considered sufficient to ascertain the final appearance of the development. Should the application have otherwise been considered acceptable, a relevant materials condition could be imposed.

However, the dwellings proposed are considered to be too deep - again, not comparable to the adjacent row of terraced houses or other semi-detached properties within the street scene, as stated in the Design and Access Statement, as they would be significantly deeper. It is recognised that the existing bungalow is deep; however, due to its single storey nature this does not result in an overly dominant appearance. The proposed dwellings as designed appear too tall and thus narrow for their height, resulting in a disproportionate form of development. This combined with the siting and depth of the pair of semis, is considered to result in overdevelopment of the plot, with the proposed development being at odds with the character of this part of Ardler Road, failing to integrate well with the street scene in a sympathetic manner. The dwellings would appear overly dominant in relation to the neighbouring row of terraced properties and out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.

The NPPF seeks a presumption in favour of sustainable development with emphasis on the need to secure high quality design and a good standard of design, as well as taking account of the character of different areas. Paragraph 60 notes that "Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness."

Paragraph 65 states that "Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns

about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design.”

Therefore, whilst policies and decisions should encourage sustainable development and not seek to impose prescriptive design, appropriate weight should be attributed to promoting or reinforcing local distinctiveness. In this case it is not considered that the concerns with regards to the incompatibility with the existing street scene have been overcome by good design.

Given the above, due to its height, massing and scale, the proposal would appear overly dominant in relation to the neighbouring row of terraced properties, would appear as an overdevelopment within the plot and would appear out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development on Ardler Road. The proposal would appear poorly integrated within the Ardler Road streetscene, resulting in an overbearing and visually intrusive form of development to the smaller-scale residential to the south and the open character of the allotments to the north. For these reasons, the proposal would fail to maintain and enhance the character of the locality and would therefore be contrary to Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015), and Policies DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity) and DM11 Development of Private Residential Garden Land) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

The neighbouring property potentially affected by the proposals is No.6 Ardler Road, to the south of the site. Two first floor windows are proposed on the flank elevation facing this property. Given these would serve a bathroom and en-suite, they could be conditioned to be obscure glazed so not to result in any significant material loss of privacy.

The proposed building would be close to the common boundary, at a distance of between approximately 0.6m and 0.9m. The dwelling would project approximately 4m past the rear elevation of No.6 and at two storey height this is considered to result in a visually intrusive and overbearing impact to the owners of this property. It is recognised that the existing bungalow and single storey structures project significantly past the rear elevation of No.6; however, these are single storey with a greater gap to the boundary. This would be contrary to Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

If the development was acceptable in all other terms, the Environmental Health Team have raised no objection to the proposals subject to conditions relating to hours of construction and demolition and bonfires.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

It is considered that the proposals would provide an overall good standard of accommodation throughout with regular shaped rooms providing suitable outlook, natural lighting and ventilation.

Whilst the plot of 8A would taper towards the end, there would remain approximately 14m of rear garden space per dwelling. This is similar to that afforded to the terraced row to the south and as such would not be out of keeping with the characteristics of the area.

Transport Issues

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 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 SPD, the development would be required to provide 1 on-site parking space for each of the proposed 2 bedroom dwellings.

In the submitted statement the applicant states that the existing garage has a substandard garage and states that on street parking will be required for the new dwellings. It should be noted that although the garage may not meet the Councils current standards there is an area of hard standing at the front of the garage where one vehicle can be parked, therefore there is existing provision in place and as such each proposed new dwelling would require one off road parking space.

It should be noted Ardler Road currently has unrestricted parking; therefore there could be problems with parking on the carriageway which could have an impact on current residents of the street and could generate additional pressure for parking in the area. Revised plans are requested illustrating off road parking for the new dwellings including access arrangements.

In accordance with the adopted Parking SPD, the development is required to provide a minimum of 2 cycle parking spaces for each of the 2 bedroom C3 dwellings which should be in

a conveniently located, lockable, covered store. Plans submitted do not illustrate any provision for cycle storage. Details of the secure cycle storage will need to be submitted.

Bin storage has not been illustrated on plans. This should be located no further than 15m from the access point. Bin storage should comply with Manual for Streets and British Standard 5906: 2005 for Waste Management in Buildings to avoid the stationing of service vehicles on the carriageway for excessive periods.

Should the application be otherwise considered acceptable then the applicant would have been asked to submit revised plans with regards to parking. In this instance, however, the Council did not wish to cause any additional delay with requesting revised plans given the request to receive the decision notice. This information was also provided at the pre-application advice stage.

In light of the above, within the context of the information provided / not provided with the application, this forms a reason for refusal of the application.

In terms of waste / cycle storage, although not shown on the plans, transport officers are content that such matters could be secured via condition and therefore does not form a reason for refusal of the application.

Ecology

All bats are protected under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act as amended and the European Habitats and Species Directive (92/43/C) Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Bats and their shelters (roosts) are protected under this legislation. It is illegal to deliberately or recklessly disturb or obstruct access to any bat roost or to disturb a bat using such a place without first obtaining the relevant licence from Natural England.

When dealing with cases where a European protected species may be affected, a planning authority is a competent authority within the meaning of the Habitats Regulations, and therefore has a statutory duty under regulation to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in the exercise of its functions.

Paragraph 99 of the government guidance on Biodiversity in the planning system¹ (which has not revoked by the NPPF) states that:

'It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision.'

In addition to statutory obligations Reading Borough Council has planning policies to protect biodiversity.

The building has the potential to support roosting bats (it is a large bungalow, located close to optimal bat foraging habitat - adjacent allotment and trees - and is likely to have a number of features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats such as raised tiles, gaps under ridge tiles and behind soffit boxes) and the proposed development which involves demolition of the building could impact upon a bat roost if it were present. As such a survey undertaken by an appropriately qualified surveyor is required to determine the presence or otherwise of bats. As this has not been provided there is insufficient information for the Council to determine whether or not protected species (a material consideration) would be affected by the proposed development. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy CS36 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015).

Should the application be otherwise considered acceptable then the applicant would have been asked to submit a bat survey to this effect. In this instance, however, the Council did not wish to cause any additional delay with requesting revised plans given the request to receive the decision notice.

Sustainability

The appropriate level of sustainable construction would be secured the appropriate building regulations requirements, had the proposals been considered appropriate.

Affordable Housing

Following submission of the application the Council's legal challenge of Brandon Lewis's written statement of 28/11/14 (regarding affordable housing on sites of less than 10

dwelling) has been decided. The outcome of which is that the Council will continue to apply the relevant local planning policies regarding contributions to affordable housing.

The proposal seeks to create one additional dwelling and therefore a contribution towards off-site affordable housing provision is required as part of the application in accordance with Policy DM6 of the Reading Borough SDPD and the Affordable Housing SPD under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Following the Court of Appeal judgement the applicant has stated that they do not consider the required contribution to be necessary and they are not willing to agree to a section 106 agreement for this required contribution which would therefore form a reason for refusal of the application.

The applicant has not offered any financial appraisal of the proposal to suggest that a contribution sought by the Council would make the scheme unviable, but instead simply refers to the Court of Appeal judgment of 11 May 2016 in respect of a challenge to the Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 (WMS). DM6 is clearly that only in instance where it can be demonstrated through viability evidence that the provision would be unviable will the Council forgo or seek a lower contribution. As stated, no viability appraisal has been submitted with the application and it is not considered that the evidence submitted demonstrates that the development is completely unviable without the submission of some contribution towards affordable housing.

The Council's affordable housing policies are crucial in seeking to assist the Council in meeting the requirements of the NPPF which state that: *"local planning authorities should...use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework,...."*

The provision of affordable housing is a major issue in the borough. The borough experiences high levels of need as evidenced by a recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment and other indicators, its residents face major issues relating to affordability as a result of high and increasing house prices compared to average local incomes and significant issues in the future supply of affordable housing to meet identified needs.

Recent appeal decisions in the Reading Borough found in favour of the Council's approach, whereby the Planning Inspector has agreed with the Council's position that the 'local

circumstances in Reading justify the need for small sites to make contributions to affordable housing as an exception to national policy'. These include:

- Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/3162427 171 Blagdon Road, Reading
- Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/3153661 17 St Barnabas Road, Reading
- Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/3159962 8 Thornton Road, Reading
- Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/16/3154971 51 Cressingham Road, Reading

In the recent Appeal decision dated 2nd December 2016 (Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/3153661, 17 St Barnabas Road, Emmer Green RG4 8RA), the Inspector concluded that:

"In light of this, while the case in hand would be an exception to national policy, I consider there to be local circumstances that indicate the proposal should be determined in line with the development plan. A means of securing a contribution towards affordable housing would therefore, in my judgement, be justifiably sought in this instance. As the proposal fails to make an adequate provision for affordable housing, the development would also run contrary to Policy DM6 of the SDPD and the SPD."

In the recent Appeal decision dated 13th March 2017 (Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/16/316427 171 Blagdon Road, Reading, RG2 7NE) the Inspector concluded that:

'...given the circumstances of this proposal and the acute and substantial need for affordable housing in the Borough, and the significance of small sites in achieving the aim of SDPD Policy DM6, outweigh the development plan. Accordingly, the need for the contribution sought by the Council arises from the proposal and satisfies the tests in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 and paragraph 204 of the Framework... My findings above are consistent with the most recent decisions by Inspectors in like cases, in which light the determination of this case in a like manner is a material consideration to which I attach substantial weight. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development should provide a financial contribution to affordable housing, the absence of which would place the proposal in conflict with SDPD Policy DM6 and the SPD.'

Both Inspectors' considered that whilst the WMS carries considerable weight, it was not considered to outweigh the development plan given the acute and substantial need for

affordable housing in the Borough and the importance of delivery through small sites towards this. The extent of the Council's evidence was found to be compelling and the Council's approach with regards to Policy DM6 to be consistent with paragraphs 47 and 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require local planning authorities to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing.

On this basis and in the absence of a financial contribution, the proposed development would not therefore make adequate provision for the delivery of affordable housing, failing to comply with Policy DM6 (Affordable Housing) of the Reading Borough Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015), Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2013). It would also conflict with paragraphs 47 and 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 which seek, amongst other things, to secure the delivery of affordable housing.

CIL

The proposal would be a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable development. The applicant has provided the appropriate CIL Additional Information Form. An informative would be attached to the decision notice to advise the applicant of their responsibilities in this respect.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE

PRINCIPLE/FLOOD RISK (SEQUENTIAL TEST/FRA)

DESIGN/STREETSCENE

NEIGHBOUR AMENITY

HIGHWAYS

ECOLOGY

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The application does not include submission of the Sequential Test, which is required due to the sites location within Flood Zones 2 and 3. As such it has not been demonstrated that there are no other alternative sites outside Flood Zones 2 and 3 that should be developed in preference to the application site. Therefore it is considered that the development which fails the sequential test is contrary to Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 para 101.

The Flood Risk Assessment fails to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in the increased risk of flooding to the proposed development itself or dwellings beyond the site boundary and contains measures to mitigate such risk, contrary to Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and guidance within the National Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Due to its height, massing and scale, the proposal would appear overly dominant in relation to the neighbouring row of terraced properties, would appear as an overdevelopment within the plot and would appear out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development on Ardler Road. The proposal would appear poorly integrated within the Ardler Road streetscene, resulting in an overbearing and visually intrusive form of development to the smaller-scale residential to the south and the open character of the allotments to the north. For these reasons, the proposal would fail to maintain and enhance the character of the locality and would therefore be contrary to Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015), and Policies DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity) and DM11 (Development of Private Residential Garden Land) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

The proposal fails to demonstrate that there would be a sufficient level of parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's parking standards. This could result in increased competition for on-street parking, adversely affecting road safety and the flow of traffic, contrary to Policy CS24 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and Policy DM12 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

The applicant has failed to submit sufficient information for the Council to determine whether or not bats (a protected species and therefore a material planning consideration) will be adversely affected by the proposed development. As such this proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy CS36 of the Core Strategy 2008 (amended 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (paragraphs 109 and 118).

In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an acceptable contribution towards the provision of Affordable Housing, the proposal fails to contribute adequately to the housing needs of Reading Borough and the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities and as such is contrary to Policy DM6 of the Sites and Detailed

Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015), Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2013) and para. 50 of the NPPF 2012. It is not considered that any robust or clear evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the development would be rendered unviable without the provision of some form of agreed financial contribution.

Informatives

The decision relates to the following drawings and documents:

Drawing No: Location Plan 17007-0-001 P1

Drawing No: Site Plan Existing 17007-0-002 P2

Drawing No: Site Plan Proposed 17007-0-003 P1

Drawing No: Ground Floor Level Proposed 17007-0-010 P1

Drawing No: First Floor Level Proposed 17007-0-011 P1

Drawing No: Front Elevation Proposed 16007-0-020 P1

Drawing No: Rear Elevation Proposed 17007-0-021 P1

Drawing No: Side Elevation Proposed 17007-0-022 P1

Received 11th April 2017

Design and Access /Affordable Housing /Flood Risk Statement Dated 20th April 2016

CGI's

Received 18th May 2017

The local planning authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way by clearly setting out concerns relating to the proposal and providing an opportunity for the applicant to withdraw the application. However, the applicant chose not to withdraw the application, hence the issuing of this refusal notice within the statutory time period to determine the application by.

The applicant is advised that the refused scheme, had it been able to be approved, would have been a CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) liable development.

In any future proposal of a similar nature at the site, you are strongly advised to submit the following plans:

- Existing and proposed streetscene elevations
- Accurate Plans (ie the submitted proposed flank elevation drawings do not include the front porch elements)

- Material Details

Without prejudice to any future application or appeal, the applicant is advised that reason for refusal 6 (affordable housing) could be overcome by entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement or unilateral undertaking for a scheme that was in all other respects acceptable.