

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT - Application No. 230745FUL

Address: Great Brighams Mead Vastern Road

Proposal: Construction of a two-storey roof (third and fourth floor) extension to accommodate 100 apart-hotel rooms (Use Class C1) with associated parking, cycle stores and bin stores

Case officer: Matt Burns

Site Description and Surrounding Area

The application site comprises a three-storey office building called Great Brighams Mead with a part brick façade, a hipped roof and a distinctive clocktower. The site is surrounded by mature Plane trees protected trees to the south and west of the building (TPO ref. 80/05).

The site is located to the north of Reading Station, fronting onto the Caversham Road / Vastern Road roundabout. It is on the edge of a residential area comprising terraced Victorian houses and flats to the rear.

The site is located within Flood Zone 3. The River Thames is located 40m to the rear of the site.

The site is within an air quality management area and includes land identified as being potentially contaminated.

The site lies outside, but on the edge, of the Central Core Policy Area and the Office Core Policy Area.

Proposal

The current application seeks full planning permission for construction of a two-storey roof (third and fourth floor) extension to the existing building to provide 100 apart-hotel rooms (Use Class C1) (64 x 1-bed rooms and 36 x 2-bed rooms) with associated parking, cycle stores and bin stores.

The application makes clear that it is proposed that the apart-hotel use would operate in conjunction with the already approved change of use of the existing floors of the building to residential flats.

The proposed apart-hotel would be served by 34 parking spaces; of which 14 would be Electric Vehicle Charing Points (EVCP). A further 118 parking spaces would be retained for the proposed separate residential use of the building.

The vehicular access to the site would remain as existing with access obtained from Vastern Road.

The planning application is for a Major category development. As this is an officer recommendation of refusal (see below) this decision can be issued under officers' delegated powers.

Plans Considered

- Site Location Plan P1048-EX112

Existing plans:

- P1048-PL111 Existing block plan
- P1048-EX001 Existing Ground Floor Plan
- P1048-EX002 Existing First Floor Plan
- P1048-EX003 Existing Second Floor Plan
- P1048-EX005 Existing Roof Plan
- P1048-EX006-A- Existing South Elevation
- P1048-EX007-C- Existing North Elevation
- P1048-EX008-B- Existing West Elevation
- P1048-EX009 Existing East Elevation
- P1048-EX013-C- Existing Inner east Elevation
- P1048-EX015-A- Existing Street Scene – Vastern Rd
- P1048-EX016-A- Existing Street Scene -Caversham Rd into Brigham Rd

Proposed plans:

- P1048-GA1100Y – Proposed Ground Floor
- GBM-PD101 Proposed First Floor
- GBM-PD102 Proposed Second Floor
- P1048-PL503J – Proposed Third Floor
- P1048-PL504H – Proposed Fourth Floor
- P1048-PL505A – Proposed Roof Plan
- P1048-PL107F Proposed North Elevation
- P1048-PL508E Proposed South Elevation
- P1048-PL509E Proposed East Elevation
- P1048-PL510E Proposed West Elevation
- P1048-PL513-B- Proposed Inner East Elevation
- P1048-PL514-B- Proposed Inner West Elevation
- P1048-PL515-A- Proposed Street Scene -Vastern Rd
- P1048-PL516-A- Proposed Street Scene – Caversham Rd Caversham Rd into Brigham Rd

- Design and Access Statement (by PEEK)
- Transport Statement (by Stantec)
- Flood Risk Assessment inc. Exceptions Test (by Stantec)
- Daylight Sunlight Assessment (by FPD)
- Energy and Sustainability Report (by FPD)
- Sequential Assessment (flood) (by FPD)
- Sequential Assessment (town centre) (by FPD)
- Landscaping Principles Statement (by FPD)
- Utilities Statement (by FPD)
- Preliminary Ecology Appraisal and Roost Assessment (by Arbtech)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Report (by Arbtech)
- Tree Survey (by Arbtech)
- AIA and Method Statement (by Arbtech)
- Contaminated Land Assessment (by Stantec)
- Ecological Mitigation, Enhancement and Management Plan (Arbtech) Issue 2
- Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys Issue 2

Planning History

The existing building was granted prior approval consent for change of use from offices to 110 dwellings using permitted development rights under prior approval consent ref. 210567, on 1st June 2021. An associated planning permission ref. 220717 for external alterations to the building was granted to facilitate the approved changes of use was also granted on 4th August 2022.

The applicant also made a further prior approval applications ref. 221479 and 220778 to add an additional two storeys to the building to provide a further 72 dwellings using permitted development rights. These applications were both refused (on 21st November 2022 and 4th August 2022) for similar reasons. Notably due to unacceptable design and harm to the character of the existing building and surrounding area and failure of the application to demonstrate that the proposals would not be detrimental to the amenity of existing surrounding occupiers in terms of overbearing, overshadowing and loss of light impacts.

230182 - Replacement of existing non-illuminated signage – Granted

230698 - Application for approval of details reserved by condition 8 (Flood Management and Evacuation Plan) of prior approval consent ref. 210567 – Details Approved.

Consultation Responses

RBC Transport – No objection. Conditions required to secure the following:

- Pre-occupation provision of all parking spaces
- Pre-occupation provision of taxi pick up / drop off bay
- Pre-occupation provision of cycle parking
- Pre-occupation provision of bin stores
- Pre-occupation submission, approval and provision of a servicing strategy
- Pre-commencement submission and approval of a demolition and construction method statement

RBC Natural Environment – No objection. Conditions required to secure the following:

- Pre-occupation submission and approval of landscaping details
- Implementation of the development only in accordance with the submitted arboricultural method statement

RBC Environmental Protection - No objection. Conditions required to secure the following:

- Pre-commencement submission and approval of a noise mitigation scheme.
- Submission and approval of plant noise assessment prior to installation of any mechanical plant
- Pre-commencement submission and approval of contaminated land assessment (and if required pre-occupation submission and approval of a contaminated land remediation scheme and timetable for implementation.
- Pre-commencement submission and approval of a demolition and construction method statement

Ecology Adviser – No objection. A condition is required to secure the following:

- Pre-occupation provision of ecological mitigation measures (bat and bird boxes)

Environment Agency – No objection.

Thames Water – No objection.

Public Consultation

The following neighbouring properties were notified by letter and a site notice was displayed at the application site on 18th July 2023.

- 17 to 29 Vastern Road (odd)
- 1 to 19 Brigham Road (odd)
- 1 to 76 Regents Riverside Brigham Road
- 9 to 47 De Montfort Road (odd)
- 108 to 130 Caversham Road (even)
- 119 to 133 Caversham Road
- 115-117 Caversham Road
- 99-113 Caversham Road
- 93-97 Caversham Road
- The Flat 97 Caversham Road
- Flats 1 to at 91 Caversham Road
- 87 to 91 Caversham Road (odd)
- Flats 1 to 6 at 87-89 Caversham Road
- 15 to 19 Thames Side
- Flats 1 to 5 at 114 Caversham Road
- Flats 1 to 3 at 128 Caversham Road
- Flats 1 to 4 at Brigham Place, Brigham Road

30 objections have been received raising the following issues:

- Loss of daylight and overshadowing to flats at Regents Riverside and houses to De Montfort Road
- Overlooking and loss of privacy to flats at Regents Riverside as well as properties to De Montfort Road, Thames Avenue and Brigham Road
- Scale of the proposed two storey roof extension is out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
- Scale of the proposed two storey roof extension would have an overbearing impact on surrounding residential properties and the river pathway
- Proposed hotel use is not in keeping with the uses within the surrounding area which are predominantly residential
- The proposals would ruin people's enjoyment of surrounding gardens
- Noise impact from hotel guests coming and going at all times of day and night
- Noise from proposed roof top plant equipment
- Noise impact from the construction of the proposed hotel
- Noise impact and timing of deliveries to the hotel, when operational, will need to be controlled.
- Increase in artificial light from the proposed 24-hour hotel use
- Additional traffic and parking pressures on the already busy surrounding roads and associated impact on air quality

- Insufficient parking for the hotel which will result in overspill on surrounding roads
- Negative impact on surrounding house prices
- Affordable Housing is needed in the community not hotels
- Proposed location of the bin store close to Regents Riverside will result in odour and vermin issues.
- Loss of view from properties on Thames Avenue and Brigham Road
- Temporary visitors to existing hotels in the surrounding area do not respect the residential locality
- Do not agree with the Applicant that there are no alternative suitable sites for a hotel within the Central Core of the town centre
- Clocktower of the existing building should be retained
- There have been too many applications at this site which is not fair on surrounding residents
- Surrounding residents have difficulties in being able to get electric vehicle charging points for their homes due to lack of infrastructure and capacity and the addition of a 100 room hotel will exacerbate this problem
- This would result in further strain on infrastructure and services such as doctors and schools
- 2 hedgehogs visit gardens of De Montfort Road which does not reflect the ecological statement submitted with the application which states that the site is an unlikely habitat for hedgehogs

One of the objections received is from the Caversham and District Residents Association (CADRA), who raise the following issues:

- Mass and bulk of the proposed roof extension is out of keeping within the scale of surrounding properties which is predominantly domestic scale houses
- Increase traffic on already busy and unsafe roundabout on Vastern Road
- If approved details methodology for construction and deliveries will be required

Reading Design Review Panel

The application was reviewed at the Reading Design Review Panel on 5th December 2023. The panel provided the following comments on the proposals:

Site

The Great Brighams Mead building sits in an extremely prominent location at the junction of Caversham Road & Vastern Road. Whilst the existing building stylistically is very much of its time, the form and composition draw upon centuries of precedent delivering a well ordered and instinctively legible building.

The addition of further accommodation on this site does nothing to improve the quality of the public realm and landscape illustrated. In fact, the proposed arrangement of ancillary accommodation and the mixing of use classes dilutes the clarity of pedestrian routes.

Building

The proposals are to add two storeys above the second floor of the existing building. An alternate approach to that presented in November 2022 is proposed, working from the ground

up, which is much more successful. The design is now formed of a 3 storey brick base, a lighter intermediate storey that replicates the materiality of the existing building and a large roof volume, within which a further storey of accommodation is located.

For a project of this scale, the Panel consider that the extent of information presented lacks the detail required to evidence the approach proposed is acceptable. There is a little in the way of sections, 3D studies or views that illustrate the relationship to neighbours especially.

The Panel are of the view there needs to be further refinement of the new proportions created through any upward extensions. At present there is an incongruity about the composition of the proposals that needs to be resolved.

The alterations proposed change the existing building to one that will dominate one's arrival into the Vastern Road area. It is possible that the massing proposed to the frontage could be supported by the Panel, but more detail is required. The Panel have significant concerns of the impact a blanket extension across the full extent of the floorplate will have on neighbours in terms of daylight & sunlight, as well as residential amenity.

The floorplans presented appear to a little too cramped in a number of places, corridor widths were raised as a concern in discussion, and volumetrically the Panel have a number of concerns that rooms under eaves and generally in the upper most floor are awkward at best. At present this suggests the applicant may be trying to squeeze too many rooms into the volume proposed.

While some of the front of house areas for the new aparthotel have an aspirational look and feel, the arrangement of rooms is often clumsy. Beyond this and more alarmingly the access and escape arrangements do not comply with current standards creating a life safety risk, this needs to be addressed as a matter of priority.

Sustainability

No additional information relating to sustainability has been submitted since the DRP of November 2022 (in relation to application ref. 221479), comments for that application should be reviewed and actioned accordingly.

Detailing

There is scant information included relating to the architectural detailing of the proposals, which rely on a replication of those that exist on the current building. Compositional 1:20 bay elevations and sections would be of great use to illustrate the scope of what is intended and to show it can be achieved with current technical standards.

Whilst in materiality terms extending the third floor up in a complementary brick from below is considered achievable, probably with some brick tinting to blend old to new, the simple replication of the façade approach of the current third floor at fourth floor is possibly a missed opportunity. The Panel would like to see some investigation of how the new extension and use influences the architecture on these upper levels.

It seems perverse to extend upwards in the style of the office building below when the intended use is different, particularly when this approach has a detrimental impact on the arrangement of the floor plans.

Design Approach

As explained above, there is no evidence that the design has been evolved to consider its context.

Any further comments

The conversion and extension of this former office has the potential to create a residential building of substantial size, impacting neighbours and the immediate townscape. Not only does the information submitted fail to demonstrate an understanding of this fact it appears the applicant is seeking to achieve consent for a development that does the bare minimum with a bare minimum of information.

The Panel found the presentation of various iterations of the scheme confusing, we need a coordinated complete submission to make a thorough assessment. In its current form the Panel will not support this application.

Equality Act

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

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. However, the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.

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

Reading Borough Local Plan 2019

CC1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

CC2: SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

CC3: ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

CC4: DECENTRALISED ENERGY

CC5: WASTE MINIMISATION AND STORAGE

CC6: ACCESSIBILITY AND THE INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT

CC7: DESIGN AND THE PUBLIC REALM

CC8: SAFEGUARDING AMENITY

CC9: SECURING INFRASTRUCTURE

EN11: WATERSPACES
EN12: BIODIVERSITY AND THE GREEN NETWORK
EN14: TREES, HEDGES AND WOODLANDS
EN15: AIR QUALITY
EN16: POLLUTION AND WATER RESOURCES
EN17: NOISE GENERATING EQUIPMENT
EN18: FLOODING AND DRAINAGE
TR1: ACHIEVING THE TRANSPORT STRATEGY
TR3: ACCESS, TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY-RELATED MATTERS
TR5: CAR AND CYCLE PARKING AND ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING
RL1: NETWORK AND HIERARCHY OF CENTRES
RL5: IMPACT ON MAIN TONW CENTRE USES
CR1: DEFINITION OF CENTRAL READING
CR2: DESIGN IN CENTRAL READING
CR6: LIVING IN CENTRAL READING

Supplementary Planning Documents

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPD 2019
REVISED PARKING STANDARDS AND DESIGN SPD 2011
SECTION 106 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS SPD 2013
AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPD 2021
EMPLOYMENT SKILLS AND TRAINING SPD 2013

Other relevant documents:

RBC Tree Strategy (2021)

Appraisal

The current application is different to and allows for a more comprehensive assessment of the proposals against the relevant Policies of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 compared to the previous approved (ref. 210567) and refused (ref. 221479 and 220778) applications on the site referred to within the planning history section of this report above, which were applications for prior approval under permitted development rights and have a much smaller range of considerations and not all aspects of the Local Plan were able to be considered.

Land Use Principles

Proposed C1 Use Class Apart Hotel

In accordance with Paragraph 91 of the NPPF (2023), Policy CR1 (Definition of Central Reading) sets out that a sequential approach to the location of town centre uses (which includes C1 use classes, such as the proposed apart-hotels) will be applied and seeks that in the first instance such uses will be located within the Central Core of the Central Area. Whilst the application site is located within the defined Central Area of the town under Policy CR1 it is not located within the Central Core. This being the case the applicant has undertaken a sequential test as part of the application to justify the location of a new town centre use, just outside the Central Core area. The sequential test has considered available units within the Central Core area of a comparable

floor space to the proposed apart-hotel accommodation, but this has indicated that none have been found to be sequentially preferable in terms of suitability, availability or viability.

It is noted that the application site is located only just outside the Central Core. Paragraph 92 of the NPPF (2023) states that 'When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale, so that opportunities to utilise suitable town centre or edge of centre sites are fully explored'. The site is considered to be accessible and well connected, given its close proximity to the Central Core and location of Vastern Road, a key distribution road leading in and out of the town centre. Options to walk, cycle and use public transport are also readily available.

Located just outside of the Central Core and providing a quasi-residential apart-hotel use providing residential accommodation for short term stays it is not considered that the location of the proposal would result in any significant harm to the vitality or viability of the Central Core area. The proposal is considered to comply with Policy CR1.

In accordance with Policy CR6 (Living in Central Reading) occupation of the proposed apart-hotel for short term stays only (maximum occupancy of no more than 3 months) would be required to be secured by way of section 106 legal agreement. Further linked obligations would also be required to robustly guard against the scheme being occupied for other uses (e.g. residential flats, as referenced in Policy CR6) without first applying for planning permission. In this respect s106 terms would include:

- Apart-hotel Use (Class C1) only and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in the same Use Class of the Schedule to the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification – (for example as a hotel (Class C1), self-contained residential units (Class C3), small/large houses in multiple occupation (Class C4 or Sui Generis)
- not to let or licence for occupation or permit or suffer occupation of any of the apart-hotel units for a continuous period of more than 3 months to the same occupier or occupiers
- other than those customers staying in accordance with the above, not to let or licence for occupation or permit or suffer occupation of any apart-hotel unit for a continuous period for more than 3 months to the same customer or customers
- not to require customers of any apart-hotel unit to agree to any minimum period of occupation (of whatever duration)
- to provide to the Council within 14 days of written request evidence regarding the use or occupation of the apart-hotel units or any of them

A completed s106 agreement is not supplied.

Flood Risk

The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, with Flood Zone 3 being areas at the highest risk of flooding. Policy EN18 (Flooding and Drainage), and paragraph 168 of the NPPF (2023) states that a sequential approach to the location of uses such as apart-hotels (which the NPPG classifies as being a 'more vulnerable use' in terms of flood risk) will be applied and seeks that such uses

are directed to areas at the lowest risk of flooding in the first instance (i.e. Flood Zone 1). The application is accompanied by a sequential test document which seeks to demonstrate that there are not sequentially better located alternative sites in terms of flood risk where the proposed development could be located, i.e. sites located within Flood Zones 1 and 2. The sequential test undertaken by the Applicant has considered alternative sites in line with guidance set out within the RBC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for undertaking the test. The test submitted has assessed each site using the following criteria

- When is the site available for development?
- Is the site currently occupied/in use?
- Can the owner be identified or are there multiple ownerships?
- Has there been any planning activity (a review of the planning history)?
- Is the site being pursued by other third parties?
- Are there any known development constraints?

The sequential test considers a range of alternative sites within the Central Area, where other policies direct uses like apart-hotels to be located, but does not identify any which meet all necessary criteria to be considered as a genuine alternative location for the proposed development.

In addition to the above it is noted that the Council's latest 'Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment' (May 2017) also sets out that 'there are not sufficient sites to meet the objectively assessed need for housing in Reading on sites in Flood Zones 1 and 2' which indicates that sites outside of Flood Zones 1 and 2 are likely to need to be considered.

On the basis of the above the proposed development is considered to have passed the flood risk sequential test.

In accordance with 'Table 2: Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'incompatibility' within the NPPG 'more vulnerable' development in terms of flood risk such as that proposed, is also required to pass the flood risk Exception Test. This requires that,

- 1) development that has to be in a flood risk area will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and
- 2) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

In respect of point 2) above the application is accompanied by a technical flood risk assessment (FRA) which has been assessed by the Environment Agency (EA). The EA do not object to the proposed development and advise that they are satisfied the mitigation measure outlined within the submitted FRA demonstrate that the proposals would comply with point 2) of the Exception test.

The EA identify that in accordance with paragraph 173 of the NPPF (2023) it is the LPA's responsibility to ensure that the 'development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, and safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate'. The FRA submitted by the

Applicant has assessed the safe access and escape routes to and from the development in terms of flood risk. The RBC SFRA sets out the LPA's standards for safe access and escape. For 'more vulnerable' development:

- a) The preference is to have a continuous dry route at the 1 in 100 annual probability plus appropriate allowance for climate change event;
- b) If (a) is not achievable, then developer should assess if safe access is available at the current 1 in 100 annual probability flood event (in accordance with Defra flood hazard guidance);

The Applicant's FRA identifies that the proposed development would not be able to meet part a) above and would be unable provide a continuous dry route to land outside the floodplain (Vastern Road) on land all within a 1 in 100 annual probability of flooding (plus appropriate allowance for climate change event). However, the FRA does identify that requirements under part b) above would be able to be satisfied. When part b) is able to be satisfied then the RBC SFRA goes on to state that safe access in more extreme events could be addressed through provision of a site 'Flood Management and Evacuation Plan', subject to a detailed analysis of the flood hazard along the route and RBC emergency planning department approval. Therefore, subject to a condition to secure submission and approval of flood management and evacuation plan prior to first occupation of the proposed development it is considered that suitable safe access and escape routes to and from the development can be demonstrated.

In respect of part 1) of the Exception Test the application is required to demonstrate that it will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk. The Applicants FRA does not detail the wider sustainability of the benefits of the development to the community. These matters will be considered within the rest of this report and in the conclusion.

Character and Appearance

Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) requires that new development is of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of surrounding area including its layout, landscape, scale, height, massing and architectural detail and materials.

The existing three storey office building is predominantly red brick and glazed in appearance with a pitched roof. The building is laid out in a 'H' pattern with two wings connected by a central link which incorporates two turret tower-like elements and central clock tower that project above the main roof line. The building is surrounded by hardstanding with an internal access road around the perimeter of the building and car parking spaces around the perimeter and central areas of the site. Trees and landscaping are located around the edges of the building and site.

The building is one of the larger buildings in the immediate surrounding area and is of overall greater height, bulk and massing than the adjacent terraced dwellings of between two and three storeys to the east and west of the site along Vastern Road, De Montfort Road, Caversham Road and Brigham Road and on the opposite side of Vastern Road and Caversham Road to the south. The Regents Riverside flats building, which is located adjacent to the north (rear) of the site and which fronts the river is larger in scale, being of between four and five storeys, albeit still sits below the ridge line of Great Brighams Mead.

The scale and location of the existing building on the large roundabout junction of Caversham Road and Vastern Road and being sited between the more modest scale and character of the terraced dwellings either side of the site, means that it is a prominent building within views from surrounding area. The building is particularly visible to views from the front (south) and from Caversham Road to west and Vastern Road to the east, on the approach to the roundabout as well as from the Regents Riverside flats to the rear (north) where a modest brick wall is the only boundary enclosure between the two sites/buildings. The building is also visible and prominent to views from Brigham Road which runs parallel to the west flank boundary of the site and from the private rear garden areas of the dwellings to De Montfort Road which runs parallel to the to the east of the site.

The proposed addition of a further two storeys and increase in scale of what is already a much larger building than those immediately surrounding it, would further increase its prominence from these views. It is considered that the proposed increase in scale would appear visually dominant and out of place in relation to the more modest scale of terraced dwellings and other buildings that surround the site. Whilst there are rows of trees to the east, west and south boundaries of the site that provides a degree of screening to views of the building from Caversham Road, Vastern Road, De Montfort Road and Brigham Road, the existing building is visible through these rows of trees. The increased scale of the proposed enlarged building is such that it would be even more visible above and through these trees which are not considered to mitigate for its visual impact on the surrounding areas.

The closest relationship of the existing building is within the adjacent two storey terraced dwellings to the east along Vastern Road and De Montfort Road. The existing building displays a notable step up in scale and mass from these adjacent terraced dwellings with the lowest eaves point of Great Brighams Mead already being well above that of the main ridge height of the adjacent terraced dwellings. The proposed upward extension of the building by a further two storeys and the associated roof form would further exacerbate the different and contrast in height between the building and considered to result in an awkward and abrupt juxtaposition within the street-scene.



Existing Vastern Road Street-Scene



Proposed Vastern Road Street-Scene

In terms of detailed design, the proposed upward extensions seek to replicate the form and features of the existing building with new third floor level reflecting the existing white metal cladding and full height glazing found to the existing second floor of the building whilst the proposed fourth floor accommodation would be within the roof space provided by tile clad dormer window projections and roof lights. Whilst the proposed retention of the rooftop clock tower within the enlarged design is welcomed it is considered that the approach of replicating the existing appearance of the building to the upper floors results in the composition of the enlarged building losing its design legibility with

the third-floor level to the building appearing squat when compared to the significant scale of the enlarged roof space of the building. It is also apparent from the proposed roof plans that the approach of replicating the design of the existing office building for the new hotel accommodation and number of rooms proposed has resulted in a number of awkward internal layout arrangements for corridors and rooms with the proposed hotel accommodation, particular to the accommodation within the roofspace.

The blanket replication of the appearance of the existing building at a larger scale across the entire building lacks subservience and visual interest and is considered to further exacerbate the visual dominance and out of keeping scale of the proposals within the more modest context of the surrounding area which is predominantly the Victorian terrace buildings which surround the site. The excessive scale and lack of visual interest is particularly evident to the east and west elevations of the buildings where the more varied roof form to the front and rear elevations is absent. This results in continuous elevations of significant length which show little architectural variation presenting a monolithic appearance when viewed from Brigham Road and from the rear gardens of the properties to De Montfort Road which is at odds within the more modest scale and character of these adjacent roads.

The submitted plans are clear that the intention of the development is for the proposed C1 hotel accommodation within the upward extension to the building to operate in conjunction with the separate consent obtained for C3 residential flats to the existing building and lower floors. It is considered that the hotel proposals fail to present a clear and legible approach as to how the two uses would operate in conjunction. In particular, at ground floor level it is proposed that the two different uses would be accessed from the same part of the building with two separate doors adjacent to each other with both residents of the flats and hotel guests likely to be accessing the building from the same external footway providing a lack of clarity and legibility. Guests of the hotel would be required to walk past ground floor habitable room windows of the flats to access the hotel resulting in poor relationship between public and private areas within the site. This is also evident within the wider site where residents of the hotel would also have to walk past habitable room windows of the residential units to reach car parking areas for the hotel as well as being able to access the wider site and it is not clear how this would or could be managed in a safe and secure way for all future users of the site. Ease of movement and way-finding within the building also appears poor, notably it is unclear how, as a result of the introduction of the ground floor hotel lobby, occupants of the ground floor flats within the eastern wing of the building would access their flats without travelling up to first floor level and then back down to ground floor level.

Outdoor spaces within the site would also be dominated by hardstanding and car parking. Whilst the protected trees around the perimeter of the site are to be retained there is limited additional landscaping proposed given the expanses of car parking for both uses. As a result of this it is considered that external spaces within the site would be of poor visual quality. It is considered that the level of car parking demonstrates an overdevelopment and intensification of use of the site in respect of the hotel and also in combination with the proposed C3 prior approval residential use to the lower floors.

It is considered that the proposals would result in a visually dominant development, the scale and appearance of which would be out of keeping with and harmful to the character of the existing building and surrounding area, failing to respond positively to its local context. The proposed plans show it is intended that the proposed C1 hotel use would operate in conjunction with the C3

residential use consented to the lower floors of the building under prior approval consent ref. 210657. Both the internal and external layout of the proposals fail to demonstrate how both uses of the site could operate in tandem in clear, legible, safe and secure manner, whilst the excessive hardstanding and lack of soft landscaping would result in poor quality external areas within the site. Therefore, the proposed development would fail to maintain and enhance the character of the area contrary to Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

Residential Amenity of Surrounding Occupiers

Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) states that development proposals should safeguard the amenity of both existing and future occupiers and Policy EN16 (Pollution and Water Resources) seeks that development will only be permitted where it would not be damaging to the environment and sensitive receptors in terms of pollution. Policy EN15 (Air Quality) seeks to protect existing and future occupiers from the impact of poor air quality.

Daylight / Sunlight

Given the close relationship of the application site to surrounding residential dwellings the proposed two additional storeys and increase in height/scale of the building have the potential to result in impacts on receipt of daylight and sunlight to windows and garden spaces of surrounding dwellings. This is a matter raised within a number of the objections to the application that have been received. The closest relationship is with the rear facing habitable windows and garden spaces of the two storey terraced dwellings to De Montford Road to the east and Vastern Road to the south east, as well as the potential for adverse impacts on the consented prior approval residential units to the lower floors of the application building. The application is accompanied by a daylight sunlight report which concludes no unacceptable impact upon surrounding residential dwellings and garden spaces.

This report has been independently reviewed on behalf of the Local Planning Authority as part of the assessment of this planning application. The initial independent review identified a number of shortcomings of the report and methodologies used. Following the initial review the Applicant submit an updated daylight sunlight report which has also been independently reviewed. The conclusions of the further independent review identified that a number of the shortcomings of the initial report had not been adequately addressed and also identified some further shortcomings. Notably, outstanding issues include:

- the positioning and sizing of assessed windows, especially to the rear of properties on De Montford Road are inaccurate
- a number of structures within gardens, especially to the rear of properties on De Montford Road are unmodelled;
- the gardens and fences to the rear of De Montford Road and Vastern Road have not been fully modelled
- the area of gardens that are likely to be most restricted in terms of sunlight have been omitted from the assessment;
- the results of the amenity sunlight analysis have been presented as an average across all properties, rather than an individual result for each property; and

- the NSL has been modelled for the ground floor of Great Brigham's Mead, but no comparison of the existing verses proposed has been made, so the impact cannot be assessed.

Whilst on balance the independent review report considers that daylight sunlight impacts of the development are unlikely to be significant it is clear that the assessment is not robust and full conclusions cannot be reached given the gaps in modelling and inaccuracies within the submitted report. Therefore, it is considered that the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in detrimental impacts in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential occupiers, in particular adjacent dwellings to De Montfort Road and the consented prior approval dwellings to the ground, first and second floors of the existing building contrary to Policy CC8.

Privacy / Overlooking

In terms of overlooking and privacy the building is surrounded by existing residential occupiers to the east (De Montfort Road), west (Brigham Road), north (Regents Riverside) and south east (Vastern Road). A number of the objectors to the application are from houses/flats on these roads who consider that the hotel rooms within the proposed two additional storeys would overlook their rear facing windows or gardens. Policy CC8 sets out the Council's standards in terms of required separation distances to prevent overlooking or loss of privacy, which requires a minimum 20m separation distance between facing windows. Whilst the policy specifically refers to back-to-back distances between residential dwellings this is also considered to be a pertinent assessment between hotel accommodation windows and surrounding residential dwelling windows.

The proposed development would only extend the building upwards and would not extend closer to existing surrounding buildings. The separation distance between the proposed hotel room windows and closest flat windows at Regents Riverside would be 24m, a separation distance of over 30m would be maintained to the closet windows to the front elevations of the dwellings to Brigham Road and there would be a distance of 26m to closest rear facing windows to the residential dwellings to De Montfort Road. All the back-to-back separation distances between windows would exceed the minimum 20m separation required by Policy CC8.

In terms of other relationships, there would be a 17.5m separation distance between the hotel room windows and the end of the rear gardens to the dwellings on De Montfort Road. It should be noted that the 20m separation required by Policy CC8 relates to back-to-back separation between windows and not garden amenity areas which, in the case of rear gardens, are generally likely to be closer to neighbouring properties. In this respect the separation to the rear gardens to De Montfort Road is considered to be sufficient such that there would not be any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to these areas, notably the significant majority of the rear garden areas, including the areas closest to the rear of the dwellings would be located over 20m from the proposed facing hotel rooms windows.

There would be an off-set relationship at a 90-degree angle with the rear facing windows and garden areas of the two storey residential dwellings to the south east on Vastern Road. There would be separation of 16.5m to the rear windows and 11.5m to the end of the rear garden of the closest dwelling here at no. 17 Vastern Road. Given this is a non-direct relationship at an angle it

is not considered that there would be any unacceptable overlooking or privacy to the adjacent dwellings on Vastern Road and the proposals are considered to comply with Policy CC8.

Given the separation to surrounding windows and garden areas it is not considered that the proposals would result in any unacceptable overbearing impacts to occupiers of surrounding dwellings.

The impact upon the privacy of future occupiers of the consented prior approval flats to the existing building also needs to be considered. In this respect it is considered that the proposed combination of uses on the site would result in unacceptable relationships. Most notably guests accessing the proposed hotel and car parking spaces would be able to walk within close proximity of the ground floor prior approval flats and their windows which is considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for future occupiers of these flats.

Noise and Disturbance

The planning statement submitted with the application identifies that additional noise insulation would be required within the building between the residential and hotel floors of accommodation. RBC Environmental Protection Officers are satisfied that details of this additional insulation can be reasonably secured by way of suitably worded condition together with details of any plant equipment to be installed as part of the hotel use if planning permission were to be granted. This would accord with Policy EN16.

However, it is considered that the proposed hotel use has the potential to result in noise and disturbance from outside the building as a result of hotel guests arriving, leaving, parking their car/being dropped off and being present within the site, given a 24 hour reception for the hotel is proposed within the building. This is likely to be a particular issues for those ground floor flats located close to the hotel entrance to the east elevation of the west wing of the building where guests accessing the hotel would be required to walk past and close to the only windows serving these flats. In this respect it is considered that the proposals would be harmful to the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the prior approval residential units within the application building, contrary to Policy CC8.

RBC Environmental Protection Officers recommend that a condition to secure submission and approval of a construction method statement would also be required if planning permission were to be granted in order to protect the residential amenity of existing surrounding occupiers during construction of the proposed development.

Future Occupiers of the Hotel

There are no specific standards within the RBC Local Plan for hotel accommodation and whilst proposed hotel rooms at third floor level appear to be adequately served in terms of outlook and access to light from windows, the majority of the rooms at fourth floor level are considered to be poorly served in this respect with only roof lights serving many of the rooms providing limited outlook and sub-optimum outlook and daylighting. As hotel rooms for short term occupancy only this is not considered to be a further reason for refusal of the proposals but further emphasises the sub-optimum design approach and overdevelopment of the building for the proposed number of hotel rooms.

Air Quality

An air quality assessment has been submitted with the application which concludes that pollutant levels at the site would be unlikely to be exceed recommended limits as a result of the proposed development and therefore no air quality mitigation is required. In terms of emissions the application is accompanied by a Transport Statement which concludes that vehicle trip numbers to the proposed hotel (as well as in combination with the prior approval residential use of the lower floors of the building) would be lower than the former office use of the building and therefore no further assessment regarding emission and air quality is required. RBC Environmental Protection Officers have reviewed the submitted assessments and agree with the conclusions of the reports, that no additional mitigation or assessment is required in respect of air quality as part of the proposed development. In this respect the proposals would accord with Policy EN15 (Air Quality).

Contamination

The application is accompanied by a contaminated land assessment which identifies a low level of contaminants found underground at the site. The proposals are for upward extensions only and the assessment identifies that the existing hard surfacing on the site and soft landscaping provide a barrier to these contaminants. RBC Environmental Protection Officers do not consider that the report satisfactorily demonstrates how the soft landscaping would act as this barrier nor how proposed landscaping would maintain this barrier. If planning permission were to be granted, then further conditions to secure submission and approval of a more detailed contaminated land assessment and remediation scheme would be required in accordance with Policy EN16.

Odour

If planning permission were to be granted a condition would be required to secure full details of the bin stores within the development to ensure they are managed effectively in terms of odours and risk of vermin in accordance with Policy EN16.

Transport

Policies TR3 (Access, Traffic and Highway related matters), TR1 (Achieving the Transport Strategy) and TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging) seek to address access, traffic, highway and parking relates matters relating to development.

The site is located at junction of the A329 Caversham Road and Vastern Road and is located within Zone 2, the primary core area but on the periphery of the central core area which lies at the heart of Reading Borough, consisting primarily of retail and commercial office developments with good transport hubs. Reading Station North entrance is located within walking distance of the site.

Traffic

The application is accompanied by a Transport Statement which concludes that the proposed hotel use would, either in isolation or when considered in combination with the consented prior approval residential use to the lower floors of the existing building, result in an overall reduction in trip rates and vehicle movements to the site when compared to the former office use of the site. Therefore,

the proposals are not considered to result an increase in associated traffic on the highway network. RBC Transport Officer concur with these findings.

If planning permission for the development were to be granted then a condition to secure a construction method statement would be required to demonstrate how construction traffic would be managed such that it would not adversely impact upon the surrounding highway network.

Vehicle Parking

The RBC Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD requires that for 100 hotel units 50 vehicle parking spaces and an additional 3 disabled parking spaces. The application proposes to provide 34 parking spaces (2 of which are disabled parking spaces). Given this provision falls short of the Council's adopted standards, a trip rate assessment has been carried out as part of the Applicant's submitted Transport Statement to justify this which assesses the demand for parking at similar developments elsewhere. RBC Transport Officers are satisfied that this assessment demonstrates that the proposed 34 parking spaces (plus 2 disabled spaces) is adequate provision for the proposed development.

14 of the parking spaces for the hotel would include electric vehicle charging points which exceeds the 10% of total spaces required under Policy TR5.

RBC Transport Officers have also confirmed that proposed development would still allow for the required number of vehicle parking spaces to be provided for the C3 prior approval flats to the lower floors of the building.

Surrounding roads outside the application site are subject to parking permit controls which would prevent any overspill of parking from the development onto these roads. If planning permission were to be granted a condition would be attached to state that guests or staff at the hotel would not be entitled to a residents parking permit.

Access

The site is served by a single vehicle access via the Caversham Road / Vastern Road roundabout to the south of the site and this arrangement is proposed to be retained as part of the proposed development. RBC Transport Officers consider this arrangement to be acceptable and that the existing access is suitable to serve the development, including for access by large service vehicles.

Servicing

A taxi pick up / drop off bay is proposed to be provided within the site near the entrance for taxis dropping/collecting guests from the hotel units.

It is proposed that a one-way system would operate within the site with all vehicles that enter following a driveway around the perimeter of the site before leaving via the single entrance point to the site from the Caversham Road/Vaster Road roundabout. A swept path analysis provided as part of the Transport Statement submitted with the application demonstrates that all vehicles, including large refuse vehicles will be able to utilise the one-way system.

Suitable bin storage is provided within the car park area adjacent to the bin store area that would serve the consented residential prior approval units. The Applicant has confirmed that waste collection would be carried out by private collection with waste collected directly from the store and that hotel staff would transfer waste from the building to the bin store. RBC Transport Officers consider the servicing arrangements for the development to be acceptable. If planning permission were to be granted, then a condition to secure submission and approval of detailed waste management strategy would be required.

Cycle Parking

The application states that the proposed hotel would have 15 staff. The RBC Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD requires 1 cycle parking space per 6 staff. The application proposes to provide 8 Sheffield cycle parking stands within a covered and secure store within the car park which is considered to be acceptable.

Natural Environment

Policy EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network) seeks that development should not result in a net loss of biodiversity and should provide for a net gain of biodiversity wherever possible by protecting, enhancing and incorporating features of biodiversity on and adjacent to development sites and by providing new tree planting and wildlife friendly landscaping and ecological enhancements wherever practicable. Policy EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland) seeks that the Borough's vegetation cover is extended and that new development makes provision for planting within the application site.

Trees and Landscaping

The site is subject to TPO 80/05, which includes all the Plane trees around the Brigham Road and Vastern Road perimeters. There are other trees within the site that will have formed part of the landscaping for the original development of Great Brighams Mead. The site is within the AQMA and in a prominent location.

The application is accompanied by an arboricultural method statement (AMS) and tree survey which identified that 1 category U (tree in bad health) and 3 category C (trees of low quality) are proposed to be removed to facilitate the proposed development. The RBC Natural Environment Officer notes the retention of the significant majority of trees on the site with removal of only 4 low quality trees and that the AMS also details other minor works to retained trees which are considered to be reasonable. It is also noted that the proposed ground floor/site plan indicates additional tree planting and soft landscaping within the site, as well as proposed green roofs to the bin stores.

The RBC Natural Environment Officer is satisfied that the proposals demonstrate that retained trees on the site would be suitably protected and that there would be an overall net gain in greening and tree planting as a result of the proposed development which would accord with Policy EN14.

If planning permission were to be granted, conditions to require the development to only be undertaken in accordance with the submitted AMS and for submission and approval of a detailed landscape scheme would be required.

Ecology

The application is accompanied by an ecology report which identifies the existing site is of little ecological value given its predominantly consists of a large building and extensive areas of hardstanding. However, the perimeter tree cover on the site, which is to be retained as part of the application, does provide good habitat on the site for commuting bats and it is identified that the building also hosts a pipistrelle bat roost. As part of the application, it is proposed to provide 8 bat bricks/tiles on the building which the RBC Ecology adviser considers to be appropriate ecological mitigation for the proposed development. The proposed bat bricks/tiles, green roofs, new tree planting and soft landscaping would ensure the development results in a net gain in biodiversity on the site in accordance with Policy EN12.

Sustainability

Policy CC3 (Adaption to Climate Change) seeks that proposals should incorporate measures which take account of climate change. A number of sustainability measures are proposed to be incorporated within the development including energy efficient materials and fittings and a net increase in greening and landscaping and biodiversity enhancements across the site.

In accordance with Policy CC4 (Decentralised Energy) the proposals incorporate an on-site decentralised energy source in the form of air source heat pumps.

Policy CC2 (Sustainable Design and Construction) requires that proposed for conversion or refurbishment of existing buildings for residential or non-residential uses meets a BREEAM standard of Excellent. The energy and sustainability statement submitted with the application projects that the development would achieve the required BREEAM Excellent standards (76.69%). If otherwise granting planning permission, these standards would be secured by way of conditions.

Employment Skills and Training

In accordance with the adopted Employment Skills and Training SPD (2013) and Policy CC9 (Securing Infrastructure) a development of this nature and scale is required to demonstrate how it is utilising local labour and contributing to skills and training for local labour in the form of a construction phase employment and skills plan associated with the development. Provision of such plan, or equivalent financial contribution, would be secured by way of section 106 legal agreement should it be recommended that planning permission be granted. However, given that planning permission is recommended to be refused for other reasons preparation and signing of a section 106 agreement has not been progressed and therefore this would represent a further reason for refusal.

Community Infrastructure Levy

In accordance with the Council's adopted CIL charging schedule residential hotel accommodation is liable for the levy which would be based upon the proposed floor new space of the development of 5, 111 m².

Conclusion

The flood risk section of this report sets out that, based upon advice from the Environment Agency, the proposed development is considered to pass part b) of the flood risk Exception Test in accordance with paragraph 170 of the NPPF (2023). To pass the flood risk Exception test a

development needs to satisfy both parts a) and b) of the test. Part a) requires development to demonstrate it would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk. The supporting information submitted with the application, including the flood risk assessment, does not specifically address this part of the Exception test.

The Officer view, having carried out full assessment of the proposed development within this report, is that whilst there are some specific sustainability benefits identified, such as projected adherence to BREEAM Excellent standard, additional tree planting and minor reduction in vehicular traffic to and from the site and provision of 15 jobs, the identified shortcomings of the proposals in terms of its scale, massing, layout, design and impact on residential amenity of surrounding residential occupiers (conflict with Policies CC7 and CC8 of the Reading Borough Plan 2019) is such that it is not demonstrated that there are any wider sustainability benefits of the development that would outweigh the development being located within an area of flood risk (Flood Zone 3). Therefore, the proposals do not pass the flood risk Exception test and would conflict with paragraph 170 of the NPPF (2023) which would represent a further reason for refusal of the planning application.

As a whole, the harm identified outweighs the benefits of the scheme.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE Planning Permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposals would result in a visually dominant development; the scale and appearance of which would be out of keeping with, and harmful to, the character of the existing building and surrounding area and would fail to respond positively to its local context. Both the internal and external layout of the proposals fail to demonstrate how both C1 and C3 (the latter of which was consented under prior approval 210657), uses of the site could operate in tandem in a clear, legible, safe and secure manner, whilst the excessive hardstanding and lack of soft landscaping would result in poor quality external areas within the site. Therefore, the proposed development would fail to maintain and enhance the character of the area contrary to Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019, paragraph 135 of the NPPF (December 2023) and in accordance with paragraph 139 of the NPPF (December 2023).
2. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the two storey upward extension of the building would not result in detrimental impacts in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential occupiers, in particular to the occupiers of adjacent dwellings and rear garden areas to De Montfort Road and Vastern Road, as well as to the consented C3 use flats granted under prior approval consent ref. 210657 at ground, first and second floor level within the existing building. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraph 135 of the NPPF (December 2023).
3. As a result of hotel guests arriving, leaving, parking their cars, being dropped off and present within the site and building generally, where there would be a 24-hour reception, the proposed C1 apart hotel use of the site would result in noise and disturbance to the consented C3 use flats granted under prior approval consent ref. 210657 at ground, first and second floor level within the existing building, detrimental to the residential amenity of the future occupiers of those residential dwellings contrary to Policy CC8 (Safeguarding

Amenity) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 paragraph 135 of the NPPF (December 2023).

4. The proposal fails to demonstrate that the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the local community that would outweigh the development being located within an area of flood risk (Flood Zone 3). Therefore, the proposals do not pass part a) of the flood risk Exception Test, contrary to paragraph 170 of the NPPF (December 2023) and Policy EN18 (Flooding and Sustainable Drainage Systems) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

5. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure provision of a construction phase employment skills and training plan or equivalent financial contribution and to restrict occupancy of the apart-hotel rooms to a short stay basis only the proposed development fails to adequately contribute to local labour and training needs and adequately control that the hotel rooms are not used as residential units, contrary to Policies CC9 (Securing Infrastructure) and CR6 (Living in Central Reading) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019, the adopted Employment Skills and Training Supplementary Planning Document 2019 and the Planning Obligations Under Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document 2015.

Informatives:

1. This decision relates to the following plans:

- Site Location Plan P1048-EX112

Existing plans:

- P1048-PL111 Existing block plan
- P1048-EX001 Existing Ground Floor Plan
- P1048-EX002 Existing First Floor Plan
- P1048-EX003 Existing Second Floor Plan
- P1048-EX005 Existing Roof Plan
- P1048-EX006-A- Existing South Elevation
- P1048-EX007-C- Existing North Elevation
- P1048-EX008-B- Existing West Elevation
- P1048-EX009 Existing East Elevation
- P1048-EX013-C- Existing Inner east Elevation
- P1048-EX015-A- Existing Street Scene – Vastern Rd
- P1048-EX016-A- Existing Street Scene -Caversham Rd into Brigham Rd

Proposed plans:

- P1048-GA1100Y – Proposed Ground Floor
- GBM-PD101 Proposed First Floor
- GBM-PD102 Proposed Second Floor
- P1048-PL503J – Proposed Third Floor
- P1048-PL504H – Proposed Fourth Floor
- P1048-PL505A – Proposed Roof Plan
- P1048-PL107F Proposed North Elevation
- P1048-PL508E Proposed South Elevation

- P1048-PL509E Proposed East Elevation
- P1048-PL510E Proposed West Elevation
- P1048-PL513-B- Proposed Inner East Elevation
- P1048-PL514-B- Proposed Inner West Elevation
- P1048-PL515-A- Proposed Street Scene -Vastern Rd
- P1048-PL516-A- Proposed Street Scene – Caversham Rd Caversham Rd into Brigham Rd

- Design and Access Statement (by PEEK)
- Transport Statement (by Stantec)
- Flood Risk Assessment inc. Exceptions Test (by Stantec)
- Daylight Sunlight Assessment (by FPD)
- Energy and Sustainability Report (by FPD)
- Sequential Assessment (flood) (by FPD)
- Sequential Assessment (town centre) (by FPD)
- Landscaping Principles Statement (by FPD)
- Utilities Statement (by FPD)
- Preliminary Ecology Appraisal and Roost Assessment (by Arbtech)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Report (by Arbtech)
- Tree Survey (by Arbtech)
- AIA and Method Statement (by Arbtech)
- Contaminated Land Assessment (by Stantec)
- Ecological Mitigation, Enhancement and Management Plan (Arbtech) Issue 2
- Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys Issue 2

2. The local planning authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive by advising of the concerns with proposal and providing for the opportunity for the application to be withdrawn. The applicant chose not to withdraw the application, hence the issuing this refusal notice
3. Without prejudice to any future application or appeal, the applicant is advised that reason for refusal 5 could be overcome by entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
4. 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.