

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Abbey

App Ref: PL/24/0604 Full planning permission

Address: 90 Friar Street, Reading, RG1 1EL

Proposal: Change of use from shop (class E) to dwelling houses (class C3) to the first and second floors only to form 2 no. 2-bedroom dwelling units (maisonettes) and associated alterations to the shop front.

Applicant: Ms Kanjana Phongtintongngam

Target Decision date: 2024-09-11

Case Officer: Nathalie Weekes

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to a non-designated heritage asset; three storey historic mid terrace property on the south side of Friar Street. The building has been in Class E use but is currently vacant. The upper floors of the building were utilised as ancillary storage to the ground floor retail use. The area is characterised by retail uses at ground floor and is located within the Reading Central Area Central Core, Primary Shopping Area and Office Core. The building is located within an area of archaeological interest and adjoins a Grade II Listed Building the former Mitre Inn public house (no. 92 Friar Street) and is opposite Grade I Listed Greyfriars Church whilst in close proximity to Grade II listed W I Palmer Memorial Hall.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a change of use from shop (class E) to dwelling houses (class C3) to the first and second floors only to form 2 no. 2-bedroom dwelling units (maisonettes) with associated alterations to the shop front. Permission was granted for a change of use of the first floor from offices to residential accommodation under application 170501 in 2017 that has now lapsed. Proposed plans for the shop frontage have been revised for the current application, which realign the front entrance of the shop frontage to the left hand side with two additional entrances proposed to access the first floor.

A BREEAM pre-assessment estimator report has been submitted that provides a target score of Very Good. An air quality and noise assessment were also provided.

Plans considered

~~A24/01 Design and Access statement Oakleaf Building surveyors, 8 May 2024~~

CIL

As received 9 May 2024

AD/01 Rev A Existing Basement& Ground floor plans

AD/01 Rev A Existing first and second floor plans

AD/03 Rev A Existing front and rear elevations

AD/04 Rev A Proposed basement & Ground floor plans

AD/05 Rev A Proposed first & second floor plans

AD/06 Rev A Proposed front and rear elevations

AD/07 Rev A Site & Location plan

As received 13 May 2024

A24/01 Design and Access statement Oakleaf Building surveyors Issue 1, 16 July 2024

A5207/AQ/01 Air Quality Assessment prepared by Accon UK Environmental Consultants, 27.06.2024

R/A/1/240716 Version 01 Noise Assessment prepared by Auricl Acoustic Consulting, 16 July 2024

As received 16 July 2024

12270 BREEAM Domestic Refurbishment certification scheme Pre-assessment prepared by Base

Relevant planning history

170501/FUL_Application for a change of use from A1 (Shop) to C3 (Dwelling Houses) to the first and second floors only to form 2x2 bed units. Alterations to shop front. Permitted 12 June 2017 – not implemented.

3. CONSULTATIONS

A site notice was sent to the agent to be displayed at the site and the following addresses were consulted by letter; Flat A, 89, Flat B, 89, 89 and 90-91 Friar Street.

No letters of representation have been received.

The following were consulted:

- RBC Transport Development Control – no objections were provided subject to a parking permit informative and any comments from waste services.
- RBC Waste – Additional information is required in relation to recycling and waste services.
- Environmental Protection Consultations – Additional information is required to demonstrate that there is no harmful impact of noise as the rear is impacted by plant noise to which a penalty should be applied and extra insulation should be brought in to reduce the levels below the BS8233 levels which are designed for anonymous noise. I would suggest the rear could be brought in line with the proposed insulation for the front. Further information regarding the mechanical ventilation is required, whether it will be sufficient to mitigate overheating or whether a cool bypass would be provided, in addition to stating where the inlets will be. The proposal for the internal insulation between uses does not meet our usual standard of 55 dB, as 50 dB has been proposed and window specifications would be required as it is not clear whether these would meet Lmax levels.
- RBC Conservation Officer – Objection to the proposed scheme due to the detrimental resultant impact on the historic shop frontage, the loss of architectural detail and use of proposed materials and the impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building.
- Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) - Objection to the proposal. Whilst there is no objection to the conversion of the upper floors is done sensitively to the historic building there is a strong objection to the proposed plans due to the harmful impact to the heritage shopfront due to the different symmetry of the proposed design, a loss of architectural details such as the entrance mosaic, entrance door handle, ventilation grills, marble stall riser, fireplaces and vintage wallpaper with a shoe repair price list, use of proposed aluminium framed units for the shopfront and replacement UPVC windows rather than timber sash windows and the resultants negative impact on the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

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.

4. LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

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

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

National Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2023) Chapter 16, Paragraph 203 and Paragraph 209

National Planning Practice Guidance

Historic England Advice Note 2 – Making changes to Heritage Assets

English Heritage's "Conservation Principles"

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

CC2: SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

CC3: ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

CC5: WASTE MINIMISATION AND STORAGE

CC6: ACCESSIBILITY AND THE INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT

CC7: DESIGN AND THE PUBLIC REALM

CC8: SAFEGUARDING AMENITY

CR1: DEFINITION OF CENTRAL READING

CR2: DESIGN IN CENTRAL READING

CR6: LIVING IN CENTRAL READING

EM1: PROVISION OF EMPLOYMENT

EM4: MAINTAINING A VARIETY OF PREMISES

EN1: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

EN15: AIR QUALITY

EN16: POLLUTION AND WATER RESOURCES

EN2: AREA OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

EN6: NEW DEVELOPMENT IN A HISTORIC CONTEXT

H1: PROVISION OF HOUSING

H10: PRIVATE AND COMMUNAL OUTDOOR SPACE

H2: DENSITY AND MIX

H3: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

H8: RESIDENTIAL CONVERSIONS

CR3: PUBLIC REALM IN CENTRAL READING

OU5: SHOPFRONTS AND CASH MACHINES

TR1: ACHIEVING THE TRANSPORT STRATEGY

TR3: ACCESS, TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY-RELATED MATTERS

TR5: CAR AND CYCLE PARKING AND ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING

SPD

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Affordable Housing SPD

S106 SPD

Other

Historic England Advice Note 7 – Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage

5. APPRAISAL

The main issues are:

- a) Land Use
- b) Design, Impact on the Host Building and Character of the Area
 - c) Impact on amenity
 - d) Mix of units
 - e) Transport Issues
 - h) Affordable Housing
 - i) Sustainability

a) Land Use

The proposal entails a proposed change of use to the first and second floor of an existing vacant Class E use building, with retail on the ground floor and associated ancillary offices on the first and second floors, to Class C3 residential use for the first and second floors. A Class E use is proposed to be retained at ground floor level and will not result in the loss of any retail use at the site. Planning permission was granted to allow a change in use of the first and second floors in 2017 which was unimplemented. The proposal lies within an Article 4 area that restricts prior approval applications for a change of use to residential accommodation.

The principle of a change of use to the first and second floor is considered acceptable, subject to meeting other policy requirements including impact on the locally listed building, safety and safeguarding amenity.

b) Design, Impact on the Non-Designated Heritage Asset Building and Character of the Area

The NPPF outlines government policy, including its policy in respect of the historic environment. Chapter 16 of the NPPF (2023) 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' sets out the Government's high-level policies concerning heritage and sustainable development.

Paragraph 203 requires local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 209 of the NPPF requires that 'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'

National Planning Practice Guidance on Historic Environment, which provides context to the NPPF, also encourages identifying non-designated heritage assets. PPG states that "Plan-making bodies should make clear and up to date information on non-designated heritage assets accessible to the public to provide greater clarity and certainty for developers and decision-makers. This includes information on the criteria used to select non-designated heritage assets and information about the

location of existing assets.” It also adds, “In some cases, local planning authorities may also identify non-designated heritage assets as part of the decision-making process on planning applications...”

Local Planning Policy and Guidance

Policy EN1 ‘Protection and enhancement of the historic environment’ of the Reading Borough Local Plan sets out the Council’s aspirations for the historic environment, which includes listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, historic parks and gardens, and other features with local or national significance, such as sites and features of archaeological importance, and assets on the Local List.

This policy requires that all proposals to protect and, where possible, enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings, historic character and local distinctiveness of the area in which they are located. It echoes the NPPF by stating, “Proposals should seek to avoid harm in the first instance. Any harm to or loss of a heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification, usually in the form of public benefits”.

Policy EN4 ‘Locally Important Heritage Assets’ of the Reading Borough Local Plan states that “Development proposals that affect locally important heritage assets will demonstrate that development conserves architectural, archaeological or historical significance which may include the appearance, character and setting of the asset.

Planning permission may be granted in cases where a proposal could result in harm to or loss of a locally important heritage asset only where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development significantly outweigh the asset’s significance. Where it is accepted by the Local Planning Authority that retention is not important, recording of the heritage asset should be undertaken and submitted alongside development proposals. Replacement buildings should draw upon heritage elements of the previous design, incorporating historical qualities that made the previous building significant. This may include appearance, scale and architectural quality.”

Policy EN6 ‘New development in a historic context’ also requires “New development will make a contribution to the historic character of the area by respecting and enhancing its architectural and visual qualities and considering how heritage considerations can influence the design of new development. When determining planning applications for new development, the following factors will be taken into consideration:

- a. The positive contribution of the development to the existing historic townscape (scale, height, mass, proportion, plot size, street form, materials, significant vistas and views, and open space);
- b. Sensitivity to historic context;
- c. Reflection of borough-wide major heritage themes that contribute to local distinctiveness (e.g. patterned brickwork or former worker terraced housing);
- d. Whether development promotes and/or improves access to previously undiscovered or neglected historic significance.”

The Shopfront Design SPD states ‘Traditional shopfronts can contribute significantly to the locally distinctive character of a town’. Design principles are expected to, ‘Respect or enhance key features of any historic interest, aiming to enhance and improve upon any original features through repair in the first instance, rather than replacement;’ to ‘Respect or enhance key features of any historic interest, aiming to enhance and improve upon any original features through repair in the first instance, rather than replacement;’ and ‘In the case of conversions from shopfront to residential or non-retail uses, retain original shopfront features to the greatest extent possible’.

Policy OU5 Shopfronts and cash machines states ‘Features that positively contribute to the character of the building and street will be retained and, where possible, restored.’

Reading's Culture and Heritage Strategy 2015-2030 aims to enhance Reading's identity as a cultural and historic destination and states 'Restoration of historic shopfronts will serve to engage local businesses, attract and retain investment and promote Reading as a visitor destination.'

Impact on setting of Listed Buildings Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires 'special regard' to be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting.

The proposal relates to a non-designated heritage asset that is located opposite a Grade I listed Greyfriars Church, next to the grade II listed 92 Friar Street, in the vicinity of listed buildings. Although it is not specifically listed itself or located within a conservation area, the proposed changes to the 1930s shopfront and front facade would result in the loss of historic architectural details and would be out of keeping with other historic buildings in the public realm.

Impact of Works:

- The relocation of the existing front entrance changes the symmetry, appearance and character of the front facade.
- Replacement of existing shopfront with aluminium framed double glazed units and aluminium framed door to match is out of keeping with the original historic facade.
- Removal of original timber and glass door with timber fanlight and transom detailing and inset mosaic recessed entrance footwell will result in the loss of important architectural features of the host building.
- Installation of composite part double glazed doors to match the new shop front design will be detract from the historic appearance of the building frontage.
- Removing the timber casement windows to replace them with UPVC type top hung double glazed casement windows would be out of keeping with the host building.
- The original fascia has been removed, it is proposed to replace it with an aluminium rather than a timber fascia.
- It is unclear whether other existing architectural details that have historic significance would be removed, including: the original shopfront door handle, ventilation grills and the marble stallriser
- Mechanical ventilation is proposed as part of the noise assessment requirements however no details have been provided as to how this would be installed.

The RBC Conservation officer objects to the proposal due to the following reasons:

The subject building is a non-designated heritage asset that appears on the map of 1853, a three-storey 19th century building with a surviving traditional shopfront. The shopfront is of elaborated design with a mosaic floor in a recessed doorway with flanking windows, large windows and leaded transom lights along the top, moulded shopfront cornice and corbels, cast iron vents, etc. It is one of the surviving stylish and well-proportioned surviving shopfronts on Friar Street. The building is also attached to the Grade II Listed The Mitre Inn and faces Grade I Listed Greyfriars Church, to which it contributes positively through its historic features and architectural language.





Reflection of Grade I Listed Greyfriars Church on the existing traditional shopfront

The proposal would replace the original timber sash windows of upper floor windows with plastic ones. It would introduce two new entrances for upper-floor residential units by vertically dividing the existing shopfront and completely altering its proportions, design and materials with unsympathetic replacement shop frontage that includes new aluminium fascia sign, aluminium double-glazed units, composite double-glazed doors, grey facing brick infill walling as new pilasters, which remains unclear. The proposal would result in the loss of the traditional shopfront due to its mixing of styles and materials. It would not respect the character of the building and shopfront and not enhance to the historic and architectural features and language of the heritage asset. It would detract from the historical settings of the listed buildings, Greyfriars Church and Mitre, contrary to the attractive frontage with rich architectural detailing of the existing building. The proposal would have an architectural language of monotonous forms, bringing no heritage value to the non-designated heritage asset itself or the settings of listed buildings. The proposed shopfront would not comprise high-quality, contemporary design and aesthetic appearance, interrupting the historical pattern in this particular prominent position.

Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies EN1, EN4 and EN6 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019), which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that new development proposals conserve, sustain and enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets, take into account the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset and ensure new development is integrated into the historic character and local distinctiveness defined by the settings of listed buildings in which they are located in accordance with the advice in the Framework.

The proposed change in materials to aluminium shop frontage and replacement UPVC windows 'with their modern aesthetics' are out of keeping with the style and architecture of the historic building and conflict with the need to maintain the integrity and character of the shop. The use of traditional timber materials and the retention of the historic shopfront would ensure that existing key features are retained. Further information is also required to clarify whether any internal features are proposed to be removed such as the wallpaper and original fireplaces. It has previously been demonstrated by planning application 170501 that the conversion of the first and second floors can be achieved without substantially changing the historic shopfront. The proposal is considered to result harm to the setting of listed buildings in the vicinity and does not respect the host building also contrary to policy OU5, CC7, CR2 and the Shopfront design SPD. In addition, the proposed development would conflict with paragraphs 203 and 209 of the NPPF.

c) Impact on amenity

Neighbour amenity

The nature of the proposed change of use and alterations are not considered to result in any material loss of light, overbearing impact or privacy given the position and nature of the surrounding properties. As such, it is not considered that the proposed change of use in itself would cause any significant adverse amenity impacts for neighbouring and nearby occupiers. This is in terms of overlooking, outlook, sense of enclosure, daylight/sunlight and overshadowing matters. As such, the proposals are considered to comply with policy CC8.

Amenity for future occupiers

Policy CC8 seeks that new development creates a quality living environment for existing and future residents. The proposed room sizes are considered reasonably sized, with light to bedrooms at the rear not considered to be so detrimental to warrant a refusal on this basis alone. The accommodation was previously considered acceptable and remains largely unchanged from the previously approved first and second floor layouts.

As is the case with the majority of town centre dwellings, meaningful amenity space is not capable of being provided on site. Given the location of the site and access to nearby public amenities it is considered that in this instance the lack of amenity space is acceptable and is not considered to unduly compromise the overall quality of accommodation proposed. In accordance with CC8 and H10.

There has been a failure to demonstrate that future residents will not be detrimentally impacted by noise and air quality. There are a number of queries relating to the noise report submitted that require further clarification or additional detail before commencement of the development. Issues such as insulation levels and mechanical ventilation requirements which could affect the external elevation and any inlets or additional vents should be illustrated on the plans. No product specifications have been provided and it is unclear whether windows would meet the required specification. It should be demonstrated that appropriate internal noise levels will be met in order to protect the amenity of future occupiers.

d) Mix of units

Policy H2 requires that developments provide an appropriate density and mix of residential development, in accordance with the findings of a housing market assessment. The supporting text to this policy states that the provision of at least an element of family housing in all developments is a priority, based on the findings of the Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) (SHMA). The policy also states that the appropriate density and mix of residential development will be informed by the characteristics of the area in which it is located and accessibility. Given the site's location within the defined Reading Centre and Central Core, it is considered that the proposed 2 x 2 bed units would be an appropriate mix in this specific instance. In accordance with Policy H2.

e) Transport Issues

The site is located within the Reading Central Area and within Reading's primary shopping area. The site is located within Zone 1 of the adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD which is an area at the very heart of Reading Borough, consisting primarily of retail and commercial office developments, with limited residential. This area is well served by rail and bus links and also contains the largest proportion of public car parking spaces. In accordance with the adopted SPD, the development would be required to provide a parking provision of 0.5 spaces per 1-2 bedroom dwelling.

Whilst there is no parking available on the site, Friar Street and the surrounding road network all have parking restrictions preventing on-street parking, therefore, any overflow in parking would not affect flow of traffic on the classified road network. Friar Street does not fall within a Resident's Permit Zone and the residents will not be eligible to apply for a Residents Parking Permit.

No provision has been included for bin or cycle storage. Under the previous application, the planning officer report stated, "It was considered that, in this specific instance, and given the location of the site, the need to preserve the shop front was greater than the need to provide refuse and cycle storage." However, the applicant is still requested to address how waste and recycling will be collected from the site. A condition would be required to provide adequate recycling, waste storage and refuse collection.

Transport does not have any objections to this proposal subject to a condition and Informative. In accordance with TR1 , TR3 and TR5.

h) Affordable Housing

The submission states that the applicant would be willing to agree to a negotiated financial contribution towards affordable housing. However, no GDV valuations have been submitted to allow the appropriate contribution to be calculated (as per the adopted SPD) and as such an affordable housing contribution has not been agreed (in any future appeal it would be expected for 2 valuations to be submitted at the outset of the appeal to allow further consideration of this). Given this, and as the proposal is not considered acceptable in other planning terms, the Council has not pursued the S106 legal agreement to secure the financial affordable housing provision. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H3 and CC9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

An informative will specify that this reason for refusal could be overcome, in the context of an acceptable scheme in all other respects, by entering into a s106 or unilateral undertaking.

i) Sustainability

Policy CC2 of the Reading Local Plan seeks the proposal, as a 'creation of new residential units through Conversion', to comply with BREEAM Level of 'Very Good'. The application is accompanied by a BREEAM Pre-Assessment Estimator which identifies that this rating is achievable. It is considered acceptable to deal with this matter by way of a suitably worded condition. In accordance with CC2.

In accordance with Policy CC2 of the Reading Local Plan.

Other issues

Archaeology

On the basis of the information presented, it is not clear that there would be any significant groundworks due to the changes to the shopfront, therefore harm to archaeology is not anticipated and this could be otherwise dealt with by a condition, were the proposal otherwise acceptable, to comply with Policy EN2.

6. CONCLUSION

This proposal does not incorporate any of the original design previously permitted, involving poor-quality materials, and loss of key architectural features without correctly addressing all the relevant issues which such a proposal raises. Although the development would comply with the required impact on neighbouring amenity, proposed density and mix, provision of two new units of C3 residential accommodation and transport requirements, the removal of the historic shop frontage, lack of an

agreed affordable housing contribution and failure to demonstrate acceptable waste and recycling and provision in respect of the impact of noise results in the levels of harm outweighing any benefit of the proposed development. Pre-application discussions could have prevented the need for issuing this refusal.

7. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Recommended Conditions:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of the traditional shopfront design and its replacement with a shopfront that does not respect the character of the building, exacerbated by use of poor quality materials and a, loss of architectural detail including the paved mosaic entrance, timber sash windows and central shop entrance. The proposed changes to the shopfront do not comprise high-quality, contemporary design or aesthetic appearance, interrupting the historical pattern and appearance of the shopfront in a prominent position within the town centre. The proposal would harm the significance of the building, a non-designated heritage asset, the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed building at no. 92 Friar Street and fail to maintain or enhance the character of the area and public realm. The proposals are contrary to Policies EN1, EN4, EN6 ,CR2 and CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019), Design Guide to Shopfronts Supplementary Planning Document (2022) and paragraphs 203 and 209 of the NPPF (December 2023).
2. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure provision of affordable housing or an equivalent financial contribution, the proposal fails to contribute adequately to the housing needs of Reading Borough. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H3 (Affordable Housing) and CC9 (Securing Infrastructure) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and the Council's Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2021.
3. The proposed development fails to demonstrate how waste and recycling can be adequately stored, managed and collected without adversely impacting upon the residential amenity of future occupiers in terms of odour and without resulting in waste and recycling being left on the street, which would be detrimental to and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area, setting of the host non-designated heritage asset, adjoining grade II listed building at no. 92 Friar Street and Grade I listed Greyfriars Church on the opposite side of Friar Street. The proposals would be contrary to Policies CC5, CR2, CC7, EN1, EN4 and EN6 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraphs 203 and 209 of the NPPF (December 2023).
4. The proposed development fails to demonstrate that future occupiers of the proposed flats would not be adversely impacted by external noise sources surrounding the site, including plant noise and as a result of internal noise transmission from the existing ground floor commercial unit. The proposals would be contrary to Policies CC8 and EN16 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraph 191 of the NPPF (December 2023).

Informatives:

1. This decision relates to the following plans and supporting documents:
AD/04 Rev A Proposed basement & Ground floor plans
AD/05 Rev A Proposed first & second floor plans
AD/06 Rev A Proposed front and rear elevations
AD/07 Rev A Site & Location plan
As received 13 May 2024

A24/01 Design and Access statement Oakleaf Building surveyors Issue 1, 16 July 2024
A5207/AQ/01 Air Quality Assessment prepared by Accon UK Environmental Consultants,
27.06.2024
R/A/1/240716 Version 01 Noise Assessment prepared by Auricl Acoustic Consulting, 16 July 2024
As received 16 July 2024

12270 BREEAM Domestic Refurbishment certification scheme Pre-assessment prepared by Base
Energy, 17 July 2024
As received 17 July 2024

2. Without prejudice to any future application or appeal, the applicant is advised that reasons for refusal 2 and 3 could be overcome by entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the matters referred to.

3 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.

4. This planning application was submitted without the benefit of first seeking pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority, which can often result in the avoidance of refusal of planning permission. Please see the following link to the Council's pre-application service here:
http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/1190/Pre-Application-Enquiry-Form/pdf/Pre-app_Nov_2016.pdf

5. The Local Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant to see if relevant concerns could be resolved to allow permission to be granted. However, that has not been possible within the prescribed target or agreed extended timescale and therefore the decision to refuse planning permission has been taken.