



Title	NPPF 2026 Compliance Report (Delegated)
Ward	Abbey
Planning Application Reference:	PL/26/0237 (FUL)
Site Address:	Battle Inn, 2 Bedford Road, Reading, RG1 7HS
Proposed Development	Demolition of the former public house and the erection of a part five-storey building comprising six self-contained residential flats (Use Class C3) with a Commercial, Business and Service unit at ground floor (Use Class E) and associated works.
Applicant	Anrish Properties Limited
Report author	Anthony Scholes
Deadline:	31 July 2026
Recommendation	Delegate to the Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection Services (ADTPPS) to: i) GRANT full planning permission, subject to the satisfactory completion of a s106 legal agreement and delegate to ADTPPS to make such minor changes to the conditions, Heads of Terms, and details of the legal agreement as may be reasonably required to issue the permission or ii) Refuse full planning permission if the legal agreement is not completed by 31/07/2026 (unless officers on behalf of the Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection Services agree to a later date for completion of the legal agreement);
	1. AFFORDABLE HOUSING – to secure the sum of £99,500.00 (equivalent 20% contribution) towards the provision of affordable housing elsewhere in Reading Borough, payable on first occupation of the development and index linked from the date of permission in accordance with Policy H3 (Affordable Housing) and the SPDs on Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing; 2. PUBLIC OPEN SPACE/LEISURE CONTRIBUTION – to secure the sum of £12,600.00 towards the provision of improvements to local open space, payable on commencement of the development and index linked from the date of permission (within Abbey and/or Battle Wards), in accordance with policies CC9 and H10 and the SPD on Planning Obligations. 3. Healthcare Contribution – to secure the sum of £5,543 towards the provision of or improvements to local healthcare infrastructure payable on commencement of the development index linked from the date of the permission (restricted to

	within Abbey and/or Battle Wards) in accordance with policy CC9 and the SPD on Planning Obligations.
Conditions (summary, to include but not limited to)	1. Time Limit (Standard three years) 2. Approved plans 3. Materials – including samples to be approved (pre-commencement) 4. Minimum reveal depths 5. Construction method statement (pre-commencement) 6. Security strategy to be approved (pre-commencement) 7. Refuse and recycling to be approved, including pest control, and waste management strategy (pre-occupation) 8. Boundary treatment details to be approved, including samples (pre-commencement) 9. Landscaping details to be approved to include all proposed biodiversity measures, and green roof details including structural information (pre-commencement) 10. BREEAM 'Very Good' Pre-assessment to be approved (pre-commencement) – Commercial element 11. BREEAM 'Very Good' Post completion certificate – Commercial element 12. Thames Water 'No Piling' condition (pre-commencement) 13. Noise assessment/noise mitigation between commercial and residential to be approved (55dB acoustic requirement) 14. Cycle parking (as proposed) 15. SAP assessment – As built – Residential element 16. Use of flat roof restricted 17. Hours of Construction/Demolition (0800-1800 Monday to Friday, 0800-1300 Saturday only) 18. Higher water efficiency standards – Residential element 19. Use Restriction ground floor (Class E (a-c; e and g) only) 20. No shutters 21. Pre-occupation removal of delivery hatch and reinstatement of footpath, Highways licence to be sought. 22. No mechanical plant 23. No Bonfires 24. PD rights removed (dwellings, not HMOs) 25. Delivery and Servicing Plan – commercial (To be approved) 26. Delivery hours restriction (9am – 5pm) 27. Waste Collection Hours Restricted – Commercial (9am – 5pm) 28. Parking Permits 1 (no automatic entitlement) Parking Permits 2 (notification of prospective occupants)
Informatives	1. Terms and conditions 2. Pre-commencement conditions 3. Building Regulations approval required 4. Complaints about construction 5. Encroachment 6. CIL

	7. S106 agreement
	8. Noise between residential buildings
	9. Highways
	10. Positive and Proactive – Approval
	11. Unidentified contamination

1. Assessment

- 1.1 The Planning Applications Committee resolved to grant permission for the current application as set out in the recommendation to that Committee on 1 July 2026.
- 1.2 The government published a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework on 17 August 2026.
- 1.3 Paragraph 3 of the NPPF states that *“Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The national decision-making policies in this Framework are a material consideration in making these decisions and should be read alongside the policies in the development plan. Planning decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements, as must the preparation of development plans”*.
- 1.4 This report examines whether the change in circumstances, in the case the NPPF 2026, would have led to a different recommendation to Committee or if it would have led the Committee to reach a different decision, in which case the application would need to be referred back to Committee for a further decision. Relevant new policies are discussed in turn below:

DM1 to DM4. These are broadly consistent with the NPPF 2024

DM5. Development viability – DM5.1 states that proposals, where they accord with up to date plan policies, they should be assumed to be viable. The application was not supported by a viability assessment, as such DM5.2-DM5.5 are not considered relevant.

DM6 to DM10 These are broadly consistent with the NPPF 2024

S3 and S4: Presumption in favour of sustainable development and Principle of development within settlements – The recommendation for approval aligns with the aim of this policy.

CC2: Mitigation of climate change

1.

a) Accordance with Policies TR3 and TR4 – The proposal is ‘car free’ and has good access to walking and cycling infrastructure, and public transport. Removal of a redundant access hatch on Bedford Road could be considered an opportunity taken to improve walking, wheeling and cycling by removing an obstacle to highway users.

b) b, c, d) The sustainability credentials were considered at 1 July PAC, including requirements to construct sustainably through compliance with BREEAM/SAP standards.

e) N/A

f, g) N/A

2. N/A

CC3: Adaptation to climate change

1. a-d) These matters are addressed in the main report and there is no indication that a different conclusion would be reached.

e) N/A

2. Resilience is referenced in the 2024 NPPF (e.g para 164). The report references adaptation to climate change. The new NPPF does not alter the overall approach currently approved or indicate that a different decision would be reached.

HO7: Meeting housing need. The NPPF refers to evidenced housing needs, consistent with the previous NPPF and the Local Plan. The proposals contribute towards meeting housing need.

HO8: Affordable Housing provision is proposed to be secured in line with the Local Plan requirements for an off-site contribution.

HO13.2: Consideration of whether to impose a planning condition requiring the development to begin within a shorter timescale than the statutory default was not given. In this instance, the statutory standard would seem reasonable, as the site is not a significantly large project that would need to be secured sooner. Indeed, the applicant has expressed a willingness to begin the development in the short term, however it is not considered necessary to expedite the development in this instance.

TC2: The benefits of the proposals in terms of the overall vitality and viability of the town centre are considered in the main report. The proposal involves a regeneration of the site, and provision of residential accommodation. There is no conflict between the proposals and the aims of this new policy.

L2.1(b) – Substantial weight has already been afforded to the ‘making better use of vacant and underutilised land’ and indeed Councillors sought to balance the proposal against this objective within the presentation to the committee.

L3 – The density of the proposal is significant and provides a high-density form of development which makes the most of the sites potential. The density exceeds 45 dwellings per hectare (within walking distance of the station).

DP3 and DP4 – the design of the proposals is discussed in detail in the main report to PAC and complies with both 2024 and 2026 NPPF versions.

TR3 – See also CC2 - The proposals are consistent with the sustainable transport aims of the new NPPF as set out in the main report.

TR4 – The proposals are consistent with the aims of the policy in terms of prioritising walking and cycling. There is no apparent new conflict.

TR6 – There are no likely transport impacts associated with the development as discussed within the committee report.

HC6: The proposal would involve the loss of the former Battle Inn public house. The existing planning report identifies that the public house use has not been abandoned and could lawfully recommence from the site. The protection of public houses has been strengthened and clarified within the NPPF 2026 through Policy HC6, which identifies public houses as key community facilities. Policy HC6 states that development proposals should not result in the loss of key community facilities unless one of three requirements can be met. HC6.1(c) relates closely to the requirements of policy RL6 (Protection of Leisure facilities and public houses) and is satisfied through the original assessment, that the decision maker (i.e. the Committee) was satisfied that there is sufficient alternative provision within the local area.

P2 to P5 – There is no apparent ground contamination on the site, and therefore suitable living conditions are expected for future residents, including with regard to noise and pollution as discussed within the committee report(s).

N2. The Ecological effects are considered in the main report and found to be acceptable. There is no change in the 2026 NPPF policy which might suggest a different outcome in respect of the application.

N3. The proposals incorporate new tree planting within the site, which was considered as a benefit of the proposal within the committee report(s)

HE4, HE5, HE6, HE7, HE9. The impact on the historic environment has been assessed through the planning applications and was found to be acceptable. There is no change in the 2026 NPPF policy which might suggest a different outcome in respect of the application.

- 1.5 Taking these individual policies into account and taking the NPPF as a whole, it is considered that there is nothing in the NPPF published 17 August 2026 which would have resulted in a different recommendation to the Planning Applications Committee, or a different decision by that Committee on 1 July 2026. As such it is considered that the resolution of that Committee to grant Full Planning Permission approval remains valid and can be relied upon to proceed to determination.

END