

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

21 JULY 2021

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO
4. POTENTIAL SITE VISITS FOR COMMITTEE ITEMS	Decision		7 - 10
11. 210163/FUL & 210164LBC - BRISTOL & WEST ARCADE, MARKET PLACE	Decision	ABBEY	11 - 14
12. 210349/FUL - 115 CHATHAM STREET	Decision	ABBEY	15 - 18
20. 210018/OUT - READING GOLF CLUB, KIDMORE END ROAD, EMMER GREEN	Decision	PEPPARD	19 - 24
21. 210644/REG3 & 210745/LBC - PROSPECT PARK, LIEBENROOD ROAD	Decision	SOUTHCOTE	25 - 28

This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE SHEET AND ORDER OF CONSIDERATION

Planning Applications Committee - 21st July 2021

Item No. 04 - Potential Site Visit for Committee Items.

Items with speaking:

Item No.	11 Page 55	Ward Abbey
Application Number	210163 Full Planning Approval & 210164 Listed Building Consent	
Address	Bristol & West Arcade, Market Place, Reading, RG1 1JL	
Planning Officer presenting	Matthew Burns	*UPDATE*

Objector:

Evelyn Williams - Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Agent:

Nick De Lotbiniere - Savills (phone)

Item No.	20 Page 297	Ward Peppard
Application Number	210018	
Application type	Outline Planning Approval	
Address	Reading Golf Club, Kidmore End Road, Emmer Green	
Planning Officer presenting	Susanna Bedford	*UPDATE*

Objectors:

Clare Grashoff - Keep Emmer Green

Helen Lambert - Caversham and District Residents Association

Steve Harcourt - Emmer Green Residents Association

Julie Jackson (phone)

Supporters:

Richard Stainthorp

Stephen Lee (phone)

Statements:

Mac Pugh - Emmer Green Surgery

Ian Lawson - Caversham Preparatory School

Agent:

Jonathan Walton - Pegasus Group

On hand to answer questions:

Andrew Smith - Fairfax

Martin Wilkes - Fairfax

Gary Stangoe - General manager

Items without speaking:

Item No.	10 Page 39	Ward	Abbey
Application Number	210007		
Application type	Full Planning Approval		
Address	124-128 Cardiff Road, Reading		
Planning Officer presenting	Ethne Humphreys		
Item No.	12 Page 125	Ward	Abbey
Application Number	210349		
Application type	Full Planning Approval		
Address	115 Chatham Street, Reading, RG1 7JX		
Planning Officer presenting	Brian Conlon	*UPDATE*	
Item No.	13 Page 177	Ward	Abbey
Application Number	210879		
Application type	Regulation 3 Planning Approval		
Address	134 Oxford Road, Reading, RG1 7NL		
Planning Officer presenting	Nathalie Weekes		
Item No.	14 Page 183	Ward	Battle
Application Number	210583		
Application type	Full Planning Approval		
Address	75 Loverock Road, Reading, RG30 1DZ		
Planning Officer presenting	Nathalie Weekes		
Item No.	15 Page 193	Ward	Caversham
Application Number	210471		
Application type	Listed Building Consent		
Address	Caversham Court Environmental Centre, Church Road, Caversham		
Planning Officer presenting	Susanna Bedford		
Item No.	16 Page 201	Ward	Church
Application Number	201141		
Application type	Full Planning Approval		
Address	65 Northcourt Avenue, Reading, RG2 7HF		
Planning Officer presenting	Claire Ringwood		
Item No.	17 Page 231	Ward	Minster
Application Number	201070		
Application type	Advertisement Consent		
Address	Land at Rose Kiln Lane, Reading		
Planning Officer presenting	Ethne Humphreys		

Item No. 18 **Page 245** **Ward** Minster
Application Number 210549 Regulation 3 Planning Approval &
210550 Advertisement Consent
Address Wensley Court (No. 193), Irving Court (No.203)
and Riversley Court (No. 205), Wensley Road
Planning Officer presenting **Jonathan Markwell**

Item No. 19 **Page 293** **Ward** Minster
Application Number 201197
Application type Listed Building Consent
Address 5 The Brookmill, Reading, RG1 6DD
Planning Officer presenting **Tom Hughes**

Item No. 21 **Page 401** **Ward** Southcote
Application Number 210644 Regulation 3 Planning Approval &
210745 Listed Building Consent
Address Prospect Park, Liebenrood Road, Reading
Planning Officer presenting **Claire Ringwood** ***UPDATE***

Item No. 22 **Page 419** **Ward** Tilehurst
Application Number 210806
Application type Householder
Address 47 Beverley Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5PT
Planning Officer presenting **Alison Amoah**

This page is intentionally left blank

**READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
SERVICES**

TO:	PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE		
DATE:	21 JULY 2021		
TITLE:	POTENTIAL SITE VISITS FOR COMMITTEE ITEMS		
SERVICE:	PLANNING	WARDS:	BOROUGH WIDE
AUTHOR:	Julie Williams	TEL:	0118 9372461
JOB TITLE:	Acting Planning Manager	E-MAIL:	Julie.williams@reading.gov.uk

1. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF REPORT

- 1.1 To identify those sites where, due to the sensitive or important nature of the proposals, Councillors are advised that a Site Visit would be appropriate before the matter is presented at Committee and to confirm how the visit will be arranged. A list of potential sites is appended to this report with an officer note added to say if recommended for a site visit or not.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION
2.1 That you note this report and confirm that the site recorded below is not visited.
2.2 Confirm if there are any other sites Councillors consider necessary to visit before reaching a decision on an application.
2.3 Confirm how the site(s) identified by 2.2 will be visited, unaccompanied or accompanied.

3. THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Appended to this report is a list of applications received that may be presented to Committee for a decision in due course. Officers will normally indicate if a site would benefit from being visited to inform your decision making or Councillors may request that a site is visited.
- 3.2 A site visit is only likely to be necessary if the impact of the proposed development is difficult to visualise from the plans and any supporting material or if there is a good reason why the comments of the applicant and objectors cannot be expressed adequately in writing; or, the proposal is particularly contentious.
- 3.3 It is possible that these difficulties will arise at Committee during consideration of an application, in which case it is appropriate for Councillors to seek a deferral to allow a visit to be carried out to assist in reaching the correct decision.

3.4 Accompanied site visits consist of an arranged inspection by a viewing Committee, with officers in attendance and by arrangement with the applicant or their agent. Applicants and objectors however will have no right to speak but may observe the process and answer questions when asked. The visit is an information gathering opportunity and not a decision making forum.

3.5 Unaccompanied site visits can take place where the site is easily viewable from public areas and allows Councillors to visit the site when convenient to them. In these instances, the case officer will provide a briefing note on the application and the main issues to be considered by Councillors when visiting the site.

3.6 There may also be occasions where officers or Councillors request a post completion site visit in order to review the quality or impact of a particular development.

4. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

4.1 The processing of planning applications contributes to creating a sustainable environment with active communities and helping the economy within the Borough as identified as the themes of the Council's Corporate Plan:

1. Healthy Environments
2. Thriving Communities
3. Inclusive Economy

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

5.1 Statutory neighbour consultation takes place on planning applications.

6. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

6.1 Officers when assessing an application and when making a recommendation to the Committee, will have regard to its duties Under the Equality Act 2010, Section 149, to have due regard to the need to—

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 None arising from this report.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Council declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 26 February 2019 (Minute 48 refers).

8.2 The Planning Service uses policies to encourage developers to build and use properties responsibly by making efficient use of land and using sustainable materials and building methods. As a team we have also reduced the amount of resources (paper and printing) we use to carry out our work.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The cost of site visits is met through the normal planning service budget and Councillor costs.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Reading Borough Council Planning Code of Conduct.

Potential Site Visit List:

Ward: Kentwood

Application reference: 210904

Application type: Regulation 3 Planning Approval

Site address: 35 Bramshaw Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG30 6AT

Proposal: Works consist of property improvements and upgrades of Thermal efficiency measures to dwellings detailed below. All properties located on the Old Norcot Estate, Reading. Phase 1 addresses to include:- 35, 37, 39, 41, 43 Bramshaw Road RG30 6AT 69, 71, 73, 75 Bramshaw Road, RG30 6AS 377 & 379 Norcot Road, RG30 6AB. Works will see the existing render overclad with a new external wall insulation system, replacement of new triple glazed windows, minor roof adaptations and associated works.

Reason for Committee item: RBC application

NOT RECOMMENDED BY OFFICERS

This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE REPORT

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 21st July 2021
ITEM NO. 11

Ward: Abbey

App No.: 210163/FUL & 210164/LBC

Address: Bristol & West Arcade 173-175 Friar Street and no.s 27-32 Market Place, Reading

Proposal:

210163FUL - Demolition of vacant former Bristol & West Arcade (173-175 Friar Street) and redevelopment of site including minor excavations at basement level to provide an 8-storey building to provide a hotel (C1 use) of up to 182 beds, creation of a bar/restaurant/gym at ground floor associated with the hotel and the provision of ancillary facilities including outdoor terrace, demolition of rear parts of 29-31 and 32 Market Place, the change of use of the retained units at 27-28, 29-31 and 32 Market Place at first, second and third floors to provide 8 residential units, retention of flexible Class E uses and public house (sui generis use) at ground and basement floors

210164LBC - Demolition of 20th Century additions to the rear of 29-31 Market Place and 32 Market Place with associated internal and external alterations to listed buildings

Applicant: Sonic Star Properties Ltd

13 Week Decision Target Date: 30/06/2012 Extension of Time Date: 31/08/2021

RECOMMENDATION:

210163/FUL: As per main agenda report but with the following amendments to the s106 heads of terms no.s 1 and 6:

S106 Heads of Terms

1. Affordable housing Contribution of £213,000 towards provision of off-site affordable housing within the Borough (index-linked from the date of permission) payable prior to first occupation of any residential unit
6. ~~High Street Heritage Action Zone (HSHAZ) contribution towards public realm improvements equivalent to 2% of construction costs~~
Contribution towards public realm improvements within the High Street Heritage Action Zone (HSHAZ) equivalent to 2% of construction costs payable prior to first occupation of Market Place units

210164/LBC: As per main agenda report

1. Amended Description

- 1.1 A minor change has been made to the application description to reference the retention of the public house (Sui Generis use) at 29-31 Market Place.

2. Amended S106 Heads of Terms

Affordable Housing Contribution

- 2.1 The heads of term for the affordable housing contribution has been amended to include reference to the payment trigger of prior to first occupation of any residential unit.

High Street Heritage Action Zone (HSHAZ) Contribution

- 2.2 The wording of the heads of term for the HSHAZ contribution has also been amended. This is to clarify that this is a contribution from the Applicant to the Council to go towards public realm improvements within the HSHAZ. Reading is one of 68 areas of England to receive a share of a £95 million government fund having secured High Street Heritage Action Zone (HSHAZ) status for three conservation areas in the centre of the town.
- 2.3 This contribution towards public realm works, delivered by the HSHAZ programme, is justified on the basis that if a contribution is sought for public realm improvements from a development then there must be a connection between the improvements and the development. In this case the guests and visitors to the new hotel, associated facilities and Market Place units will pass through or spend time in the public area of Market Place by walking on pavements, using benches or bins whilst congregating around the site and enjoying the enhanced historic environment. This makes the contribution necessary to make the application acceptable in planning terms as supported by Policies CC9 (Securing Infrastructure) and CR3 (Public Realm in Central Reading). The final sum sought will be based on an accepted reasonable and proportionate method.

3. Other

- 3.1 Paragraph 6.40 of the main agenda report set out that a report evidencing the essential repair works that have been carried out to the Market Place listed building would be provided by way of update report to the Committee. At the time of writing this update report a report evidencing the works carried out has not been received by Officers. It is understood that as a result of a period of wet weather some weeks ago the completion of the essential repair work and production of the report has been delayed. An email update has been provided from the Applicant which confirms that the essential works undertaken so far include:

- Remove temporary roof and tarpaulin, clear out gutters, seal, re-glaze roof with Perspex sheets, remove and clear out down pipe, re fix and leave free flowing
- Re-board monitor roof light
- Repair flashing and outlets on flat roof
- Re fix hoarding and provide flashing over door
- Clear out internal valley area including clearing gulley, pipework and internal gutters
- Clear out internal valley and outlet
- Remove broken hatch and hoard up access point
- Clear out all gutters to front elevation including outlets, rainwater pipes and internal guttering system
- Replace flat and stepped lead flashing, pointed ion lime mortar and lime render patches
- Form access between ground and first floor in BBS
- Clear flat roof area and gutters including sealing water ingress points around AC installation
- Premises cleaned of pigeon guano
- Floors over-boarded and handrails installed where required to provide safe circulation around building
- Floors and ceilings propped in various locations to make safe
- Secure hoarding provided to fireplace
- Work commenced on isolated valley gutter between Coopers Arms and adjacent property (Parkers)
- Front elevation to BBS being prepped prior to decoration/painting
- Generally secure / hoard access points for intruders and pigeons
- Replaced broken and missing tiles and slates generally to all roofs

3.2 Councillors who attended the committee site visit on 15th July 2021 were able to view the works that had been undertaken. As per heads of term no.5 within the recommendation box of the main agenda report, completion of this essential works prior to occupation of the hotel, together with the more extensive works to the listed buildings as detailed in the main agenda report, is proposed be secured as part of the section 106 legal agreement.

4. Conclusion

4.1 The recommendation remains as per the main agenda report but subject to the amended s106 heads of terms discussed above.

Case Officer: Matt Burns

This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE REPORT

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 21st July 2021
ITEM NO. 12

Ward: Abbey

App No: 210349/FUL

Address: 115 Chatham Street, Reading, RG1 7JX

Proposal: Demolition of the existing buildings on site and erection of a 3 - 5 storey building to provide 54 residential units (Class C3). Provision of private and communal external amenity areas, car and cycle parking and refuse storage.

Applicant: Archel Homes Ltd

Received Date: 4 March 2021

13 Week Target Date: 18 Aug 2021

RECOMMENDATION:

Amend Recommendation on main report as follows:

Delegate to the Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services (HPDRS) to:

- i) **GRANT** full planning permission subject to
- ii) ~~(1) no objection being raised by RBC's Ecology consultants to the satisfactory submission of a Bat Survey, and~~
- iii) **(1)** satisfactory completion of the Section 106 agreement;

Or;

- i) Refuse full planning permission if ~~sustainability~~ **ecology** matters not resolved or the S106 agreement is not completed by 18 August 2021 (unless the Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services agrees to a later date for completion of the legal agreement)

S106 to include Heads of Terms as set out in the Main Report with the following amendment:

- The car club usage should be reviewed on an annual basis **(for 5 years)** to establish whether a second vehicle is required **due to demand generated by residents of the approved development.**

CONDITIONS:

Additional conditions:

32. NOISE ASSESSMENT & MITIGATION FACE BAR (TO BE SUBMITTED)
33. VEGETATION CLEARANCE OUTSIDE NESTING SEASON

Ecology matters

No objection was received from RBC Ecology to the submitted Bat Survey and Assessment (Aspect Ecology Ltd, July 2021) subject to those additional conditions listed above.

Transport matters

The area fronting on to Chatham Street has now been adopted as Public Highway to allow the planting and entrances through the S142 licence, should permission be granted.

Representations

The following representation letter/statement submitted on behalf of Mr S Stanton (owner of The Butler public house) has been included below in full:

Dear Mr Conlon,

RE: PLANNING APPLICATION 210349; 115 CHATHAM STREET

On behalf of our Client, Mr S Stanton (owner of the Butler public house), we are writing to you to object to the application 210349.

The application is within a site identified for development or change through policy CR12(c) of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan 2019.

The reasons for objection are:

1. Overlooking impact

Whilst the applicant makes reference within their design and access statement to the existing permission the objector has for 14 boutique hotel rooms with external courtyard amenity space at the Butler (180365/FUL, determined 5th March 2019), there is no assessment as to how this permission has been respected within the application 210349.

The development within application 210349 contains both windows to habitable rooms and an external roof area accessed from residential properties facing east, looking directly towards the objector's land. At first and second floor levels of the applicant's scheme, the windows are only 3.5m from the boundary and in some instance, the overlooking windows are the only provision of light / views to habitable rooms.

This compromises the achieved permission 180365/FUL, as the design will allow overlooking into part of the approved proposals and permit views from the amenity space into this applicant's residential spaces.

The proposals therefore would compromise and blight any potential development of our site, against the direction of item vii of CR12.

2. Live music and cultural events

In light of this being a fully residential application, please be aware that the Butler is a pub that always has, and always will, promote live music and cultural events. Without live music, the Butler would not be a financially viable establishment. It is important in accessing this application that these rights are both returned and even promoted and protected by Reading Borough Council.

This is relevant for the reasons set out in item 1 above - this application having residential rooms and spaces directly in line with the Butler and therefore affected by the music played.

3. Current planning on the Butler site

As the Council is aware - through correspondence with Richard Eatough, Ethne Humphries and Jonathan Mullis over the last 2 years - the adjoining owner of the Grade 2 listed building the 'Butler' has been and is currently working up a scheme for the adjoining site following receipt for approval of a 'boutique' hotel in 2019 (application 180365/FUL).

This scheme revolves around our client responding to the pre application advice given to us on 29th May 2020 by Ethne Humphries and colleagues, where it relies on the ability to gain natural light coming from the west (ie from the direction of 115 Chatham Street).

Whilst this application for 115 Chatham Street is unlikely to directly impact on the pre-application proposals submitted to Reading Borough Council, we would request that the concept of sourcing natural light from the westerly direction for future applications is not restricted due to permittance of east facing windows providing views for habitable rooms. This would again be in accordance with item vii of policy CR12.

4. Impact on the Listed Building

Policy EN1 of the Local Plan states that historic features, which includes Listed Buildings, will have their settings protected and enhanced by any applications which may affect them. Being only 3.5m from the shared boundary, we feel that this application should include an assessment of any potential harm to the Listed Building caused by the application before determination can be made.

We believe that this request is further supported as Reading Borough Council have placed significant weight to the importance of the Butler as a local heritage asset, in accordance with policy EN4, in the past.

This is also supported by Policy CR12 item v - where the areas of transition should conserve and, where possible, enhance listed buildings and their settings.

Without a written assessment by the applicant, the impact of the proposal and any level of harm caused to the Butler, cannot be qualified.

5. Greater Pedestrian Permeability

As with the pre-applications for the site at 10 Eaton Place and that for the Butler, the planning officer(s) requested that we worked in conjunction with their office and the adjoining developer to achieve development across both sites that was harmonious between them and was in keeping with the aim of Policy CR12 item ii.

To date no such conversations have taken place with our client in relation to this and so we would therefore request that this joint approach is looked at again prior to the current application being considered any further.

We believe that there is a good opportunity to open up the eastern boundary of this application with the Butler and Eaton Place beyond through a co-ordinated approach in compliance with figure 5.4 of the Local Plan.

We would also be very happy to meet with officers and the applicant in the coming weeks and show them the proposals we have for our site in order that they can consider these in parallel with their existing application in process.

Finally, and for the purposes of good record can we please have written confirmation of receipt of this objection and look forward to your earliest response.

Yours Sincerely,

Tony Mullin

Case Officer - Brian Conlon

Update Report

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 21st July 2021

Ward: Peppard

App No.: 210018

Address: Reading Golf Club, 17 Kidmore End Road, Emmer Green

Proposal: Outline planning application, with matters reserved in respect of Appearance, for demolition of the existing clubhouse and the erection of a new residential-led scheme (C3 use to include affordable housing) and the provision of community infrastructure at Reading Golf Club

Applicant: Fairfax (Reading) Limited and Reading Golf Club Limited

Deadline: Original 16 week date 18/5/2021 - Extended to 30/7/2021

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Amended Reason 1.

The application site forms a significant area of Undesignated Open Space within Reading Borough. The application proposals would lead to the loss of a significant part of this space through built form and related enclosed domestic gardens, roads and driveways. The proposal fails to demonstrate that replacement open space of a similar standard and function can be provided at an accessible location close by; or that improvements to recreational facilities on remaining open space can be provided to a level sufficient to outweigh the loss of the open space and that the off-site compensation arrangement is deliverable. The Layout applied for in this application proposal will therefore lead to an unacceptable loss of undesignated open space in the site/in the local area, contrary to Policy EN8 (Undesignated Open Space) of the adopted Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

New Reason 6

6. The proposal has failed to demonstrate that the development has been designed to incorporate measures to adapt to climate change; provide sufficient justification of the proposed decentralised energy provision and aimed zero carbon homes contrary to Policy CC3 Adaptation to Climate Change, CC4 Decentralised Energy H5 Standards for New Housing and the adopted 'SPD Sustainable Design and Construction' 2019.

1.0 Corrections:

- Second Para 4.23 the Public consultation event by the applicant was undertaken on 11th February 2020
- 6.11.3 should read 'clarity is required in...'
- Due to the number of letters required to be sent out to notify of the item coming to this Committee a small batch was posted out prior to others.

2.0 Further comments received

Chiltern Conservation Board Revised date 11th July

Thank you for consulting the Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB). The application site is located to the south east of the AONB, varying between 1 km and 2 km, at the nearest point to the existing boundary. The landscape area to the south and south-

east of the AONB boundary around Kidmore End, is sensitive and falls within the wider setting of the AONB. Much of this landscape would justify the status of a 'valued landscape', consistent with the guidance in the NPPF at 170. Some of this landscape has considerable potential to be a candidate for the AONB boundary review, as announced by the Secretary of State and Natural England on 24th June 2021. The CCB would consider this a matter of material relevance. The landscape character to the south and south-east of Kidmore End enjoys a landscape character that is consistent with the nationally protected landscape of the Chilterns AONB.

The CCB has looked at the application papers and the Environmental Statement (Volume 3 - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment), especially. We also give weight and authority to our own Position Statement (2011) on '*Development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB*'. We have concluded that the application site here falls broadly within the wider setting of the AONB and sits next to or just beyond a wider valued landscape, itself a part of the setting and contained within the National Character Area 110 and with a landscape character that shares much with the South Oxfordshire LCA Chilterns Plateau with Valleys.

The topography, local vegetation and built form in and around the current planning application site impacts the immediate visual relationship to the AONB. The CCB has concluded that there is a landscape character relationship here, accepting the more direct visual relationship is affected by distance and topography. The application site clearly enjoys a visual link, due to its open character, with the valued landscape between the AONB and the edge of the built settlement.

We would recommend that the status of the wider valued landscape is given weight in any planning decision and that a landscape master-plan and management plan protects and indeed enhances the relationship between the existing site edge and the wider landscape. We note that the applicant has submitted a constraints plan and it is an important landscape consideration that these landscape boundary issues are taken into account.

In summary, the valued landscape status and the potential for an AONB boundary review are matters of relevance and weight can be attached.

Our duties.

The CROW section 87 (2) establishes that, A conservation board, while having regard to the purposes mentioned in subsection (1), shall seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the area of outstanding natural beauty and shall for that purpose co-operate with local authorities and public bodies whose functions include the promotion of economic or social development within the area of outstanding natural beauty.

The Chilterns AONB is nationally protected as one of the finest areas of countryside in the UK. Public bodies and statutory undertakers have a statutory duty of regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB (Section 85 of CroW Act).

Emmer Green Surgery dated 16th July 2021

Over the last 2/3 years the Emmer Green Surgery has taken on a significant increase in patient numbers owing to the closure of two other practices in the area and when we became aware of the proposed development on the local golf course and the added impact this would have on patient numbers we engaged with the all parties

involved at an early stage to identify what the impact on the local healthcare requirements might be and how we might help to resolve those issues.

We met with representatives from our CCG along with Susanna Bedford from RBC, Jonathan Walton from the Pegasus group, senior representatives from the golf club and Fairfax.

It was interesting to view the draft plans for the golf course which included a range of facilities and social areas etc to cater for the proposed residents and indeed the wider Reading population including provision for some new healthcare facilities on site although this was not something we were personally interested in moving to or even managing as a satellite site to our own existing Practice.

We explained that we did have an alternative solution to resolve any increase in healthcare requirements resulting from this proposed development on the golf course and that was to purchase the property next to our existing surgery and expand our existing facilities but in order to do this we would need the support from all parties attending the meeting to achieve it.

Since that early meeting the Pegasus group in particular has helped us to prepare our own development plans for submission to the RBC for consideration and we have now had feedback from Suzanne Bedford as to what adjustments would need to be made to make them fully acceptable and we have also entered into discussions regarding financial support in order to deliver this project.

We have not answered all the questions yet but clearly with the ongoing help and support of the people concerned we can at least say that the future healthcare requirements for the area do not have to present an issue to any of the plans submitted for either of the proposed projects but from our perspective there is a time limit on our solution being viable as our neighbours are keen to progress their own moving requirements now that we are emerging from the Pandemic.

I thought this input might be useful, so you have a full picture of all the background work that has been going on to try and ensure that everyone's needs are best catered for in the future as the population continues to grow and both housing and healthcare services continue to be in great demand.

Statement of Ian Lawson of 23 Brooklyn Drive and Caversham Preparatory School dated 20th July 2021 - Extract

- 1.1 It is agreed with the officers recommendation to refuse the application
- 1.2 I wish to make a statement concerning the change of use of the land which may be inappropriate in light of recent events in Germany were climate change events have cause considerable damage due to flooding -
- 1.3 I have lived in Emmer Green for over 9 years and have seen minor flooding on the golf course and at my school in Peppard Road the latter caused by altering the solid depth due to new building work in neighbouring properties.
- 1.4 After the rain storms which occurred this year the water table was at surface level in Brooklyn Drive and on the golf course.
- 1.5 I believe these issues may not have been given the correct consideration given the land has been in recreational use for over 100 years.
- 1.6 I believe that significant development on the course will cause flooding in adjacent properties as has happened in my school in Peppard Road.
- 1.7 Properties in the vicinity of the new development will be blighted by the development and inundated by water which will undoubtedly fall in climate change events.

Group Responses:

Keep Emmer Green dated 6th July

Reiterate previous objections however the conclusion of each paper has been summarised:

Trees: The applicant has increased the number of trees to be removed including removal of additional canopies therefore the impact on trees has become worse NOT better.

Transport: Maintain objections to previous comments.

Land contamination: If the land at RGC has been subjected to regular treatment with chemicals, then a full analysis of the soil at different depths and at multiple locations (100+) should be undertaken. With similar rigor, a full investigation of the groundwater for potential contaminants should be undertaken. In the interim, the building of any dwelling and the creation of private and public open space on potentially contaminated land would be unwise.

Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: As part of its Programme, Natural England announced on 24th June 2021 that it will explore a 'boundary extension of the Chilterns AONB.

Compliance checklist: do not consider the proposal is in accordance with numerous local plan policies.

Kidmore End Parish Council dated 10th July 2021

Maintain previous objections

3.0 Officer Assessment

3.1 Sustainability

3.1.1 As set out in the main report Local Plan Policy H5 'Standards for New Housing' seeks that all new-build housing is built to high design standards. In particular, new housing should adhere to national prescribed space standards, water efficiency standards in excess of the Building Regulations, zero carbon homes standards (for major schemes), and provide at least 5% of dwellings as wheelchair user units. Policy CC2 (Sustainable Design and Construction) and Policy CC3 (Adaption to Climate Change) seeks that development proposals incorporate measures which take account of climate change. Policy CC4 (Decentralised Energy) seeks that developments of more than 20 dwellings should consider the inclusion of combined heat and power plant (CHP) or other form of decentralised energy provision.

3.1.2 Amendments to the initial Energy and Sustainability Report were submitted in March 2021. The amended information specifies:

To reduce energy consumption through appropriate design measures, in this case, adherence to higher 'u-value' standards, plus provision of PV arrays and Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP) on properties throughout the site. This approach ensures an 83% reduction in CO2 emissions over a Part L compliance baseline for the proposed homes, with a net 75 TCO2 per annum liable for an offset payment to comply with Reading Policy H5 (£135,000).

Decentralised heating was considered, but discounted for a number of reasons including:

- *Distribution losses - CP1: Heat Networks: Code of Practice for the UK sets the target for 10% distribution losses which is challenging for designers to achieve on schemes, and in reality is often exceeded in operation. Even on schemes where a 10% distribution loss target is met - this is still a significant loss of energy. The proposed local generation of heat for the dwellings reduces these transmission losses.*

- *Development Density - District heating networks are more feasible where there is a higher density of development - for example, in large apartment blocks. This is linked strongly with the issue of distribution losses.*

3.1.3 Officers consider that it is an improvement that there has been a significant increase in solar installation on site. However, the proposal should be assessed using SAP12 calculations to determine the specified reduction in CO2 emissions. The proposal using SAP10 is not considered to be in accordance with the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD in this respect and the S106 sum is therefore not agreed. Further detailed water efficiency and number of wheelchair accessible units could be conditioned and secured at Reserved Matters stage.

3.1.4 In relation to decentralised energy, district heating is not proposed within the development and, in this instance, it is accepted that the density of development is a prohibitive factor. It is noted that air source heat pumps have been included within the scheme however ground source heat pumps are not proposed, and it is not considered that sufficient justification has been submitted to demonstrate why ground source heat pumps are not viable. There is also limited information in relation to how the development been designed to optimise the use of the energy from the sun and limit heat losses or how the development has been designed to optimise natural daylighting, energy efficient lighting, external lighting and natural ventilation.

3.1.5 Officers are therefore not satisfied that the proposals demonstrate a sufficient standard of sustainability and the development is not considered to be compliant with policies H5 *Standards for New Housing*, CC3 *Adaptation to Climate Change* and CC4 *Decentralised Energy* and the adopted 'SPD Sustainable Design and Construction.

3.2 Health Care

The comments of Emmer Green Surgery are noted above.

3.3 Education

Education officers have calculated that the range of primary pupils expected from the development is 59 - 88. Therefore, as set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Section 106 Planning obligations SPD' the Council will use CIL monies for education infrastructure for Early years, primary and secondary education.

3.4 S106 /CIL

The applicant has confirmed agreement to the following additional condition as sought by Transport officers in the main report:

£50,000 towards MOVA and pedestrian cycle improvements at the Peppard Road / Henley Road/ Westfield Road junction

£50,000 a year towards the bus services serving the site for the duration of the build for a minimum of 3 years and a maximum of 5 years

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 Subject to amendments in the recommendation box above, officer recommendation as per the main report.

UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 21st July 2021
ITEM NO. 21

Ward: Southcote

App No.: 210644/REG3 & 210745/LBC

Address: Prospect Park, Liebenrood Road, Reading

Proposals: **210644/REG3** - New playground with reinstatement of existing playground back to informal parkland

210745/LBC - Listed Building Consent for new playground with reinstatement of existing playground back to informal parkland at Prospect Park a Grade II Registered Park and Garden

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant 210644/REG3 and 210745/LBC

With conditions as set out in the main agenda report.

1. Consultation Responses

Berkshire Archaeology

1.1 This matter had been discussed prior to an application being submitted and the comments were that there would be no harmful impact on buried archaeology. This was based on two factors: one that there is little known archaeological potential in the area, and two that the playpark itself would have little impact on soil levels which might be archaeological in origin, having only shallow/minimal impact. The applicant has advised that there will be no significant excavation as part of the scheme.

1.2 A question was raised by a Councillor with regards to markings shown on the grass of an aerial photo in the location of the proposed playground (as shown below). Berkshire Archaeology stated they believe the markings are as a result of (relatively) modern activity. They do exist back as far as 2003 in the Google Earth imagery, and they look like lines made for sports pitches/training areas. There are a few lines that could conceivably be rather older, but they consider as long as that latter point above still holds true, that there are no plans for significant stripping/excavating in the course of the playpark construction, then their response would remain the same, of no impact on buried archaeology.



Aerial photo showing markings

2. Berkshire Gardens Trust

- 2.1 The Berkshire Gardens Trust were re-consulted on the amended location of the proposed playground and asked to clarify their position in relation to their initial comments that enhancements to this area of the park be included.
- 2.2 Berkshire Gardens Trust most recent comments refer to both the applications for the relocation of the existing playground and a separate application currently pending consideration (210647/REG3 and 210746/LBC) for the provision of a play service venue at the existing park pavilion (as noted in the Planning History in the main report).
- 2.3 Berkshire Gardens Trust commented “we welcome the protection recommended for the trees, as while we do not believe that many in that area are specimen or currently ‘veteran’ trees, they will mature to hopefully provide welcome shade and contribute to the setting of the nearby approach into the park. As to the ‘enhancements’ we mention, it would be good if these could be made a condition of planning, as the ‘track’, parking area and surrounds to them and the courts nearby are a real mess (potholes, verges and rubbish), which distracts from the enjoyment of visiting the park. However, there is obviously no sense in both the applications having the same requirements with duplication by contractors at extra cost to RBC and also disruption to all Park users, so we hope you can liaise with Ethne Humphreys and anyone else in RBC who needs to be involved in the improvements proposed for Prospect Park”.
- 2.4 The applicant has advised that the following works are proposed:

Main driveway

- Repair the potholes on driveway surface;
- Remarking of the driveway including a 10mile speed marking at the entrance from road;
- Create a new pedestrian crossing from the carpark to the new play area location; and
- Repair knee railing to the south side of the drive.

Paths

- Repair the existing path that runs adjacent to proposed new play area and driveway; and
- Remove the existing path behind the Astro turf pitches that leads to the tarmac tennis courts and realign so it will run outside the tree (T17) canopy.

Trees

- Replace the two trees (T2 & T4) that the tree impact assessment has identified for removal;
- Mulch around mature and semi mature oak trees (T13, T22, T32, T33); and
- The Parks Department routinely carry out work to ensure the maintenance of the landscape character of Prospect Park.

2.5 Although these enhancements are not to the level suggested by Berkshire Gardens Trust, Officer's consider that as the applications are solely for the relocation of the existing playground and taking into consideration the condition requiring the submission and approval of the proposed materials, the proposed works above are sufficient and any further enhancements are not required as part of the applications relating to the playground. Some further enhancements however may be justified as part of the proposal for the park pavilion and this will be addressed by the Officer dealing with that application.

3. Existing Playground area

3.1 A question has been raised with regards to the safety of the existing playground area once reinstated as open space following a healthy Oak tree falling due to underground springs eroding the soil underneath. The applicant has confirmed that the remaining Oak tree was heavily pollarded after the other Oak tree fell and they have no reason to suspect that the tree is dangerous. It is on an inspection schedule and therefore monitored by the Park's Arborist team. Parks have fenced off other veteran oaks on the site to protect the trees and they may consider doing the same to this remaining Oak tree as they state it is a magnificent specimen.

4. Conclusion

4.1 The officer recommendation remains to grant planning permission and listed building consent as per the recommendation in the main agenda report.

Case Officer: Claire Ringwood

This page is intentionally left blank