



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

26 JUNE 2024

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO	
10.	210639/FUL - EATON COURT, 112 OXFORD ROAD	Decision	ABBEY	5 - 6
13.	220409/FUL & 220410/LBC - CAVERSHAM PARK, PEPPARD ROAD, CAVERSHAM	Decision	EMMER GREEN	7 - 10
14.	231793/FUL - 142-144 WHITLEY WOOD LANE	Decision	WHITLEY	11 - 14

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Annex

UPDATE SHEET AND ORDER OF CONSIDERATION

Planning Applications Committee – 26/06/2024

Applications With Public Speaking

Item No. 9 **Page 107** **Ward** Abbey
Application Number 231423
Application type ADV
Address Broad Street Pedestrian Zone, West of King Street

Planning Officer presenting Richard Eatough
Objectors: Richard Price, Victoria Drazhner, Helen Palmer
Applicant: Huw James, Peter Dixon (ECE Planning)

Item No. 10 **Page 117** **Ward** Abbey
Application Number 210639
Application type FUL
Address Eaton Court, 112 Oxford Road,

Planning Officer presenting Richard Eatough ***UPDATE***
Objectors: Evelyn Williams (Conservation Area Advisory Committee)
Applicant: David Walters (Venta PropCo 1), Sophie Steed (Squire & Partners),
Gareth Fox (Montagu Evans)

Item No. 13 **Page 201** **Ward** Emmer Green
Application Number 220409/220410
Application type FUL/LBC
Address Caversham Park, Peppard Road,

Planning Officer presenting Matthew Burns ***UPDATE***
Objector: Chris King
Applicant: John Gale (Savills)

Applications Without Public Speaking

Item No. 8 **Page 43** **Ward** Abbey
Application Number 230626/230627
Application type FUL/LBC
Address 13 Market Place, Reading

Planning Officer presenting Jonathan Markwell

Item No. 11 **Page 141** **Ward** Caversham
Application Number 240068
Application type FUL
Address 2-4 Church Road, Caversham, Reading
Planning Officer presenting Jonathan Markwell

Item No. 12 **Page 189** **Ward** Coley
Application Number 231077
Application type FUL
Address Reading Link Retail Park Rose Kiln Lane
Planning Officer presenting Anthony Scholes

Item No. 14 **Page 349** **Ward** Whitley
Application Number 231793
Application type FUL
Address 142 Whitley Wood Lane, Reading
Planning Officer presenting Anthony Scholes ***UPDATE***

Planning Applications Committee

26 June 2024



Reading
Borough Council
Working better with you

Title	PLANNING UPDATE REPORT
Ward	Abbey
Planning Application Reference:	210639
Site Address:	Eaton Court, 112 Oxford Road, Reading, RG1 7LL
Proposed Development	Demolition and residential redevelopment to provide three buildings comprising 120 residential units (Use Class C3), along with car parking, cycle parking, servicing bay and associated landscaping, amenity space, plant and refuse areas, and access arrangements.
Applicant	Venta Propco 1 Limited
Report author	Tom Bradfield
Recommendations	As per main agenda report
S106 Terms	As per main agenda report
Conditions	As per main agenda report
Informatives	As per main agenda report

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The applicant has raised some queries regarding three statements made in the main agenda report and is requesting further clarification on their points. The first point is regarding amenity standards in the development; the second and third relate to heritage matters. A response to each is provided below.

2. AMENITY CLARIFICATIONS

- 2.1 The applicant has queried the section of the report (para 6.52) which, they feel, discusses the separation distances between Buildings 1, 2 and 3 in a negative way.
- 2.2 The separation distance between facing elevations for these blocks is 13.5 metres. At ground floor level the potential for overlooking will be mitigated by the low-level landscape planting proposed. At upper levels, to help reduce overlooking there is a slight offsetting of windows and balconies, however the overlooking distances balcony to balcony are at their nearest points 11 metres to 13 metres.
- 2.3 Therefore, there will be a close relationship between these blocks. The main report explains that in a new-build situation this is far from ideal and raises concerns in terms of meeting the requirements of Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity); however,

Officers have concluded, in this central Reading location and weighing up the benefits of the proposed development, that the arrangement can be supported.

3. HERITAGE ASSET IMPACTS

- 3.1 The applicant has asked for clarification that in the report (para 6.22 onwards), discussion of harm to Listed Buildings is referring to the setting of the listed buildings and not the buildings themselves (ie. their fabric). This clarification is accepted.
- 3.2 Secondly, the applicant has questioned why the report has not referred to the 'net effect' of the proposal on heritage assets (Listed Buildings and views of the Conservation Area). The advice of the Council's Conservation Officer has been sought on this point.
- 3.3 The Conservation Officer advises that there is no "net harm" definition that requires the LPA to compare the proposal with the existing situation. The harm is defined by a development's impact on the significance of the heritage asset, weighing any harm to that significance against any benefits to it is required by the NPPF (paragraph 208). But the Conservation Officer in any event, disagrees with the applicant's assertion, as the existing building can be argued to have less impact than the proposed one. If they consider this a benefit or improvement, it can be counted as some environmental benefit, but it is not enough by itself.
- 3.4 The Conservation Officer continues:
"The related paragraphs from the NPPF are 205, 206, 207, 208. If I do this weighting, I conclude that there is a very limited public benefit (I can see some economic, but little social (because it is blocks of flats – privately owned, purchased and enjoyed) and little environmental – environment one refers to the design, conservation, eco-friendly – innovative solutions, etc.) Still, the massing, scale and architectural languages matter and using paragraph 205, I give great weight to the setting of the buildings & conservation area and suggest refusal."
- 3.5 Notwithstanding the Conservation Officers comments and objection, officers consider that overall, the proposal provides a benefit in townscape and heritage terms.

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1 The clarifications above should be noted but these do not alter the officer conclusion or recommendation for this planning application.

<p>26 June 2024</p>	 <p style="font-size: 1.2em; font-weight: bold; margin: 0;">Reading</p> <p style="margin: 0;">Borough Council</p> <p style="font-style: italic; margin: 0;">Working better with you</p>
Title	PLANNING APPLICATION UPDATE REPORT
Ward	Emmer Green
Planning Application Reference:	220409FUL & 220410LBC
Site Address:	Caversham Park, Peppard Road, Caversham, RG4 8TZ
Proposed Development	<p>220409/FUL</p> <p>Redevelopment of Caversham Park for assisted living accommodation (Class C2) for over 55's through conversion of Caversham Park House, erection of a care home (Class C2) and age-restricted retirement dwellings (Class C3) including conversion of existing buildings Bursars House and The Lodge. Erection of affordable housing (Class C3 non-age restricted) and refurbishment/extension of existing pavilion to provide changing facilities, café/studio/interpretation hub, sports provision of 2 croquet lawns & 2 bowling greens, refurbishment of tennis court, associated parking and landscaping following demolition of extensions/outbuildings to the main house (amended description)</p> <p>220410/LBC</p> <p>Works associated with the redevelopment of Caversham Park to provide assisted living units including alterations to the main house and demolition of existing extensions and outbuildings. Works associated with the residential conversion of Bursars House and, The Lodge Caversham Park Drive (amended description)</p>
Applicant	Beechcroft Developments Ltd
Report author	Matt Burns - Principal Planning Officer
Deadline:	Originally 16 th June 2022 but an extension of time has been agreed with the applicant until 31 st July 2024
Recommendation	<p>As per main report but with addition of the following: (new text in <i>italics and bold</i>):</p> <p><u>220410/LBC</u> <i>Grant listed building consent, subject to the recommended conditions</i></p>
S106 Terms	As per main report but with amendments to the following obligations (changes shown in <i>italics and bold</i>):

	- <u>Zero Carbon Offset financial contribution (new build C3 dwellings only)</u> : As per the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2019. If zero carbon is not achieved the scheme must instead achieve a minimum of a 35% improvement in regulated emissions over the Target Emissions Rate in the 2013 Building Regulations, plus provide a financial contribution of £1,800
Conditions	As per main report.
Informatives	As per main report.

1. RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 A recommendation for the listed building consent application is added to the recommendation box having been missed from the main agenda report in error.

2 CHANGES TO S106 OBLIGATIONS

- 2.1 The s106 obligation relating to zero carbon off-setting is amended to clarify that this would only apply to the new build C3 dwellings within the development (those located within the proposed north eastern, eastern and western parcels of development), as per Policy H5 (Standards for New Housing) of the RBC Local Plan 2019 and the RBC Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2021. As set out within paragraphs 7.230 to 7.244 of the main agenda report the other parts of the proposed development, relating to non C3 uses, are subject to different sustainability requirements and standards.

3 CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

- 3.1 At paragraph 3.1, in the table after paragraph 3.3 and within paragraphs 3.30, 3.31, 7.9, 7.224 and 7.249 of the main agenda report, the proposed public access arrangements for the development are referred to as being from dusk to dawn when this should state dawn to dusk.
- 3.2 Paragraph 5.26 of the main agenda report is amended as follows (new text in *italics and underlined*):

5.26 *A total of 70* letters of objection have been received in response to the various rounds of public consultation on the applications that have taken place *(60 objections were received on the original plans and a further 10 in response to the amended plans)*.

3.3 Under paragraph 5.31 of the main agenda report it should be noted that the comments from Councillor Mitchell were made in respect of the original plans and not the revised plans submitted during the course of the application.

3.4 Paragraph 7.116 of the main agenda report is amended as follows (new text in *italics and underlined*):

7.116 In terms of the north eastern parcel the advice received (in relation to the previous plans) noted that this would introduce a group of modern buildings in an area of previously completely undeveloped land that is currently lightly wooded with relatively recent plantings. It was advised that the proposals would significantly decrease the surviving extent of parkland in this part of the site and create a highly developed outlook and character for the parkland to the north of the main house. The advice goes on to consider that the five buildings proposed would dominate the immediate area, extending built form into a currently undeveloped location, creating a modern developed character for the northern part of the park, and even more so when considered in the context of the proposed increased car parking, extended pavilion, and associated sports/leisure uses. The advice was that this part of the development should be removed completely or at the very least the development should be very significantly reduced in scale and footprint and set back to the east.

3.5 Paragraph 7.205 of the main agenda report is amended as follows (deletions ~~crossed through~~ and new text in *italics and underlined*):


7.206 Within the Applicant's Transport Statement the trip rates for the proposed residential elements of the scheme have been broken down into residential mixed/affordable housing, residential assisted living, residential retirement units and care home. The proposed development is anticipated to result in a reduction in the traffic generation of the Site compared to its extant use. For context, it should be noted that the house and its grounds have been used by the BBC as its Monitoring Station, together with 257 Parking Spaces (extant use). The proposed uses would reduce the level of parking to ~~247~~ 254 Parking Spaces.

3.6 Paragraph 7.215 of the main agenda report is amended as follows (deletions ~~crossed through~~ and new text in *italics and underlined*):

7.215 A total 51 parking spaces are proposed for the Eastern Parcel (36 Parking Spaces for Land to the East and 45 18 Parking spaces for Land to the North) which equates to 1.25 parking spaces/unit and therefore below the SPD standards as shown in the table below.

4. Historic England – possible request to ask the Secretary of State to call the application in

- 3.7 Within paragraph 5.9 of the main agenda report the comments received from Historic England are set out and state that if the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is minded to grant planning permission for the proposed development, in light of their objection, they request that they are notified of this, so that they can decide whether or not they wish to write to the Secretary of State (SoS) to request that they call the application in for their determination. The need to notify the SoS of the decision is not a statutory requirement on the LPA in this instance. Referral to the SoS is only a statutory requirement for LPAs in relation to planning applications recommended for approval, and where Historic England object, that would impact on heritage assets of world heritage importance or for listed building consent applications relating to Grade I and II* Listed Buildings; none of which are applicable to the application site. In this instance it would be Historic England asking the SoS to call the application in as a third party on a non-statutory basis. It should be noted that anyone can request an application is called in by the SoS if they have good reason to do so.
- 3.8 Therefore, if Planning Applications Committee resolves to grant planning permission as per the officer recommendation, officers would then notify Historic England of this. But, at the time of writing this update report, there has been no request received from the SoS to call the application in and officers have received no further indication or confirmation from Historic England as to whether or not they will request a call in. Therefore, at this moment the officer recommendation remains unchanged. In the event that Historic England do decide to request that the SoS call the application in, then the SoS would likely write to the LPA and request that a decision is not issued until they have had time to consider whether or not to call in the application.

<p>26 June 2024</p>	 <p style="font-size: 24pt; font-weight: bold; margin: 0;">Reading</p> <p style="font-weight: bold; margin: 0;">Borough Council</p> <p style="font-style: italic; margin: 0;">Working better with you</p>
Title	PLANNING APPLICATION UPDATE REPORT
Ward	Whitley
Planning Application Reference:	231793/FUL
Site Address:	142-144 Whitley Wood Lane, Reading
Proposed Development	Demolition of existing single-storey buildings and two-storey rear extensions, and replacement with a two-storey side and rear extension to convert to 11 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO), and 3 ground floor commercial units, and two-storey new build to the rear to provide 3 x 2 Bed three person (2B3P) houses alongside associated parking, cycle and refuse storage.
Applicant	Whitley Wood Properties C/0- ECE Architecture
Report author	Anthony Scholes – Senior Planning Officer
Deadline:	Extension of time has been agreed with the applicant until 31 st July 2024
Recommendation	<p>As per main report, with the matters relating to bat survey removed. Removals noted with strikethrough:</p> <p>Subject to the satisfactory provision of ecological (bat) surveys and no objections raised Delegate to the Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection Services (ADPTPPS) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) GRANT full planning permission, subject to the satisfactory completion of a s106 legal agreement and delegate to ADPTPPS 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 31/07/2024 (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)
S106 Terms	As per main report.
Conditions	<p>As per main report, with the removal of duplicate condition 23 (habitat enhancement scheme) including renumbering of conditions, and additional ecological condition. Changes noted in bold, and removals with strikethrough:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time Limit (Standard) 2. Approved Plans

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Materials (To Be Approved) 4. Construction Method Statement (pre-commencement) 5. Vehicle Parking (As Specified) 6. Vehicular Access (As Specified) 7. Cycle Parking (Details to be provided) 8. Refuse and recycling (Details to be provided including method for control of rats) 9. EV Charging Points (Details to be provided) 10. SAP Assessment Minor – Design Stage 11. SAP Assessment Minor – As Built 12. Landscaping Small Scale to include all proposed biodiversity measures (pre-commencement) 13. Boundary Treatment (pre-commencement) 14. Use of roof restricted 15. Habitat Enhancement Scheme (pre-commencement) 16. Noise Mitigation Scheme (Internal) (to be submitted) 17. Contaminated Land Assessment (to be submitted) 18. Remediation Scheme (to be submitted) 19. Remediation Scheme (Implement and Verification) 20. Unidentified Contamination 21. Hours of Construction/Demolition 22. No Bonfires 23. Habitat Enhancement Scheme (pre-commencement) 23. HMO Tenant Management Plan (to be submitted) 24. Mechanical Plant (Noise assessment required) 25. Ventilation & Extraction (to be submitted prior to installation of any extraction equipment) 26. Commercial Extensions/Alterations Restricted 27. PD rights removed (dwellings) 28. Delivery and Servicing Plan (To be approved) 29. Delivery hours restriction (9am – 5pm) 30. Waste Collection Hours Restricted – Commercial (9am – 5pm) 31. Works and vegetation removal outside nesting season unless checked by suitably qualified ecologist.
<p>Informatives</p>	<p>As per main report, with the additional information relating to bats and works to roof:</p> <p>14. Work on a loft or roof may affect bats. The applicant will need to consider protected species when planning work of this type. A survey may be needed, and if bats are using the building, a licence may be required. To view specific information regarding bats use the following link: https://www.gov.uk/wildlife-licences</p>

1. Additional Information Provided

1.1 Following the main report, the applicant has provided the following:

- Dwg No. 7184-ECE-PL02 - 142-144 Whitley Wood Lane - Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plan, prepared by ECE Architecture, and dated 14 June 2024
- Document Title: Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys (BERS) report, prepared by Arbtech, and dated 22nd June 2024

2. Transport Comments and Response

- 2.1 The applicant submitted an amended site plan, as noted in 1.1 above, that addressed comments from RBC transport officers. These amendments were minor in nature and related to location of the quadrant kerb, and bin collection point for the proposed HMO. These were reviewed and considered acceptable by transport officers.

3. Bat Emergence Survey

- 3.1 As originally anticipated, the final bat emergence survey was completed on 20 June 2024. The submitted report, and evidence from multiple surveys notes that: *“No bats were observed emerging from the building during the survey. No evidence of bats was present during the PRA. The surveys have concluded a likely absence of bats roosting within this building.”* This report has been reviewed by RBC’s Ecologist consultant who has advised that there are therefore no objections to this application on ecology grounds, and that the bat emergence survey report (Arbtech, June 2024) has been undertaken to an appropriate standard and concludes that the risk of bats being affected by the proposals is minimal. RBC Ecologists stated: *“However, the PEA (Arbtech, 2024) stated that there were nesting birds in the building at the time of that survey and so please could you add a bird nesting (care needed during construction) condition:”*

Condition: *All buildings, hedges and shrubs or similar vegetation where birds may nest which are to be removed as part of the development, are to be cleared outside the bird-nesting season (mid-March to August inclusive) or if clearance during the bird-nesting season cannot reasonably be avoided, a suitably qualified ecologist will check the areas to be removed immediately prior to clearance and advise whether nesting birds are present. If active nests are recorded no works that may disturb active nests shall proceed until the nest(s) are no longer in use*

Reason: *To ensure that wildlife is not adversely affected by the proposed development.*

This page is intentionally left blank