



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

29 APRIL 2026

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO
5. PLANNING APPEALS	Information		5 - 6
7. RESPONSES TO NATIONAL PLANNING CONSULTATIONS	Decision		7 - 12
9. PL/24/0846 (FUL) - NAPIER COURT, NAPIER ROAD	Decision	THAMES	13 - 16

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Annex

## UPDATE SHEET AND ORDER OF CONSIDERATION

### Planning Applications Committee – 29 April 2026

<b>Item No. 5</b>	Appeal Report Update	Page 15
<b>Item No. 7</b>	Responses to National Planning Consultations - Update Report	Page 27

### Applications Without Public Speaking

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Page 75</b>	<b>Ward</b> Thames
<b>Application Number</b>	PL/24/0846		
<b>Application type</b>	Full planning permission		
<b>Address</b>	Napier Court, Napier Road		
<b>Planning Officer presenting</b>	Matthew Burns		<b>*UPDATE*</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Planning Applications Committee



**Reading**  
Borough Council  
*Working better with you*

**29 April 2026**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Appeal Report Update – Trinity Hall, South Street</b>
<b>Purpose of the report</b>	To note the report for information
<b>Report status</b>	Public report
<b>Executive Director/ Statutory Officer Commissioning Report</b>	Emma Gee, Executive Director Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services
<b>Report author</b>	Steve Vigar, Planning Applications Team Leader
<b>Lead Councillor</b>	Councillor Micky Leng, Lead Councillor for Planning and Assets
<b>Council priority</b>	Promote more equal communities in Reading
<b>Recommendations</b>	N/A

### 1. Background

Permission ref. PL/24/1079 was appealed under reference APP/E0345/W/25/3376563. A hearing took place on 24 March 2026. The two main issues identified by the Inspector were, a) The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including whether it would preserve the settings of surrounding heritage assets; and b) Whether the proposed development would make adequate provision for affordable housing.

### 2. Outcome of the Appeal

On the first issue, character, the inspector disagreed with the Council that the building would be excessive in scale with a bulky appearance and found instead that the apparent massing would be largely unchanged and the appearance would fit with the existing character. The inspector found no harm in respect of the effect on the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

On the second issue, affordable housing, the Inspector found that the £100,000 affordable housing contribution included in the appellant’s s106 unilateral undertaking submitted with the appeal was not justified due to the non-viability of the development as demonstrated by the appellant’s financial viability assessment.

However, the Inspector did find that there is a demonstrable need for affordable housing provision in the Borough and that there was justification for the deferred payment mechanism set out in the unilateral undertaking. In effect he agreed that the viability assessment demonstrated that no affordable housing could be afforded based on the current financial situation, but should this improve, then the need for affordable housing justifies a contribution.

### 3. Costs

The Council’s independent viability consultants advised the LPA that the development would be capable of providing affordable housing due to viability. The Inspector criticised

the Council for persisting in seeking an upfront contribution towards affordable housing despite failing to provide evidence to demonstrate why it did not accept the expert independent advice of its consultant. The Inspector found that the reason for refusal could have been avoided so the applicant has been put to unnecessary expense in contesting this point.

#### **4. Officer Comment**

Although it was disappointing to have the appeal allowed, the Inspector's support of the demonstrable need for affordable housing in the Borough is welcome, also, importantly his support of the Council's approach to securing affordable housing contributions through a deferred payment mechanism should financial conditions improve during the course of the development.

The reason for the costs award is noted and in future officers will be mindful of the need to fully justify all reasons for seeking affordable housing, especially where evidence from the Council's own external consultant throws doubt on the reasonableness of doing so. Having said that, discussions around the affordable housing position had not been concluded when the applicant chose to appeal and officers remain of the view that an appeal could not have been avoided without further discussion on that point, nevertheless the Inspector's decision is final.

## Planning Applications Committee



**Reading**  
Borough Council  
*Working better with you*

29 April 2026

<b>Title</b>	<b>Responses to National Planning Consultations – UPDATE REPORT</b>
<b>Purpose of the report</b>	To make a decision
<b>Report status</b>	Public report
<b>Executive Director/ Statutory Officer Commissioning Report</b>	Emma Gee, Executive Director Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services
<b>Report author</b>	Mark Worringham, Planning Policy Manager / Acting Development Manager (Planning & Building Control)
<b>Lead Councillor</b>	Councillor Micky Leng, Lead Councillor for Planning and Assets
<b>Council priority</b>	Secure Reading's economic & cultural success
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>Recommendation 1 as main report</p> <p>Recommendations 2-4 from main report amended as below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. To note the response that has been that has been submitted to the Planning Committee Reform consultation</li> <li>3. To agree the response to the consultation on consulting the Secretary of State set out in this report.</li> <li>4. To agree the response to the consultation on fees for planning applications set out in this report.</li> </ol>

### 1. Background

1.1 This report:

- Sets out the response that has been submitted to the consultation on planning committee reform
- Sets out a proposed response to the consultation on planning fees for Committee agreement
- Sets out a proposed response to the consultation on consulting the Secretary of State for Committee agreement.

### 2. Planning Committee Reform

2.1 The main report highlights the consultation on Planning Committee Reform, which closed on 23 April. A response was submitted by the deadline as set out below:

***Question 1: Do you have any comments on the draft Regulations?***

Whilst the Council understands the aims of increasing consistency across authorities in how planning committees function, we are particularly concerned that the approach set out in the draft Regulations would have the effect of substantially reducing democratic oversight and eroding trust in decision making. The Council is particularly concerned about the inability to call a Schedule 1 application into committee and the automatic delegation of reserved matters applications to officers unless they are part of a phased permission.

The ability for a councillor to call an application in to be dealt with at committee is a crucial part of ensuring democratic accountability within the planning system. It also allows the views of local residents and communities to be heard by committee and helps to build transparency and confidence in the system. In practice, call-in powers in our area do not act as a significant roadblock

on meeting our development needs and do not create an unmanageable workload for committees or for officers. The negative impacts of preventing call-ins of Schedule 1 applications would seem to outweigh the advantages, and we would suggest that this instead be dealt with by stronger guidance on when a call-in would be appropriate.

In terms of reserved matters, we are increasingly seeing outline applications with very broad parameters around matters such as the mix of uses and the design of the development. This means that there are still significant decisions with wide-ranging impacts on communities to be made at reserved matters stage. For instance, whilst the height of tall buildings may be set at outline stage, their final design, which is vital to the understanding of how they will impact surrounding areas, is often left to reserved matters. Communities would rightly expect these decisions to be made through established democratic processes and therefore in our view, reserved matters applications for major developments should be in Schedule 2.

It is not clear to us what the rationale is for inclusion of some types of application in either Schedule 1 or 2. For instance, on our reading of the draft Regulations, a minor application would always be delegated to officers under Schedule 1, but a variation of condition on a minor permission could potentially come to committee under Schedule 2, subject to passing the relevant tests, even though the variation may raise far fewer issues than the initial permission. Likewise, a minor retrospective application could also come to committee. In these cases, the main consideration on whether an application ought to be eligible to be determined at committee ought to be scale rather than the specific type of application.

The Council has no objection to the proposed limit of 13 for committee membership in Regulation 7, and our committee membership currently complies with this.

The date for implementation of 30 September in Regulation 1 seems ambitious to have undertaken changes to the constitution, particularly since the outcome of this consultation is not yet known.

***Question 2: Do you agree with our proposed approach to phased reserved matters applications? If not, do you think we should return to the original position of reserved matters on phased development being delegated in all circumstances or should we instead consider delegating certain types of phased reserved matters applications?***

Subject to the comments in relation to question 1 relating to reserved matters, the Council agrees that phased reserved matters applications should be considered at planning committee.

***Question 3: Do you have any comments on the draft guidance?***

It would be useful if the guidance were to make clear whether an authority's constitution could set out the circumstances under which a Schedule 2 application would be referred to committee (based for instance on size thresholds) or whether this would always need to be a case-by-case decision made by the nominated officer and member. Making this a case-by-case decision risks a great deal of uncertainty about timescales and process, particularly since the level of environmental, social or economic effects of in terms of the development plan may not be immediately clear on receipt of the application, as well as inconsistency. The Council believes that it is clearly preferable for all parties for the constitution to set out precisely which applications will be decided at committee.

### **3. Consulting the Secretary of State**

3.1 The main report outlined the consultation on consulting the Secretary of State on planning applications, and recommended that a response be agreed. The proposed response is set out below.

***Question 1: Do you agree with this proposed consultation requirement for applications for large-scale, strategic commercial development where an LPA is minded to refuse?***

The Council agrees that it would be logical to have a corresponding consultation requirement for large-scale commercial alongside the proposed residential requirement, but considers that the threshold proposed is too low (see response to question 2).

***Question 2: Do you consider the proposed area threshold of 15,000m<sup>2</sup> or more to be appropriate?***

The proposed 15,000 sq m threshold is too low. A single large office building can easily exceed 15,000 sq m and remain of primarily local significance and not of strategic importance. We would suggest that 50,000 sq m is a more accurate threshold for the scale of development that is of genuine strategic importance and should be used for these purposes.

**Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed consultation requirement for applications relating to land owned or leased by the NDA or its subsidiaries where the LPA is minded to refuse?**

The Council does not wish to respond to this question.

**Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed consultation requirement for applications relating to nuclear fuel cycle facilities where the LPA is minded to refuse?**

The Council does not wish to respond to this question.

**Question 5: Do you agree with this proposed consultation requirement for applications for residential development within a Defence DEPZ where the LPA are minded to grant permission and the Office for Nuclear Regulation and/or a LPA's Emergency Planning Team maintains an objection?**

The Council understands the reasoning for this proposal, and does not object to it, as in most cases the relevant authorities have policies in place that would generally lead to a refusal where the ONR advises against development.

With the Detailed Emergency Planning Zones around nuclear facilities being recognised in the draft National Planning Policy Framework and this consultation, it is clear that emergency planning concerns are likely to be given very substantial weight. However, there needs to be a recognition of the impacts this will have on the affected local planning authorities meeting their development needs. In the case of Reading, 8% of the Borough's total area falls within the DEPZ of AWE Burghfield, and this is one of the few areas of Reading where there is still significant development potential. This should be reflected as a strategic constraint on an authority in meeting its needs within national policy or reflected in how those needs are calculated in the first place.

**Question 6: Do you agree that one dwelling is the correct threshold for referral?**

Yes.

#### **4. Fees for planning applications**

4.1 The main report outlined the consultation on fees for planning applications and recommended that a response be agreed. The proposed response is set out below. There are a large number of questions in the consultation, so only those questions where a response is proposed are shown.

**Question 1: Do you support the proposed National Default Fee Schedule, set at 90% of full estimate cost?**

Yes. There will be some natural variation in costs across the country, so a default schedule set at 90% of the estimated average is a reasonable approach.

**Question 2: Are there any proposed fees in the National Default Fee Schedule that you consider to be unrepresentative of 90% of estimated full cost levels for LPAs (either too low or too high)?**

We have not undertaken sufficient work to fully answer this question, but we continue to have concerns that the fee for prior approvals that would result in residential development is very low, at less than half the equivalent fee for a change of use application to residential. Prior approval applications have become increasingly complex and entail a significant number of consultations with other internal or external consultees, and we are not convinced that the proposed fee is likely to cover 90% of the costs in practice.

**Question 3: Do you support the proposed changes to the fee structures for outline, full and reserved matters applications for residential and non-residential development as set out in the proposed National Default Fee Schedule?**

Yes. The proposed fee structures represents a relatively modest change to the existing structure which will minimise confusion when changes are introduced, but also represents a useful simplification, whilst ensuring that fees cover as much of the cost of processing an application as possible.

**Question 8: Do you think the three-band fee structure currently used for section 73 applications remains appropriate? If no, what changes would you propose and why? Please provide evidence to support your view.**

**Question 9: Should section 73 and section 73B applications be charged using the same fee structure? Please explain your reasoning.**

Since a Section 73B application can be used to alter the description of development, the potential changes to the permission that this could entail are more significant than a Section 73 application, despite the qualifier that the effect should not be substantially different from the existing permission. This could potentially nevertheless allow for additional dwellings on a large residential development, for example. We are therefore concerned that the proposed default fee for a Section 73B application may not cover the costs of processing the application.

**Question 10: Do you think the fee for discharging conditions should be charged per condition rather than per application? If yes, what do you consider to be an appropriate fee per condition? Please provide evidence to support your view.**

The fee should be charged per condition, because this would reflect the cost of the work proposed. We do not currently have the evidence to point towards a specific fee.

**Question 11: Should applications for the approval of biodiversity gain plans be subject to a separate fee to reflect the specific work involved? If yes, what do you consider to be an appropriate fee level? Please provide evidence to support your view.**

Yes. Biodiversity gain plans are a unique type of application with specific consultation requirements. For those authorities without in-house ecology advice, determining these applications will require consultant support, which carries a cost. We do not currently have the evidence to point towards a specific fee.

**Question 17: Do you agree with our working proposal that the planning fee surcharge should be in the region of 10% of the national default fee (subject to further policy development and consultation)?**

At this stage we consider that the 10% surcharge appears reasonable, and we do not have any information that would suggest an alternative level. We note that this proposal still needs to be considerably worked up so that we have an understanding how it will work in practice.

**Question 18: Do you have any comments on how local fee setting will operate? In particular, is there any additional information that you would wish to see covered through guidance?**


We welcome the guidance on local fee setting, and consider that this is a vital measure to ensure that local planning authorities' planning functions can be adequately funded. We are concerned that the guidance prevents the funding of other planning functions including policy and enforcement. These budgets are under considerable pressure in many authorities, in particular enforcement as a non-statutory service, but are still a critical element of operating a planning function for which there are few alternative funding mechanisms other than central budgets. It would be unfortunate if this opportunity was missed to enable the whole planning function to operate independently of central budget pressures.

**Question 19: Do you think local fee variations should be capped? If so, what level would be appropriate - 15%, 25% of the national default fee, or another figure?**

- **yes - 15%**
- **yes - 25%**
- **yes - other (please specify)**
- **no**
- **unsure**

No. The whole purpose of local fee setting is intended to be for planning authorities to cover the costs of determining planning applications. If local work demonstrates that these costs vary by more than a set percentage of the national default fee, then the fee should cover those costs without an arbitrary cap being applied.

This page is intentionally left blank

29 April 2026	 <b style="font-size: 2em;">Reading</b> Borough Council <i>Working better with you</i>
<b>Title</b>	<b>PLANNING APPLICATION UPDATE REPORT</b>
<b>Ward</b>	Thames
<b>Planning Application Reference:</b>	PL/24/0846/FUL
<b>Site Address:</b>	Napier Court Napier Road Reading
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of new buildings of 11 storeys to provide 570 build to rent residential dwellings (Class C3) with residential amenity space, parking, landscaping and associated engineering works (amended description)
<b>Deadline</b>	Extension of time date: 26 <sup>th</sup> February 2026
<b>Recommendations</b>	As per the main agenda report
<b>S106 Heads of Terms</b>	As per the main agenda report
<b>Conditions</b>	As per the main agenda report
<b>Informatives</b>	As per the main agenda report

### Amended Plans and Information

- The applicant submitted a pack of revised drawings, documents and rebuttals shortly after midday on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2026 in response to the reasons for refusal outlined in the main agenda report. Given the limited time available, officers may not be able to consider all the new information before the committee meeting. If they are able to, officers will update Members verbally at Committee as to whether any of this information changes any of the refusal reasons or the officer recommendation. An updated list of the submitted plans and documents is set out at the end of this update report.

### Section 106 Obligations

- Since publication of the main agenda report, the applicant has also advised officers of their agreement to secure provision of the contributions or works by way of s106 agreement in relation to reasons for refusal 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 as numbered in the recommendation box at the top of the main agenda report. These contributions/works relate to matters discussed in the main agenda report that officers have identified as necessary, justified and directly related to the development, in order to mitigate its impacts on local infrastructure.
- In relation to reason for refusal 8 (Leisure/Open Space/Public Realm) the applicant has advised of agreement to provide the requested contribution of £500,000 (prior to commencement of the development) towards improvement of the existing children's play area at Kings Meadow. The applicant has also confirmed agreement to an obligation to provide a new pedestrian crossing over Napier Road (and for detailed design of this to be

submitted and agreed with the LPA and to enter into necessary highway works agreements to deliver the works).

4. In relation to reason for refusal 9 (Kings Meadow Landscaping) the applicant has advised of agreement to provide the requested contribution of £20,000 (prior to commencement of the development) for tree planting within Kings Meadow.
5. In relation to reason for refusal 10 (Zero Carbon Off-Setting) the applicant has advised of agreement to provide an appropriate carbon off-setting contribution. This would be calculated as per the formula within the adopted Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
6. In relation to reason for refusal 11 (Employment and Skills Plan) the applicant has advised of agreement to provide a construction phase employment and skills plan.
7. In relation to reason for refusal 12 (Healthcare) the applicant has advised of agreement to provide the requested contribution of £492,480 (prior to commencement of the development) towards healthcare facilities within Thames and adjacent Wards.
8. In relation to reason for refusal 13 (Loading Restrictions to Napier Road) the applicant has advised of agreement to provide the requested contribution of £5,000 (prior to commencement of the development) towards loading bay restrictions on Napier Road.
9. The applicant has not advised of full agreement to the s106 obligation required in relation to reason for refusal 14 (Build to Rent Accommodation Council Standard Terms) nor agreement to any part of the s106 obligation relating to reason for refusal 15 (Heat Network Feasibility Study).
10. Notwithstanding the above officers continue to recommend reasons for refusal 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 given the absence of a completed s106 agreement to secure the necessary contributions and works. Please note that the applicant continues to decline to agree that an obligation/contribution in relation to affordable housing is required.

#### Updated List of Plans and Documents

READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-000001\_P15 Existing Site Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-001000\_P15 Existing Site Location Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-000100\_P16 Demolition Plan – Masterplan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-042100\_P12 Demolition Elevations – Masterplan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-00-DR-A-022200\_P01 GA Masterplan – Ground Floor Constraints Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-00-DR-A-022200\_P29 GA Masterplan - Ground Floor Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-01-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Masterplan - First to Fourth Floor Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-07-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Masterplan - Fifth to Eighth Floor Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-09-DR-A-022200\_P22 GA Masterplan - Ninth to Tenth Floor Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-11-DR-A-022200\_P22 GA Masterplan - Eleventh Floor Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-RF-DR-A-022200\_P21 GA Masterplan - Proposed Roof Plan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-042000\_P13 Existing Elevations, Sheet 1 of 2 – Masterplan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-042001\_P13 Existing Elevations, Sheet 2 of 2 – Masterplan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-042200\_P18 Proposed Elevations – Masterplan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-052000\_P13 Existing Sections - Sheet 1 of 2 – Masterplan  
READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-052001\_P13 Existing Sections - Sheet 2 of 2 – Masterplan  
READ-5PA-AB-GF-DR-A-022200\_P28 GA Plan - Ground Floor - Block A & B  
READ-5PA-AB-01-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - First Floor - Block A & B  
READ-5PA-AB-02-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Second Floor - Block A & B  
READ-5PA-AB-03-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Third Floor - Block A & B  
READ-5PA-AB-04-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Fourth Floor - Block A & B  
READ-5PA-AB-05-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Fifth Floor - Block A & B  
READ-5PA-AB-06-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Sixth Floor - Block A & B

READ-5PA-AB-07-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Seventh Floor - Block A & B  
 READ-5PA-AB-08-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Eighth Floor - Block A & B  
 READ-5PA-AB-09-DR-A-022200\_P24 GA Plan - Ninth Floor - Block A & B  
 READ-5PA-AB-10-DR-A-022200\_P24 GA Plan - Tenth Floor - Block A & B  
 READ-5PA-AB-11-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Eleventh Floor - Block A & B  
 READ-5PA-AB-RF-DR-A-022200\_P21 GA Plan - Roof Level - Blocks A & B  
 READ-5PA-CD-GF-DR-A-022200\_P28 GA Plan - Ground Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-01-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - First Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-02-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Second Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-03-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Third Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-04-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Fourth Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-05-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Fifth Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-06-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Sixth Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-07-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Seventh Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-08-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan Eighth Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-09-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Ninth Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-10-DR-A-022200\_P23 GA Plan - Tenth Floor - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-CD-11-DR-A-022200\_P22 GA Plan - Roof Level - Block C & D  
 READ-5PA-AA-ZZ-DR-A-042201\_P21 Proposed Elevations - Sheet 1 of 2 - Block A  
 READ-5PA-AA-ZZ-DR-A-042202\_P21 Proposed Elevations - Sheet 2 of 2 - Block A  
 READ-5PA-BB-ZZ-DR-A-042201\_P21 Proposed Elevations - Sheet 1 of 2 - Block B  
 READ-5PA-BB-ZZ-DR-A-042202\_P21 Proposed Elevations - Sheet 2 of 2 - Block B  
 READ-5PA-CC-ZZ-DR-A-042201\_P21 Proposed Elevations - Sheet 1 of 2 - Block C  
 READ-5PA-CC-ZZ-DR-A-042202\_P20 Proposed Elevations - Sheet 2 of 2 - Block C  
 READ-5PA-DD-ZZ-DR-A-042201\_P21 Proposed Elevations - Block D  
 READ-5PA-AA-ZZ-DR-A-052202\_P18 Proposed Sections - Block A  
 READ-5PA-BB-ZZ-DR-A-052203\_P18 Proposed Sections - Block B  
 READ-5PA-CC-ZZ-DR-A-052204\_P18 Proposed Sections - Block C  
 READ-5PA-DD-ZZ-DR-A-052205\_P18 Proposed Sections - Block D  
 READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-043200\_P16 Typical Bay Studies - Sheet 1 of 4 - Bay Study 1  
 READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-043201\_P16 Typical Bay Studies - Sheet 2 of 4 - Bay Study 2  
 READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-043202\_P16 Typical Bay Studies - Sheet 3 of 4 - Bay Study 3 & 4  
 READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-043203\_P17 Typical Bay Studies - Sheet 4 of 4 - Bay Study 5  
 READ-5PA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-900031 Bike Store Section  
 READ-5PA-ZZ-GF-DR-A-023201 P05 Cycle store – plan layout  
 READ CUR XX XX DR C 090044\_P02 Section 278 Footway Tie-in Long sections  
 READ CUR XX XX DR C 090043\_P08 Section 278 Layout and Sections  
 READ-CUR-XX-XX-DR-C-090045-P01 Zebra Crossing Layout  
 READ CUR 00 00 D C 95001\_P03 Vehicle Tracking Panel Van  
 80908 CUR XX 00 D TP 05001 P18 Swept path Analysis 7.5t Panel van (in TA)  
 80908 CUR XX 00 D TP 05002 P20 Swept path analysis 11.2m refuse vehicle (in TA)  
 80908 CUR XX 00 D TP 05003 P17 Swept path analysis large car ground floor (In TA)  
 80908 CUR XX 00 D TP 05006 P14 Swept path analysis 7.7m fire tender (In TA)  
 80908 CUR XX 00 D TP 75001 P11 Access Arrangement (IN TA)  
 35206-RG-LD-101-P9 Overall Landscape Reference Plan\_A1.pdf (In DAS)  
 35206-RG-LD-200-1-P11 Hard and Soft Landscape GA 1\_A0.pdf (In DAS)  
 35206-RG-LD-200-2-P11 Hard and Soft Landscape GA 2\_A0.pdf (In DAS)  
 35206-RG-LD-200-3-P11 Hard and Soft Landscape GA 3\_A0.pdf (In DAS)  
 35206-RG-LD-200-4-P7 Hard and Soft Landscape GA Spec Sheet\_A0.pdf (In DAS)

Design and Access Statement (5plus Architects) (dated April 2026)  
 Planning Statement, including Affordable Housing Statement (Carney Sweeney)  
 Planning Position and Benefits Statement (Pegasus Group) dated April 2026.  
 Air Quality Assessment (Air Quality Consultants)  
 Acoustics Report (CPWP)  
 Arboricultural Assessment Including Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method  
 Statement Rev H (FPCR) (dated April 2026)  
 Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (Orion Heritage)

Contamination - Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment and Phase 2 Ground Investigation Report (Curtins)  
Daylight and Sunlight Report – Assessment of Proposed Development (MES Building Solutions) (dated 20th April 2026)  
Daylight and Sunlight Report – Assessment of Impact on Neighbours (MES Building Solutions)  
Daylight and Sunlight – response to BRE Review dated 08/12/2025. (MES Building Solutions dated 31st March 2026)  
Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Metric (FPCR)  
Energy and Sustainability Statement (CPWP)  
Fire Statement (Design Fire Consultants)  
Flood Risk Assessment, SuDS and Drainage Strategy (Curtins)  
Heritage Impact Assessment (HCUK)  
Statement of Community Involvement (CarneySweeney)  
Transport Assessment (Curtins)  
Highways Technical Note Rev P01 dated 22nd April 2026 including Transport Assessment Addendum including ATE assessment Revision P03 (Curtins) dated 28th April 2026  
Framework Travel Plan (Curtins)  
Townscape and Visual Appraisal (HCUK)  
Utilities Statement (HVSS)  
Wind Microclimate (Urban Microclimate)