



Reading
Borough Council
Working better with you

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

1 JULY 2026

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO
6.	PL/26/0237 (FUL) - BATTLE INN Decision PH, 2 BEDFORD ROAD	ABBEY	5 - 12

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Annex

UPDATE SHEET AND ORDER OF CONSIDERATION

Planning Applications Committee – 1st July 2026


Applications with Public Speaking

Item No.	6	Page 21	Ward Abbey
Application Number	PL/26/0237		
Application type	Full planning permission		
Address	Battle Inn PH, 2 Bedford Road		
Planning Officer presenting	Anthony Scholes		*UPDATE*
Speaker:	Evelyn Williams, CAAC		
Applicant/Agent:	TBC		

Applications With No Public Speaking

Item No.	7	Page 63	Ward Abbey
Application Number	PL//26/0603		
Application type	Full planning permission		
Address	St Marys House, 66-68 St Marys Butts and 75-77 Broad Street		
Planning Officer presenting	Jonathan Markwell		

This page is intentionally left blank

01 July 2026	 Reading Borough Council <i>Working better with you</i>
Title	PLANNING APPLICATION UPDATE REPORT
Ward	Abbey
Planning Application Reference:	PL/26/0237 (FUL)
Deadline	31 July 2026 (agreed extension of time)
Site Address:	Battle Inn, 2 Bedford Road, Reading, RG1 7HS
Proposed Development	Demolition of the former public house and the erection of a part five-storey building comprising six self-contained residential flats (Use Class C3) with a Commercial, Business and Service unit at ground floor (Use Class E) and associated works.
Recommendations	As per main report.
S106 Heads of Terms	As per main report with the addition of: 3. Healthcare Contribution – to secure the sum of £5,543 towards the provision of or improvements to local healthcare infrastructure payable on commencement of the development index linked from the date of the permission (restricted to within Abbey and/or Battle Wards) in accordance with policy CC9 and the SPD on Planning Obligations.
Conditions	As per main report.
Informatives	As per main report.

1. Additional Plans and Information Received

1.1 Following publishing of the main report, the following amended plans and documents were received:

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal revision, received 26 June 2026, as received by the Local Planning Authority 26 June 2026

The '24 Acoustics', Technical Memorandum, dated 26 June 2026, as received by the Local Planning Authority 26 June 2026

Drawing No: 9481 PL-04.19 – Proposed Green Roof Details

Drawing No: 9481 PL-04.08 – Proposed South and West Elevations

As received by the Local Planning Authority 26 June 2026

1.2 The amended plans relate to the additional details of the green roof on top of the mansard roof portion, and amendments of front boundary treatments requested

by officers as per paragraph 7.41 on page 41 of the main reports pack. This has resulted in a simpler metal railing to the frontage. No other changes have been made to the proposal (specific amendments circled in red on full plans in Appendix 1).



Figure 1 - Amended front railing treatment

2. Plan amendments

Green Roof on Mansard Portions

- 2.1 The inclusion of a green roof on the mansard sections of the building, as shown on the submitted plans, has been queried by officers in terms of its practical feasibility. While the applicant has provided a sectional drawing indicating how a green roof could be installed on a mansard roof, it remains uncertain whether this can be realistically implemented. Further details will therefore be required under Condition 9, as set out in the main agenda report, to ensure that the proposal can be delivered as intended. The provision of green roofs on the building is considered a positive element of the scheme, and contribute toward multiple objectives, including biodiversity, rainwater management, and appearance of the development. Should the green roofs atop the mansard portions not be deliverable, the applicant will need to vary any planning permission given.

Front Boundary Treatments

- 2.2 As noted above and referenced in paragraph 7.41 (page 41) of the main agenda report, amended front boundary treatment plans were requested. These have since been received and show a simple metal railing detail between brick piers, as illustrated in Figure 1. The revised boundary treatment is considered acceptable and no longer seeks to replicate the existing historic brick wall and railings found in the vicinity of the site. This move away from a pastiche approach was recommended by officers and is welcomed.

3. Additional Consultation Received

- 3.1 The following additional consultation response was received:

NHS Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire Integrated Care Board (NHS BOB ICB)

- 3.2 The NHS BOB ICB was consulted due to the development resulting in additional dwellings within an area with a known shortfall of healthcare provision. The NHS BOB ICB oversees health and care services across the region and seeks to ensure that the healthcare needs of local communities are met. The consultation comments have confirmed that the local GP service for the development, being the Broad Street Health Centre, is at a deficit and does not have sufficient clinical capacity to accommodate new patients. The NHS have stated that a contribution would be required to offset the harm associated with the shortfall.

Officer Response

- 3.3 The proposal would introduce additional dwellings within an area confirmed to have a shortfall of GP services. Policy CC9 (Securing Infrastructure) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019, states that development will not be permitted unless the infrastructure, and services (including healthcare) made necessary by the development are provided through direct provision or financial contributions. Given there would be harm to the future residents of the scheme, through the lack of suitable GP places, a contribution towards the provision of local healthcare services is considered necessary to meet the specific needs of the development and ensure that GP services can be provided for residents. The Applicant has agreed to a contribution towards healthcare infrastructure, and it is considered to be reasonably related to the scale of the development proposed (£5,543.00).
- 3.4 Any contribution, in accordance with the CIL Regulations Test (Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) (122)), must be: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. In conjunction with the harm to the development and lack of GP services, the contribution must reasonably be restricted to the local area that would serve the development. As such, the contribution will be secured to only be used within Abbey and/or Battle Wards.

4. Building Control Comments

- 4.1 As per 7.83, on page 48 of your main agenda reports pack, comment from RBC's Building Control team have been sought regarding whether compliance with M4(2) of the Building Regulations for accessible and adaptable homes is capable of being achieved within the development.
- 4.2 Requirements M4(2) and M4(3) are 'optional requirements' as defined in the Building Regulations. An optional requirement only applies where a condition requirement is imposed on a development. As noted in the main report, Policy H5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019, seeks that all new developments must be built as M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' (not M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings').

- 4.3 It is noted that compliance with Building Regulations is a separate matter, that would be sufficiently addressed through separate approvals, under the Building Regulations Regime. Planning decisions, in the first instance must assume that other regimes are working effectively, unless there is clear evidence that those regimes are not working effectively. In this instance, there is no clear evidence that the Building Regulations regime is not working effectively.
- 4.4 The current query with RBC Building Control Officers relates only to whether the building, as currently proposed, could provide for accessible and adaptable dwellings under the optional provisions of M4(2), though it is currently assumed that the proposal would not, and therefore would be in conflict with Policy H5, and this would weigh against the proposal. However, no comments have been received at this time to confirm this.
- 4.5 As outlined in the main agenda report (6.9 P.32), the 'Tilted Balance' is considered to be engaged. With regard to the assessment conclusions with respect to the 'Tilted Balance', a 'strong reason' for refusing the development pursuant to footnote 7 of the NPPF would only relate to (in this instance) the impacts on Designated Heritage Assets (Listed Buildings, NDHA's, Conservation Area), and therefore the non-provision of adaptable and accessible homes would not be a reason to refuse the application in line with the 'Tilted Balance' i. of paragraph 11.
- 4.6 Paragraph 11 d) ii. of the NPPF (2024, as amended), also states that:
- "(granting permission unless) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination⁹"*
- 4.7 Footnote 9 states the policies which are relevant to the tilted balance assessment (paragraphs 66, 84, 91, 110, 115, 129, 135, and 139). Policy 115 relates to sustainable transport and seeks that development provide safe and suitable access for all users. Paragraph 135 seeks that developments function well over the lifetime of the development and create places which are inclusive and accessible. Though, there would be some harm associated with the non-provision and contribution to accessible housing provision, this would not be considered to 'significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits' as required by the 'Tilted Balance'. Whilst weighing against the proposal, is not considered to weigh against the proposal to such a degree that the proposal should be refused in this regard.

5. Town Centre Public Realm Strategy

- 5.1 As discussed in paragraph 7.28 on page 38 of the main reports pack, the Town Centre Public Realm Strategy (TCRPS) (2024) was presented to Strategic Environment Planning and Transport (SEPT) committee on 23 June 2026. It was unanimously supported by SEPT members and was adopted as a Supplementary

Planning Document (SPD) on 23 June 2026. As outlined within the TCPRS, the SPD supplements Policy CR3 which requires that proposals for new development make a positive contribution towards the quality of the public realm of the central area.

- 5.2 As such, this should be given full weight as an SPD within consideration of this application. It is noted that the scheme would provide some benefit to the internal site arrangements which align with the TCPRS, predominantly through the inclusion of landscaping. Whilst greater weight can be given to the SPD following publishing of the main agenda report, it is not considered that this alters the overall planning balance as the proposal is already making a contribution toward the public realm, albeit only through on-site landscaping.

6. Leisure Contribution

- 6.1 As outlined within paragraph 7.59 on page 45 of the main agenda reports pack, this section seeks to provide further details of the leisure contribution sought. As outlined within the main agenda report, the proposal does not include any on-site open space, either in a private or communal arrangement. The lack of on-site open space is considered contrary to Policy H10 and would result in harm to the future living environment of residents. The nearby open spaces in the vicinity of the site are limited, with the Victoria Recreation Ground (Great Knollys Street) being the closest (and is within Abbey Ward). In addition to the harm to future residents, the proposal would place additional pressure on existing open space. The town centre is a focus for residential growth and is only provided with limited public open space. As such, there would be harm to the functionality and space available within existing public open spaces.

- 6.2 Any contribution, in accordance with the CIL Regulations Test (Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) (122)), must be: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. In conjunction with the harm to the development and existing local space, the contribution must reasonably be restricted to the local area that would serve the development. As such, the contribution will be secured to only be used within Abbey or Battle Wards, as outlined within the main agenda report recommendation, to be secured by s106 legal agreement.

7. Highways – Delivery hatch commentary

- 7.1 As outlined in paragraph 7.66 on page 46 of the main agenda reports pack, a service hatch is located within the Bedford Road highways land, associated with deliveries for the pub. RBC's Transport Development Control Officers have confirmed that there would be an appropriate mechanism for the Highways Authority (Reading Borough Council) to seek details of, and ensure suitability of its infilling and subsequent repair to the footway. Section 171 of the Highways Act gives highway authorities control over excavation within streets (among other

things). As such, a separate regime would sufficiently manage the details of the infilling and repair of land within the highway, and a condition requiring the infilling of the delivery hatch and replacement footway is recommended as per condition 21 (page 22) within the main agenda reports pack.

8. Ecology

- 8.1 As outlined within paragraph 7.78 on page 47 of the main agenda reports pack, an updated ecological report was required, primarily due to typographical errors. The amended 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal' provided has addressed RBC's Ecologist's comments and has been confirmed as suitable subject to the conditions as discussed within 5.11 on page 29 of the main agenda reports pack.

9. Noise Matters

- 9.1 As outlined within paragraph 7.69 on page 47 of the main agenda reports pack, additional clarification on noise matters was required. The 'technical note' provided has addressed RBC's Environmental Protection Officers queries and has demonstrated that with windows open (to assist with and/or avoid overheating), that noise levels within the development would meet the required standards and would be acceptable. As such, RBC's Environmental Protection Officer remains content with the proposal, including conditions recommended within the main agenda reports pack (7.68-7.73, p.47).

10. Conclusion

- 10.1 The matters covered within this update report are not considered to affect the detailed assessment contained within the main agenda report. The recommendation has been amended to reflect the agreement on the agreed healthcare contribution.

Case Officer: Anthony Scholes

This page is intentionally left blank