



PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

4 SEPTEMBER 2019

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO
4. POTENTIAL SITE VISITS FOR COMMITTEE ITEMS	Decision		3 - 4
9. 190809/FUL - THAMES QUARTER, KINGS MEADOW ROAD	Decision	ABBEY	5 - 8
10. 190522/FUL - 39 BRUNSWICK HILL	Decision	BATTLE	9 - 14
12. 181377/REG3 - NORCOT COMMUNITY CENTRE, TILEHURST	Decision	KENTWOOD	15 - 16

This page is intentionally left blank

Reading Borough Council

Applications for Committee Determination since previous Committee Report

Printed: 30 August 2019

Ward: Abbey

Application reference: 191086

Application type: Full Planning Approval

Site address: Unit 16, North Street, Reading

Proposal: Redevelopment of site to provide 295sqm of office space (Class B1(a)) and 6no. 1-bed apartments and 4no. 2-bed apartments (Class C3) including cycle and bin storage.

Reason for Committee item: Major Development

Ward: Abbey

Application reference: 191088

Application type: Full Planning Approval

Site address: Crowne Plaza Reading, Richfield Avenue, Reading

Proposal: Redevelopment of former Crowne Plaza Hotel car park and construction of new 132-bed hotel (Use Class C1), with associated access, car parking and landscaping.

Reason for Committee item: Major Development

Ward: Abbey

Application reference: 191384

Application type: Regulation 3 Planning Approval

Site address: Land at, Abattoirs Road, Reading

Proposal: Demolition of existing outbuildings and the provision of a new public car park with access required from Abattoirs Road with egress on to Great Knollys Street, Reading.

Reason for Committee item: RBC Application

Ward: Abbey

Application reference: 191395

Application type: Full Planning Approval

Site address: Land Adjacent, Canal Way, Reading

Proposal: New play area on land adjacent Canal Way

Reason for Committee item: RBC Application

Ward: Caversham

Application reference: 191205

Application type: Listed Building Consent

Site address: Caversham Library, Church Street, Caversham, Reading

Proposal: Replacement of heating system

Reason for Committee item: RBC Application

Ward: Katesgrove

Application reference: 191176

Application type: Outline Planning Approval

Site address: The Woodley Arms Ph, Waldeck Street, Reading

Proposal: Outline permission for Approval in Principle: Demolition of former public house, and re-development of the site with 2 no. Co-Living blocks, one containing 18 bedrooms with communal accommodation, and one containing 20 bedrooms with communal accommodation; vehicle parking and open space.

Reason for Committee item: Major Development

Ward: Park

Application reference: 191341

Application type: Regulation 3 Planning Approval

Site address: Sun Street Youth & Community Centre, Sun Street, Reading

Proposal: New boundary fence to creche play area

Applications for Committee Determination since previous Committee Report

Printed: 01 January 0001

Reason for Committee item: RBC Application

Ward: Peppard

Application reference: 190087

Application type: Full Planning Approval

Site address: Land At Autumn Close

Proposal: Construction of a 4-bedroom dwelling, garage, and associated works

Reason for Committee item: Requested by Ward Councillor

UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

ITEM NO. 9

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 4 Sept 2019

Ward: Abbey

App No.: 190809

Address: Thames Quarter, Kings Meadow Road, Reading (AKA Former Cooper BMW, Kings Meadow Road, Reading)

Proposal: Erection of a part 13-storey, part 23 storey building comprising 335 apartments in a mix of studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom and three-bedroom units; residents' lounges, tech-hub, dining room, and cinema room; various rooftop outdoor amenity spaces; concierge/reception with coffee meeting area; residents' storage facilities; postroom; ancillary back-of-house facilities; 335 secure cycle parking spaces; car parking spaces; landscaping; and associated works (revision to planning permission 162166 dated 23/11/2017) (Part Retrospective)

Applicant: MG RPF Limited Partnership Thames Quarter Ltd and Lochailort Thames Quarter Ltd

Date received: 20 May 2019

13 Week target decision date: 19 August 2019

Agreed determination date: 20 Sept 2019

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT, as per main agenda with revised conditions listed below.

1. Revised list of drawings for approval (C)
2. Hard and soft landscaping details (C)
3. Landscaping implemented as per the Cond 2 and 3 (C)
4. Landscaping maintenance period (A)
5. Landscaping management plan to be approved (A)
6. Remediation timetable (B)
7. Unexpected contamination (A)
8. Land gas protection strategy (B)
9. Land gas validation report (A)
10. Piling details (B)
11. Foul & surface water drainage strategy (B)
12. Construction Management Method Statement (B)
13. Limited construction working hours (A)
14. No materials to be burnt onsite (A)
15. Previously-approved materials to be used (B)
16. SUDS management and maintenance (A)
17. Details of ground floor laminated glass (A)
18. Security features to be approved (A)
19. 10% Part M(2) units to be identified (A)
20. Communal area extraction facilities (A)
21. Bird nesting features to be approved (A)
22. Mechanical ventilation & heat recovery to be approved (A)
23. Acoustic glazing to be installed (A)
24. Level 13 parapet wall detail to be approved (D)
25. External lighting to be approved (A)
26. Temporary surfacing schedule of works (A)

- 27. Sprinklers to be fitted (A)
- 28. Development completed in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (A)
- 29. Accessibility of communal facilities (A)
- 30. Council to be notified of each postal address (A)
- 31. Residents informed of non-eligibility for parking permits (A)
- 32. Noise assessment of mechanical plant required (A)
- 33. Service vehicle strategy to be approved (A)
- 34. Parking space provision/maximum (A)
- 35. Refuse storage facilities to be provided (A)
- 36. Cycle parking facilities to be provided (A)
- 37. Development completed in accordance with the Sustainability Strategy (A)
- 38. Emissions reduction certification to be submitted (A)
- 39. Lifts to be provided and retained in working order (A)
- 40. No Building Maintenance Units permitted (A)
- 41. Location of electric vehicle charge points (C)
- 42. Location of car club spaces (C)
- 43. Location of disabled parking spaces (C)
- 44. Full travel plan to be submitted (C)
- 45. Annual review of the Travel Plan (C)

Condition Key

A. Condition wording to remain unchanged

B. To be implemented in accordance with previously-approved details

C. Amended condition wording/ new conditions

1. Consultation

- 1.1 No additional consultation responses or public representations have been received.

2. Wind and microclimate verification

- 2.1 Further to paragraph 7.89 of the main report, at the time of writing verification from the BRE has not been received and any recommendation remains worded to delegate to the Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services, subject to satisfactory outcomes as per the main report.

3. Community Infrastructure Levy

- 3.1 Revised CIL legislation came into effect on the 01/09/2019. In summary there are changes to the way the CIL liability is calculated for certain types of planning applications, depending on if the liability increases or decrease. At this present time, the projected CIL calculation provided in main agenda report remains unchanged.
- 3.2 For clarity, the estimated basic CIL charge would be £4,462,913.44 based upon the proposed floorspace. As with the previous application, the CIL liability is likely to be reduced by the original demolished floor area, resulting in an amended CIL charge of £4,177,029.64.

3.3 This gives an indication of the likely CIL outcomes but is without prejudice to further examination of the CIL application by the Council as to the direct implication of this new legislation. Officers will update the PAC if any significant adjustment occurs to the headline figures detailed in the main agenda.

4. Conditions

4.1 In light of further assessment and implementation of the previously approved scheme, conditions have been updated in the above recommendation.

Case Officer: Brian Conlon

This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE REPORT

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES READING BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 4 Sept 2019	ITEM NO. 10 Page:
--	----------------------

Ward: Battle

App No.: 190522

Address: 39 Brunswick Hill

Proposal: Erection of new building containing 9 no. apartments with parking at rear following demolition of existing buildings

Applicant: Mr Eric Benjamin

Date received: 27 March (valid 27 March 2019)

8 week target decision date: 19 July 2019

Agreed determination date: 6 Sept 2019

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT, as per 17th July main agenda report with two additional legal agreement obligations.

Recommendation (amended):

Delegate to Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services to (i) GRANT Full Planning Permission with appropriate conditions and informatives, subject to the satisfactory completion of a S106 legal agreement by 19th July 2019, or;

(ii) to REFUSE permission should the legal agreement not be completed by the 19th July 2019 (unless officers on behalf of the Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services agree to a later date for completion of the legal agreement).

The legal agreement to secure the following:

- Provision of a deferred affordable housing contribution mechanism;
- Should the building subsequently be extended / altered (to create further units) or units subdivided then contributions to affordable housing would apply on a cumulative basis;
- a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) amount £5,000

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The original recommendation made to PAC on the 17th July 2019 has been updated to reflect the changes reported in the previous update paper dated 17th July and includes the following updates.

2. Consultations

2.1 Consultation responses have again been received from Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee and Reading Civic Society which were reported in the previous update paper. A copy of these comments are again included below:

Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee 15th July 2019

“Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) object to the current application to demolish 39 Brunswick Hill and build 9 flats on the site. We objected to application 171719 which was refused on appeal.

1. LOCAL LISTING

1.1 Although the building was refused local listing we urge that Reading Borough Council (RBC) reconsider this decision.

2. HERITAGE VALUE OF THE PROPERTY

2.1 We note that the planning inspector spoke strongly against the demolition of the 39 Brunswick Hill the decision letter on the appeal by the developer against RBC’s refusal to grant application 171719. In para 6: *“In my view, its heritage interest has more than sufficient architectural significance to be a material consideration in determining the appeal. The Framework requires a balanced judgement to be made, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. In these circumstances, the total loss of the heritage asset would conflict with policy CS33 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy adopted 2008 (CS) which protects the historic environment and seeks its enhancement. This weighs against the proposal. I turn now to its replacement”*.

2.2 And in para 11: *“Allowing the proposed development would conflict with its advice that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout, and create distinctive places to live”*.

2.3 Reading CAAC feel that a sympathetic extension and expansion of accommodation units in the property would be a more appropriate solution than demolition. The property retains many original features which are worthy of a continued useful life.

2.4 As well as retaining a heritage asset, this would also be a more environmentally sustainable solution.

3. DESIGN

3.1 The current design while of ‘traditional’ appearance, mocks the house built by George Parsons with the attempt at a replacement for the oriel window which was one of the most unique features of the house.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 Whilst this application may address many of the reasons for refusal of application 171719 it still results in the loss of a heritage asset which could be sympathetically extended and retained in use.”

Reading Civic Society (15th July 2019)

“We wish to restate very firmly the position we took with regard to the planning application in 2017 (no 171719) that the planned demolition of this building is totally inappropriate and un-necessary. Our key points are:

1. The Planning Inspector, in October 2018, gave great weight to the value of the building even though he said there was nothing remarkable about it. There were 4 reasons the appeal was rejected, of which 2 related to the impact of the loss of the heritage asset. These would still apply with the current application.

2. The building is in good condition and well maintained internally and externally.

3. Whilst we understand that it is a large home, and that the owner, Mr Cataline, wishes to move on as the majority of his family have left, we argue that demolition is not the answer.

4. The property has not been marketed to test interest in it as a family home. Given its proximity to the station and with a good west facing garden we believe it would find a market as a home. We are aware of distinguished large properties in other parts of Reading which have been bought as family homes by people coming out of London, rather than for HMOs.

5. Since the 1920s part of the house has been rented out whilst still remaining in single ownership and this continued under the existing owner (a very early HMO).

6. We believe the building should be added to the Local List. Whilst there are many Edwardian houses in Reading this one seems far more impressive and distinguished and unusual in Reading, in its form and presence on the street scape. It also has a local history which we provided in our comments on the last planning application (see attachment to this letter).

7. We note also comments from neighbouring property, 29 Brunswick Hill, about the degree of overlooking of their property and garden. The degree of overlooking of the garden of a neighbouring property was one of the five reasons the Planning Inspector rejected the Appeal re 3-5 Craven Road in 16 November 2018.

The Planning Inspector in the decision in November 2018 re no 39 said *"Whilst there is nothing remarkable about the house... it has an interesting composition of well-detailed architectural elements including a distinctive, curved oriel window, a four-centred arch over the entrance, stone dressings around openings and a background of crisp, red brick in which diapering and bands are picked out in blue headers. Its materials and architectural language make a passing reference to the Victorian houses further down the street but the idiosyncratic arrangement of the architectural elements , and the exuberance of its scale distinguish it from them. "... its heritage interest has more than sufficient architectural significance to be a material consideration in determining the appeal.....the total loss of the heritage asset would conflict with*

policy CS33 of RBC Local Development Framework Core Strategy (RBCLDF) which protects the heritage environment and seeks its enhancement. This weighs against this proposal"

The inspector concluded about the proposal "...However, this is outweighed by 1. the loss of the heritage asset, 2. the harm to the character and appearance of the area, 3. the inappropriate mix of dwelling size and type, 4. and its lack of provision for an employment and skills plan or alternative contribution, which is in clear conflict with the policies of the development plan. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

This building is exactly the type of building which the Victorian Society, which champions Victorian and Edwardian buildings (to 1914), seeks to encourage local authorities to conserve. It is asking groups to identify Victorian and Edwardian buildings under threat.

To quote the Victorian Society "Victorian and Edwardian buildings are irreplaceable, cherished, diverse, beautiful, familiar and part of our everyday life. They contribute overwhelmingly to the character of places people love and places where people live. They belong to all of us. Their owners are really only custodians for future generations."

During the site visit re 171719 we were invited to view the inside of the property by the existing owner, Mr Cataline, who has lived there with his family since 1998. We noted that not only has he maintained the outside of the building well but that the same applies to the inside of the house and the garden. This is NOT a building which is suffering from neglect. Mr Cataline has been a good custodian.

The demolition which would follow approval of the application therefore is even more inappropriate.

We ask that the PAC resists the advance of the bulldozer, which is part of this application, and demands a more appropriate solution which will retain the building, we accept this may include use as an HMO. In addition we ask for full consideration be given for Local Listing."

Additional objections

- 2.2 2 Additional letters of representation have been received from 3 and 33 Brunswick Hill. The content of these letters are included below:
- This is a very old and attractive building, one of the nicest on the street. It is a large house and could be redeveloped into flats without demolition of the structure.
 - I live downhill from 39 at 33 and the new building would seriously overlook my back garden.

Officers advise that these issues are all covered in the Appraisal to the main agenda report and no further response is required.

3. Affordable Housing

- 3.1 Further to paragraph 7.28 of the original PAC report and as reported in the 17th July Update Paper, officers consider it relevant and necessary (in light of established planning policies and housing objectives in the Borough) to seek the provision of a deferred affordable housing contribution mechanism to be secured as part of any recommendation to approve. Residual valuations are highly sensitive to changes in costs and values over time, therefore a deferred contributions mechanism would ensure that any improvements in viability that result in a profit surplus being generated, would trigger the payment of affordable housing contributions.
- 3.3 A deferred payment mechanism has been agreed between the developer and your officers, pending formalisation. The incorporation of such a mechanism will enable the Council to share in any subsequent uplift in the site's value and is considered a proactive approach. Based on the inputs agreed during the viability appraisal, an affordable housing review would trigger when a profit point of 17.5% is reached. With such a mechanism as part of any legal agreement, Officers remain content that the proposals are policy compliant in this respect.
- 3.4 In order to prevent any change in the unit mix or increase in the number of units hereby proposed, it is also recommended that a condition is secured preventing any such change without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority. This is to safeguard the mix altering to potentially unacceptable mixes in the future, while also having a dual benefit of not altering the sales values of units (which could improve scheme viability) without this being managed and assessed by the Local Planning Authority. Separately to any planning condition is the need to capture through the legal agreement any affordable housing liability through the uplift in site value as a result of any such change.
- 3.5 In order to incorporate the above matters in any legal agreement, the officer recommendation is amended and an additional condition (Condition 19) is attached as per the original update paper (See below):

43. Additional condition

As per 17th July 2019 Update Paper insert condition 19:

19. Notwithstanding the provisions of the GPDO 2015 no change to the unit mix (4 x 1-bed and 5 x 2-bed units) shall be made to the development hereby permitted without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Case Officer: Brian Conlon

This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE COMMITTEE REPORT

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES	ITEM NO.12
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL	Page: 189
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 4th September 2019	

Ward: Kentwood

Application No.: 181377/REG3

Address: Norcot Community Centre, Tilehurst, Reading

Proposals: Erection of a three storey building comprising 18 (8x1 and 10x2 bed) residential units (Use Class C3) with associated bin and cycle storage, a 96.4sqm (NIA) building for community use (Use Class D1), vehicle parking, landscaping and associated works.

Applicant: Reading Borough Council

Date Application Valid: 13th August 2018

Application target decision date: Extension of time to 31st October 2019

RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION

Delegate to Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services to (i) GRANT full planning permission subject to completion of a unilateral undertaking legal agreement or (ii) to REFUSE permission should the legal agreement not be completed by the 31st October 2019 (unless the assessing officer on behalf of the Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services agrees to a later date for completion of the legal agreement). The legal agreement to secure the following:

1. At least 30% residential units as Affordable Rent Units in perpetuity
2. Employment Skills Plan for the construction phase of the residential development in accordance with the Council's SPD, to be submitted and approved at least one month prior to works commencing. Or contribution in lieu (in accordance with levels as set out in the adopted SPD).

Conditions and informatives as per the original committee report.

1. Affordable Housing Amount

- 1.1 The main Agenda report confirms that all 18 units as proposed will be for Affordable Housing and terms set out for the S106 required 100% provision to be secured. However, whilst that may ultimately be RBC Housing's intention, this would be in excess of the adopted affordable housing policy and spd requirement.
- 1.2 Therefore, the S106 terms, as amended above, reflect the policy compliant figure of 30%. This will not prevent the developer from providing all the dwellings as affordable rent units.

2. Affordable Housing Tenure Update

2.1 The original recommendation referred to the 18 residential units as being social rent affordable housing units. Subsequent to this, it has transpired from discussions with RBC Housing that they are actually seeking for these units to be termed as affordable rent units, as outlined in the recommendation above. In short, this is so the applicant has greater flexibility in setting rental levels for these new build properties, mindful of the mandatory annual 1% rent decrease for all social housing imposed by Government in 2015 for 4 years, whilst still fitting within the definition of Affordable Housing. The proposed approach is consistent with the position agreed by Policy Committee in November 2018 in respect of proposed rents for local authority new build properties.

3. Conclusion

3.1 This change in the recommendation from 100% to 30% and the definition of the affordable units is considered acceptable by officers as the scheme remains compliant with relevant policies. Recommendation remains to grant.

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys