

04 September 2024



**Reading**  
Borough Council  
Working better with you

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Title</b>                           | <b>PLANNING APPLICATION UPDATE REPORT</b>  |
| <b>Ward</b>                            | Abbey  |
| <b>Planning Application Reference:</b> | PL/22/0933   |
| <b>Site Address:</b>                   | 35-39 Friar Street, Reading, RG1 1DX   |
| <b>Proposed Development</b>            | Demolition of existing buildings and installation of basement and erection of part 7, part 11 storey mixed use building comprising 103 upper floor residential units (Class C3) and Class E uses at part basement, part ground floor level plus landscaping and other works (amended description). |
| <b>Applicant</b>                       | Shaviram Group   |
| <b>Report author</b>                   | Jonathan Markwell, Principal Planning Officer  |
| <b>Deadline:</b>                       | As per main report.  |
| <b>Recommendations</b>                 | As per main report.  |
| <b>S106 Terms</b>                      | As per main report.  |
| <b>Conditions</b>                      | As per main report.  |
| <b>Informatives</b>                    | As per main report.  |

## 1. Additional public consultation response

- 1.1. Subsequent to the publication of the main report, an objection has been received from an address in Reeds Avenue, Earley (RG6). As such, further to paragraph 5.67 of the main report, **two** objections have now been received. This latest objection is concerned with the loss of the existing (Cosmo) restaurant, specifying *“This proposal is economical suicide as it is another example of removing a lucrative business for genetrified flats” [sic.]*. In response, it is noted that paragraph 3.3 of the main report explains that whilst the applicant has indicated the retention of the existing occupier, in practice a variety of Class E uses could occupy the space, with permission running with the land and not specific occupiers. The objector also specifies the proposals seem *“economically unjust”* and that there is a need for *“a balance of amenities and private/public housing/flats to make a location work”*. In response, it is considered that the proposals provide a suitable mix of uses, as per sections 7i. and 7ii. of the officer appraisal.
- 1.2. Accordingly, this additional public consultation response has been taken into account, but is not considered to alter the planning balance or Recommendation/conclusion of the main report, which remains unaltered.