



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 24 March 2026

Site visit made on 24 March 2026

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/25/3376563

Trinity Hall, South Street, Reading RG1 4QU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Hardeep Hans (Hanslink Ltd) against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/24/1079.
 - The development proposed is change of use of existing building and extensions to provide 18 apartments.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of existing building and extensions to provide 18 apartments at Trinity Hall, South Street, Reading RG1 4QU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/24/1079, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Hardeep Hans (Hanslink Ltd) against Reading Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.
3. An application for costs was made by Reading Borough Council against Mr Hardeep Hans (Hanslink Ltd). This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. Amended plans numbered H17-PL48 Rev A, H17-PL49 Rev A, H17-PL50 Rev B, H17-PL51 Rev B, H17-PL52 Rev B, H13-PL53 Rev A, H17-PL54 Rev A, 8493/LSP Rev D, and 8493.PP.2.0 Rev C were submitted with the appeal. These showed a reduction in the scale of the proposed roof, and a simplification of its form. The Council had the opportunity to consider these revisions in its Statement of Case, describing them as minor changes that did not resolve its previously identified concerns. However, some inaccuracies were also identified. In response, the appellant submitted further amended drawings numbered H17-PL50 Rev C, H17-PL51 Rev C, and H13-PL53 Rev B. The Council accepted at the Hearing that these drawings were also for minor changes, and no cogent evidence was provided to suggest that I should not consider them.
5. Although they were not the subject of consultation at application stage, the two sets of amended drawings do not fundamentally alter the original scheme. The

changes reduce the scale of the building and incorporate detailed design amendments in response to objections raised. They do not, therefore, introduce fresh issues and I see no prejudice to any party in my taking them into account.

6. At the Hearing, the appellant submitted a completed Unilateral Undertaking under s106 of the Act, dated 24 March 2026 (the UU). The UU contains obligations relating to affordable housing, carbon offsetting, and construction employment and skills measures and provisions. It was agreed in the Statement of Common Ground (the SOCG) that the obligations in the UU would overcome reasons for refusal numbered 3 and 4 on the decision notice.

Main Issues

7. Consequently, the main issues are:
 - 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.

Reasons

Character and appearance/heritage assets

8. The site lies in a busy area of mixed uses near to the city centre. There is little planting within the building plots and, whilst there are some street trees, they have been heavily pollarded. Consequently, the street scene is dominated by roads and buildings and has a distinctly urban character. The buildings are largely three-storey in the immediate vicinity of the site. However, there are four-storey buildings on the opposite side of South Street, and two-storey terraced houses in Sidmouth Street to the south. The roofs are generally ridged, but there are also parapeted flat roofs, mansards, and dormers, so there is a variety of roof forms and heights in the locality.
9. There is also diversity in the design of the buildings, some of which are of historic interest, with fine architectural detailing, and others, of more recent origin, which vary in quality and character. The predominant building material is red brick, but buff brick, render, painted brick, and stone are also present. The buildings are laid out so that they align with the roads, and are set back on similar building lines. Consequently, the street scene is relatively orderly. Overall, the area is characterised by substantial buildings, which vary in form, design, and materials, but which display some consistency in their layout, their generally 3 - 4 storey scale, and the predominance of red brick.
10. The SOCG identifies that there are three Grade II listed buildings near to the site¹. At the Hearing, the Council referred to a fourth, Queens Crescent, which lies to the northwest. No 3/5 is a 3-storey building with a symmetrical pattern of arched windows and ornate bands of decorative brickwork. Its significance is derived from it being a well-preserved example of an 1880s building in the Butterfield Vicarage style. The elements of its setting that contribute to its significance are its open frontage, which allows its form, decoration, and symmetry to be appreciated, and

¹ 3&5 Sidmouth Street (No 3/5), 9 Sidmouth Street (No 9) and 43-49 (odd) South Street (No 43-49)

the similar scale of the adjacent buildings, which means its stature in the street scene is not challenged. The significance of No 9 lies in its unusual composition, as a two-storey building at the end of a three-storey terrace, and in its decorative architectural features in the Italianate style. The aspects of its setting that contribute to its significance are its open surroundings, which allow all three decorative elevations to be readily appreciated, and its relationship with the adjoining and perpendicular terraces which share similar architectural features.

11. No 43-49 is somewhat unusual in its context, as it is only two-storeys high on the South Street frontage. Its significance is derived from its display of key visual components typical of the Italianate style that developed during the Victorian period, including rusticated bath ashlar on the main elevation, and flint with brick dressings and quoins to the side and the rear. Its setting includes much larger buildings directly opposite and on either side, including the appeal site. The elements of its setting that contribute to its significance are its alignment with the other buildings on the frontage, which allows its decorative façade to be appreciated as part of a wider street scene, and the openness to the north and east, which allows views of the decorative flint elevations.
12. Queens Crescent is a row of three-storey buildings following the curve of Queens Road. Its significance lies in it being a good example of the Italianate architectural style in the area, with a rusticated ground floor, first floor pediments over sash windows, and a plain cornice and parapet at the top of the second floor. The wide and curved nature of Queens Road provides an open setting to the sweeping front elevation, allowing it to be appreciated from distance, and contributing positively to its significance.
13. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving these listed buildings, or their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
14. The existing building on the appeal site is a red brick, L-shaped, three storey structure with frontages to South Street and Sidmouth Street. It is of no great architectural merit, but its elevations align with the other buildings that front these two roads, and it accords with the general scale, materials, and pattern of buildings in the area. Its simple design, and its location on the site, means that it does not intrude into the aspects of the settings that contribute positively to the significance of the nearby listed buildings. It therefore has a neutral impact on these heritage assets. However, it has been vacant since 2014 and is fire damaged, unkempt, and subject to vandalism. Its current condition therefore has some adverse impact on the general character and appearance of the area.
15. The proposal would involve squaring the L-shape of the building footprint and extending onto the open carpark area to the west. Whilst there would be a considerable increase in the footprint and internal floorspace of the building, this would be achieved without an increase in its overall height. Consequently, when looking down Sidmouth Street, from viewpoints to the south of its junction with South Street, the scale of the building would not appear significantly altered. The two gables would be a little higher, but would be seen against a backdrop of much larger buildings beyond. The proposed dormers would be a noticeable addition, but would be subservient in scale to the overall roof, and would be seen alongside those currently being installed in the adjacent building to the north. The expanse of

flat roof to the rear would not be evident from here, so the overall mass of the building would appear largely unchanged. Indeed, the introduction of render to the ground floor of the building would relieve the existing, somewhat monolithic nature of the building, thus visually reducing its apparent bulk.

16. In views along Sidmouth Street from the north, the impact on the street frontage would be similarly benign. The increased height of the front-facing gable would have little effect on the apparent overall scale of the building, whereas the introduction of ground floor render, together with landscaping in front of the building would reduce its visual mass. There could be some glimpses of the rear extensions in the gap between buildings, but these elements would be recessed, and set well back from the frontage, so the somewhat complicated roof configuration would not be readily evident. The existing regular pattern of windows would be retained, with some minor alterations. As a result, there would be minimal appreciable change to the Sidmouth Street frontage. Consequently, the character of the street scene would not be harmed and the settings of No 3/5 and No 9 would be preserved.
17. The western extension to the building would be visible in views along South Street. From both directions it would be seen as part of a street frontage that displays a variety of roof heights and configurations, and a disparate range of architectural styles and materials. The set back of the extension, the use of contrasting brick, and the adoption of a different roof form would mean that, in views up and down the street, it would be visually distinct from the existing building, thus reducing its apparent mass. The regular pattern of windows would, however, retain the rhythm of the frontage. The parapeted roof would echo that of No 43-49, and would only be marginally higher, so would result in a gradual, rather than abrupt increase in the street scene to the existing, higher roof of the core building. Furthermore, the introduction of landscaping would be beneficial to the appearance of this prominent corner site. The extension would, therefore, bridge a somewhat uncharacteristic gap in the buildings without any harm to the appearance of the street scene.
18. Viewed from the east, the extension would partially obscure the side elevation of No 43-49. However, a considerable gap between the buildings would remain, which would allow the flint wall to still be easily appreciated. Furthermore, the proposal involves the removal of a detached garage on the site, which currently protrudes beyond the building line and obscures part of the front elevation of the listed building in views down the street. Removal of this structure would enhance the setting of the listed building, as it would allow the uninterrupted appreciation of the whole of its front elevation. Overall, therefore, the proposal would preserve the setting of No 43-49 in views along South Street.
19. The northern and western sides of the proposed extensions would lack the coherence of the outward facing elevations. These parts of the building would be visible from Livery Close. Whilst I was advised at the Hearing that this is a private road, it is clear that it is regularly used by many people and vehicles to access the rear of the surrounding buildings and attendant car-parking areas. It is an area enclosed by the rear aspects of buildings that front the surrounding roads, and is characterised by a very varied roofscape, an assortment of rear extensions, and open car-parking and bin storage. Consequently, whilst the rather complicated configuration of the building, and its flat roof, would be apparent from here, it would

not result in any significant harm to the existing character and appearance of this enclave.

20. The rear elevations of No 43-49 and Queens Crescent back onto this space and are readily visible from it. Other than allowing views of the buildings, the area does not positively contribute to their settings. The proposal would not obscure the listed buildings, so would not prevent their appreciation. Furthermore, the part of the extension nearest to No 43-49 would be of a similar height, so would not distract from the presence or stature of the heritage asset. Consequently, the settings of both listed buildings would be preserved from Livery Close.
21. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the settings of the surrounding heritage assets. It would, therefore, accord with Policies CC7, EN1 and H2 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (Adopted November 2019) (the Local Plan). Taken together, these policies seek to ensure that development is of an appropriate density and high design quality, so that it maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area, and protects the significance of heritage assets and their settings.

Affordable housing

22. The evidence indicates that there is a demonstrable need for affordable housing provision in the Borough, with the Reading Housing Needs Assessment 2024 identifying a requirement for 406 additional affordable homes per year. This level of need is not disputed by the appellant. Against this background, Policy H3 of the Local Plan requires that on sites of 10 or more dwellings, 30% of the total dwellings will be in the form of on-site affordable housing. However, where proposals fall short of this target as a result of viability considerations, the policy requires that an open-book approach will be taken to clearly demonstrate the circumstances justifying a lower affordable housing contribution.
23. As part of the application, the appellant submitted a Financial Viability Assessment (the FVA)². Whilst disputing some of the inputs, the Council agreed at the Hearing that the FVA complied with the open book approach. Using a residual valuation methodology, the FVA concluded that, without provision of any affordable housing, the scheme would result in a deficit of £800,000, so could not viably support any affordable housing provision. Before determining the application, the Council commissioned an independent review of the FVA (the FVA Review)³, which sought to identify whether any key revenue assumptions had been under-assessed or any key cost estimates over-assessed.
24. The FVA Review considered that the Benchmark Land Value used in the FVA should have been considerably lower. However, even when accounting for this, and other adjustments, the FVA Review concluded that the scheme did not currently appear able to support a contribution to affordable housing, and that, even without the inclusion of any affordable housing, a 5% increase in assumed values and a 5% decrease in build costs would be necessary to achieve viability.
25. The FVA Review clarified that its conclusions were based on costs and values at the time of its preparation, and commented that national reporting suggested that

² James R Brown and Co Ltd: Trinity Hall, South Street, Reading, RG1 4QU – Financial Viability Assessment ('FVA') - August 2024

³ Dixon Searle Partnership: Review of Applicant Submitted Viability Position - Trinity Hall, South Street, Reading RG1 4QU - March 2025 (DSP24881C)

the housing market generally was improving, with average house prices reported as having increased slightly, with overall prospects for 2025 being seen as positive. Furthermore, it identified that, although construction costs were still increasing, this was at a much slower rate than in previous years, so could be stabilising.

26. The appellant submitted an updated viability appraisal with the appeal (the Updated FVA)⁴, which showed that Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 costs had been underestimated in the FVA, and that the deficit had now increased to £1,043,314, without inclusion of any affordable housing. The Council declined to comment on the Updated FVA in its statement of case or at the Hearing. However, no cogent evidence was provided to cast doubt on the conclusions of the FVA or the FVA Review, or to demonstrate that economic conditions may have improved since they were prepared.
27. I am mindful that paragraph 4.4.24 of the Local Plan says that the Council will be sensitive to exceptional costs of bringing a site to market, such as for reasons of expensive reclamation, or infrastructure costs. The FVA does not include any such exceptional costs. However, the Council agreed at the Hearing that consideration of viability under Policy H3 was not limited to exceptional or site-specific circumstances. Consequently, there is no reason for me to discount the appellant's viability evidence because it relates largely to economic conditions that prevail across the region, or the building industry in general.
28. The Council argued at the Hearing that applicants frequently provided viability appraisals that demonstrated schemes were not viable, but that, nevertheless, financial contributions were negotiated and development proceeded. However, this evidence was anecdotal, and no specific details were provided. Furthermore, developers may be faced with the prospect of making a commercial decision to proceed with a development, even if the scheme's viability is shown to be in deficit. Consequently, I have no evidence before me to cast doubt on the conclusions of the FVA or the FVA Review, which both find that the scheme cannot support any contribution to affordable housing.
29. Notwithstanding the conclusions of the FVA, the appellant's UU would secure obligations requiring a financial contribution of £100,000 towards off-site affordable housing, together with a late-stage review mechanism (LSR). The LSR would ensure that if the scheme produced a surplus that could contribute towards affordable housing, a deferred financial contribution could be secured. The Council has confirmed that these obligations overcome reason for refusal number 2. However, it is the appellant's case that they do not comply with the tests set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (the CIL Regs). The UU is constructed so that the obligations shall not apply if I find that the tests in the CIL Regs are not satisfied.
30. There is a clear development plan policy basis for seeking to secure affordable housing, or an appropriate contribution, as part of the proposal. However, in accordance with Policy H3, the FVA and FVA Review clearly demonstrate that the scheme cannot support an affordable housing contribution. The Policy does not say that, in such circumstances, permission for housing on an otherwise suitable

⁴ James R Brown & Company Ltd: Trinity Hall, South Street, Reading, RG1 4QU - Financial Viability – Summary Recap & Update - 3rd December 2025

site should be refused. Consequently, the obligation requiring a financial contribution to affordable housing is not necessary to make the development acceptable. Furthermore, there is no rationale setting out how, despite the non-viability of the scheme, a figure of £100,000 has been calculated. Consequently, I cannot be certain that it is fair and reasonable in scale. This obligation does not therefore comply with the tests in the CIL Regs, so does not constitute a reason for granting planning permission.

31. The FVA and FVA Review were based upon a particular point in time. Whilst the appellant argued otherwise, it is possible that economic conditions may change leading to a contribution towards affordable housing becoming viable as the scheme progresses. The appellant contended that the inclusion of the obligation relating to a LSR would dissuade funders, so would be harmful to the deliverability of the scheme. However, the evidence in support of this contention was anecdotal in nature, so carries little weight. In view of the considerable need for affordable housing within the Borough, and the requirements of Policy H3, I am satisfied that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable. The obligation is also directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it. It therefore conforms to the statutory tests contained in the CIL Regs.
32. Accordingly, with the obligation in the UU securing a LSR, the proposed development makes appropriate provision for affordable housing. It therefore accords with Policies H3 and CC9 of the Local Plan. It would also accord with the aims and objectives of the Council's Affordable Housing and Planning Obligations under Section 106 Supplementary Planning Documents.

Other Matters

33. The UU also contains obligations relating to Carbon Offsetting and to Construction Employment and Skills Measures and Provisions. There is no dispute between the parties regarding the compliance of these obligations with the tests set out in the CIL Regs, and there is no evidence before me to indicate that they do not. Consequently, I am satisfied that these obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to it, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it.

Conditions

34. The Council submitted a list of conditions that it considered necessary in the event that I allowed the appeal, which was annotated with comments from the appellant. At the Hearing, the Council accepted that a number of the conditions would not meet the tests set out at paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework, so should not be imposed. I have considered the other suggested conditions against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
35. In accordance with the legislation, I have imposed a condition limiting the period within which the development must commence. I have also included a condition specifying the relevant plans, as this provides certainty.
36. A pre-commencement condition requiring approval of a construction method statement is necessary in the interests of protecting the living conditions of neighbouring residents and on highway safety grounds. A condition restricting the

hours of construction, demolition, and deliveries to the site is also needed to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

37. Conditions requiring approval of external materials and landscaping are necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area, as is a condition requiring the refuse storage area to be provided prior to occupation. A condition requiring the approval of details of the proposed photovoltaics, and their subsequent implementation, is needed in the interest of sustainability. A condition requiring the cycle storage area to be provided prior to occupation of the development is also necessary to ensure that sustainable transport options are available. As agreed at the Hearing, the approved drawings include the necessary details, so I have not required any further specification to be submitted for approval.
38. In the interests of flood prevention, a condition is necessary to secure the submission of a more detailed scheme of surface water drainage for approval. As discussed at the Hearing, I have altered the suggested wording so that it is not a pre-commencement condition.
39. Finally, conditions requiring the provision of biodiversity enhancements, and the eradication of invasive species, are necessary in the interests of biodiversity. Again, following discussion at the Hearing, I have amended the wording of the proposed conditions, so that there is no requirement to submit further details for approval.

Conclusion

40. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Philip Robson – Counsel (Instructed by Planning Law)

Paul Butt – Agent

James Brown – Viability and Affordable Housing Consultant

Harry Crosland – Architect

Rosalind Andrews – (Planning Law) – Solicitor

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Marcelina Rejwerska - (Reading Borough Council) – Senior Planning Officer

Steve Vigar - (Reading Borough Council) – Planning Applications Team Leader

Caroline Bellamy - (Reading Borough Council) – Council Valuer

Buju Cancetin - (Reading Borough Council) – Conservation Officer

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Suggested Conditions Rev B
2. Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking – signed and dated 24 March 2026.
3. Reading Borough Council's response to appellant's application for costs.
4. Reading Borough Council's application for costs

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos AC01 Rev A (Location Plan); PL02 Rev A (Block Plan – Proposed Scheme); PL45 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan); PL46 (Proposed First Floor Plan); PL47 (Proposed Second Floor Plan); PL48 Rev A (Proposed Third Floor Plan); PL49 Rev A (Proposed Roof Plan); PL52 Rev B (Proposed Section a-a); PL54 Rev A (Proposed Roof and Existing Context); 8493/LSP Rev D (Landscape Strategy Plan); 8493.PP.2.0 Rev C (Roof Terrace Landscape Plan); PL50 Rev C (Proposed Sidmouth Street and South Street Elevations); PL51 Rev C (Proposed Livery Close and North Elevations); PL53 Rev B (Proposed Street Elevations).
- 3) No development shall commence on site, including any works of demolition, until a site-specific Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - a) Space on site where vehicles of site operatives and visitors can be parked with details of how site operatives and visitors will be required to make use of the parking area provided;
 - b) Location on site for storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - c) The erection and maintenance (including removal of any graffiti or fly posters) of security fencing around the site;
 - d) Required wheel washing facilities on site;
 - e) A scheme for recycling waste resulting from the construction works;
 - f) Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes;
 - g) Required measures to control the emission of dust, dirt, and other airborne pollutants during demolition and construction;
 - h) Provisions to be made for the control of noise coming from the site during demolition and construction;
 - i) Full details of pest control measures following any demolition required. Where necessary, capping of drains/sewers and baiting arrangements.

The measures within the approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period.
- 4) Development shall not proceed above ground level until a schedule of the materials and/or samples to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) The development shall be constructed in accordance with a Sustainable Drainage Strategy and associated detailed design, management and maintenance plan of the surface water drainage for the site using SuDS

methods in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to development proceeding above ground level. The plan shall include:

- a) a timetable for its implementation, and
 - b) a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include any arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.
- 6) Prior to their installation, full details of the proposed roof mounted photovoltaics shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include a detailed roof plan showing the location and position of the photovoltaics, their dimensions, manufacturer's specification, and ongoing maintenance arrangements. The approved photovoltaics shall thereafter be installed in accordance with these approved details and maintained in good working order to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.
- 7) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved a scheme of hard and soft landscaping shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:
- a) Proposed finished ground and floor levels or contours, means of enclosure and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
 - b) Hard surfacing materials and minor artefacts and other ancillary structures;
 - c) Soft landscaping details, which shall include planting plans, specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), tree pit specifications, schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, and an implementation timetable;
 - d) A maintenance programme detailing all operations to be carried out in order to allow successful establishment of planting;
 - e) Routes and details of proposed and existing functional services above and below ground including foul and surface water drainage, soakaways and SUDs details, power, communications cables and water and gas supply pipelines, including access points.

The approved hard and soft landscaping scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a timetable approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

- 8) The cycle parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with approved drawing no PL45 prior to the first occupation of any of the apartments and

shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details and be kept free of obstruction for such use and remain available for the parking of cycles at all times.

- 9) The bin store shall be provided in accordance with approved drawing no PL45 prior to the first occupation of any of the apartments and shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details and be kept free of obstruction for such use and remain available for the storage of refuse at all times.
- 10) Prior to occupation of any of the apartments the biodiversity enhancements described at paragraph 5.4.4 and figures 5a, 5b, 5c and page 31 of the Ecological Appraisal - Trinity Hall, South Street, Reading RG1 4QU - August 2024 by Aluco Ecology Ltd shall be completed in full. These facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.
- 11) To prevent the spread of *Montbretia*, development shall proceed in accordance with the guidance at paragraph 5.4.2 of the Ecological Appraisal - Trinity Hall, South Street, Reading RG1 4QU - August 2024 by Aluco Ecology Ltd.
- 12) No construction, demolition or associated deliveries shall take place outside the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays, and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays, and not at any time on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays without prior written approval from the local planning authority.

END OF SCHEDULE