

1 November 2021

Erratum to Bruce Edgar's 1) Heritage Statement of Case and 2) Rebuttal of Appeal Heritage Proof of Evidence

1. Erratum to Bruce Edgar's Heritage Statement of Case on behalf of Reading Borough Council dated August 2021

1.1 Paragraph 3.4, page 13

1.2 It has been identified that there is rouge wording within Paragraph 3.4, which were simply a drafting error from a quotation by the Council's then Heritage Consultant.

1.3 Paragraph 3.4 should have accurately quoted the Consultants application stage memorandum conclusion, as follows:

1.4

3.4 The memorandum from the Council's Heritage Consultant further states in relation to the effect of a proposal on significance:

“As stated in paragraph 197 of the NPPF:

The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The proposed justification for the demolition of the locally listed building, therefore, rests on the benefit of the proposals in relation to the wider public benefits of the scheme against the heritage value of the non-designated heritage asset in the planning balance.”

1.5 Please also note that paragraph 197 of the NPPF 2019 is now replaced (unchanged in wording) by paragraph 203 of the NPPF 2021.

2. Erratum to Bruce Edgar’s Rebuttal of Appeal Heritage Proof of Evidence of James Weeks (27 September 2021), dated 15 October 2021

2.1 It has been identified that paragraph 2.2 inadvertently references the incorrect paragraph numbers of the NPPF. Instead of referencing paragraph 184 on two occasions, it should rather reference firstly paragraph 190 and then secondly paragraph 189. This error can generally be attributed to the change in paragraph numbers between the 2019 and 2021 versions of the NPPF.