

**From:** Hanson, Sarah <Sarah.Hanson@reading.gov.uk>

**Sent:** 05 August 2020 12:16

**To:** Markwell, Jonathan <Jonathan.Markwell@reading.gov.uk>; Giles Sutton (GS Ecology) <giles@gsecology.co.uk>

**Subject:** RE: 55 Vastern Rd, Reading (200188)

Jon,

With reference to all the info contained within your email below, including Landscape Planting Framework Plan 448.LA.102 D, my memo of 15 April and email of 22/5/20:

In terms of tree species, I note the changes which are positive, albeit they still include Prunus, which I advised should be omitted due to over-representation in the Borough. It is useful to have the canopy spread after 25 years shown on the plan. This helps to demonstrate that the buffer planting strip adjacent to the river is too narrow for large canopy trees - future conflicts, hence the need to prune, can be seen. I previously stated that large canopy trees were required on the river frontage and that a greater set-back was required to achieve this. The application has provided the former but not the latter.

I note the size of trees (at planting) proposed which will help to provide a greater clear stem height adjacent to road access, i.e. to allow vehicles to pass underneath. Greater stock size does, however, come with a need for greater aftercare.

The other changes to non-tree landscaping, as explained in Joe Harding's email of 15 July to the EA, sound positive. I assume the EA and Giles will be commenting on this.

I note that they are considering their energy strategy further to we await details in this. I hope that green roofs will be factored in as required by policy to improve biodiversity on the site. It will be disappointing if the development (and potentially others in the Borough) come to the conclusion that they can only be energy efficient OR maximise biodiversity. I appreciate that both are important but I hope a balance is achieved.

I don't think that my comment re services and landscape provision has been answered. I maintain that a certain degree of detail is required prior to a decision. My email of 22/5/20 stated:

*I requested confirmation of soil volume provision and my comments where clear on the reasons for this request. The applicant's response is that this will be dealt with via condition. This is not an acceptable response. Whilst full details can be agreed via condition, the applicant should submit a basic plan now showing the likely service route corridors and areas allocated for soil root provision, i.e. that can be allocated to roots either as soft landscape beds or under hard surfaces - those unimpacted by structures (above and below ground).*

In terms of lighting, I will leave the EA and Giles to consider this further. The responses do appear to focus on the impact on the river from the shading by the building. The light spillage from the building onto the river is also a factor to consider - this will be determined by their design so I would suggest needs to be resolved prior to a decision.

Regards,

Sarah Hanson  
Natural Environment Officer  
Planning Department  
Directorate of Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services  
Reading Borough Council  
Floor 1 North, Civic Offices  
Bridge Street  
Reading  
RG1 2LU

Direct: 0118 937 2440

Mobile: 07855 125975

[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

