

Mr. J. Markwell, Esq.,  
Reading Borough Council,  
Civic Offices,  
Bridge Street,  
READING.  
RG1 2LU

**BY EMAIL: [jonathan.markwell@reading.gov.uk](mailto:jonathan.markwell@reading.gov.uk)**

28876/A3/EF/CP/KC/slh

10<sup>th</sup> June, 2020

Dear Mr Markwell,

**53-55 VASTERN ROAD, READING (RBC APPLICATION REFERENCE 200188)**

We write on behalf of Berkeley Homes (Oxford and Chiltern) Ltd regarding the full planning application for the redevelopment of 53-55 Vastern Road, Reading submitted to Reading Borough Council (RBC) on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

In response to the comments received from Transport Development Control on 28<sup>th</sup> May, our Client has been working with Stantec to address the concerns raised. To address concerns regarding the site access junction on Lynmouth Road it is necessary to make a minor amendment to the red line boundary. The change required to the access relates to the kerb alignment on the western side of the junction, with this to be set back further to ensure there is an appropriate width for a refuse vehicle and large car to pass on the entrance road and then track around onto Lynmouth Road. The red line boundary has been marginally increased to accommodate this change, as shown on the enclosed revised plans. The additional land is RBC highways land, upon whom notice of the application was served prior to submission.

We trust that this minor amendment is acceptable to the Council and would be grateful for confirmation of this.

Revised plans showing the amended access have been prepared and are enclosed. The amended plans are as follows:

- 448.PL.SL.001B Site Location Plan – Application Boundary
- 448.PL.SL.001C Site Location Plan – S106 Boundary
- 448.PL.SL.002C Illustrative Masterplan
- BHOC.448.LA.101C Landscape General Arrangement
- BHOC.448.LA.102C Planting Framework Plan

More generally, as you will be aware, the statutory determination date for the application is 15<sup>th</sup> June. In advance of this deadline, and further to your recent exchange of emails with our Client, we summarise below the actions undertaken and ongoing in response to consultee responses received thus far. You will recall that detailed comments on the consultee responses were provided by Berkeley on 20<sup>th</sup> May, this note provides a progress update as a follow up to the detailed comments previously provided.



FS 29637

Registered in England  
Number: 0C342692

Barton Willmore LLP  
Registered Office:  
The Blade  
Abbey Square  
Reading  
RG1 3BE  
F/ +44 (0)118 943 0001

With regards to outstanding consultee responses, we are anticipating comments on design, energy and viability. We understand that the energy feedback is due later this week and that the viability review should now be instructed and a response due in c.2-3 weeks. We look forward to receiving these comments along with your design comments as soon as possible.

We trust that the below table is a useful summary of responses and actions to date. We note that as yet we have not received any thoughts from you in relation to revised material and clarifications provided by our client; and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss your current views and the next steps for the application with you in more detail. We note that a virtual meeting or conference call has been offered by our Client and we therefore look forward to agreeing a suitable time with you. If you would prefer to have separate meetings on individual topics we would be agreeable to such an approach.

In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries or wish to discuss the above.

Yours sincerely,



**CRAIG PETTIT**  
Planning Associate

cc. C. McHardy - Berkeley Homes (Oxford and Chiltern) Ltd

Encs.

448.PL.SL.001B Site Location Plan – Application Boundary  
448.PL.SL.001C Site Location Plan – S106 Boundary  
448.PL.SL.002C Illustrative Masterplan  
BHOC.448.LA.101C Landscape General Arrangement  
BHOC.448.LA.102C Planting Framework Plan  
433.LAND.RP.001 Strategic Shared Cycle Footway  
448.PL.BC.100.B Block B and C Ground Floor Plan  
448.PL.BC.202.C Block B and C North-East Elevation  
448.PL.D.100.A Block D Ground Floor Plan  
Block B and D Cycle Review comments  
448.001 Drawing Issue Sheet Rev C  
47500-TN04 RBC Highway Response

Subject	Summary of Comment	Date Received	Action Taken	Date Actioned	Council Response
Transport	Comments were received from RBC Transport Development Control requesting changes to the proposals to address concerns regarding access to and movement through the site for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. The submission of further material such as further vehicle tracking was requested.	28 <sup>th</sup> May	<p>Stantec have reviewed the response received from RBC Transport Development Control and our Client/Stantec have addressed the concerns raised and revised information is enclosed for consideration.</p> <p>A booklet has been prepared regarding the proposed Strategic Shared Cycle Footway and is enclosed (document reference 433.LAND.RP.001).</p> <p>Plans showing revised cycle parking are enclosed (references 448.PL.BC.100.B, 448.PL.BC.202.C and 448.PL.D.100.A). A marked up copy noting the changes made is also enclosed.</p>	A response to RBC is enclosed.	Further comments are awaited.
Ecology	Comments were received from the Environment Agency, with issues raised regarding the potential for overshadowing of the River Thames, the buffer to the river and proposed mix of plant species.	14 <sup>th</sup> April	Our Client reviewed the comments made by the Environment Agency and, in seeking to overcome the objection raised, has submitted a response. Our Client is willing to meet with the Environment Agency and to that effect, have contacted the EA directly and will be setting up a meeting to discuss/clarify their concerns.	A response to the Environment Agency's comments was provided on 19 <sup>th</sup> May and a virtual meeting is being set-up to discuss their comments.	Comments are awaited.
	Comments were received from RBC's Ecology Officer which reiterated and supported the comments from the Environment Agency.	2 <sup>nd</sup> June	A partial response to the RBC comments was provided on 3 <sup>rd</sup> June, relating to inaccuracies concerning the proposals EIA status. The consultant team are reviewing the remaining comments and will provide a response shortly.	Our Client is reviewing the ecology response and will aim to get a response back as soon as possible.	A response was received from you on 4 <sup>th</sup> June confirming that this issue has now been addressed.

Natural Environment	Comments were provided by RBC's Natural Environment Officer, raising issues in relation to the footpath through the site, buffer to the River Thames, use of green roofs and species mix.	1 <sup>st</sup> May	A response to the issues raised was provided by our Client. This included justification for the proposed footpath route and not providing green roofs.	Response provided on 20 <sup>th</sup> May.	Further comments are awaited.
Access	Comments were received from RBC's Access Officer regarding some aspects of the design of the proposed development and potential accessibility issues.	2 <sup>nd</sup> April	A response was provided by the applicant on 21 <sup>st</sup> April seeking to respond to the issues raised.	Response provided on 21 <sup>st</sup> April.	Further comments were received from the Access Officer on 1 <sup>st</sup> May. The comments have been reviewed, and following further exchanges between our Client and the case officer when it was confirmed that further comments only needed to be provided if our Client considered necessary, matters are considered to have been addressed and overcome.
Daylight/sunlight	Comments were provided by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) on the methodology used and results presented.	7 <sup>th</sup> April	Further work has been undertaken by our Client's consultant eb7, including an assessment of the scheme in combination with nearby proposed schemes. Changes have also been made to the proposed development to address some of the issues raised and revised plans were submitted on 1 <sup>st</sup> June with mark ups to show where changes have been made (drawing numbers are provided within the	Submission made on 20 <sup>th</sup> May. Revised plans submitted on 1 <sup>st</sup> June (Drawing Issue Sheet Rev C).	Comments are awaited following this submission and an updated review by BRE is awaited

			appended Drawing Issue Sheet Rev C).		
Wind	Comments were provided by the BRE regarding the methodology used and results.	7 <sup>th</sup> April	Further work has been undertaken by RWDI to respond to the comments made and justify the methodology used. In addition, assessment of the development in combination with nearby proposals has been undertaken.	Submission made on 20 <sup>th</sup> May.	Comments are awaited following submission on 20 <sup>th</sup> May and an updated review by BRE is awaited.
Heritage	Comments were received from Historic England and RBC's Historic Buildings Consultant with no objections raised.	23 <sup>rd</sup> March and 1 <sup>st</sup> April (respectively)	The comments made have been noted and are not considered to require further action at this time.		
Archaeology	Comments were received from Berkshire Archaeology recommending a condition requiring further archaeological investigation.	26 <sup>th</sup> March	Our Client and their consultant RPS have reviewed and are agreeable to the proposed condition.	Confirmation of agreement to condition provided on 20 <sup>th</sup> May.	
Drainage	Comments were received in relation to sustainable drainage recommending a condition relating to implementation of a sustainable drainage scheme.	29 <sup>th</sup> May	Advice has been sought from our Client's consultant Stantec in relation to the recommended condition and a response will be provided shortly.		
Noise	Comments were received from RBC's Environmental Health Officer querying the approach to designing the glazing specification.	25 <sup>th</sup> March	Our Client's consultant 24 Acoustics have reviewed the comments made and it has been confirmed that, as stated in the submitted report, the development has been engineered to ensure that noise levels internally in habitable rooms do not exceed the criteria of the Salford University/ Defra research report NAN45. This sets threshold noise levels at frequencies between 10 and 160 Hz (in 1/3 octave bands) which includes the 100 Hz noise generated by the transformers.	Response provided on 20 <sup>th</sup> May.	No further comments have been received.

Air Quality	Comments were received from RBC's Environmental Health Officer with some queries raised in relation to air quality modelling.	25 <sup>th</sup> March	Our Client's consultant Stantec has reviewed the comments made and prepared a note in response to queries raised.	Full response provided on 20 <sup>th</sup> May.	No further comments have been received.
Odour	Comments were received from RBC's Environmental Health Officer recommending a condition relation to odour assessment for the proposed café.	25 <sup>th</sup> March	Stantec note that the DEFRA guidance referred to in the draft condition has been withdrawn and replaced with EMAQ guidance. We request that the wording is amended to reflect this change. We also request that the required odour management plan is referred to as a 'scheme for odour mitigation' to avoid confusion with Odour Management Plans in the wider context. Subject to the requested amendments, the applicant agrees to the proposed condition.	Full response provided on 20 <sup>th</sup> May.	No further comments have been received.
Ground Conditions	Comments were received from RBC's Environmental Health Officer recommending conditions relating to contaminated land assessment and remediation and ground gas assessment.	25 <sup>th</sup> March	<p>Our Client's consultant Omnia has reviewed the comments made. A change is requested to condition CO5 relating to the remediation scheme so that the validation report is required pre-occupancy rather than prior to construction above foundation level. This change is sought as the completion of remedial works prior to construction above foundation level is not feasible where soil capping is proposed within areas of soft landscaping.</p> <p>It is noted that a ground gas assessment, as recommended to be conditioned, has already been completed by Omnia and was submitted as part of the planning application (for clarity: Section 9.3.1 of the submitted Geo-Environmental Site Assessment and</p>	Response provided on 20 <sup>th</sup> May.	No further comments have been received.

			associated Appendix VII).		
Leisure	Comments were received from RBC's Leisure Services Officer raising no in-principle objection and recommending a S106 contribution towards upgrading of the riverside path.	26 <sup>th</sup> March	The comments made have been noted. S106 HOTs are to be discussed and agreed at a meeting between our Client and RBC.		
CCTV	Comments were received from RBC noting no impact on CCTV is anticipated.	24 <sup>th</sup> March	The comments made have been noted and are not considered to require further action at this time.		
Fire & Rescue	Comments were received from Berkshire Fire & Rescue Service noting fire safety regulations.	14 <sup>th</sup> April	The comments made have been noted and are not considered to require further action.		

