



Peter Tanner
RPS Group
140 London Wall
London
EC2Y 5DN

Giorgio Framalicco
Director of Planning, Development and
Regulatory Services

Civic Offices, Bridge Street, Reading RG1 2LU
☎ 0118 937 3787

Our Ref: 180971/APPCON
Your Ref:

Direct: ☎ 0118 937 3338
e-mail: Richard.Eatough@reading.gov.uk

8 April 2019

Your contact is: **Richard Eatough, Planning**

Dear Peter,

Application to discharge planning conditions
Conditions 7, 8 and 19 of planning permission 162087/VARIAT (as has been subject to
non-material changes 171795/NMC and 171801/NMC)
Verto/Kings Point, 120 Kings Road, Reading

I refer to the above application, which seeks to 're-discharge' planning conditions in relation to the above development, following other recent approvals, in order that the landscaping and SUDS arrangements agree with the alterations to the development already approved. In both cases, the relevant conditions cannot be re-discharged, because none of them were originally subject to details which were in themselves, subject to later agreement. However, this letter seeks to encompass all changes proposed.

Conditions 7 and 8 (SUDS)

Conditions 7 and 8 of planning permission 162087/VARIAT are 'restrictive'-type conditions, rather than 'pre-commencement'- conditions.

You have submitted updated drainage details as amended plans as follows:

- 16012 C1060 C2 Technical Layout Ground Floor (received 6/6/18)
- 16012 C1070 C1 Private Drainage Details Sheet 1 (received 6/6/18); and
- 16012 C1071 C1 Private Drainage Details Sheet 2 (received 6/6/18)

These details have been assessed and agreed as suitable by the Council's SUDS Manager, providing that the SUDS 'Letter from Manhire Associates' remains unaltered and it is the plans only which are being substituted.

Condition 19 (approved landscaping plans)

Planning permission 162087/VARIAT approved a detailed landscaping scheme, which is now proposed to be slightly amended as a result of the changes agreed in 171801/NMC.

This APPCON application effectively is seeking to 're-discharge' Condition 19 of 162087 although of course, this condition requires landscaping to be implemented in accordance with the specific plans listed.

The effect of this letter is therefore to consider the following plans:

P-1419-100	General Arrangement	Received 6/6/18
P-1419-101	Hardworks Layout	Received 6/6/18
P-1419-102A	Terrace General Arrangement	Received 6/6/18
P-1419-103B	Planting Plan	Received 13/3/19
P-1419-104A	Roof Planting Plan	Received 6/6/18
P-1419-200B	Terrace Detail Section 1	Received 13/3/19 to supersede Fabrik plan L410 B of permission 162087
P-1419-201C	Riverside Boundary Details	Received 13/3/19 to supersede Fabrik plan L411 E in permission 162087)
P-1419-202	Sectional Elevation	Received 6/6/18 to supersede Fabrik plan L420 B in permission 162087
P-1419-203D	Section Through Planters	Received 13/3/19 to supersede Fabrik plan L430 in permission 162087
P-1419-204A	Plaza Planter and Kings Road Entrance	Received 13/3/19
P16039-G T -00-ZZ-D R -A-04303	Sketches proposed bird box locations	Received 6/6/18

With reference to the above plans (latest versions received 13/3/19) the Council's Planning Natural Environment Officer (Tree Officer) responds as follows:

Whilst now generally satisfied with the above versions of these plans, it is noted that the Planting Plan 'Planting Specification notes' have been amended to omit reference to 'tree support'. There is still limited watering specification details, certainly less than would normally be acceptable and the Tree Officer has asked for the following advice to be reported to you:

Planting Plan P-1419-103B allows for watering a minimum 12 times (it appears, for the 36 month maintenance period) - it is not clear whether this is annually or in total. In either case, given watering weekly is likely to be required in each growing season (approx. April - Oct) within the maintenance period, 12 times is unlikely to be sufficient and there needs to be allowance for considerably more watering, particularly given the use of planters. Regular watering after 36 months, particularly for the raised planters, is also highly advisable.

The Tree Officer also advises me that your landscaping consultant was not clear regarding the use of a geotextile under the root ball of trees proposed and she retains her concern that this would not allow roots to grow down into all available soil. Your consultant

advised that the tree roots would tend to spread out not down. But of course, as various raised planters are being used in this development, roots will have a very limited ability to spread out, hence being able to make full use of the entire soil volume in the planter is critical. These planters would appear to be approx. 1m deep hence roots will probably use this depth as they would in a more natural setting.

Conclusion

The amended plans in respect of Conditions 7 and 8 are suitable. The amended landscaping plans also appear to be suitable and I am content that the changes are not material and although I cannot technically discharge Condition 19, please take this letter as confirmation that the proposals are acceptable to the Local Planning Authority; and providing that the development is completed and where applicable (e.g. in relation to landscaping maintenance) maintained in accordance with these details, no planning enforcement will be taken forward.

I trust this confirmation is suitable for your purposes.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Richard Eatough

Acting Development Management Team Leader