

Civic Offices, Bridge Street, Reading, RG1
2LU

Eva Erjavec
Architect – Berkeley Homes (Western)
Berkeley Group
Berkeley House
Mill Lane
Taplow
Maidenhead
SL6 0AG

☎ 0118 937 3787

E-mail: jonathan.markwell@reading.gov.uk

Please quote this reference when
contacting us: PL/26/0191

Date: 23rd April 2026

Via email only to Eva.Erjavec@berkeleygroup.co.uk

Your contact is: Jonathan Markwell, Principal Planning Officer

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Dear Ms Erjavec,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Enquiry Reference & Address: PL/26/0191 – 55 Vastern Road, Reading, RG1 8GU

Proposal: Pre-application enquiry following withdrawal of PL/25/1844 and ahead of an envisaged future re-submission for non-material amendments to permission PL/23/1673 (granted on 27/03/2024) to amend the wording of condition 14 (compliance condition in relation to the drainage strategy) by altering the approved drainage strategy.

Information submitted with pre-application enquiry:

- Site Location Plan S106 Boundary - 448.PL.SL.001 Rev B
- Illustrative masterplan - 448.PL.SL.002 I
- Drainage Strategy Addendum by Stuart Michael Associates Limited Ref 0453-STU05-XX-XX-RP-C-655-002, Issue 03, dated 09/02/2026.
- Letter from Berkeley, ref L.448.031.EE dated 12/02/2026

Advice

Thank you for your pre-application enquiry. It is welcomed that following the withdrawal of the previous s96a application that you have sought pre-application advice in advance of any further application submission.

As per the description of this pre-application enquiry, this is made within the context of a number of previous applications at the site. This is also explained within your covering letter, so for the purposes of brevity, this is not repeated here.

On the basis of the above, the Lead Local Flood Authority has been engaged to review the further information provided as part of this pre-application, whilst also taking into account the previous context. The following further comments have been received from the Lead Local Flood Authority:

It is noted that the scheme now includes the provision of three attenuation storage tanks instead of two, with the vast majority of surface water now being discharged into the River Thames. It is noted that the scheme does however include a reduction in discharge rate from the development site when compared to the approved scheme and this is deemed acceptable.

Notwithstanding the above, it is noted that the outflows for each of the assessed events is greater than has been stated at Table 1. However, these outflows are still a significant reduction over what has been approved previously and therefore is accepted.

The exceedance drawing now also identifies that any flood water will be directed out onto the Public Highway onto Vastern Road, Lynmouth Road, onto Christchurch Bridge and the Thames Path. This is not acceptable and any flooding must be contained and managed within the application site.

Lastly, the applicant has not provided a maintenance and management plan along with a timetable for implementation which would be necessary to allow approval for any revised scheme.

Accordingly, it would appear to me that there are still matters to be resolved in order to satisfy the Lead Local Flood Authority. I consider that it may be beneficial for you to seek follow-up pre-application advice, subsequent to your consideration of the above, prior to any formal application submission. This would be charged at a rate of £104.60 + VAT per hour = £125.52. My preferred approach would be to seek to ensure that all matters are resolved, or substantially resolved, prior to the submission of any future s96a non-material amendment application, to help ensure the timely determination of that application once submitted, for the benefit of all parties. Moreover, as you continue to advance these proposals, they should also be acutely aware of potentially impacting other conditions or elements of the approved scheme (e.g. services / landscaping / ecology matters). Accordingly, your future submission should include clear commentary explaining how any changes to the drainage strategy sit within the context of the development as a whole. This will help to satisfy that procedurally the future application can progress through the s96a non-material amendment mechanism, rather than the more complex s73 variation of condition route.

Concluding comments and next steps

Once again, thank you for coming forward and engaging in pre-application discussions regarding this matter. It is hoped that the above feedback moves discussions and considerations forward in a positive manner for you. As per the above, there are however still matters to resolve and my suggested approach would be to continue to discuss these in the context of pre-application advice, rather than as part of a formal application – ultimately however, that choice is yours.

Please note that the advice contained within this letter is that of an officer of the Borough Council and is provided without prejudice to the decision of the Borough Council, in the event of a formal application for planning permission (or s73 or s96a application). This advice is in good faith and will not over-ride the formal consideration of any type of planning application by the Council.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Markwell

Jonathan Markwell
Principal Planning Officer (sent via email only)

RE