

S. Vigar, Esq.,
Senior Planner,
Planning Department,
Reading Borough Council,
Civic Centre,
Reading,
BERKSHIRE. RG1 7AE

18511/A3/SL/dw/ef

BY EMAIL & POST: steve.vigar@reading.gov.uk

19th September, 2014

Dear Steve,

ST. MARTINS CENTRE, CAVERSHAM
PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 140997/FUL

I write further to your written correspondence dated 1st August and the meeting which followed with Lynette Baker and yourself on 27th August to enclose a suite of updated architectural plans which are submitted in support of the above planning application. I would be grateful if these could formally substitute those submitted previously.

As agreed during our meeting last month, updates to the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and sample panel of materials will follow shortly.

As you will appreciate, we are working to tight timescales and to facilitate your urgent consideration of the revised plans, I set out below, in **bold**, responses to specific comments raised in your letter which I repeat in *italics*.

Transport

RBC Comment: *Transport DC are concerned over the accuracy of the trip rates and highway capacity assessment (see Appendix A). The current Highways Assessment is not sufficient to allow the highways, traffic and transportation implications to be fully assessed and therefore fails to demonstrate that the additional traffic likely to be generated by the proposal would not adversely affect the safety and flow of users of the existing road network within Reading, contrary to Policies CS4, CS20 and CS22.*

Response: In response to written comments from RBC's Highways Officer, Chris Saunders, a meeting took place between the applicant's transport consultant and Chris Saunders on 14th August, 2014 during which trip generation was discussed in detail. A Trip Generation Technical Note (TN01) has subsequently been issued to Chris Saunders for agreement and WYG are awaiting Officer's urgent comment on this.

RBC Comment: *Transport DC object in absolute terms to the proposed service access to Church Street. The lane is adopted and part of the national cycle route and contains a cycle hire station*



which cannot be moved. The tracking diagrams show that the lane is not wide enough to accommodate HGVs and would require vehicles turning onto Church Street to use both lanes, which is not acceptable in highway safety terms, especially as the turning would be directly opposite a busy petrol station and bus stop. The access would cross a very busy footway with poor visibility of oncoming pedestrians. These concerns suggest that the application would be contrary to Policies CS20 and DM12.

The revised layout (drawing no. PP-MP-02 Rev. P2) no longer proposes a service egress to Church Street in response to RBC's Highway Officer who objected to this arrangement. Following discussions between Chris Saunders and WYG on the 14th of August, it was agreed that all delivery vehicles will continue to service the Site via Abbotsmead Place, this is as per the existing arrangement. The scheme now 'blocks' off access to the route between Block A and Church Street and this has been further demonstrated with the provision of cycle spaces at the previous point of egress. The service yard has also been analysed and tracked for delivery vehicles within the service yard and all 10 previous parking spaces have been removed to allow a full turn of delivery traffic. Masterplan drawing PP-MP-02 Rev P2 and Block A drawing PP-A-01 illustrate the revised configuration.

RBC Comment: The service yard for block D is also unacceptable to Transport DC as a HGV would have to reverse across the public realm area which will be extremely busy with pedestrians. The tracking plans show that any HGV's entering this area would require the use of several mother and toddler bays, the main pedestrian walkway, several other parking bays as well as the removal of landscaping features. This arrangement is therefore considered to be dangerous and unacceptable, contrary to Policies CS20 and DM12.

Response: This arrangement was discussed in detail with Chris Saunders at the meeting on the 14th of August and the revised layout plan illustrates a delineated street to the service yard. This will be protected by a rising bollard to ensure it cannot be used by general visitors to the Centre and thus protecting the integrity of the proposed public square. The servicing and use of the bollard will be controlled by the on site management team.

Given that the service yard is an existing feature, careful consideration to the scheme design has been given to reduce conflict in this location and ensure it functions as a shared space but primarily, a public square. The submitted public realm documentation, clarified within the updated DAS to follow, explains how this square will be treated, in terms of landscaping and surface materials, to clearly delineate its area.

RBC Comment: With regard to vehicle parking, Transport DC have calculated that, based on the Council's Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011), the maximum provision required is 296 parking spaces. The proposals are for 308 spaces for the retail uses and 40 for the residential uses which represents an over-provision of 52 spaces. The site is in a very sustainable location, an attribute that will be enhanced further with the opening of the new footbridge over the River Thames. This being the case, this over-provision is not required and contrary to national and local policy.

Response: The existing parking provision at the Centre predates RBC standards and as discussed and accepted by Chris Saunders, these standards should not be retrospectively enforced on the Site where car parking not only serve the Centre but the wider District Centre too. During the public consultation, over half of all comments received specifically supported an uplift in car parking as proposed and this is notwithstanding those respondents who supported the scheme (including its proposed additional parking) in its entirety. Support for additional car parking was also made explicit by a local ward Member during the pre-application stage and Central Government Policy is quite clear that Local Authorities cannot stifle urban regeneration through punitive parking policy.

Overall, 324 car parking spaces are proposed against the existing 310 spaces, representing an uplift of 14 parking spaces. Within the proposals we have removed informal uncontrolled trader parking and provided parking for the proposed new uses well within the maximum RBC standards.

RBC Comment: Cycle provision is considerably below the minimum requirements of the Parking SPD and predicted staff numbers should be provided in the Transport Assessment to allow these to be calculated. There are two locations for the cycle racks, one adjacent to the entrance to Waitrose, which is considered to be acceptable, and the other which is located underneath a ramp on the ground floor of the decked car park. The latter is considered to be unacceptable as it would be unsafe for cyclists due to numerous cars reversing with poor visibility. The location would also be very unattractive to cyclists and would make vulnerable persons feel unsafe, especially on dark evenings during winter.

Response: Additional cycle parking provision is proposed, equating to a total of 46 spaces compared to the previously proposed 20 spaces. The locations of these are shown on the revised layout plan, attached, with additional cycle parking being provided to the south west of Block A, adjacent to the National Cycle Route and RC's cycle hire scheme, and to the south of the Site at the end of Archway Road which will be attractive to users of the new Thames crossing to the south-east. The focus has been to provide good locations at along the Site boundaries to encourage users to cycle and offer a number of alternative parking areas while trying to reduce conflict between cyclists and pedestrians within the public squares.

In response to comments raised during our meeting last month, the undercroft cycle parking has been repositioned closer to the Centre and is proposed to be set along the open, eastern edge of the undercroft car park, thereby benefiting from greater natural light and surveillance and reducing the distance which cyclists need to travel on foot to the Centre.

RBC Comment: The TA and Planning Statement refers to the new Thames footbridge and states that a pedestrian route linking the centre to Abbotsmead Place and the bridge will be created. However the proposed route is not attractive or safe as it crosses directly through the car park and servicing area and requires pedestrians to cross the entrance and exit of the car park as well as directly in front of both ramps to and from the upper level. This is not conducive to pedestrian safety.

Response: As the revised proposed layout plan illustrates, the pedestrian route has been realigned to reflect comments from both yourself and Chris Saunders. It now represents a more direct route with raised surface treatment to give greater priority to pedestrians and creates a strong link from Caversham Square to Abbotsmead Place and beyond. Linear tree planting follows the route to help emphasise this.

The alignment of the pedestrian is illustrated on drawing nos. L25 Rev. 01 and PP-MP-02 Rev. P2.

Layout

RBC Comment: A pleasant, safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle route is required to connect the southern edge of the site to the new square to the rear of Block D and to provide for the pedestrian and cyclist desire line from the new Thames crossing. It is vital that this is not treated as an afterthought, passing through a space dominated by car parking and servicing arrangements. The character of the current proposal would appear to be very much that of a car park with other users forced to negotiate numerous crossings and to walk along a relatively narrow, poorly landscaped path beneath the car park deck. This is in addition to the safety concerns identified by Transport DC due to pedestrians passing immediately in front of car park ramps.

Response: As per above. A designated, pedestrian dominant route is proposed which has been designed for vehicles to give way to pedestrians. Cyclists are encouraged to follow the cycle route on the west side of the car park.

RBC Comment: *It is not clear how cyclists would pass through the site in order to use the cycle parking facilities. Well-defined routes should be included that integrate effectively with existing cycle routes surrounding the site (such as the one to the west). The new routes should also allow for informal cycle desire lines that already exist together with those that will be created once the new Thames bridge is constructed (for instance along Abbotsmead Place).*

Response: As explained above, additional cycle parking is proposed and this will be sited along the edges of the Site to encourage cyclists to park and walk through the Centre, or to encourage cyclists to dismount and walk their cycles through the public squares. The proposed layout depicts the existing cycle route to the west of the Site retained. As explained above, additional cycle parking is proposed at the edges of the Site – South West of Block A, South East of the car park at the junction of Abbotsmead Place and Archway Road, and North East of the car park along Archway Road.

RBC Comment: *The 'market square' appears to have evolved since pre-application stage into an area dominated by bollards and surfacing associated with the Block D service bay access. It was made clear at pre-app that in order to achieve a necessary 'sense of place' this square should appear as a unified space, characterised by good quality hard and soft landscaping that is not dictated by the existing service bay. The current layout is disrupted by bollards and results in a somewhat random arrangement of landscaping features. By removing bollards and securing access to service yard with a single gate/bollard arrangement at edge of public car park the square could operate as unobstructed shared surface. Delivery drivers could be guided more subtly with planting/surfacing/seating etc. It was understood at pre-application stage that servicing for Block D would be carried out using smaller goods vehicles, rather than HGVs and this would seem to be part of the solution to the servicing question. As discussed at pre-app it is considered necessary to limit the hours of deliveries to outside of main retail hours (similar to Reading Town Centre) and this would minimise the potential for conflict between delivery vehicles and other users of the square.*

Response: As clarified during our meeting last month, no bollards are proposed within the public square; this is to ensure it functions as a shared open space which can accommodate sufficient landscaping. A rising bollard is proposed to the south of Caversham Square. This will control deliveries and minimise impact to the Square; the managed solution prioritises the Square for public use to facilitate a safe environment.

RBC Comment: *The overprovision of 52 parking spaces identified above presents a clear opportunity to reduce the extent of the site given over to car parking. In doing so there is real potential to reduce the visual dominance of car parking and associated structures (including the deck), improve the pedestrian and cyclist experience and provide high quality hard and soft landscaping, including a substantial number of trees. Trees and other landscaping should be used to aid legibility and guide visitors through the site, for instance an avenue of trees along the north-south pedestrian/cycle route would appear to be a good option.*

Response: Please see comments above in response to Transport. Where possible tree planting has been incorporated within the proposals, as shown on drawing no. L25 Rev. 02. A linear strip of trees follow the pedestrian route from Caversham Square to Abbotsmead Place and trees are planted throughout the Centre and car park.

Landscaping and Trees

RBC Comment: *The Council's Natural Environment Officer agrees that the proposals provide an opportunity to provide better quality trees, with a longer lifespan (from this point) and for these to be planted in a manner so as to avoid future root/surfacing issues. The removal of all 5 Horse chestnuts is agreed, without prejudice to the decision of elected members of the Planning Authority*

on the condition that appropriate mitigation planting is secured. Removal of the other trees identified is also appropriate, subject to suitable replacement planting being secured.

Response: Comments noted.

RBC Comment: *Further justification is required regarding whether the proposed Japanese Pagoda trees would be appropriate for the precinct area. The size and spread of this species appears to be large and could conflict with the relatively narrow precinct space and particularly the potential for future pressure to prune or fell from occupiers of proposed new flats facing onto the precinct.*

Response: The applicant will take advice from RBC and their landscape officer regarding the most appropriate tree species for the location shown. Japanese Pagoda trees are suggested following comments raised locally during the public consultation given these already exist adjacent to the library; their ultimate size is controlled by the available rooting volume which would prevent their onward growth to a scale which is unsuitable for the Centre. As discussed during our meeting, the applicant is agreeable to the imposition of a condition controlling the type of tree species to be secured at the Site.

RBC Comment: *It is considered that the space available (particularly once the number of parking spaces is reduced) allows for more tree planting and a more formal arrangement of trees to reinforce formal routes through the site and better define the formal spaces within site. The overall effect should be of significant canopy cover and a car park area dominated by trees and other high quality landscaping, rather than vehicles. There would appear to be opportunity for an avenue of large canopy species trees forming an avenue along an improved north-south pedestrian/cycle route. There would also be opportunity for tree planting along the boundary to the south west of Block C to soften the appearance of Block C and improve the outlook for residents of the flats to the south west.*

Response: Additional tree planting is proposed throughout the Site (see drawing no. L25 Rev. 02), with further tree planting shown along the pedestrian route through the car park and hedge planting shown along the edge of the decked car park on the western side of Archway Road. Where possible, trees have been maximised throughout the car park and Centre.

RBC Comment: *Additional trees should be provided to the east side of car park deck to provide a more regular arrangement and screen the deck in the long term. The recycling point may need to be re-located to achieve this, although space for more trees could be achieved by reducing the extent of the deck, given the need to reduce car parking provision.*

Response: As above - additional hedge planting is now proposed along the car park's eastern edge on drawing no. L25 Rev. 02. Tree planting is not possible in this location due to the mains public sewer which runs beneath.

As set out below, the recycling point has been relocated closer to the Centre, with additional cycle parking now proposed in its place, at the end of Archway Road.

RBC Comment: *Further information is required as set out in full in Appendix 2, including detailed planting proposals, full tree pit details and details of landscaping maintenance.*

Response: To date, the applicant has provided tree pit details (see landscape chapter in DAS). Suggested tree species and landscape maintenance strategy are also shown within the updated DAS.

Affordable Housing

RBC Comment: *Paragraph 4.8 of the submitted Planning Statement confirms that the scheme will provide Affordable Housing. Policy CS16 requires 50% on site. It is acknowledged that there may be*

viability implications in achieving this and the Council's Valuer is currently assessing the submitted viability assessment and will be in a position to discuss matters further shortly.

Response: RBC's Valuation Officer, Mr. Steve Hicks, responded to the applicant's commercial agents on 15th September seeking clarification on several matters raised in the submitted Viability Appraisal. A formal response to the submitted Viability Appraisal remains outstanding to date and we would be grateful for RBC's urgent attention on this matter.

Flooding

RBC Comments: *Block A and part of Block B extend to within Flood Zone 2. It is considered that this part of the development is integral to the regeneration of the centre and would contribute to its future vitality and viability. On this basis it is considered that the search area for the Sequential Test is limited to the site and that the street frontage is the most appropriate focus for new development in design terms. On this basis, it is considered probable that the proposals would pass the Sequential Test. The EA do not object to the proposals, provided the Sequential Test is passed, that the development is carried out in accordance with the FRA and appropriate floor levels and are secured by condition.*

Response: Comments noted.

Noise and Air Quality

The applicant's noise consultants are liaising directly with RBC's EHO in response to their comments. In response to the query raised in relation to the bottle banks, it should be noted that the location of these has been revised; these are now sited further away from the residential dwellings in order to minimise any noise impact. Furthermore, the stores will be encased within a brick wall to minimise visual and noise impact.

In addition, and with regards to the location of mechanical ventilation equipment, this will be positioned amongst the existing plant area of on the roof of Block E, away from the Church Street façade. ACU (Air Conditioning Units) are illustrated on the roof plan of block E (drawing no. PP-E-17 P2).

In terms of deliveries, there are currently no restrictions controlling these and given there are no changes to retailers proposed (with the exception of one retailer vacating the Site), it is envisaged that the existing arrangement can be maintained.

Building Design and Appearance

Please see the attached schedule which explains the architectural changes made, in response to your comments, on a block by block basis. In summary, key changes to note are as follows:

- All building materials, examples of which have been presented to and discussed with Lynette Baker and yourself, have been clarified on the submitted plans and their specification improved where feasibly possible. This has included upgrades to materials on Blocks A, B, C, D and E where, amongst other changes, a natural coated metal system with a zinc finish will be used.
- In response to the request for more locally relevant brickwork, and as explained at our meeting, the traditional Caversham brick is no longer being produced but the applicants have sourced as closest a match to this as possible. Berkshire Rose is manufactured by Wienerberger and is proposed throughout the Centre. This brick, as discussed, is in supply and is also available in brick-slip format to be used as necessary where weight is a consideration. As explained during our meeting last month, the brick type has to be in a

format which is flexible to allow a light weight solution (i.e. in slip format) for building over and refurbishing certain blocks aswell as full bricks for new build elements.

- Greater detail and depth is provided for the building elevations and the drawings (see attached schedule) illustrate an improved articulation of the facades which result in well-proportioned buildings. In terms of the residential blocks, the revised drawings illustrate the changes made to improve the solid to void ratio by increasing window sizes, particularly to Blocks A and D and therefore the design now assimilates a more 'vertical' orientation through the detailing. Generally, the palate of materials, as discussed with Lynette and yourself, avoids standard functional systems and we are proposing to improve materials and use metal with a natural finish. We are also proposing to use a red brick which closely matches the appearance of the Caversham Red Bricks evident at the library. All aluminum framed windows will be finished in an anodised treatment.
- The design of Block C has been revised and its overall configuration rationalised. The design is now articulated and separated with materials treatments, carefully proportioned to identify distinct separate uses and highlight features. We have also introduced improved materials and common themes such as stone cladding over the lobby area as shown on drawing nos. PP-C-09 Rev. P2 and PP-C-10 Rev. P2.
- In relation to Block E and in particular the Waitrose elevation, the design seeks to limit the outward projection with a revised entrance design where the glazing line follows the height of the existing shop fronts and a vertical return feature band further emphasises the location of the customer entrance from Church Street. A projecting brick wall further separates the entrance from the Superdrug side, as shown on the northern elevation (please see drawing nos. PP-E-20 Rev. P2 and PP-E-21 Rev. P1. Above the proposed entrance is a new 'box' feature which will be clad in stone a finish, forming the backdrop for the food store signage.
- Overall, the scheme design has been reviewed and upgraded considerably in response to points highlighted in your written response.

Materials

As explained above and illustrated on the accompanying plans, the palette of materials has been revisited and upgraded where possible in response to your comments. A sample panel will follow shortly, illustrating those materials which have been presented to, and found acceptable, by yourself and Lynette Baker.

In summary, an extensive review of materials has been undertaken and where possible, on residential elements, the solid to void ratio has been increased and the specification of the window frames has been improved. Details of Block E have also been reviewed; the design now encompasses traditional materials, taking design cues from the library. The design further demonstrates that it is more in keeping within a District Centre rather than an 'out of town' development. Block C reflects a well-proportioned build; it distinguishes the various uses through materials and design contrast but assimilates the more traditional material palate as proposed on other areas of the development.

Signage Strategy

RBC Comment: Whilst planning permission does not relate to the signs, it is important that provision is made for future advertisements at planning application stage. A clear signage strategy is required with a design code for all future advertisements within the centre, including the size, construction, means of illumination and position on the various building types. Signage on the canopy fascia appears appropriate, but a second fascia above the shopfront beneath the canopy is likely to appear excessive and contribute to a proliferation of signage.

Response: Signage zones are now clarified on all elevations. These are also accompanied with a signage zone plan and details of the canopies across the Site (see drawing nos. PP-MP-08 Rev. P1 and PP-MP-09 Rev. P1).

RBC Comment: *The indicative Superdrug advertisement shown on CGI images appears obtrusive and more appropriate within a retail park rather than this District Centre.*

Response: A signage zone has been provided on this façade (see drawing no. D-601 Rev. P2) which demonstrates that a detailed sign in this location (to be the subject of a future advertisement consent) is in keeping with the scale and massing of the Block.

RBC Comment: *The Waitrose sign to the northern entrance may be acceptable, however, it is large and it would need to have a suitably high quality, refined, appearance in order to be acceptable. Internal face-illumination of the lettering is unlikely to be acceptable in this position and at the size shown.*

Response: Detailed design subject to future advertisement application.

Ecology

RBC Comment: *The Council's ecologist advises that the ecological survey submitted has been carried out to an appropriate standard and concludes that the risk of bats roosting at the site is minimal and, with the exception of nesting birds, there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints to the proposals. Ecological enhancements should be included in the revised landscaping details.*

Response: Comments noted. The landscape planting proposals provide habitat, food and shelter for insects, birds and mammals and provide urban green links. The ecological benefits associated with the landscape planting proposals at the Site are as follows:

- ***Hornbeam*, which is proposed as both trees and hedging, supports insects, moths and butterflies, provides food for birds and shelter for birds and small mammals.**
- ***Prunus avium 'Plena'* provides shelter for birds and insects birds.**
- ***Styphnolobium japonicum* provides shelter.**
- ***Tilia tormentosa 'Brabant'* provides habitat and nectar for insects and bees and attracts insect eating birds.**
- ***Quercus palustris* supports a large variety of insects, moths and butterflies and provides food for birds and mammals.**
- ***Betula utilis* provides habitat for insects and attracts insect eating birds and the catkins also provide a food source for birds.**
- ***Climbers* including honeysuckle, passion flower, golden hop, Boston ivy, claret vine and clematis are proposed. These are a mix of native and ornamental species that provide nectar for bees and butterflies, food for insects and birds and shelter for insects, birds and mammals.**

Environmental Sustainability

RBC Comment: *Green/brown roofs would appear to be a possible on the proposed flat roofs, with associated biodiversity, urban cooling and SuDS benefits. The proposals should be amended to use these wherever possible, in accordance with Policy DM1.*

Response: Comments noted. The proposals incorporate additional tree planting and greenery to the car park. As the previously submitted technical evidence explains, the proposals include sustainable drainage techniques (such as SuDs) which will reduce flood risk at the Site by 30%. Given weight is consideration at the Site, and green roofs have a loading impact, they are not suitable at the Centre. Moreover, they would not visible and their contribution towards the overall landscaping proposals would be redundant, having no improvement in visual amenity.

RBC Comment: *The Council's Sustainability Team advises that from an energy point of view the proposals appear generally acceptable. However further information is requested in respect of the type(s) of heating system proposed for the proposed dwellings. The submitted BREEAM Pre-Assessment indicates a Very Good target rating of 62.5 % which stands in the middle of Very Good and Excellent with a 3 % improvement as buffer. It is recognised in the assessment that fit out decisions relating to certain aspects of the building will be made by the future tenants. It follows therefore that it will be necessary for the fully fitted operational building to meet the same environmental standards. For that reason it is likely that future conditions will require BREEAM certificates to relate to post 'fit-out' by the intended occupier and not just 'shell and core' of the building.*

Response: Comments noted.

Public Toilets

RBC Comments: *A number of public comments have been received objecting to the loss of the existing public toilets. I am also advised by the Council's Building Cleaning Services Manager that the existing unit is one of the busiest in the Borough. The current opening hours are from 0630 to 2330, 364 days per year. I am also advised that the unit is well-used outside of Waitrose opening hours. I would suggest that the current toilets are a 'Community Facility' and as such Policy CS31 seeks to maintain the same level of provision. I am concerned that toilets sites wholly within Waitrose would not be capable of meeting the needs of visitors to the centre as a whole due to the reduced opening hours and the less convenient location. I would suggest that the proposals should be amended to include a toilet block with direct access from the public spaces surrounding the buildings, preferably integrated within one of the buildings fronting the square or precinct, or possibly in place of the proposed kiosk. For reference, the current provision is: Ladies 3 no. WC, Gents: 2 no. WC and a urinal trough; and 1 no. unisex accessible Unit.*

Response: As discussed during our meeting last month, it is proposed to accommodate new toilet provision within the Waitrose store. To ensure these are as accessible as possible to visitors to the Centre as a whole (and not just to the Waitrose store), these will be located adjacent to the store's southern entrance (car park entrance, as shown on drawing no. PP-E-14 Rev. P2). Their provision in-store represents a significant, qualitative improvement to the now out-dated, external facilities which currently exist at the Centre. Moreover, they will be regularly monitored and cleaned, benefiting from a safe, secure and well-lit internal environment; their re-provision in-store also offers greater surveillance, both naturally from footfall and from in-store CCTV.

In addition, it is envisaged that store opening hours will be extended once the physical extension to the store is complete, meaning the difference between the existing and proposed operation of the public toilets will be minimal.

It is understood that RBC wishes to regard the existing public toilets as a community facility under Policy CS31 of the adopted Core Strategy. The Policy does not define a community facility, and whilst RBC's background paper to support the Core Strategy does, it makes no reference to public toilets. Nevertheless, should RBC continue to regard public toilets as a 'community facility' under Policy CS31, the policy itself remains permissive of development for "...new, extended or improved community facilities" [Barton Willmore emphasis].

On this basis, there is no requirement to expand and improve the facilities, nor does Policy CS31 seek 'like for like' re-provision. For those reasons outlined above, the re-provision of the public toilets within the Waitrose store represents a qualitative improvement to the existing operation. Furthermore, their re-provision in-store provides the opportunity to remove an unattractive element of the existing Centre, providing space for a new and improved public square/public realm works, facilitating improved

pedestrian permeability throughout the Centre and creating a District Centre environment which is qualitatively improved.

Bottle Bank

RBC Comments: *The existing bottle bank is conveniently located to the northern edge of the car park, close to the precinct and the rear of Waitrose. The proposed location adjacent to Archway Road has the potential to conflict with vehicles entering and leaving the site and could result in users of the bottle bank attempting to turn in the road to exit without entering the car park area. The proposed position would be inconvenient for pedestrian or cyclists using the facility. In addition it is considered that the proposed location would detract from the visual appearance of the centre due to its location adjacent to the main route into the car park. This siting also conflicts with the desirable aim of securing tree planting along the length of the flank of the decked car park. A more suitable, convenient but less obtrusive location within the site should be explored.*

Response: As discussed above, the bottle bank has been relocated to within the service yard behind Block D (see drawing nos. PP-MP-02 Rev. P2 and D-501 Rev. P2). The enclosures will sit behind a brick wall with built-in openings facing Caversham Square.

S106 Agreement

In response to the potential Section 106 matters you raise in your letter, comments are noted. As you are aware, a Viability Report has been submitted and we are awaiting feedback prior to agreeing a package of Section 106 contributions. However, in response to the following points, discussed during our meeting last month, please note the following:

- *Public pedestrian link through Waitrose during open hours - a plan with a clearly defined, unobstructed route through should be provided.* **Response: Plan attached (drawing ref: PP-E-14) which now identifies the route through the north south link which should be unobstructed by the end user layout.**
- *Signage Strategy.* **Response: As discussed and agreed at our meeting last month, there is no requirement for this to form part of the legal agreement given appropriate signage zones are shown on the revised (and now submitted) plans.**

Miscellaneous

RBC Comment: *Existing floor areas have not been provided on the application form, making comparison with the proposal, and other proposals in the Borough, difficult.*

Response: Please refer to attached schedule.

RBC Comment: *The number, size and tenure of the existing flats are not provided on the application form.*

Response: Please refer to attached schedule.

Summary

In summary, the applicant and their design team has sought to work closely with yourself and key statutory consultees in response to those matters raised both within your letter and our subsequent meeting last month to ensure the proposals for St. Martins Centre secure a positive and successful scheme which compliments local character and ensures the scheme's overall quality, viability and deliverability.

The proposals for St. Martin's Centre will significantly improve its out-dated retail environment and represent a significant betterment to its existing functionality and appearance. The proposals will deliver much needed investment to the Centre which will have wider benefits for the vitality and viability of Caversham District Centre.

We trust that the updated plans will be considered favourably and that you now have all you need to progress the application to an October committee. We look forward to receiving confirmation of their receipt. In the meantime, should you have any queries or require any further clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



SOPHIE LUCAS
Senior Planner

Encs.

DRAWING SCHEDULE:

Drawing no.	Drawing title	Superseded Drawing no. (where applicable)
Masterplan		
PP-MP-01 Rev. P2	Existing Site Plan	PP-MP-01 Rev. P1
PP-MP-02 Rev. P2	Proposed Site Plan	PP-MP-02 Rev. P1
PP-MP-03 Rev. P2	Proposed Site Sections	PP-MP-03 Rev. P1
PP-MP-04 Rev. P2	Proposed Streetscape Elevations	PP-MP-04 Rev. P1
PP-MP-05 Rev. P2	Proposed View along Church St - 1/3	PP-MP-05 Rev. P1
PP-MP-06 Rev. P2	Proposed View along Church St - 2/3	PP-MP-06 Rev. P1
PP-MP-07 Rev. P2	Proposed View along Church St - 5/3	PP-MP-07 Rev. P1
PP-E-01 Rev. P1	Site Location Plan	As previously submitted
PP-MP-08	Typical Shopfronts and Canopy Detail	N/A
PP-MP-09	Signage Strategy Plan	N/A
Block A:		
PP-A-01 Rev. P2	Proposed Ground Floor GA	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-02 Rev. P2	Proposed First Floor GA	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-03 Rev. P2	Proposed Second Floor GA	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-04 Rev. P2	Proposed Third Floor GA	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-05 Rev. P2	Proposed Fourth Floor GA	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-06 Rev. P2	Proposed South Elevation	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-07 Rev. P2	Proposed North Elevation	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-08 Rev. P2	Proposed West Elevation	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-09 Rev. P2	Proposed East Elevation	PP-A-01 Rev. P1
PP-A-10 Rev. P2	Proposed West Elevation (Context)	N/A
Block B:		
B-E1 Rev. P2	Existing Ground Floor Plan	B-E1 Rev. Rev. P1
B-E2 Rev. P2	Existing First Floor Plan	B-E2 Rev. Rev. P1
B-E3 Rev. P2	Existing Second Floor Plan	B-E3 Rev. Rev. P1
B-E4 Rev. P2	Existing Elevations E&W	B-E4 Rev. Rev. P1
B-E5 Rev. P2	Existing Elevations N&S	B-E5 Rev. Rev. P1
B-P1 Rev. P2	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	B-P1 Rev. Rev. P1
B-P2 Rev. P2	Proposed First Floor Plan	B-P2 Rev. Rev. P1
B-P3 Rev. P2	Proposed Second Floor Plan	B-P2 Rev. Rev. P1
B-P4 Rev. P2	Proposed Elevations N&S	B-P4 Rev. Rev. P1
B-P5 Rev. P2	Proposed Elevations E&W	B-P5 Rev. Rev. P1
Block C:		
PP-C-01 Rev. P2	Existing Ground Floor GA	PP-C-01 Rev. P1
PP-C-02 Rev. P2	Existing First Floor GA	PP-C-02 Rev. P1
PP-C-03 Rev. P2	Existing Roof Plan	PP-C-03 Rev. P1
PP-C-04 Rev. P2	Existing Elevations	PP-C-04 Rev. P1
PP-C-05 Rev. P2	Proposed Ground Floor GA	PP-C-05 Rev. P1
PP-C-06 Rev. P2	Proposed First Floor GA	PP-C-06 Rev. P1
PP-C-07 Rev. P2	Proposed Second Floor GA	PP-C-07 Rev. P1
PP-C-08 Rev. P2	Proposed Roof Plan	PP-C-08 Rev. P1
PP-C-09 Rev. P2	Proposed Elevations Sheet 1	PP-C-09 Rev. P1
PP-C-10 Rev. P2	Proposed Elevations Sheet 2	PP-C-09 Rev. P1
Block D:		
D201 Rev. P2	Existing Ground Floor Plan	D201 Rev. P1
D202 Rev. P2	Existing First Floor Plan	D202 Rev. P1

D203 Rev. P2	Existing Roof Plan	D203 Rev. P1
D301 Rev. P2	Existing Elevations Sheet 1	D301 Rev. P1
D302 Rev. P2	Existing Elevations Sheet 2	D302 Rev. P1
D501 Rev. P2	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	D501 Rev. P1
D502 Rev. P2	Proposed First Floor Plan	D502 Rev. P1
D503 Rev. P2	Proposed Second Floor Plan	D503 Rev. P1
D504 Rev. P2	Proposed Terrace Floor Plan	D504 Rev. P1
D601 Rev. P2	Proposed Elevation Sheet 1	D601 Rev. P1
D602 Rev. P2	Proposed Elevation Sheet 2	D602 Rev. P1
Block E:		
PP-E-02 Rev. P1	Existing Ground Floor GA	N/A
PP-E-03 Rev. P1	Existing First Floor GA	N/A
PP-E-04 Rev. P1	Existing Second Floor GA	N/A
PP-E-05 Rev. P1	Existing Roof Plan	N/A
PP-E-07 Rev. P1	Existing Elevations N, S & W	N/A
PP-E-08 Rev. P1	Existing Elevations East	N/A
PP-E-14 Rev. P2	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	PP-E-14 Rev. P1
PP-E-15 Rev. P2	Proposed First Floor Plan	PP-E-15 Rev. P1
PP-E-16 Rev. P2	Proposed Second Floor Plan	PP-E-16 Rev. P1
PP-E-17 Rev. P2	Proposed Roof Plan	PP-E-17 Rev. P1
PP-E-18 Rev. P2	Proposed Car Park - Grade	PP-E-18 Rev. P1
PP-E-19 Rev. P2	Proposed Deck Parking	PP-E-19 Rev. P1
PP-E-20 Rev. P2	Proposed Front Elevation	PP-E-20 Rev. P1
PP-E-21 Rev. P1	Proposed Rear Elevation	N/A
PP-E-22 Rev. P2	Proposed Sections Sheet 1	PP-E-22 Rev. P1
PP-E-23 Rev. P2	Proposed Sections Sheet 2	PP-E-23 Rev. P1
PP-E-24 Rev. P2	Proposed Car Park Elevations (1:200)	PP-E-24 Rev. P1
PP-E-25 Rev. P2	Proposed Kiosk	PP-E-25 Rev. P1
PP-E-26 Rev. P1	Proposed Car Park Elevations (1:100)	N/A
Public Realm		
L25 Rev. 02	18511-L25 Public Realm Sheet	L25 Rev. 01
RG-L-AI13	Soft Landscaping	N/A