

### **Size of the gate**

The gate at the entrance is over 21.3 ft wide and completely disproportionate to other gates in the Conservation Area. We understand that the size of the gate included in the Architect's design came about because they were conforming with a standard Highways Department Regulation relating to the angle of visual display needed by motorists when exiting the property.

Given the level of traffic on Upper Redlands Road, and the adverse visual impact that such a large gate will have on the street scene, we believe that this regulation is excessive and inappropriate in this setting.

We therefore suggest that the Planning Department consults with the developers and others to agree on a smaller gate with a smaller visual impact. This will have the added benefits of reducing the amount of wall to be removed.

### **Quality of Build**

In their opening Planning Statement, Pegasus says that Hurst Grove Estates intend on seeking a self-build/Pre-Sale for the plot. This option, if pursued raises question of a risk of poorer quality design build that might result from such a decision.

Pegasus suggests two ways of mitigating this risk:

*'the proviso that Hurst Grove Estates remain as the commissioned contractor to manage the buildout process, alongside Trace Architects.*

*'that the proposed development would be required to provide material by condition, and this would be secured by the planning process and would be within the control of the local authority and local residents.'*

These are a welcome response to residents' concerns on this issue. However, reflecting on the significant difference between the original Wellswood design and the final build, we are anxious to ensure that on this particularly sensitive development, these requirements are rigorously enforced to ensure that the quality of the design as set out in the current plans is in fact realised in practice.

We expect the Planning Department, working closely with Hurst Estates will respect residents' concerns on this matter, will provide effective support, monitoring, documentation and control of the development, and take steps to ensure that corrective action is taken if the design is likely to be compromised. This should include regular consultation with the Residents Advisory Group who should be alerted if specific issues need to be brought to their attention during the build process. These issues relate to any unforeseen concerns, about materials or the external design, that have a potential adverse impact on local character and distinctiveness (EN3); the contribution of the build to the historic character of the area by respecting its character and visual qualities(EN6); the amenities of adjacent and nearby residents(H11).

### **Risk of future development in the garden area**

The need to preserve open space in the garden area was a key feature of residents' objections to earlier planning applications. The importance of this was recognised by the Planning Inspector when she rejected the previous appeal against the PAC's unanimous decision to reject the application.

The current design reflects our original objections and builds on a site adjacent to the main garden site. But if this application is accepted the whole of the garden will belong to the owner of the property, and there is a risk that parts of this might be used for additional buildings.

This would be in direct contravention of the earlier decisions by the Council and the Inspector, and we would expect any such applications to be rejected by the Council.

**Protection of trees**

As in our earlier objection, we want to emphasize the importance of retaining trees on the site in order to protect the green environment, which are a key feature of the Redlands Conservation Area, and which contribute significantly to enhancing the amenity value of properties, especially in New Road.

64 Redlands Road  
Reading  
RG1 5HU  
12/04/2021

Sent by email to [planning.comments@reading.gov.uk](mailto:planning.comments@reading.gov.uk)

Dear Ms Humphreys,

Re: Planning Application No. 210308 Site Adjacent 43 Upper Redlands Road

I write as a resident in the Redlands Conservation area with knowledge of and involvement in the history of this application (previously application No.182214 and then No.191860). Also of five other major planning applications and subsequent building works that have been carried out in the last five years within the conservation area immediately surrounding my property.

The feeling of local residents to this application is well documented and known to the planning officers, planning committee and ward councillors so I won't repeat myself but direct anyone to the letters previously submitted regarding this site.

I can see the detail the developers have gone into to address concerns of residents and points relating to the refusal at planning committee and dismissal of appeal.

Of course, for residents the optimum outcome is for this green land not to be built on and we would always ask for this first. However, if it is to be built on then the plan for one property rather than the previous four is preferred. Equally as local residents we would be happy to accept some of that land (for example the area between No.1 New Road and Yew Tree Lodge) as a gift to the community from developers to be set up as a community garden, enterprise project or space for horticultural therapy.

If this application is to be approved, we as residents, would ask for the following **conditions** to be met:

- Building hours and conditions and any amendments asked for to be flagged to all those who have a vested interest in the development.
- A plan of communication with residents regarding a timetable and programme of works (Upper Redlands Road, New Road, Redlands Road for example)
- Adherence to RBCs modern slavery policy
- The impact of lighting e.g. LED pollution and its effects on the wellbeing of residents and local wildlife to be taken into consideration
- Waste to be disposed of in environmentally friendly way, i.e. considering toxicity, air and noise pollution
- Disposal of waste offsite to minimise noise disruption.
- Adherence to a plan of recycling local/historical unwanted material. For example, bricks may be used locally in the conservation area from which they came.

I would also like to refer to the paragraph 4.7 of the Planning Statement the Applicant where offers to give up all Permitted Development rights if the proposal is approved. *"Furthermore following concern regarding the impact of erection of further outbuildings in the future, it is confirmed that the applicant is content to accept a condition removing permitted development rights."* I would ask that this is agreed to before any work were to commence.

As in previous communications from many residents, the trees on the site are of huge importance. They must be protected and are a feature that enhances the conservation area as well as providing habitats to wildlife. They would also provide coverage of the proposed development to properties overlooking the site for which the outlook would change.

The developers have gone to lengths in their design and access statement to illustrate the massing of the proposed property. I would ask that these dimensions are not enlarged in any way.

I would ask that these points are raised in your report and conditions discussed and met before any work is agreed to. I would also like it to be acknowledged the time, stress and upset this has caused to local residents over the last 2 years and 4 months who look to uphold the positive impact the conservation area has to the wider community.

Many thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Anouska Henderson  
64 Redlands Road

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 43 Upper Redlands Road Reading  
**Date:** 12 April 2021 09:00:20

---

Planning application 210308

Dear Ms Ethne Humphreys

I think this new proposal for development of this piece of ground with one dwelling is very reasonable and I have no objection to it, provided there are no changes from the plan.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely  
Naomi Froy

26 New Road Reading RG15JD

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 43 Upper Redlands Road Reading  
**Date:** 12 April 2021 08:47:17

---

Re. Planning application 210308.

Dear Ms Ethne Humphreys,

Thank you for your letter about this planning application in my neighbourhood.

I would just like to say that I support the proposed development No. 210308 and have NO OBJECTIONS to it.

I am writing to you because in the past I have objected to several proposed developments of this site, but I find this latest proposal to be very much better than its predecessors, and in keeping with a green leafy site in a conservation area of Reading.

The only other point I would like to make is that the felling of the important trees in this plot be kept to the very minimum, to preserve its green leafy character.

Yours sincerely,  
John Froy

26 New Road, Reading, RG1 5JD

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: application number 21038 adjacent 43 Upper Redlands Road RG15JE  
**Date:** 25 March 2021 15:41:18

---

Dear Ms Ethne Humphreys

I wish to object to this application. The scheme contradicts the Council's own policy for development in tightly-packed urban conservation areas, blocking out the long view of the listed Wantage Hall from New Road and adjacent dwellings. It involves breaking into existing 150 year-old boundary walls to provide vehicular sightlines . These boundary walls are part of the established vernacular of the area enclosing properties in Upper Redlands Road, Redlands Road and New Road. The site has already had applications turned down by the council three or more times - supported by planning Inspectors in lost appeals - and the applicants are trying to gain permission by attrition for a out-of-keeping development which would set a precedent.

I believe the application should be referred to the Planning Committee.

Yours sincerely

Alan Beardmore dipl arch RIBA

13 New Road Reading RG15JD

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application 210308 Attn Ms Ethne Humphreys, Planning  
**Date:** 12 April 2021 09:10:03

---

Dear Ms Ethne,     **Re: Planning Application 210308 for erection of a single detached dwellinghouse on site adjacent to 43 Upper Redlands Rd Reading RG1 5JE**

I received a notification of a Planning Application Near You by letter a couple of weeks ago and when I attempted to view the details by using the links provided and separately by searching planning applications with the relevant details all I got returned was a server error which meant that I could not access the Application or view any of the details. This means that I am unable to comment on the application in an informed way and as the deadline is rapidly approaching now I request that this be deferred until the technical details have been sorted out at your end to give everybody the opportunity to comment.

In the absence of information, I have looked at the proposed site address and see that this is in the middle of a Conservation Area. This would likely involve breaching a historic wall for access and would additionally destroy the character of the conserved dwellings in the area. Also, I would like to draw your attention to your own policy:

**POLICY CUD 7:**

**NEW DEVELOPMENT IN CONSERVATION AREAS AS APPROPRIATE NEW DEVELOPMENT IN CONSERVATION AREAS SHOULD MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO THE AREA BY RESPECTING OR ENHANCING ITS ARCHITECTURAL AND VISUAL QUALITIES AND ACHIEVING A HIGH STANDARD OF DESIGN. DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CONSERVATION AREAS WILL NORMALLY BE PERMITTED ONLY WHERE THE PARTICULAR HISTORIC OR ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE OF THE AREA WILL BE PRESERVED AND THERE IS NO LIKELIHOOD OF HARM BEING CAUSED TO THE AREAS CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE.**

I hope this helps to make clear the opinion of myself and my wife on the matter of eroding the quality of existing Conservation Areas in Reading.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Ryall

Michael and Gloria Ryall

62 Redlands Rd

Reading RG1 5HU

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: PLANNING APPLICATION REF NO: 210308  
**Date:** 13 April 2021 07:44:47  
**Attachments:** [The first planned development of Southern Hill from 1854 - F.pdf](#)

---

To Ms Ethne Humphreys  
Planning – Reading Borough Council

**Planning Application Number: 210308**

Dear Ms Humphreys,

Thank you for your letter dated 24 April 2021 giving notice that you have received the above application for determination and full planning approval. We have some observations as follow.

I have looked at the application documents thoroughly but there have been intermittent problems with your website (500 - internal server error) – not very satisfactory and thought you should know. After two hours I have just been allowed in so can continue but my response will have to come tomorrow.

The applicant refers to pre-application discussions with residents and I acted as the go-between on account of my professional background. I confirm that these talks were amicable, productive and the residents' response was broadly positive albeit with some important reservations.

Here are my observations on relevant material considerations:

1. The last three years in which this site has been under consideration for development has exposed the fact this area is the first planned development on Southern Hill. I have attached my document 'Southern Hill – The first planned Development - from 1854' which sets out the rationale. The current Redlands Conservation Area Appraisal is dated March 2008 and there has been no formal review since. I did a short informal review for RBC in 2015 and believe that it is time for a proper review – the recommended interval is around 5 years. This needs to bring on board this new evidence to ensure that its elevated status is preserved in the long term. This would help to protect the few remaining open areas that are integral to the character of this part of the Conservation Area.
2. The design proposal is a vast improvement compared with previous submissions. The robust decision letter from the Planning Inspector S Edwards who dealt with the Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/19/3237840 makes very clear the importance that was attached to the layout, existing buildings and enclosures. There are pointers in the letter which to a large extent have been acknowledged in the current proposal.
3. The Applicant proposes to leave certain design issues until after a planning approval. Whilst this is quite common practice I believe that there should be certainty about the complete proposal before any consent is given.
4. The above comment also applies to the manner of procurement. That means that the architect must be retained to ensure that the design is implemented in every particular. Can this be done way by of a condition? I rather doubt it but there must be a way of forming a legal agreement. This is important.
5. There are some matters of detail which I have discussed with Trace Architects and these need to be clarified. For example the drawings show a chimney stack close to No 43 Upper Redlands Road yet there are no appliances or fireplaces. I have been told that it would be built to allow occupiers to install a woodburning stove for example. This is fair enough. If not we have another Wellswood which has many fake chimneys to its shame.
6. In paragraph 4.7 of the Planning Statement the Applicant offers to give up all Permitted Development rights if the proposal is approved. This is a generous and unusual offer in my experience as it would prevent the construction of garages, sheds, glasshouses and other outbuildings without specific and separate planning applications. I ask that the RBC agrees

to this prior to considering the application further.

7. There are two design issues which we cannot support:

- The proposed demolition of the existing wall to provide access is ridiculously wide – 6500mm or 21ft 4 inches. There are three existing openings for vehicle access that I can think of and these are:
  - 45 (Lawn) URR – the width is about 3700 mm or 12ft 1.7 inches approx.
  - The gated access to 37 URR which is about 4000 mm or 13ft 1inch approx. and that is adjacent to a crossroads.
  - 17/19 RR The Care Home – width 3700 mm or 12ft 1.7 inches approx. This exits onto the increasingly busy Redlands Road.

All of these allow forward entry and exit and are in regular use.

It follows that the access must be reconsidered. The demolition of this amount of wall is by any definition harmful, arguably substantially so, in conservation terms.

- The second issue is the gate itself. To apply cut brick slips to a metal background is artifice not even a trompe l'oeil. In no way does it replicate the demolished wall. The proper answer is the alternative which the applicant has suggested and that is a full width Corten steel gate perforated with a discreet diaper pattern – a totally modern solution that would fit well with a narrower opening. This would be a modern statement of its own time which the Government encourages.

Whilst it is not a material consideration the long views across the open spaces northwards and towards Wantage Hall will disappear. That is a sad consequence for those that live on the north side of New Road.

Finally you will note that we have a few serious reservations so cannot support the proposal as it stands. If these are resolved satisfactorily we will be as pleased as any to close this saga. RBC's Historic Buildings Consultant Jonathan Mullis had strong views about the setting of Wantage Hall and we request that he is consulted about this much improved proposal. Given that the previous application went through a rigorous examination by the Planning Applications Committee and then to appeal we request strongly that this application is put before the PAC for determination. Thank you.

As this is close to the deadline would you please acknowledge safe receipt.

Yours sincerely,  
Michael and Jean Thomas  
5 New Road

Cc Karen Rowland  
Josh Williams  
Tony Jones

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reading Borough Council Online Planning - Comment  
**Date:** 13 April 2021 07:38:21

---

Application Number: 210308  
Name: Robert Cox  
Address: 10, Northcourt Avenue  
Reading RG2 7HA  
Comment Type: Observation

Comment: This planning application is for a new building in a Conservation Area. The Application Site is directly opposite a Grade II listed building &#8212; Wantage Hall of the University of Reading and so is especially sensitive.

Whatever the architectural merits of this proposal &#8212; and from the artist&#8217;s impressions in the Design and Access document it looks to be a well considered building &#8212; this application should be rejected as it does not meet either in letter or in spirit the legislation or local planning policies controlling development in a Conservation Area.

Conservation Areas exist to manage and protect the special architectural and historic interest of a place - in other words, the features that make it unique. Reading Borough Council&#8217;s Appraisal document for the Redlands Conservation Area states:

&quot;The Redlands Conservation Area represents a middle-class residential area, untouched by commerce and industry. It was clearly designed to be a more spacious and leafy area than the artisans&#8217; terraces which lie closer to their employers to the north and east of this general area.&quot;

By adding this proposed building some of the spaciousness and leafiness of the area will be lost, so harming this designated heritage asset. I understand that the proposed design is intended to meet the specific architectural requirements of the Planning Inspector&#8217;s report at the conclusion of an Inquiry concerning a previous submission for the same site but in this context the massing and detailing of the proposed building is irrelevant - it&#8217;s very presence would not align with the character of this area or the policies in the Reading Local Plan.

I ask that this application be rejected and the integrity of the Conservation Area maintained.

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reading Borough Council Online Planning - Comment  
**Date:** 13 April 2021 07:51:07

---

Application Number: 210308

Name: Shane Donnelly

Address: 7 Mount Pleasant, Reading, RG1 2TF Comment Type: Observation

Comment: I am due to be moving to New Road and am aware of the history of this application. I would ask that the following conditions are met if this application is to be accepted by the planning committee: building hours are set and adhered to, a plan of works is to be communicated to residents, waste is to be disposed of in an environmentally friendly way, the adherence to Reading Borough Council's modern slavery policy. I would like to add that the developer writes in paragraph 4.7 of the planning statement that "Furthermore following concern regarding the impact of erection of further outbuildings in the future, it is confirmed that the applicant is content to accept a condition removing permitted development rights." I would ask that this is agreed to before any work were to commence.

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reading Borough Council Online Planning - Comment  
**Date:** 12 April 2021 08:54:19

---

Application Number: 210308

Name: Sheila Cox

Address: 18 New Road RG15JD

Comment Type: Observation

Comment: This application for a single dwelling in Upper Redlands Road is a great improvement on previous plans. I would not be in agreement for additional dwellings to be considered in the future or for any additional brickwork to be removed or altered.

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reading Borough Council Online Planning - Comment  
**Date:** 12 April 2021 08:55:51

---

Application Number: 210308

Name: Alison Black

Address: 34 New Road

Reading RG1 5JD

Comment Type: Observation

Comment: I would like to comment that, assuming the Planning Committee approves the planning application, it would be important both for preservation of the architectural heritage and local ecology that restrictions are placed on further development on the site. In particular &#8211; that the development adheres to plan approved by the Planning Committee &#8211; that any further development that would add a breach of the boundary walls is not permitted &#8211; that subsequent building of additional dwellings/dwelling space or outbuildings that impinge on the preserved green space and on the privacy of neighbouring residents is not permitted.

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reading Borough Council Online Planning - Comment  
**Date:** 12 April 2021 09:01:52

---

Application Number: 210308

Name: Elisabeth Nichols

Address: 42 New Road Reading RG1 5JD

Comment Type: Observation

Comment: Preservation of the architectural heritage of this area and also protecting the local ecology are paramount issues. If the Planning Committee approves this application, this would necessitate restrictions being placed on any further development of this site.

Particular restrictions should include:

1. that the development adheres strictly to the submitted plan
2. that there should not be any further development that would allow a breach of the boundary walls
3. that any subsequent building of additional dwellings/dwelling space or outbuildings that could have any effect on the preserved green space and on the privacy of neighbouring residents should not be permitted.

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reading Borough Council Online Planning - Comment  
**Date:** 12 April 2021 09:11:52

---

Application Number: 210308

Name: Liz Nichols

Address: 42 new Road Reading RG1 5JD

Comment Type: Object

Comment: Whilst acknowledging the work that has been done to achieve a more acceptable design I continue to object to this application particularly on the following grounds

1. I am unclear as to how any requirements to prevent further building could be enforced as sheds, summer houses etc. do not require approval and I am mindful of how the Wellswood development was changed considerably from the original design. Once the plot is sold how will any conditions about future buildings be relevant.
2. Reading's Strategy regarding Climate Change would suggest that planting suitable trees on this land would be a better option than building. As a Conservation area, its openness was deemed a valued characteristic in 1991; this needs to be preserved.
3. The size of gate and entrance is disproportionate and out of keeping with the area; it would involve destroying part of a wall which is not listed but Historic England acknowledged that the walls do have clear local interest and add to the built texture of this part of Reading. The history of this small area determines its character and cutting into the wall for safe vehicular access is harmful and unnecessary

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reading Borough Council Online Planning - Comment  
**Date:** 12 April 2021 08:57:16

---

Application Number: 210308

Name: Heather Leonard

Address: 8 New Road

Reading

Rg15jd

Comment Type: Observation

Comment: The small square of land in The Redlands Conservation Area bounded by Redlands, Upper Redlands and New Road has been successfully defended against various development threats for over thirty years. Plans for blocks of flats for staff/student accommodation and multiple houses for the University of Reading have been turned down by the DoE and Planning Inspectorates since they were deemed to have a 'profoundly adverse affect' on the Conservation Area.

In light of this history, assurance must be offered by the Planning Committee that the current planning submission for a single dwelling will not be re-configured or reinterpreted in the future. Appropriate conditions to ensure that this does not happen ( Paragraph 4.7 Planning Statement; Pegasus Group ) should be clearly included if approval is made.

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Reading Borough Council Online Planning - Comment  
**Date:** 30 March 2021 08:02:44

---

Application Number: 210308

Name: Ada Lee

Address: 11 Southern Hill  
Southern Hill

Comment Type: Object

Comment: Having fully read the detail plans of the application. I object the application, due to multiple grounds. The area belongs to very very unique distinctive heritage area which is of significant Conservation values within Reading University area. Once the area is rebuild, this will greatly damage the historical elements within the area, which cannot be replaced.

Secondly, by building on such a vast area, it will damage many historical trees, which took many decades to grow. These historical trees cannot simply be replaced, the biodiversity of the area which will greatly impacted. The building design also do not fit into the designs of other buildings within the area, further destroying the conservation area. Will fully involve the Reading MP and other regional MP etc to look deeply into how this have widespread impacts on the area.

Thanks & Regards

Ada Lee

**From:** [Comments, Planning](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Grahame](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Response to planning application 210308  
**Date:** 15 April 2021 07:49:51

---

As a resident of New Road, I would like to submit my comments to the planning application number 210308 for the erection of a single detached dwelling at the site adjacent to 43 Upper Redlands Road. If the planning application is approved, I would like to seek assurances from the Council that any planning permission will:

1. Protect the Victorian Wall surrounding the site from any further development and more specifically, the planning permission should prohibit any future opening in the Wall facing New Road. The protection of the Wall would be consistent with previous Planning Inspectors decisions.
2. Prohibit any future development in the open garden adjacent to the proposed dwelling. There is a risk that parts of the garden might be used for additional buildings. This would be in direct contravention of the earlier decisions by the Council and the Planning Inspector.
3. Protect the trees in the garden which contribute significantly to enhancing the amenity value of properties in New Road.

Thank you very much.

Francisco J Jimenez

12 New Road