

50 Mount Pleasant
**Planning/Heritage
Statement Addendum 2**
Revise A



-

3.50.MNT

50 Mount Pleasant, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 2TF

Heritage & Conservation Statement Addendum 2

-

Revision A - 15.05.2025

-

Introduction

Please find below our response to both the conversation officer and case officer comments on the ongoing amendments to the planning application (reference number: 231865) proposed drawing and document pack. Alongside this Heritage & Conservation Statement Addendum, we are providing revised proposed plans and elevations and additional drawings in the form of a proposed landscape plan and proposed internal room elevations. The format of the below text is conservation/case officer comments and a written response from Pont + Wils Architects:

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: Whilst complete retention of architectural elements inside the building and on the façade(s) of the building is ok, as the building is a heritage asset, I would like to see making good works (minor repairs, repainting, etc) be included within the proposal so that anyone can understand that significance of the building is being considered

P+W=A Response: All downpipes, soil pipes and railings are now proposed to be repainted black and this has been specified on all proposed drawings.

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: Ground Floor: the door of the reception room would be blocked, and a new doorway is proposed. This is okay if only the door surround and architrave remain, indicating that the original access to this room is there. We need a section elevation for this work/wall.

P+W=A Response: We've produced the requested existing and proposed section/room elevation drawings, where original features, including wall panelling, skirting, architraves and doors remain (Doors to be fixed in place and Leafs replaced to match existing to be suitably fire rated).

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: First Floor: Similar work – new doorway to unit 3 by blocking up the door of bedroom 4 – should be treated as the same, we need a drawing and confirmation that the door frame would stay and the door (if original) would be stored securely.

P+W=A Response: We've produced the requested existing and proposed section/room elevation drawings, where original features, including wall panelling, skirting, architraves and doors remain (Doors to be fixed in place and Leafs replaced to match existing to be suitably fire rated).

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: I'm happy to see notes about the proposed services and alignment of the proposed wet room on the ground floor and shower rooms on the first floor, suggesting that minor pipework would take place within the most significant part of the listed building.

P+W=A Response: Great, no further action required.

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: Roof plan – black cast iron traditional air vents and grilles for extractor fans are welcomed. But we will need details of them (this element can be conditioned).

P+W=A Response: Please condition this.

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: We also need details and materials for any new internal fittings, doors, etc. for the glazed link and rooflights too.

P+W=A Response: All decorative joinery features to be retained as existing (for example skirting boards, wall panelling, picture rails and architraves).

Any new internal doors to match the two panel original doors, product: Tonbridge 2-Panel Smooth Fire Door (FD30) <https://www.todd-doors.co.uk/2-panel-smooth-fire-door-fd30> (or similar).

Roofmaker double glazed fixed flat rooflight (see product specification for details: double-glazed-fixed-flat-info-spec-installation-241004.pdf). Proposed drawings have been labelled accordingly.

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: I cannot help but wonder whether there are any damp issues in the basement. As stated before, addressing any conservation/condition problem would be expected for any heritage assets within an application. The front garden can be tidied up, windows can be repainted with oil-based



LIDAR Images of the four internal room elevations of the basement.

white paint, etc.

P+W=A Response: Images attached overleaf of the basement. There are no visible damp issues, but should you need a third party consultant report produced to consider this, then can we please get it conditioned, but only if required. We've included some of the images from our LIDAR survey of the basement. We've included reference to the following in our proposed drawings: The front garden will be de-weeded and the existing pea shingle finish topped up and the existing grid of 3 by 3 concrete pavers removed, all of which is noted on the proposed drawings drawings. Existing timber window frames to be repainted with oil-based white paint where required.

Reading BC Conservation Officer: It is hard for me to understand what is proposed in the rear garden as

there is a dividing wall/fence (?) proposed between gardens of unit 1 and 2 and a gate which I think would have an impact on the appearance of the rear elevation when perceived from the rear garden. I'm not against them but we need to know their design and materials.

P+W=A Response: All of the proposed fencing is to be timber, in Slatted Contemporary Larch Gate, such as this product: <https://www.forestgarden.co.uk/product/6ft-double-slatted-gate-1-83m-high/>

Also pictured here (to the middle left):

All of the proposed gates are to also be Slatted Contemporary Larch Fence Panelled, such as this product: <https://www.forestgarden.co.uk/product/1-8m-x-1-8m-pressure-treated-contemporary-double-slatted-fence-panel/>

Also pictured here (to the middle right):



-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: The alterations to the existing rear extensions are fine. Timber cladding would be suitable, but again, what is the material for the fenestration – aluminium or plastic? It says 'doors and windows with black frames'. (plastic not acceptable)

P+W=A Response: All proposed fenestration to the timber clad single storey rear structures will be PPC Black Aluminium frames. These are now noted as such on the proposed drawings.

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: Any hard surface material, gate details, and landscape details would also be submitted – maybe creating a landscape plan can be helpful.

P+W=A Response: We have not produced a proposed landscape plan as a separate drawing. This in-

cludes all hard surfacing details and specifies areas of greenage (planting/planters). All of the proposed timber fencing and gates are proposed as per the above specification and product selection.

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: Are the proposed bike store and bin store enclosed by a fence? Are they structures? The Bin store appears too large for me for 5 units.

P+W=A Response: We've reduced the amount of bin store by a third, as part of the hard landscaping design. The bin store is proposed as timber fenced enclosures with no covers, references as such in the proposed landscaping plan. The bike store is just located within a recessed between two fences and is not made up of its own separate enclosure (but is behind the side access gate to the site).

-

Reading BC Conservation Officer: Lastly, the Planning/Heritage Statement Addendum states that new rainwater goods would be uPVC. Not generally acceptable. Can the agent confirm whether some of the new rainwater pipes would replace the existing and/or original pipes? The colour needs to be specified as well.

P+W=A Response: All existing rainwater goods are being retained, and we've added to all proposed drawings that these will be repainted black. We are not planning on using uPVC and I agree that this is unacceptable and have produced a Heritage Addendum to cover this. The overclad rear projecting volumes have hidden downpipes (behind the cladding) and guttering set behind the parapet of the flat roof. Therefore, no new visible rainwater goods are proposed.

-

Reading BC Case Officer: The proposal appears to be acceptable in general. However, the landscape plan for the rear garden and details for proposed elements should be clarified and submitted as above. We can condition the schedule of works. Please could this be addressed?

P+W=A Response: Please do condition anything that you can e.g. the schedule of works. We'd also appreciate the soft landscaping design be conditioned given that we have not appointed a landscape designer and envision this process to be rather drawn out. We can provide a hard scaping plan - would this be sufficient? And could this also be conditioned?

-

Reading BC Case Officer: Could I also please have a section drawing for the unit in the roof space, to clarify actual useable floor space? I am concerned this unit might be cramped.

P+W=A Response: Having returned to the property to survey this space using LIDAR, we have now produced a proposed section drawing of the Loft level where Unit 5 is proposed.

-

Reading BC Case Officer: I've also been reviewing the relationship with the development next door 40-48 which is well under way. Please could you confirm the distance between the roof terraces and proposals, and provide some commentary in this respect – I have a concern about overlooking from the roof terraces.

P+W=A Response: We have provided some proximity measurements for each of the six roof terraces to 40-48 Mount Pleasant on the new proposed landscape plan. These are taken from the edge of the boundary to

the external wall of Unit 2 50 Mount Pleasant, the façade which will potentially be partially visible from the 40-48 Mount Pleasant roof terrace direction.

We have produced a site section to include the rear yard of 50 Mount Pleasant a section of 40-48 Mount Pleasant, showing the roof terrace finish floor levels in comparison to our site. It is worth noting that 40-48 Mount Pleasant has a ground level of almost an entire storey below our site, hence why the roof terraces have far less of an impact on overlooking of neighbours that might have been expected.

Our analysis, considering a viewpoint of 1500mm from the roof terrace finished floor level results in no overlooking from the lowest roof terraces of 40-48 Mount Pleasant Units 1 and 2, which are both lowest and set in line with the main structure of our site. As far as 40-48 Mount Pleasant Units 3 to 6 go, we've deduced the following:

- 50 Mount Pleasant Proposed Unit 1 + 2 Gardens are not visible from 40-48 Mount Pleasant Unit 6 Roof Terrace.
- 50 Mount Pleasant Proposed Unit 2 Side Facing Facade is visible from 40-48 Mount Pleasant Unit 6 Roof Terrace at above 900mm only.
- 50 Mount Pleasant Proposed Unit 1 + 2 Gardens are not visible from 40-48 Mount Pleasant Units 1,2,3,4 or 5 Roof Terraces.
- 50 Mount Pleasant Proposed Unit 2 Side Facing Facade is not visible from 40-48 Mount Pleasant Units 1,2,3,4 or 5 Roof Terraces at below 1500mm

Additionally, could you please confirm whether it is our, 50 Mount Pleasant's, responsibility to ensure that our scheme to not be overlooked by another site?

Its also worth noting that our client is also the developer of this scheme:

- Planning Application Number: 201880
- Site Address: 40-48 Mount Pleasant Reading
- Description: Demolition of existing car repair garages and erection of 6 family dwellings and associated landscaping, waste and bicycle storage

If we do need to further screen the terrace to Unit 6 at 40-48 Mount Pleasant then my client is willing to do so. This would consist of additional 1.7m high opaque glazed screen for privacy of the two gardens of units 1 and 2 as proposed to 50 Mount Pleasant (to align with the current consideration given to the rear gardens on Southampton Street, in requiring similar screening).

Conclusion

In conclusion, we have addressed all the key points raised by the conservation and case officers to ensure that the proposed alterations to 50 Mount Pleasant align with the necessary heritage and planning requirements. Detailed revisions have been made to the plans and drawings to clarify proposed works and their impacts on the heritage fabric of the building, with specific attention to the retention and repair of architectural features, the use of appropriate materials, and careful consideration of visual impacts.

The proposed landscape plan and internal elevations now provide a clearer picture of the alterations, while the additional section drawings help address concerns related to space usage and privacy. We believe the scheme, as amended, strikes a balance between enhancing the building's functionality and preserving its historical significance. Any outstanding concerns, such as specific details of rainwater goods, fencing, and landscaping, can be conditioned as requested.

We trust that these revisions will meet the expectations of the conservation and planning officers and help move the application towards a positive outcome.

-

Document Written and Prepared by:

Oscar Wilson
Director, Pont + Wils Architects Ltd
Ba(Hons) MArch PgDip ARB RIBA

m. 07833287819
e. oscar@pontwils.co.uk
ig. @pontwilsarchitects