

PLANNING REF : 253109
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 21 Milton Road Earley
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG6 1EN
SUBMITTED BY : The ACER The Whitegates Residents Association
DATE SUBMITTED : 12/03/2026

COMMENTS:

Planning Application 253109 at 20 Culver Lane

To Replace the existing modest property with a large four bedroom two storey detached house.

-Objection from ACER, The Whitegates Residents Association

ACER objects to this Application as the back garden recreational space is unacceptably small and it is not evident that the appearance of this very large corner property would be in keeping due to its large rendered walls and unspecified soft landscape planting. Access to the garage appears blocked by parking bringing into question its function and purpose.

Please note the following:

1. The proposal results in loss over more than half of the back garden.
2. The existing block plan shows continuous hedging along the Eastcourt Avenue fence nearest Culver Lane which does not exist. It should be borne in mind that none of the soft landscaping plans submitted in recent plans have ever been implemented in keeping with approved applications.
3. All proposed soft landscaping should be visible from the road to comply with the need for the development to be in keeping with the characteristics of the area. ACER request that this should be a condition of any Approval and that plant species should be specified and approved in a landscape condition.
4. The three new trees alongside the back garden wall are welcome. They are not specified but it should be mandated that they are visible above the walls.
5. Two small trees are shown by the hedging behind the front wall. This would be very welcome but it should be mandated that both the trees and the hedge are visible above the front wall.
6. Continuous hedging behind the parking bays next to Eastcourt Avenue is welcome, but it should be mandated that the hedge is visible above the wall alongside Eastcourt Avenue
7. The Biodiversity report accompanying the application is misleading in that it references the property in January 2026 which was after all the trees and bushes had been removed, including the large grassed area in the front which contained mature evergreen trees. There has been a significant loss of biodiversity at these premises, which the proposed soft landscaping only partially offsets.
8. The greatly increased mass and dominance of this large building at this corner plot requires a finish which will not clash with the

existing character of the area. The application states a white rendered finish with an unspecified band around the building at first floor level. The band needs to be specified, for example if it was a red brick band and white rendering this may be considered in character,

9. The replacement of the cheap looking fence panels with a brick wall is very welcome. Again, red brick would be in keeping but a large expanse of grey brick would not.

10. The front carpark and turning area surface has not been specified. This needs to be porous with rainwater management evident to prevent runoff over the pavement into the road,

11. The parking bays as shown would block access to the car ports and also to the recently built exceptionally large garage. This brings into question the purpose and functions of the car port and garage.

12. It is noted that the EV charging point is far away from the parking bays.

13. The exceptionally large roof lends itself to future roomy loft conversions. Such conversions would significantly increase the mass and dominance of the property compared with the original size and mass and would be unacceptable. A condition removing the automatic right to a loft conversion is required.

Summary:

There is a high risk that this large building at this prominent corner plot will be totally out of keeping with the area, as the finish and landscaping is not specified in sufficient detail. There is no

assurance in the Application that the visual impact would comply with Policy CP3, which requires development " of an appropriate scale mass build form height" and to "integrate with their surroundings". A large dominant grey building would be unacceptable. There is no assurance that that there is sufficient visible soft landscaping, particularly in the front garden, firstly in order to comply with Policy TB06 Development of Private Residential Gardens, which states in a) iv) Providing appropriate soft landscaping, particularly at boundaries. And secondly, to comply with policy CP3 (f) .integrate with their surroundings (especially existing dwellings) .including the use of appropriate landscaping.

Unless assurances on finish and landscaping complying with policy CP3 and TB06 are forthcoming ACER request refusal of this application.

The further enlargement to provide habitable space in the loft should be subject to normal planning applications and not be an automatic right under Permitted Development.