

PLANNING REF : 252185
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 12 Silverdale Road
: Wargrave
: RG108EA
SUBMITTED BY : The Silverdale Road Residents Group
DATE SUBMITTED : 10/02/2026

COMMENTS:

Silverdale Road Residents Group Response - Planning application
252185

The following comments summarise the facts as known to the residents of Silverdale Road which include, but are not limited to: Ian and Melissa Kirker, Nicola Jordan, Chris and Nicola Gosling, Simon Robinson, Griselda Truscott Wicks, and Marcus and Jo Hickman.

We are grateful for the contributions of: Kieran Neumann - Senior Planning Officer (Case Officer for application 252185) and Brian Conlon - Operational Manager - Development Management.

In short, there have been failures in the planning process from 2022 to the current day. These have led to a loss of trust in WBC.

Our concerns with the planning process include:

1. The points that we have made since our initial objections in Sept 2022 and more recently have just been ignored and not addressed.

2. More recently, on the new variation:

1. Noise Levels Concerns

2. Visual Intrusion - Impact/Increased height of building

3. Failure to relocate HVAC Plant, or use a dedicated HVAC Plant Room

4. Alternative Placement / Relocation of HVAC units and ancillary equipment to the south side

5. Location of Noise Measurements not representative

6. Background Noise base levels taken during Construction Activities

7. Noise Impact level is underestimated

8. Noise duration

9. Assumptions about plant operation are not valid

10. Effectiveness of acoustic screens

11. Amendment under Section 73 of Town and Country Planning Act not valid

12. Visual and Acoustic Impact of Added Equipment not assessed

3. Still of relevance and indicative of the process, we refer to the Nexus Planning letter of 02 December 2022, supposedly addressing the issues raised by the public in their comments on the original Planning Application 222456. As the building work has progressed, it is now obvious that the developer/owner has in fact not addressed the issues raised by the public and local neighbours. In particular, (and just one example of this) the building height is not consistent with the general height of domestic development in the area. The comment that "the proposed building height will not dominate the surrounding area or surrounding properties" is sadly

not the case, and now made worse by the addition of the HVAC roof units and ancillary equipment. The development is not sensitive (as promised) to those of us who view and back onto it in Silverdale Road and adjacent roads.

4. The unsightly view of rooftop HVAC units and mechanical equipment is totally out of keeping with the surrounding residential area, and affects the views from all the neighbouring properties in Silverdale Road, and adjacent roads. There are now two 'exhaust pipes' extending from the highest point of the home which were not clearly represented in any planning application documentation.

5. Car parking (present and future). Residents on the odd side of the road (7, 9, 11 ..) had no notification of any of the planning applications. Appalled that by 8am Silverdale Road is full of tradesmen's vehicles with drive's blocked, van doors slamming, horns beeping, people shouting. What happens once Thames Wood opens re visitors, people who work there, deliveries etc. What plans will the planning department enforce to ensure that deliveries, parking etc will be on site and not in the surrounding residential roads especially out of hours?

Issues with planning process

1. Why was the HVAC system (subject of the new application 252185) not assessed as part of the original planning application 222456, that was approved on 14 June 2023? Why has it taken 2.5 years for this HVAC matter to be raised?

2. Why was a dedicated HVAC Plant Room not included in the design when the current proposal of roof mounted HVAC causes such unnecessary noise and visual impact? The HVAC roof mounted kit is more the sort of solution that a retrofit of an existing industrial building would use; not what we expect on a new commercial development in the middle of a residential area.

3. Why has the planning process for 252185 been disjointed: delayed decision dates, lack of notifications for residents, incomplete and inaccurate responses/actions from developers (eg noise impact, height impact assessments)?

4. The WBC uploaded an undated document (Revised Planning Statement-Increases in Roof Height) on Mon 19th January 2026, and somehow it is back dated it to 15th January 2026. It was definitely not on the website when we lodged our submission up to and including Fri 16th January. It makes false and disingenuous claims about the visual impact and height of the development and design process. When do we get an opportunity to respond to this? Why upload after at the end of the consultation period? The drawn-out unprofessional saga just continues.

5. How often have WBC planning officers visited the site to assess impact on residents and adherence to the original planning permission? WBC were advised on 26 October 2025 (in one of the neighbour's submissions) about the contractor placing HVAC units and ducting on the roof, before the close of the first consultation period for application 252185. What did WBC do upon learning that?

6. What will the planning department consider in assessing

application 252185? What data and information will be evaluated?

7. Going forward, who in WBC will take responsibility to ensure that all the complaints and comments from neighbours are properly responded to? One of the key frustrations for residents, is that well thought out comments/observations/questions are just ignored by WBC and the Developer, and are not professionally considered or responded to. The behaviour of the Developer, their contractors and the lack of consideration and failure to address our concerns raised during the consultation processes is very stressful and time consuming for all of us.

8. What are the dates for the committee meeting and decision on Planning Application 252185?

9. What remedies can the WBC planning department consider? What changes to the existing HVAC equipment (already installed before planning is approved) can be required? Different positioning to the South side, etc?

10. Depending on the planning process, what remedies, planning enforcements or fines will be issued to the developers? (We understand that the aim of dealing with breach of planning control is to set right any unacceptable harm caused, which is what has happened in this case).

Key Summary Conclusions from the Teams call with WBC Planning on 09 Feb 2026:

1. The meeting noted the deficiencies (many set out above) in the processes relating to the original Planning Application 222456, and the deficiencies in the Developers Revised Planning Application 252185 (again noted above), and the deficiencies with WBC communication and dialogue with residents.

2. Considering the current Revised Planning Application 252185 we note/request the following points to be considered to refuse the application or place conditions on the application:

a. The proposed addition of the roof mounted HVAC and Mechanical Equipment and increased building height will cause substantial harm to neighbours' amenity and neighbouring properties and local character due to the impact of constant noise pollution, further obtrusive visual impact, further overbearing impact, further loss of light and further spoiling the enjoyment of our local environment. We refute the findings in the undated letter from Pozzoni architects of approx. 15 Jan 2026, much of which is disingenuous and incorrect.

b. In the meeting it was mentioned by WBC that the building height had increased by 0.4m. This figure needs to be checked and may relate to the overall height of the whole development adjacent to School Hill, but locally it is approx. 2-2.5m higher immediately behind the properties in Silverdale Road, therefore having significant impact to the residents of Silverdale Road. This adds to the substantial harm residents face as a result of the development.

c. We noted serious deficiencies in the base line for the recent

Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) carried out by the Developers Consultant, all of which have been clearly noted already in submissions by residents of Silverdale Road in Jan 2026. The WBC must request the NIA to be recommissioned in conditions reflecting the site before the construction period, when the NIA should have been carried out. The current NIA report is seriously flawed and is unreliable, and therefore its findings and conclusions cannot be relied upon to support the Revised Planning Application 252185. Residents should not be subject to substantial harm to their mental health due to noise and the developers unwillingness to use the quietest and least intrusive HVAC equipment.

d. The revised planning application needs scrutinised to consider these points, as a minimum.