

PLANNING REF : 260353
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 2 Nursery Close
: 2 Nursery Close Hurst, Reading, British (United Kingdom)
: RG10 0EQ
SUBMITTED BY : Mr James Kiddie
DATE SUBMITTED : 04/03/2026

COMMENTS:

I wish to make the following objections regarding this application:

My wife and I have lived in Hurst for over thirty years. Our two sons went to school here. Much has changed in those years particularly with regard to flood risk and traffic density, both of which have increased visibly in the last ten years.

Previous Inspectors have stated that Hurst is unsuitable for major development as currently defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In order to qualify as a medium or minor category the area of the proposed development must be below 1 hectare. In order to comply with this requirement this proposal claims a site area of 0.96-hectares. This is a cynical play on the rules where a three-quadrant hole strangely appears in the centre of the plot. Is this a case of Emmental Planning Permission - a sort of planning permission with holes in it?

If this strange hole has no planning permission, then presumably no pipes, cables, paving or other construction can pass over or under it. In reality, of course, this area would be used like any other part of the plot, making a mockery of the 0.96-hectare submission.

Also, in order to meet the 1-hectare rule the Attenuation Pond is situated outside the defined Red Line area. Does this mean that it cannot be connected by pipework as there is no planning permission beyond the Red Line area? Of course it does not. This pond would be incorporated in the plot, again making a mockery of the 0.96-hectare submission.

The Attenuation Pond will require a flow control valve, typically a vortex device to modulate the onward water flow. Whilst these devices are simple and reliable they do require occasional inspection/maintenance. If the pond is not within the scope of planning permission how will such maintenance be formulated and enforced?

In other words, this is not a medium or minor development. It is a major development covering considerably more than 1-hectare, and as such should not have been submitted for Permission in Principle under current NPPF rules.

The Supplementary Statement on Flood Risk (SSFR) Para 3.1.2, states, "...run off [surface water] would be stored, controlled and released at rates less than existing greenfield rates." This carefully controlled flow is then going into a drainage ditch system which the report declares is blocked. See Paras 3.3.3/4/5.

The SSFR suggests that "...WBC as the LLFA work in partnership with the Environment Agency and Local residents to ensure that riparian

awareness is acknowledged and understood." Why has nobody thought of such a simple, elegant solution to flood risk before?

This application is a blatant attempt to brush aside flooding concerns and to play the system in order to obtain planning permission. It should be rejected accordingly.

James Kiddie