

PLANNING REF : 251215
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 59 London Road
: Twyford, Reading, Berkshire
: RG10 9EJ
SUBMITTED BY : Ms Elizabeth Allen
DATE SUBMITTED : 16/06/2025

COMMENTS:

While I support the principle of providing supported living in appropriate locations, I believe this specific site is unsuitable due to several key factors: limited on-site parking, the sensitive nature of neighbouring uses (notably an adjacent infant school), and existing traffic pressures on an already busy main road. I therefore object to the proposed change of use and respectfully request that the Council carefully consider the following concerns before reaching a decision.

1. Inadequate On-Site Parking and Risk of Overspill

The property currently offers only two large or three small on-site parking spaces. According to Section 4 (Staff & Parking) of the planning proposal, up to seven staff members will be present during weekday afternoon shifts. With a total of 11 staff, along with visits from healthcare professionals, delivery drivers, and other support

personnel, this would create a significant and ongoing shortfall in parking capacity.

While the proposal cites the availability of additional on-street permit parking, the existing Permit Holder Only bays on this stretch of London Road are already oversubscribed. As one of only seven current permit holders, I am seriously concerned that the increased competition for limited spaces would negatively impact current residents. Crucially, given the property's existing off-street parking provision, no residential parking permit should be granted to No. 65. Issuing additional permits to this address would undermine the integrity of the existing permit system. However, without adequate off-street and on-street alternatives, the proposed change of use presents a substantial logistical challenge.

Recommendation:

Given that No. 65 already benefits from off-street parking, it should remain ineligible for residential parking permits. This condition should be explicitly secured through planning obligations before any approval is granted.

2. Proximity to an Infant School - Safety Concerns

The property is located immediately adjacent to an infant school. Introducing a facility with frequent vehicle movements - including staff changeovers, visitors, health professionals, and deliveries - in this sensitive location poses clear risks to child safety, particularly during busy school drop-off and pick-up periods. Many families walk or cycle to the school, and the added traffic would exacerbate existing congestion, reduce visibility, and increase the potential for accidents. This is not a suitable environment for introducing additional vehicle activity. The sensitive nature of the neighbouring land use must be taken seriously, and planning decisions should prioritise the safety and wellbeing of young children.

3. Location on a Main Road - Access, Congestion, and Safety

The site is positioned on a heavily trafficked main road that already experiences congestion, particularly at peak hours. The

proposed

change of use would generate regular vehicle activity throughout the day - including staff shift changes, external service providers, and visitor arrivals - further worsening local traffic conditions.

This concern is compounded by the proximity to the infant school and the limited road infrastructure to accommodate safe access and turning for vehicles.

If the property is intended to house potentially vulnerable, residents aged 8-18, the location also raises questions about resident safety and wellbeing. The proposal provides little detail on how supervision or safeguarding will be managed in a high-traffic setting.

Additionally, there are very few suitable amenities for young people in Twyford village - such as cinemas, leisure centres, or structured recreational facilities. This lack of engagement opportunities may increase the risk of social isolation or anti-social behaviour, particularly if support structures are insufficient.

Finally, I would like to raise concern over the claim that the existing use of the property is as a "bed and breakfast hotel." As a nearby resident, I have seen no evidence of such use. This discrepancy should be investigated, as it may impact the legitimacy of the proposed change of use.