PLANNING REF : 261809
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Woodlands Avenue
: Woodley, Reading
: RG5 3AF
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Colin Brooks
DATE SUBMITTED : 02/09/2026

COMMENTS:
I am a member of The Earley Home Guard Social Club (EHGSC) and am writing to register my objection to planning application ref. 261809 relating to the former religious meeting room building, more recently used as a martial arts gym, located at 20 Pitts Lane.

The proposal seeks to introduce a noise-sensitive residential use on land directly adjacent to an established active licensed premises namely the EHGSC which was opened in 1947 and is a valuable local asset used by many not only as a Social Club but as a venue for various group meetings, celebrations and other gatherings and a polling station.

This proposal represents an incompatible land-use conflict that directly violates the Agent of Change principle as set out in Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that existing businesses should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established.

Licensed premises are recognised as vital community and cultural assets within the NPPF. Permitting a poorly designed residential unit next door places the Club at the risk of potentially challenging future restrictive Noise Abatement Notices or licence reviews which would adversely affect its future viability.

By introducing this dwelling within close proximity to and with balconies to the rear elevation and 1st and 2nd floor windows overlooking the EHGSC this development places its existing business, licensing conditions and longevity under direct and unreasonable threat.

A Noise Impact Assessment should be provided by the applicant before the council can safely conclude that this site is suitable for residential use..

Should the council be minded to approve the application conditions should be attached including a requirement for a legally binding Deed of Easement for Noise to protect our valued Social Club from future
litigation.

In addition to the above objection, I agree with comments made by others that the design of the property is strikingly different to other existing properties in the surrounding area and creates a loss of privacy for other neighbours.