

Rosebank  
Tape Lane, Hurst  
RG10 0DP

Email to: [development.control@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:development.control@wokingham.gov.uk)  
Kieran.neumann@wokingham.gov.uk

Dear Kieran Neumann, Case Planning Officer

4 May, 2026

Re: Planning Application 253074

Application for approval of **Reserved Matters** pursuant to Outline Planning Consent 230074 (allowed at appeal APP/X0360/W/24/3342812) for the erection of 23 dwellings with associated access and 15 carparking spaces for the local primary school. Details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be considered.

Further to my email dated 13<sup>th</sup> April, requesting reconsultation on this application and my original objection letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2026 regarding this matter, after perusing the numerous reconsultation documents submitted by the applicant over a period between 10<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 and 22 April, 2026, I have concluded that my original objections still stand, however, I wish to add the following:

**1) Condition 11 – I contest the revised BNG metric submitted** which somehow comes to the conclusion that there is an improvement of 101.47% net gain/change in onsite Habitat units, despite the fact that they have deliberately and wilfully ‘destroyed’ what was the existing habitat by killing the vegetation with systemic weedkiller (as per my objection 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2026) and altering the baseline. Any visit to the site will see in the verdant months of April/May, when the site should be rich with wildflowers, green grass and biodiversity, it is struggling to provide habitat for all the wildlife that was once there.

**I request WBC scrutinise and challenge this Metric and the way the applicant has gone about attaining it – especially as in the outline permission (230074) the evidence supplied by the appellant was only +11.47%<sup>1</sup> net gain, which was challenged and believed unattainable by WBC’s own ecology officer:**

**At the time of outline application of 230074, Duncan Fisher’s, WBC Ecology report<sup>2</sup> (submitted 27/11/23) stated that “The proposal predicts that 25 medium sized trees will be planted within the site .... I also think that there is limited space within the development site to accommodate 25 trees”. He goes on to state “It is not appropriate to count trees that are added to hedgerows” [which is what they have done here].**

**Duncan Fisher for WBC then stated: “that the post-development scenario is likely to result in a biodiversity net loss on site, measured as approximately -2 habitat units. For a site this size, this is a significant loss”.**

1) **Condition 8** - There is still lack of clarity in the Parking Management Strategy (resubmitted 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2026). Paragraph 5 of the Fifth Schedule states:

*That, once constructed in accordance with this Schedule, it will allow the land containing the **Car Park** to be used solely as a car park for the parking of vehicles by the **Council and the general public** at all*

<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> [ViewDocument](#) Duncan Fisher WBC Ecology Report for 230074 submitted November 2023.

*times in perpetuity and will ensure the Car Park is at all times made available and in a proper condition for such use.*

**And yet the application heading clearly states that the parking is for the local primary school. Still no clarification – it is entirely possible that the School will not be able to fully utilise the area as it will be used as an overfill car park for the residents of the new development and public parking.**

- 2) **Condition 12.** Superseded CEMP (submitted 10<sup>th</sup> April, 2026) continues to fail to address any of the issues raised in my previous objections, including:
- a. The lack of road names on the route map, no acknowledgement that construction traffic will be using the Winnersh/Davis Street/Sawpit Road route and how this will be dealt with;
  - b. No acknowledgement of Tape Lane, ‘access only’ which is a ‘walk to school’ route and is directly opposite the construction site entrance;
  - c. No acknowledgement of the safety of children and parents walking to and from the pre-school to the primary school; The pre-school finishes at different times during the day. There is no mention of the close proximity of the pre-school whatsoever.
  - d. The suggestion that a ‘competent’ banksman will sort out the ‘holding’ of vehicles is unacceptable (of which they persist in unrealistically judging to be 3 delivery vehicles a day) – no further details have been given as to where the vehicles will be ‘held’. Please refer to the recent issues for the Care Home (App 222456) in Wargrave, along School Hill with the construction opposite the primary school to see how dangerous and problematical this is and has been during the construction period at school pick up times.

**Let me make it very clear, the complete lack of due diligence and duty of care within the current proposed CEMP** regarding the safety for the pedestrians, vehicles along School Road and all road users, together with the juxtaposition of Tape Lane, is wholly unacceptable. The residents will be monitoring the delivery vehicles each day; Any breach and incident will immediately be reported to WBC and if considered dangerous, the police will be informed. There is absolutely no doubt that the company should and will be held to account should any accident, near accident or injury occur in School Road due to the construction activities. The current CEMP is not fit for purpose.

- 3) **Condition 9 - The Inadequate drainage issues** have been tinkered with but persist in assuming that infiltration will work – it won’t. The reports clearly continue to ignore the high groundwater level throughout the site. The greenfield run off rates should be thoroughly examined, the proposed strategy still shows flood risk to the wider area, especially School Road and Tape Lane. They have not addressed the usage of the poor privately owned drainage assets highlighted in the WBC S19 Flood Investigation Report 2024 in the vicinity of the site.
- 4) **Condition 1 - Lack of design integrity as it fails to reflect local design policies causing harm to the traditional character of Hurst.**

On investigating the applicant’s resubmission of design by OSG Architectural Ltd (Document 25-1791-OSG-XX-ZZ-DR-A-53, Revision A dated June 2025) submitted on portal 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2026 which appears to supersede the document submitted on 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2025 (although it is difficult to distinguish differences between the two), it is evident that OSG Architectural Limited, who are based in Kent, have no intention of changing the current designs to adhere to and reflect local design policies.

**Therefore there is a conflict with WBC’s CS Policy CP3(f) whereby they do not contribute to a sense of place in the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way they integrate with their surroundings (especially existing dwellings) including the use of appropriate landscaping.** [I also refer to WBC footnote CP3 4.19 whereby is categorically states: ‘.... All development can impact on the overall character of the area. **Consequently it is vital that the Council minimises any adverse impact.** Each town and village, together with the areas between them has their own unique character which is

*illustrated in Village Design Statements. Proposals for development must acknowledge this to ensure that the distinctiveness of different parts of the borough is maintained inline with PPS1 (Paragraph 13 iv).'*

No effort has been made by the OSG designs to reflect the character of Hurst. All the OSG designs have been obviously copied and pasted from their previous designs for residential development, most of which are based on the vernacular of Kent. All of their proposed designs introduce design features which are completely out of context for Hurst.

Looking at their portfolio, the vast majority of their projects have been centered around Kent, East Sussex, with a few in Norfolk and Croydon. The nearest to Hurst that I can establish is 'Langley Police Station'<sup>3</sup> in Slough, Buckinghamshire and there they typically display their 'trademark' inappropriate 'Kent' dark weatherboard design:



OSG have singularly failed to respect the site's historical and contextual significance within the village of Hurst. They are projecting unsuitable Kent vernacular into the village, which they have used on all but 5 of the dwellings, including those to the frontage of School Road. Together with using 'buff/yellow' brick, which is not a local colour (urban and more likely to be found in South London) and at the same time, cramming this yellow brick and dark weatherboarding inappropriate design between an Area of Special Character and the Victorian primary school and the 'Binfield red-brick' Hurst village hall.

Example OSG designs taken from their portfolio portal which demonstrates how they continue to perpetuate the same 'design' no matter where the locality is:

- 1) West Kingsdown, Sherpherdswell, Kent<sup>4</sup>. Note the dark weather boarding.



- 2) Montpelier Avenue, for Moat Homes, Thanet Way, Kent<sup>5</sup>. An affordable housing development. Note the dark weather boarding.



---

<sup>3</sup> [Langley Police Station Project | OSG Architecture | OSG Architecture](#)

<sup>4</sup> [West Kingsdown | OSG Architecture](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Montpelier Avenue - Affordable Housing for Whitstable | OSG Architecture](#)

- 3) Military Road Development<sup>6</sup>, Folkestone & Hythe, Kent- Note the light weatherboarding.



- 4) Great Pett Farm, Kent<sup>7</sup>. Note the dark weather boarding.



- 5) Winterbourne Fields<sup>8</sup>, between Faversham and Canterbury, Kent. Note the predominant, overbearing dark weather boarding



**The NPPF states that development proposals that are not well designed should be refused.**

The NPPF<sup>9</sup> sets out that achieving high quality places and buildings is fundamental to the planning and development process. It also should lead to improvements in the quality of existing environments. The NPPF expands upon the fundamental principles of good design to define what is expected for well-designed places and explain how planning policies and decision should support this.

---

<sup>6</sup> [Military Road | OSG Architecture](#)

<sup>7</sup> [Great Pett Farm | OSG Architecture](#)

<sup>8</sup> [Winterbourne Fields | OSG Architecture](#)

<sup>9</sup> [National Planning Policy Framework - 12. Achieving well-designed places - Guidance - GOV.UK](#)

The NPPF is supported by a suite of planning practice guidance that is relevant to both design quality and quality in delivery.

**The design of this development DOES NOT adhere to NPPF (Paragraph 135)** which specifically states that Planning decisions should ensure that developments:

- (a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- (b) be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*

#### **NPPF Paragraph 139 States:**

***Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes.***

#### **The applicant has chosen to ignore the following:**

**A DESIGN FOR HURST (the Parish Design Statement)**<sup>10</sup> reference S12 page 24, which the applicant acknowledges in their submission and then completely disregards the key elements, such as the predominant red brick buildings, slate tiles on the School which is part stone and part rendered. There is no weatherboarding in the Parish Design Statement, neither are there 'yellow bricks' both of which are the predominant feature in the OSG Designs, alongside inappropriate casement windows, cream stone cills, homogenous, vertical panelled doors lacking any character. The more recent Martineau Lane development, has red bricks, as does within in the immediate vicinity, Dorndon House, the Old School House, the old Victorian Brewery (Tape Lane) and Village Hall. Willowmead House and heritage asset Vine Cottage along Orchard Road are also red brick, with the White House being white rendered, all set within their own substantial grounds – NONE OF THEM ARE YELLOW BRICK WITH WEATHERBOARDING!

**WOKINGHAM BOROUGH DESIGN GUIDE**<sup>11</sup> specifically Section 3 (Local Character) and 3.2.3 and S4 Residential which states:

*New housing should respond to its context, in particular taking opportunities presented by the physical characteristics of the site and surroundings, including relating well to neighbouring land uses and properties.*

*New residential development must respond to both natural and man-made features (built and landscape) that contribute to local distinctiveness.*

**WBC Design Guide S8** focuses on Rural and Settlement Edge development. This site was originally designated as 'Countryside' and therefore the development is 'Edge of Settlement'. The Core Strategy did not allocate or envisage development taking place on this site. However, as this has been given outline permission subject to conditions and reserved matters it is important for the decision maker to consider the **Rural & Settlement General Principles as laid out by WBC in their Design Guide:**

- **S8.2 RD1 states:** *New development and associated landscape should retain, incorporate and enhance features that contribute towards the landscape character and biodiversity of the area.*

---

<sup>10</sup> [Hurst Parish Design Document.PDF](#)

<sup>11</sup> [CD13.03 Borough Design Guide Interactive SPD \(1\).pdf](#)

- **S8.2 RD2 states:** *New development associated with existing villages or hamlets should retain, enhance and incorporate some of the existing features and characteristics of the settlement pattern, wherever possible.*
- **S8.2 RD3 states:** *The location and design of new development must respond to and should not harm the setting of the village in the landscape.*
- **S8.2 RD4 states:** *New development must be carefully composed in relation to important views into or out of a village, so that the setting of the village in the landscape is maintained or enhanced.*
- **S8.3 RD5 (Built Form) states:** *New development in the rural area should respond to the typical forms of buildings in the village or locality.*
- **S8.3 RD6 states:** *The elevations of new buildings must be well composed, well proportioned and well detailed. New development should be sympathetic to the traditional character of a village.*
- **S8.3 RD7 states:** *New buildings should respond to the materials, details and colours that may be distinctive to a locality.*
- **S8.4 RD8 (Spaces and Landscape).** *The relationships between public and private space and the transition between them in new developments should relate to the existing character of the village. The types of roads and streets that are characteristic of the locality, retaining the character of those that exist already and creating new routes with similar characteristics.*

**This proposal and design do not meet any of the above criteria; the designs neither enhance or respond to the typical forms of buildings and are not sympathetic to the traditional character of the village of Hurst.**

#### **NATIONAL DESIGN GUIDE<sup>12</sup>**

According to the National Design Guide – Components for a good design (Para. 21) A well-designed place is unlikely to be achieved by focusing only on the appearance, materials and detailing of buildings. It comes about through making the right choices at all levels, including:

- The layout (or master plan);
- The form and scale of buildings; their appearance;
- Landscape;
- Materials; and
- Their detailing

**This proposal fails on all of the above:**

- **Fails on Form and Layout:**  
It does not recognise or adhere to the building lines along School Road. Inappropriate bulk – the volume is inappropriate along School Road. The size and shape in the plan due to over-massing along School Road.
- **Fails on Scale:**  
It does not relate to the overall size and massing of individual buildings and spaces in relation to their surroundings. The cluster of ‘affordable’ dwellings are not proportionate to the existing School Road layout and scale.
- **Fails on Appearance:**  
The proposed architecture, materials, decoration, colour and texture proposed of the new dwellings are visually at odds with the existing vernacular and street scene.
- **Fails on Landscape:**  
It does not enhance the natural environment. With the introduction of close-boarded fencing at every dwelling, inadequate drainage and poor boundary treatments. In particular School Road with its miniscule frontages and the large urban block of flats crammed inappropriately right up to the street line.

---

<sup>12</sup> [National design guide.pdf](#)

➤ **Fails on Materials:**

Materials should be practical, durable, affordable and attractive. The materials proposed, such as yellow brick (typical urban/London vernacular), dark fascia weather boarding, do not fit in harmoniously with the local surroundings. They bring about an urbanisation which is harmful to the street scene.

**Paragraph 38 of the National Design Guide emphasises that well-designed places are:**

- *Based on a sound understanding of the features of the site and surrounding context, using baseline studies as a starting point for design:*
- *Integrated into their surroundings so they relate well to them*
- *Influenced by and influence their context positively; and*
- *Responsive to local history, culture and heritage.*

**This proposal does none of these. The applicant would do well to refer to Section C1 of the National Design Guide to understand exactly what this means. Kent and Urban London designs do not fit in with a rural village street scene such as Hurst.**

**This proposal for reserved matters fails on Context, Identity, Built Form and Nature – it is not fit for purpose in a rural village such as Hurst. It is clear that the ‘Design and Layout are poor and do not ‘enhance’ the community, the heritage or the local landscape.**

**To conclude, this application remains ill-conceived as it continues to omit very relevant, important information and detail and conflicts with national and local policy and design.**

- The BNG metric needs scrutinising and their proposals do not align with WBC’s own ecology officer’s views.
- The design and layout are urban in layout, unsympathetic in design and unacceptable materials brought about by their complete lack of understanding of the local vernacular, historical landscape, street scene and biodiversity/ecology of the area.
- The CEMP is poor and shows lack of understanding of the transport issues and conflicts with a rural community with narrow country lanes that are unlit with no pathways, and the poor infrastructure in this area for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists and other road users whose safety will be compromised during this construction.
- The drainage strategy remains unviable and incapable of confirming that this development won’t exacerbate the already existing flooding issues in the immediate and wider area.

**The applicant should not be given any more time to submit and resubmit refinements. They have had a very ‘generous’ opportunity to take into consideration the residents views on this site to revise their original application and have chosen to ignore them.**

**For the reasons given above WBC should refuse this application for reserved matters.**

Yours faithfully,

Lou Robinson