

PLANNING REF: 252167

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 17 Priors Gardens, Reading, Berkshire, RG7 1WS

SUBMITTED BY: Doctor Zaid Al-Daher

DATE SUBMITTED: 02/06/2026

COMMENTS:

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS FOLLOWING SUBMISSION OF REVISED DRAWINGS

Application 252167 – 11 Mayflower Meadow (Plot 40, Stanbury View / Parklands Development)

Dear Planning Officer,

Following my previous objection submission, I have reviewed the revised drawings and additional information recently uploaded by the applicant.

I appreciate that further information has now been provided. I also wish to make clear that my comments relate only to the planning implications of the proposal. I fully understand that homeowners may wish to improve and adapt their properties, and I do not object in principle to reasonable improvements to Plot 40 where these can be achieved without unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity or the approved landscape design.

My concerns relate specifically to the impact this has on my property, the loss of the approved landscape/ecological buffer, the change to the intended relationship between Plot 40 and Priors Gardens, and the impact this may have on the wider approved estate design and neighbouring amenity.

While the revised submission addresses some matters, I do not consider that the amended plans overcome the key concerns relating to the approved landscape strategy and conditions of Reserved Matters approval 201337.

I therefore wish to provide the following supplementary comments.

1. Proposed Change of Use Would Result in Loss of the Approved Landscape / Ecological Buffer Function

I acknowledge that the application seeks permission for a material change of use from amenity/landscape land to residential use. My concern is not simply the change in ownership or maintenance responsibility of this land, but the loss of the specific function this area was required to provide under Reserved Matters approval 201337.

The approved plans did not identify this area as surplus land or unused open space. It was specifically designated as:

“Landscape / Ecological Buffer

and formed part of the approved mitigation strategy for the development.

The buffer was required to provide:

- ecological connectivity,
- biodiversity and habitat value,
- visual separation between the developments,
- acoustic screening and mitigation for Priors Gardens.

The revised drawings demonstrate the practical effect of the proposed change of use by showing:

- removal of existing buffer vegetation,
- replacement with grassed domestic space,
- removal of the physical separation between residential curtilage and buffer land.

The proposal therefore does not simply change ownership or maintenance responsibility; it changes the character and function of land that was intentionally designed as part of the approved landscape strategy.

This remains contrary to the purpose of Conditions 12 and 13 of Reserved Matters approval 201337.

2. Proposed Replacement Planting Does Not Provide Equivalent Mitigation

The revised plans propose replacement planting consisting of:

“Wild Privet hedge (*Ligustrum vulgare*), height 500–1750mm planted at 2 No. per linear metre.”

While replacement planting is welcomed in principle, the submitted information does not demonstrate that this provides equivalent mitigation to the approved ecological buffer.

The submitted details do not confirm:

- the maturity of the planting,
- how many plants would be provided at the upper end of the 1750mm range,
- the expected timescale to establish effective screening,
- how the ecological and acoustic mitigation functions would be restored,

A hedge potentially starting at only 500mm in height cannot reasonably be considered equivalent mitigation for the approved mature landscape buffer.

3. Removal of Boundary Separation and Effective Incorporation Into Domestic Curtilage

The revised plans indicate removal of the existing boundary separation and creation of a narrow approximately 900mm passage between the proposed extension and boundary fence.

Although the drawing states “No access required other than maintenance”, the physical arrangement appears inconsistent with this statement.

The removal of the separating boundary and creation of an open route between the proposed extension and boundary fence would provide direct access from the dwelling and the applicant's existing rear garden and the former buffer area.

This creates a continuous connection between the existing residential garden and the protected landscape strip, meaning the buffer would no longer function as a separate landscaped area but would effectively become part of the domestic garden environment.

Residential gardens are normally clearly defined and enclosed areas associated with a dwelling. If the intention were for the former buffer to remain a separate landscape feature rather than becoming usable garden space, it would be expected that a clear physical distinction would remain.

The approved layout under Reserved Matters 201337 instead introduced:

- the landscape/ecological buffer,
- a 1m post-and-wire fence defining the curtilage boundary,
- retained separation between residential areas.

The proposal would remove this planned separation and would result in my existing boundary fence becoming the direct boundary with Plot 40's domestic curtilage.

This represents a fundamental change from the approved relationship between the properties. A boundary that was designed to adjoin protected landscape planting would instead become a normal residential boundary exposed to domestic activity.

This arrangement also creates uncertainty regarding future boundary treatment, access, and maintenance responsibilities.

Under the approved 201337 layout, the ecological buffer could be maintained as a separate landscape feature without requiring access through private garden areas.

If the former buffer becomes enclosed within the applicant's garden, future access to maintain remaining ecological planting along my boundary would appear to require access through private residential space rather than through a dedicated landscape buffer.

Furthermore, any future gate, fencing, or boundary treatment associated with the 900mm passage should be independent and should not rely upon, connect to, or place additional load on neighbouring boundary fencing.

4. Importance of Maintaining the Continuity of the Wider Landscape Buffer

The landscape/ecological buffer affected by this application is not an isolated strip associated only with Plot 40.

The approved layout under Reserved Matters 201337 created a continuous landscape feature extending along the rear boundaries of properties on Priors Gardens, including my property and neighbouring properties, before continuing towards other plots around Mayflower Meadow.

This continuous arrangement was designed to provide:

- consistent visual separation,
- ecological connectivity,
- habitat continuity,
- acoustic mitigation.

Removal of one section risks fragmenting this planned landscape corridor and reducing the effectiveness of the mitigation originally secured.

It may also encourage other properties within Mayflower Meadow to do the same.

The buffer was approved as a wider landscape and environmental feature, and its protection should therefore be considered as a whole.

5. Revised Outbuilding Drawings Remain Inaccurate

The revised elevation drawings still do not accurately represent the outbuilding already erected on site.

The submitted West Elevation continues to show a blank elevation with no openings. However, the existing structure contains windows on this elevation facing towards the ecological buffer and Priors Gardens.

This is relevant because this is the most sensitive elevation in terms of neighbouring amenity and privacy.

The approved layout of Plot 40 avoided direct-facing windows towards Priors Gardens, reflecting the sensitivity of this boundary relationship.

The Council should therefore assess the development based on the structure actually constructed, or require corrected drawings before determination.

6. Revised Drainage Arrangement – Further Evidence Required

The revised plans appear to replace the previous soakaway proposal with a connection into the existing surface water drainage system via:

- new rainwater pipe (RWP),
- new 100mm surface water drain,
- new inspection chamber.

While this approach may be acceptable in principle, insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the existing drainage network can accommodate the additional impermeable area and how this connection will be implemented.

No information has been provided confirming:

- available capacity within the existing surface water system,
 - technical approval for the additional connection,
 - confirmation that the revised drainage arrangement will not adversely affect neighbouring land or retained landscaping.
-

7. Garage Alterations and Cumulative Impact

The revised information also includes garage alterations, including replacement of the garage door with a window and conversion of internal space to a home office and utility area.

I have no objection in principle to the garage alterations themselves, provided they remain ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling.

However where vegetation has already been removed along the boundary, replacement planting should be secured to restore the privacy, ecological, visual, and acoustic screening function originally approved.

Conclusion

Having reviewed the amended drawings, my main concerns remain regarding the proposed loss of the approved landscape/ecological buffer function and the change to the intended relationship between Plot 40 and Priors Gardens.

I therefore maintain my objection to the current proposal and respectfully request that the application is refused or amended to ensure the approved buffer function and neighbouring amenity protections are retained.

Should the Council consider some elements of the proposal acceptable, I respectfully request that any approval secures appropriate safeguards, including:

- retention of the remaining established buffer vegetation wherever possible;
- replacement planting where vegetation has already been removed;
- maintenance of a defined separation between private garden space and the ecological buffer;
- confirmation of suitable long-term maintenance arrangements for the buffer planting;
- no attachment of gates, fencing, or structures to neighbouring boundary fencing;
- additional fencing and separation between our garden and landscape/ecological buffer;
- accurate approval drawings reflecting the outbuilding as constructed.