

PLANNING REF : 261624
PROPERTY ADDRESS : The Cricketers
: The Cricketers Wards Cross, Hurst, Reading, Berkshire
: RG10 0DS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr John Vimpany
DATE SUBMITTED : 25/07/2026

COMMENTS:

Dear Sirs

I write to OBJECT to this speculative application.

The developer appears to base his case on the premise that this scheme is merely 'infill'. This is not the case. The frontage extends 92 yards and the proposal intrudes on and despoils the open vista to a working agricultural field. Based on visuals supporting his previous attempts to acquire permission to build, the developer is likely to produce undistinguished architecture and buildings that most certainly will not enhance the overall character of the existing group of dwellings in the immediate locality, rather they will diminish it. The proposal is yet another attempt to transgress the clear objectives of the WBC Development Plan as it is beyond the settlement limit of Hurst on land designated as countryside. It is contrary to Policies CP1, CP9 and CP11.

The resulting intrusions of suburbia in an ancient country lane built for farm carts would harm the entire setting. Hurst is rural. It retains this ambiance because it is surrounded by protected visually important agricultural land. Inappropriate and unnecessary building will destroy the experience of viewing a particularly worthy example of English landscape that once built upon can never be recovered. Although I understand a 'Heritage Report' has been submitted, I believe it relates to a previous application and so will presumably be discounted.

Concerning flood risk, several technical items have been submitted by objectors that draw attention to this risk.

Concerning the Hogmoor Lane/ Wards Cross junction, my house is directly opposite. Although I am not aware of any recent accidents it certainly induces great caution among its users. Various suggestions to modify it it look unconvincing.

This last minute application via the 'PIP' procedure seem inappropriate and would leave even more scope for the developer to alter the plan architecturally and extend the height and footprints of the proposed buildings, as often happens. But more worrying is that, were this scheme to be approved, as certain as night follows day, it will serve as a precedent for the landowner/developers to immediately respond with further requests to approve more extensive development embracing the entire field.

Please reject this application.

Yours faithfully

John Vimpany

