

PLANNING REF : 261506
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 16
: 16 Moor Copse Close, Reading
: RG6 7NA
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Sarah Hanson
DATE SUBMITTED : 19/08/2026

COMMENTS:

In relation to the extensions themselves, no doubt you will be assessing these against policy to determine if the proposals are acceptable in terms of their appearance and whether they present an overdevelopment of the site (in addition to the PD elements).

My main concern is the parking, its feasibility and impact of this. I note that 3 parking spaces are proposed, the layout of which is shown on PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS SHOWING PD FALLBACK DEVELOPMENT 2604-24 B and LOCATION PLAN AND BLOCK PLAN P2604-21 B. Currently, the access point (drop kerb) is one vehicle width wide. The application form states that there is no alteration to the access proposed, however, without a widened access how could the parking spaces reasonably be accessed? Their layout makes manoeuvrability impossible once there is a car parked in the existing driveway location. In all probability, approving these parking spaces with no widened access will result in vehicles illegally crossing the grass verge to access the parking, detrimentally impacting the verge - this is happening all over the neighbourhood, unchecked by WBC. Equally, allowing a widened access would lose on-street parking which is at capacity in this road, so is undesirable.

On the assumption that the application has demonstrated sufficient space for the parking, it will result in the loss of the front garden to the detriment of the street scene. I note Section 6 of the

Planning Statement says: 'new native mixed-species hedge planting to soften the frontage'. It is questionable whether there is space for this and in any case, it is not labelled on either of the aforementioned plans, which I would suggest is required to secure this if the application is approved. I hope that, if approved, a condition will be attached to secure the details and maintenance of this hedge otherwise there is the real possibility of it not materialising. The question arises as to whether 3 parking spaces are required anyway, which I assume you will be assessing against your parking

standards. The publicly viewable documents do not include any internal comments from highways officers, which I assume have been sought.

As a last point, you may not be aware that No. 26 is vacant and has been for many years. As such, there is no occupier to comment on the proximity of the side extension to the boundary - I note the office at the front is on the boundary line, with the rest very close. I assume you will consider the reasonableness of this (assuming its acceptable in policy terms) in the absence of a current occupier to raise concerns.