

PLANNING REF : 260338
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 21
: Bushell Way, Arborfield, Berkshire
: RG2 9FQ
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Susan McIntosh
DATE SUBMITTED : 11/02/2026

COMMENTS:

(Objection):

I object to the retrospective application for advertisement consent at the Co-op site for two timber banner frame signs (about 2.1m high and 1.86m wide).

These signs were installed without permission and only moved after enforcement contact. Retrospective consent should not be given automatically because the design and position cause harm to local amenity and conflict with planning policy.

The timber frames look tacky, temporary and out of keeping with the area. Their size and crude construction make them visually intrusive on the grass verge, which previously gave a pleasant and open appearance to the street scene.

The Co-op already has more than enough signage to identify the store. These extra banners add nothing useful and just create unnecessary visual clutter. Procedural and Compliance Concerns
The signage was installed without advertisement consent, contrary to established planning procedure.

Retrospective consent should not be viewed as automatic regularisation; each application must be assessed on its planning and visual merits.

The circumstances suggest limited regard for advertisement control processes, undermining public confidence in consistent enforcement of planning policy.

Design, Scale and Visual Impact

The timber banner frames, each 2.1m high and 1.86m wide, are of a substantial scale in a visually exposed location on a grass verge. The design two 75mm square posts with 40mm battens framing the signage appears temporary and utilitarian, rather than a permanent, high quality feature appropriate to the setting.

Their positioning introduces a visually intrusive element in what is otherwise a landscaped frontage, detracting from the amenity and character of the locality.

This aspect conflicts with Wokingham Core Strategy Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development), which requires development including advertisements to:

Demonstrate high standards of design;

Be appropriate in scale and materials; and

Protect and enhance the local character and public realm.

It also conflicts with MDD DPD Policy TB23 (Advertising), which allows advertisements only where they are well designed, appropriately located, and do not harm local amenity or highway safety.

Impact on the Street Scene and Green Character

The grass verge forms part of the area's green infrastructure, contributing to local visual quality and setting.

The installation of two large timber frame signs interrupts this open space and appears incongruous with the surrounding landscape treatment and adjacent highway corridor.

This is contrary to:

Core Strategy Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) - requiring

protection and enhancement of environmental quality;
MDD DPD Policy CC03 (Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping)
- which expects development to maintain and improve the landscape
and green network; and
MDD DPD Policy TB21 (Landscape Character) - which seeks to ensure
development responds sensitively to its surrounding landscape
setting.

The adopted Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD (2021) further
advises that advertisements should not dominate the street scene,
disrupt
green spaces, or create visual clutter. The proposed signage does
not adhere to this guidance.

Amenity and Cumulative Impact

The size and positioning of two banner frames create a cluttered
frontage, undermining visual coherence.

The materials and scale are at odds with the generally modest retail
signage style used within the area.

The cumulative effect is a detriment to local amenity, contrary to
both MDD DPD Policy TB23 and NPPF paragraphs 136-138, which
stipulate advertisement control in the interests of amenity and
public safety
only.

Precedent and Enforcement Context

Approving this retrospective application could set an undesirable
precedent encouraging retrospective justification of unauthorised
signage.

Consistency in applying planning control is essential to maintain
the integrity of WBC's advertisement and design policies.

Suggested Alternatives or Conditions

Should the Council consider granting consent, it is recommended that
strict conditions be imposed:

Reduced sign dimensions more appropriate to the local context;
A temporary consent period (e.g. 12 months) to allow review of
long term visual impact;
Materials, colours and finishes to be conditioned for better visual
integration;
Conclusion

In its current form, this retrospective proposal appears
inconsistent with several relevant planning policies, including:
Wokingham Core Strategy Policies: CP1 (Sustainable Development),
CP3 (General Principles for Development)
MDD DPD Policies: CC03 (Green Infrastructure), TB21 (Landscape
Character), TB23 (Advertising)
Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD (2021)
NPPF Paragraphs 136-138 and Section 12 (Achieving Well Designed
Places)

On this basis, I respectfully request that the Local Planning
Authority refuse advertisement consent or impose robust conditions
to minimise the adverse impact on amenity and character.