

Email for the attention of the Planning Officer development.control@wokingham.gov.uk

Submitted 26 September, 2026

Re: St Nicholas Hurst Parish Council submission in respect of Application 261842 -Land at Forest Road, Wokingham, RG40 5SA. PIP for 4 residential dwellings.

St Nicholas Hurst Parish Council (SNHPC) **object** to this PiP Stage 1 application for the following reasons:

1. Against PPG Guidelines.

The PPG's advice is that the amount of residential development **must be expressed as a range**, indicating the minimum and maximum amount of new dwellings which are, in principle applied for. This application has not done this.

2. Inaccurate Context Drawing.

Whilst SNHPC understand that each planning application must be decided on its own merits, SNHPC note that there is concurrently another Planning in Principle (PiP) application (261841) within close proximity (21.65 metres) west of this site submitted by the same agent for Projx Services Limited which is for between 3 and 4 dwellings. Should both applications be allowed then the cumulative effect of these two applications would be exponentially substantially harmful to the rural landscape.

The Context Plan MLP02 submitted by the applicant implies that there are already 3 dwellings to the west of the proposed site, when in fact these 3 dwellings do not exist and do not have permission as they are the subject of application 261841 which is currently a greenfield site. The nearest dwelling is 64 metres away from the site is 'Tailend' (although now appears to be called 'Rosenhurst'). See images below comparing the context Plan MLP02 and WBC Planning Map:



Application 211699 for reroofing of 'Rosenhurst', regarding Landscape, WBC commented as follows: *'The site forms a boundary with open fields and hedgerows. It is important that the boundary treatment to the eastern site boundary is retained as vegetation rather than wholly close boarded fence'*. This acknowledges that there is no further development beyond the eastern boundary of 'Rosenhurst'. The gap between the site and nearest dwellings is far more than the applicant would suggest as the nearest property to the East of the site on the same side of the road is in excess of 257 metres (Saxon Forest Court). This proposal is not an infill site and it does not qualify as a rural exception site.

3. This application conflicts with both the current development plan the emerging WBC Local Plan Update (LPU) and National Planning Policy Framework.

By virtue of its location represents unacceptable unplanned development outside of development limits within the designated countryside which is contrary to the spatial objectives of the development plan. The proposal is contrary to policies CP1, CP2, CP3 CP6 and CP11 of the Core Strategy (2010), CC01, CC02 and CC03 of the MDD (2014) and the Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the NPPF (2026). The proposal by virtue of its location and amount of development would fail to suitably assimilate into the established landscape and character of the surrounding area and would fail to retain and enhance the area as it would have a significantly urbanising effect on the rural character and will be harmful to the Green Route.

- a) **Conflict with WBC Core Strategy Policy CP11 – Proposals outside Development Limits (including countryside)** in that the site is outside the settlement/development limit of Hurst and does not meet any of the exception criteria.
- b) **Conflict with WBC CS Policy CP1 and NPPF – Sustainable development** in that it does not:
 - Maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment.
 - Ensure the provision of adequate drainage.
 - Demonstrate how they support opportunities for reducing the need to travel, particularly by private car in line with CP6.

Contrary to the applicant's statement, the proposed site is not sustainable. Just because the applicant suggests that the site is not very far away from other places, buildings and people, the fact remains that all of the new occupants will be wholly reliant on the private motor car to access facilities, such as stations, large supermarket, doctor, dentist and schools.

As detailed in the applicants Table in their Planning Statement paragraph 4.26, the round trip is at least 2 miles to and from the small number of shops at Binfield Centre. The applicant confirms that the King's Academy is oversubscribed and out of catchment as will the nearest Binfield Primary School as both are in Bracknell Forest Borough Council.

There are no improvements within the proposal to finding alternative safe and reasonable modes of transportation other than the motor car.

This proposal is not on a bus route, there are narrow pathways only on one side of the road where the site is proposed, which are not wide enough in places for 2 people to pass or a parent with a buggy and child, or a wheelchair user to use safely; they are not continuously on the same side of the busy B3034. There are no pathways to the village of Hurst once pedestrian reaches the roundabout with Maidenhead Road/Warren House Road neither of these roads have pathways. The B3034 Forest Road is a well-known route for commuters to avoid central Wokingham when travelling from Bracknell to journey towards A4/M4/Twyford Station/ Woodley and beyond. It is busy and fast.

SNHPC authorised a traffic survey with Traffic Survey Partners (TSP) along the Forest Road between 22nd September and 28th September, 2022 (**APPENDIX 1**). The survey revealed that over the 7 days Eastbound Traffic there were 20,334 vehicle movements of which 48.67% exceeded 40 mph and Westbound there were 21,443 vehicle movements of which 54.34% were over 40 mph. This survey was on the straight area of Forest Road within 100 metres of the PIP application site and provides evidence that there is persistent speeding along the Forest Road. Since then, more houses have been built in both Bracknell and Wokingham and the amount of traffic and speeding has undeniably increased exponentially. This confirms that this is a busy and fast route which only very confident cyclists would use as there are no designated cycle ways along this road and you cannot utilise the pathways for cycling.

NPPF (2026)¹ confirms that a 'reasonable' walking distance is 800 metres when relating to developing land around stations and 400 metres for Hot food takeaways. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to use these NPPF (2026) distances when accessing other facilities, such as GP surgery, dentist, vet etc. The walk to Binfield and any other facilities is in excess of these NPPF distances, without including the return journey.

¹ Annex B: Glossary

c) Conflict with WBC CS Policy CP9 – Scale and Location of development

proposals in that this is not a rural exception site and the location is inappropriate for a designated limited location such as Hurst.

d) Conflict with NPPF (2026) S1 Paragraph 1 and S2 – The planning system should

be genuinely plan-led. This is a speculative planning application which does not accord with the current or future spatial strategy for Hurst or Wokingham Borough.

4) Conflict with Emerging LPU Policy SS5 Development in the Countryside.

This proposal conflicts with Emerging policy SS5 as it does not satisfy any of the requirements including but not excepting:

- 2a) It is not an exception site
- 2b) It is not a site for which land is allocated
- 3. It does not take a landscape led approach as it will harm the rural character and landscape setting.
- 3b) It is not of the scale, nature and location that is appropriate.
- 3c) It is not sited and designed to minimise visual impact.
- 3g) It does not maximise opportunities to make the location more sustainable.

SS5 Paragraph 5.24 and 5.25. It does not prevent the proliferation of development in an area away from defined settlements. This is unplanned growth which has great reliance on the private car use for travel. It does not help to protect the identity of the area or respect the landscape character.

SS5 Paragraph 5.27. This is a greenfield site and there is no re-use of existing buildings.

5) Harm to the Landscape:

The application will be significantly harmful to the rural character and landscape which is designated as a green Route in the current development plan (CC03) and is designated countryside.

The applicant believes that the '*...straight configuration of the Forest Road will allow for good visibility when egress from the site is taken and turning into the dwellings will be safeguarded by this visibility*'. It must be noted however, that this part of the Forest Road because it is straight, also has very fast traffic, using the SNHPC supporting evidence (**APPENDIX 1**) confirms how busy and fast the traffic was along the Forest Road in 2022.

Therefore² according to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, the additional access(es) will need approximately a combined minimum sightline of 240 metres with a setback of 2.4 metres for the visibility splays to make the exit and entrance safe. Not only would the introduction of the visibility splays be harmful to the Green Route and the rural nature of the landscape, but also the combined requirement of the visibility splays are wider than the proposed site, which would necessitate attaining third party permission.

The illustrative layout is irrelevant at PiP Stage 1 and could easily be altered at Pip TDC (Stage 2). However, this does confirm that whatever formation they introduce into the countryside, the visual amenity of Tippens Wood and the overall rural character will be significantly, detrimentally affected by this proposal.

6) Discrepancies within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA)

The PEA fails to mention that according to the DEFRA MAGIC Map the site is a protection area for Lapwing and Grey Partridge Priority Species.

It also omits to mention that this site is designated within the Berkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS)³ as an ACB i.e. an area which could become of importance to biodiversity within Berkshire; This LNRS area, including the proposed site, forms a natural wildlife corridor from the fields south of the site through to the adjacent Tippens Wood which the LNRS has already designated as important to biodiversity.

The LNRS is recognised by the NPPF (2026) as a system of spatial strategies for nature and environmental improvement required by law under S.104 of the Environment Act 2021 and must be taken into account when calculating the BNG metric and the impact of any future development.

7) No further sites are required for the emerging LPU

The applicant argues that there is a Housing Land Supply (HLS) shortage, however, with the LPU hearings now completed, the Inspectors Post Hearing Letter dated 4 August, 2026 (**APPENDIX 2**) Paragraph 12 clearly states that it is not necessary to allocate any further sites for housing in the Plan:

² According to the requirements for a 40 mph Classified 'B' Road in the UK, the standard national design guide (following the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) DMRB.

³ [Berkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy Map](#)

*‘To reflect these changes, an updated housing trajectory should be prepared to replace the one in Appendix F, as a main modification to the Plan. The supporting evidence should also be updated and made available at the time of the main modifications consultation (see paragraph 15 below), as an update to document WBC27. **Notwithstanding the above, and for reasons we will detail in our final report on the examination, we are satisfied that it is not necessary to allocate any further sites for housing in the Plan for it to be sound**’* [SNHPC embolden].

8) WBC’s Housing Land Supply Trajectory Update (March 2026)

Currently the deliverable housing land supply (HLS) is calculated against the national standard method which calculates local housing need (LHN) for Wokingham Borough to be just over 1,300 homes a year. The Local Plan Update (LPU) is currently being examined, and on its adoption the housing requirement set out in the LPU will be used. **As the plan was prepared under now superseded national planning policy, currently the housing requirement is circa 751 homes a year (Policy SS10 of the LPU).**

The applicant quotes the March 2025 HLS, but since then, important evidence has come to light at the ongoing emerging LPU Examination: On 19th May, 2026, WBC submitted their (WBC 27B) *Housing Trajectory Update Table showing the current housing land supply at 31 March, 2026⁴* (SNHPC Appendix 3). This confirms that the **deliverable housing land supply (HLS)** for period 1 April 2026 to 31 March, 2031 (with a 20% Buffer included) is between **5.5 and 6.2 years**, depending on the calculation.

The accompanying explanation also submitted as evidence on 19th May, 2026 (WBC 27A) *Explanation of Differences between WBC 25 and 27⁵* (SNHPC Appendix 4) supports the anticipated timing of housing delivery of the plan period 2023 -2040.

In addition, the above evidence is clearly demonstrated in WBC’s response statement set out in *Question 2 (Page 5) of Matter 5: Housing Land Supply* (SNHPC Appendix 5)

The strategic planning for the LPU has been agreed by the Examiners and as the LPU is at such an advanced stage, in this instance, the LPU HLS figures should carry significant weight. Thus, at the date of this application, moving forward, there would currently appear to be no housing

⁴ [Up to date Housing land supply 2026.pdf](#)

⁵ [017f5b_df276c11daef4f35a53f51f0a2fc797b.pdf](#)

land supply shortage in Wokingham Borough and no justification to build 4 dwellings on a site such as this.

In addition, WBC have commenced work (30 June 2026) on the new-style Local Plan⁶ including the call for sites on 6th July, 2026 (until 1 September, 2026) to ensure that they comply with any immediate review once the LPU has been adopted.

To summarise:

There is very little benefit gained from this speculative proposal. The small amount of additional housing is no longer needed as Paragraph 12 of the Inspectors Letter dated 4th August, 2026 confirms that no further housing allocation is required for the LPU and that with a small amount of mandatory changes, the LPU is sound and ready for adoption in the early part of 2027.

Therefore, the emerging plan does carry some weight. The location is not sustainable, there is no public transport available, the walking distances (including the return journey) to and from the small range of facilities are over and above those that are 'reasonable' and cycling is unsafe due to the large volume of speeding traffic. There is harm to the landscape and it conflicts with the LNRS. There is no justification for a site such as this.

With the reasons stated above SNHPC request that this application be refused.

APPENDICES

- 1. TSP Data for speeding along Forest Road**
- 2. LPU Post Hearing Letter dated 4 August, 2026**
- 3. WBC 27B Tables 1 & 2 HLS position 31 March, 2026**
- 4. Explanation of differences between WBC25 and WBC27**
- 5. WBC LPU Response to Matter 5 HLS**

⁶ WBC Local Plan 2045