

Application Reference: 253071 (Reserved Matters)

Site Address: Land West of Park Lane, Charvil, Reading

Objector Details: Owners and Occupiers of 22 Canberra Lake Way, Charvil, Reading

Submission Type: Updated Formal Objection and Comprehensive Technical Representation

1. Context and Purpose of this Update

This representation is an updated and comprehensive formal objection submitted on behalf of the owners and occupiers of 22 Canberra Lake Way. It builds upon, updates, and consolidates all our previous technical submissions regarding application 253071.

This updated submission introduces critical new evidence, including professional planning reports and an alternative layout drawing, which must be fully evaluated before this application is determined.

We do not object to the principle of development on this site, nor do we contest the architectural character of the proposed housing. This objection remains strictly spatial and relates to a severe, unmitigated impact on our residential amenity and privacy.

The current proposed layout sites the angled rear footprints of Plots 25 and 26 tightly onto our boundary. This layout fails to provide the robust, structural landscape buffer required to protect existing residents. This submission provides conclusive, professional planning evidence proving that an enhanced structural landscape buffer exceeding 10 metres can be achieved entirely within the applicant's red-line boundary. This change requires zero net loss to the approved 75-dwelling density, zero reduction in unit counts, and zero impact on affordable housing layouts.

2. Material Planning Grounds and Legal Precedent

- **The Amery/Cook Precedent (Legitimate Expectation):** We explicitly direct Wokingham Borough Council ('WBC') to the established *Amery/Cook* planning precedent regarding residential edge-protection and the principle of consistency in decision-making. The history of this site establishes a clear, legitimate expectation that existing boundary residents would be protected by a significant structural landscape buffer. The failure of past administrative wording to fully secure this does not erase its material status. Under this precedent, the council has a heightened duty to use this active Reserved Matters application to secure the spatial protection originally deemed necessary.
- **Direct Conflict with the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan:** The proposed layout directly breaches the statutory Charvil Neighbourhood Plan, specifically Policy CHARVIL 1 (Local Character and Design) and Policy CHARVIL 3. These policies dictate that all new developments must respect the existing settlement pattern, protect the visual amenity of neighbouring properties, and integrate high-quality structural green infrastructure. Siting dense housing footprints with severely compressed boundary separation directly undermines the central design and environmental objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- **Breach of Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policy CP3:** Policy CP3 mandates that new development must be of high quality and must not detrimentally impact the amenity of adjacent land users. Siting Plots 25 and 26 against our boundary creates an overbearing visual impact and an unacceptable loss of privacy to our corner plot.
- **Conflict with Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD (Section 4.7 & Requirement R15):** The council's adopted Design Guide states that standard separation distances are a minimum

floor, not a ceiling. It explicitly notes that boundary interfaces with existing properties are "particularly sensitive" and require greater separation distances or enhanced design features. The current layout treats standard minimums as a target, failing to provide the required enhanced protection.

- **Demonstrated Geometric Feasibility:** The applicant's *Garden Depths and Areas Plan* shows that Plots 25, 26, and 41–43 feature rear gardens measuring 12 to 16+ metres deep. This significantly exceeds Wokingham's standard 11-metre policy minimum. Furthermore, the applicant's *Arboricultural Impact Assessment* confirms that the unbuilt open zone tracking toward the Sonning Golf Course boundary is entirely free of statutory Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and Root Protection Areas (RPAs). There are no environmental or geometric constraints preventing a modest footprint setback.

3. Formal Requests to the Local Planning Authority

To achieve a policy-compliant design balance, we request that the Local Planning Authority take the following actions:

1. **Issue a Formal Directive for Amended Plans:** Direct the applicant to submit an amended layout plan that compresses the over-compliant private gardens on Plots 25, 26, and 41–43 down to the standard 11-metre depth. The row must be reshuffled toward the unencumbered Sonning Golf Course boundary to establish a continuous, secure structural landscape buffer exceeding 10 metres in depth directly adjoining our boundary.
2. **Require a Detailed Boundary Landscaping Specification:** Require the applicant to submit a comprehensive, scaled planting scheme for this sensitive interface, detailing robust tree species, high planting densities, and a legally binding, long-term maintenance strategy to ensure the screen is permanently preserved.
3. **Referral to the Planning Committee:** We request that this application be withheld from delegated officer approval and be determined in an open, public forum by the Planning Committee, as requested via the formal Call-In by Councillor Leon Cook.

Submitted on behalf of Sarah Beere and Mike Cordrey, 22 Canberra Lake Way, Charvil

Schedule of Attached Appendices and Technical Evidence

- Appendix A: Professional Planning Objection Report (Prepared by Planning Voice)
A full assessment of the site layout against Policy CP3, Policy CC03, the Borough Design Guide SPD, the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan, and relevant legal precedents, which includes a scaled drawing demonstrating the exact geometric feasibility of compressing over-compliant gardens to deliver a continuous landscape buffer exceeding 10 metres within the red line, maintaining full 75-unit site density.
- Appendix B: Full Planning Officer's Report (Authored by Lee Searles, Chartered Town Planner)
An independent historical and policy analysis establishing the spatial context, intent, and requirements for a landscape buffer at this specific boundary interface. Submitted in full for procedural completeness with key sections regarding the spatial context, planning intent, and requirements for the boundary landscape buffer highlighted for ease of reference.
- Appendix C: Redacted Formal Developer Correspondence Log (Emails with Bellway Homes Planning Manager)
A redacted record of the 5-email chain with Bellway's Planning Manager. This confirms the

developer's position that layout adjustments are a matter for the Council's planning officers to direct.

Appendix A: Professional Planning Objection Report (Prepared by Planning Voice)

To: Planning Department, Wokingham Borough Council
planning.enquiries@wokingham.gov.uk

Date: 8 June 2026



Formal Objection to Planning Application 253071 – Land West of Park Lane, Charvil

Proposal: Approval of Reserved Matters (including layout and landscaping) for the residential development of 75 dwellings, pursuant to the outline permission for the site.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We act for the owners and occupiers of 22 and 23 Canberra Lake Way, Charvil ("our clients"), whose rear boundaries adjoin the south-eastern edge of the application site, and we submit this objection to the above Reserved Matters application on their behalf. Our clients do not object to the principle of 75 dwellings on this site, which is established by the outline permission. This objection is directed at the detailed layout and landscaping at the interface with their properties, and in particular at the failure of the submitted scheme to provide an effective landscaped buffer along that boundary and an adequate degree of separation from established homes. For the reasons set out below, the layout as drawn conflicts with the adopted development plan and the Council's adopted design guidance. We ask the Council to require the applicant to submit an amended layout that secures a proper boundary buffer. As we demonstrate by reference to a revised layout we have prepared, such an amendment is achievable within the site, with no reduction in the approved number of dwellings and with a net gain in greenspace and tree cover.

The adopted development plan and design guidance

The application must be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The most directly relevant provisions are Policy CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (adopted 29 January 2010), Policies CC03 and TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (adopted 21 February 2014), and Policies CHARVIL 3 and CHARVIL 4 of the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan, which was made on 7 May 2026 (90.9 per cent of those voting in favour) and now forms part of the statutory development plan. The Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD is a material consideration of substantial weight in the assessment of design and amenity.

Policy CP3 provides that planning permission will be granted for proposals that, among other things:

"(a) Are of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area together with a high quality of design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life; ... (f) Contribute to a sense of place ... in the way they integrate with their surroundings (especially existing dwellings) including the use of appropriate landscaping ..."

Wokingham Borough Core Strategy, Policy CP3.

The Borough Design Guide SPD reinforces these requirements. Requirement R15 provides that "Buildings must be designed to provide reasonable levels of visual privacy to habitable rooms", and the SPD sets out the Council's adopted separation standards, including a minimum back-to-back distance of 22 metres.

Critically, the SPD makes clear that those standard distances are a floor, not a ceiling, where new development meets established homes:

“These distances will generally be considered adequate for the relationships within new developments but may not be appropriate in relation to existing properties. ... The relationships between existing properties and new development can be particularly sensitive. In such cases ... it will be necessary to provide a greater distance or to incorporate additional design features to minimise any harm caused by perceptions of loss of privacy or other potential impacts at the rear of properties.”

Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD, section 4.7 (Privacy, visual impact and amenity).

The boundary between the application site and our clients' established homes is precisely the “particularly sensitive” relationship to which the SPD refers. It calls for a greater degree of separation and additional design measures — not less. The submitted layout does the opposite.

Failure to provide an effective landscaped boundary buffer

The submitted layout provides only a narrow residual strip of land between the rear elevations and gardens of the new dwellings and the boundary with our clients' properties. That strip is too constrained to accommodate and sustain the trees and hedgerow planting necessary to form an effective and durable visual and acoustic screen; planting confined within so restricted a space is liable to fail to establish or to be lost over time. A buffer of this nature cannot be an incidental by-product of a tightly drawn layout; it requires a defined and adequately dimensioned landscaped zone. The failure to provide it is contrary to Policy CP3(f) and to Policy CC03 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan, which seeks the provision and long-term retention of green infrastructure, trees and landscaping as an integral part of development.

The revised layout prepared on our clients' behalf

To demonstrate that the necessary improvement is deliverable, we have prepared a revised layout, which is reproduced below. It adjusts development within the site so as to establish a continuous, properly dimensioned landscaped buffer along the eastern boundary with Canberra Lake Way and northern boundary with The Hawthorns.

The revised layout materially increases the separation and screening to our clients' properties at 22 and 23, to the other dwellings immediately adjacent, and to the properties further to the north, while retaining the full complement of 75 dwellings and the developable area of the scheme.

The landscape and biodiversity effect of the revised layout is positive overall. As the plan shows, the new arrangement creates substantial additional greenspace and tree and hedgerow planting (shown in green), principally in the form of the enhanced boundary buffers. It would involve the removal of only a small number of trees (shown in red), which are of limited size, and the new planting created comfortably exceeds the planting lost, resulting in a net gain in greenspace and tree cover and ample space for mitigation planting. The limited tree removal would, moreover, be further reduced at the detailed design stage, including through the modest garden-depth adjustments described below, which provide the necessary flexibility to refine the layout around the trees worth retaining.

The revised layout is also deliverable in highway and access terms. The internal road geometry has been prepared with regard to vehicle tracking, and where any junction requires it there is space to widen the turning radius to accommodate the swept paths of refuse and emergency vehicles. The amendment we seek therefore raises no impediment of access or highway safety.

Over-provision of private garden depth at the expense of the buffer

The space required to provide the buffer and avoid tree removals exists within the applicant's own layout. The applicant's Garden Depths and Areas Plan classifies the rear gardens of the scheme against the Council's minimum garden-depth standard, identifying gardens of approximately 11 metres as complying with the minimum, gardens of 12 to 14 metres as exceeding it, and gardens of 14 metres or more as significantly exceeding it.

On the applicant's own plan, for example, Plots 41 to 43 and Plots 25 and 26 are shown with rear gardens of 14 metres or more, significantly exceeding the minimum. As such a layout that achieves a reasonable buffer and safeguards the existing trees can be achieved here while retaining compliant 11m gardens.

We do not suggest that generous gardens are an issue in themselves. The point is one of design balance, and of flexibility. The applicant has allocated substantial garden depth, far in excess of the adopted minimum, to new private occupiers while leaving established neighbours with an inadequate separation

and no effective buffer. That distribution does not represent the high quality of design or the protection of neighbouring amenity required by Policy CP3, does not accord with the Borough Design Guide's requirement for a greater degree of separation where new development abuts existing homes, and is inconsistent with Policy CHARVIL 4, which requires plot depths and development form to respect the established low-density character of Charvil. Importantly, this surplus depth also provides headroom for detailed design: the modest reductions in over-deep garden depth referred to above would allow the layout to be fine-tuned so as to minimise tree removal while still delivering the buffer.



Revised layout prepared by Planning Voice on behalf of 22 and 23 Canberra Lake Way (green: greenspace/tree planting created; red: small trees lost).

Harm to the residential amenity of 22 and 23 Canberra Lake Way

Independently of the buffer, the disposition of the plots closest to the boundary in the submitted scheme causes a direct loss of amenity to our clients' properties. The footprints of the dwellings on Plots 25 and 26

are angled relative to the common boundary, presenting their corners towards our clients' dwellings and gardens. The effect is an overbearing relationship and a loss of outlook, most acute at the corner plot, aggravated by the absence of the screen planting discussed above. The separation provided falls short of the standard the Borough Design Guide expects, still less the "greater distance" the SPD requires at a sensitive interface with existing homes.

These impacts are contrary to Policy CP3(a) and to Requirement R15 of the Borough Design Guide. They are also contrary to the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan: Policy CHARVIL 3 (Design of New Development) requires proposals to maintain a sympathetic relationship to existing development in terms of scale, building orientation, building line and setback, in accordance with design code MS02. A layout that turns angled building corners towards the established rear boundary of neighbouring dwellings, with an inadequate setback, is not a sympathetic response and does not step the development down towards the boundary as that policy and code envisage. The revised layout, by contrast, achieves that stepping down and a sympathetic building line.

Reduction in separation since the pre-application proposals

We are also concerned that the separation between the development and our clients' boundary in the submitted layout has been reduced compared with the arrangement shown to residents at the pre application stage. Rather than responding to the concerns raised by affected residents, the layout now before the Council places built form closer to the boundary than the earlier proposals did. That worsening of the relationship at this sensitive interface, in the direction opposite to that which the Borough Design Guide requires, weighs further against the scheme as drawn.

Inadequate landscape specification, management and boundary treatment

The submitted material does not demonstrate that the boundary treatment and landscaping will be delivered and maintained to an acceptable standard. No detailed, scaled landscape specification has been provided identifying the species, planting densities and soil depths for this boundary, and the masterplan shading alone does not enable a proper assessment of whether effective screening can be achieved. Nor is there any binding long-term management and maintenance strategy, or any defined ownership and boundary

treatment regime, for the strip of land along the boundary; absent such provision there can be no confidence that planting will be retained rather than cleared or enclosed by future occupiers. This is contrary to Policy CC03 and to the requirement in Policy CP3 for a high quality of design that integrates with existing dwellings through appropriate and durable landscaping.

The amendment is feasible, deliverable and involves no loss of dwellings

The harm we have identified is avoidable, and the revised layout shows how. The amendment combines a re-distribution of built form within the site with the reduction of the over-deep boundary gardens towards the adopted minimum, the land so released being allocated to a properly dimensioned planted buffer. It involves no net loss of dwellings, consistent with Policy CP3(i), and it delivers a net gain in greenspace and tree cover.

In advancing the revised layout, we are mindful of the role that an alternative scheme plays in planning law. As the Court of Appeal confirmed in *R v Westminster City Council ex parte Mount Cook Land Ltd* [2003] EWCA Civ 1346 (applying *R (Scott) v North Warwickshire Borough Council*), the relative merits of an alternative are normally immaterial where a proposal is itself acceptable, and become material only in the case where the proposal gives rise to a clear planning objection and the alternative is not vague or speculative but has a real prospect of implementation.

We respectfully argue that this is such a case. The submitted layout gives rise to a clear and demonstrable conflict with the adopted development plan and the Borough Design Guide for the reasons given above; and the revised layout is concrete, lies wholly within the applicant's own site and control, and retains the full development quantum, such that there is a real prospect of its implementation if the layout were required

to be amended. The existence of that feasible and less harmful alternative is accordingly a material consideration going to the weight to be attached to the identified harm and to whether it is necessary. We respectfully invite the Council, which is able to do so at this Reserved Matters stage, to require the amendment rather than approve a layout that entrenches an avoidable harm.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the Reserved Matters layout as submitted fails to provide an effective landscaped buffer, over-provides private garden depth in the very location where a buffer and greater separation are required, gives rise to an overbearing relationship and loss of outlook to 22 and 23

Canberra Lake Way (as well as in relation to other dwellings), reduces the separation previously shown to residents, and is unsupported by any adequate landscape specification or management strategy. It is contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy, Policies CC03 and TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan, Policies CHARVIL 3 and CHARVIL 4 of the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan, and Requirement R15 and the separation standards of the Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD.

We therefore object, on our clients' behalf, to the application in its current form. We do not ask the Council to refuse the principle of development, but to require the applicant to submit an amended layout — along the lines of the revised layout enclosed — which re-establishes a properly dimensioned landscaped buffer along the Canberra Lake Way boundary, by re-distributing built form within the site and reducing the over deep boundary gardens to the adopted minimum, together with a detailed and enforceable landscape and management specification for that boundary. We would be grateful to be notified of the Council's decision in due course.

Kind regards,

Planning Voice Chartered Town Planners

on behalf of the owners and occupiers of 22 and 23 Canberra Lake Way, Charvil

Appendix B: Full Planning Officer's Report (Authored by Lee Searles, Chartered Town Planner)



Andrea Pellegram Ltd.

Andrea Pellegram Ltd 6 Chesterton Park
Cirencester GL7 1XU
<https://www.pellegram.co.uk/> +44 (0) 7521 092223
lee@pellegram.co.uk

Sent by email to: planning.enquiries@wokingham.gov.uk
Reference: planning application 253071

Date: 22nd January 2026

For the attention of the planning case officer,

**RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION 253071, LAND TO THE WEST OF PARK LANE,
CHARVIL, RG10 9TS**

The comments attached to this letter have been prepared on behalf of residents of 8, 11, 12, 22 – 26 on Canberra Lake Way, Charvil, in response to reserved matters proposals set out in planning application 253071 at Land West of Park Lane, Charvil.

I would be grateful if you would carefully consider the points raised and take action to ensure that the proposals are amended to address them. Should you have any questions or suggestions, the residents would welcome an opportunity to discuss how the proposals can be amended to address their concerns. Should this be of interest, I am available and can facilitate this with them.

Yours Faithfully,

Lee Searles

Director,
Andrea Pellegram Ltd

Response to Reserved Matters Application 253071 on behalf of residents of 8, 11, 12, 22 – 26 on Canberra Lake Way, Charvil.

1. This response has been prepared on behalf of residents living in the development on Canberra Lake Way. The response aims to provide a basis for either a decision or action by the applicant to address the matters raised. The key concerns addressed relate to matters of addressing the requirements of consented development and matters related to privacy, amenity and security.

Consented Developments

2. Relevant matters arising from the appeal decision on planning application 143292 which consented development on Canberra Lake Way are discussed first, as these have relevance to the current applications for approval of Reserved Matters in planning application 253701 and approval of details provided to discharge planning condition 41 of permission 232704.

Landscape considerations planning application 143292 and subsequent appeal.

3. Below, extracts are provided from the landscape proof of evidence, conditions requested by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and the appeal decision.
4. **Extract from Proof of Evidence (Clive Self, CSA) – Landscape Matters** - *“5.10 There are no landscape features contained within the body of the Appeal Site to constrain development and the vast majority of perimeter vegetation can be retained, save for sections of hedgerow which will require removal to facilitate access, and some areas of self-set scrub vegetation. The detailed landscape proposals submitted with the application demonstrate that there are significant opportunities for new tree, shrub and hedgerow planting as part of the proposed development to compensate for any minor loss. Overall there will be a significant net gain in tree cover and species diversity.” (my underlining)*
5. **Appeal Decision extract** - *“54. Therefore, whilst the new development would be visible, the views would be largely contained by the natural topography of the site and its surroundings and as such the effect of the proposed development would be localised. Furthermore, these views would not be out of context in the setting of Charvil being a settlement that already has built development particularly on the southern side of the A3202. Further, taking account of the topography of the appeal site, the sensitively planned and designed landscaping scheme would be consistent with the LCA. This would be likely to ensure that the development would over time be viewed as an integral part of Charvil. As a result, this would to a large degree mitigate the limited harm in relation to the change of character and outlook.” (my underlining)*
6. LPA Suggested relevant conditions submitted to the appeal – Two relevant conditions are provided (numbers 2 and 15).

“2. This permission is in respect of plan no [] dated []. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the application form and associated details hereby approved.”



“20. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include, as appropriate, proposed finished floor levels or contours, means of enclosure, car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas, hard surfacing materials and minor artefacts and structure (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, external services, etc). Soft landscaping details shall include planting plan, specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, and implementation timetable. (my underlining)”

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a timetable approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved and permanently retained.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21.”

7. Relevant conditions 2 and 15 imposed by the Planning Inspector in his Appeal Decision – the corresponding conditions included in the Appeal Decision are set out below.

2. This permission is in respect of plan numbers in Schedule 1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Schedule 1

	Site location OS plan with Red and blue line boundaries
1978-01E	Site layout
1978-02B	3 bed house- Plot 1
1978-03A	3 bed house- Plots 15,18,19
1978-04B	4 bed house- Plots 2,3,4,5
1978-05A	4 bed house- Plots 7,10
1978-06A	4 bed house –Plot 6
1978-07A	4 bed house- Plots 8,9
1978-08A	5 bed house –plots 11,12, 21-25
1978-09A	4 bed house- plots 13,14,17
1978-10	Garages
1978-11B	Site layout in local context
1978-12	3 bed house – Plot 20
1978-13	3 bed house – Plot16
1978 -14	3 bed house- Plot 15
1978-20	Cycle store details



“15. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a timetable approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved and permanently retained.”

8. **Comments in relation to 143292** - Beyond housing land supply, the other main planning consideration relating to the determination of planning application 143292 and the subsequent appeal was landscape and visual impact. In the Appeal Decision (see paragraph 54), the Inspector reached the conclusion that the proposed landscaping scheme would mitigate residual impacts so that planning permission could be granted.
9. Unfortunately, the appeal decision set planning conditions containing two significant errors (which must be considered errors in view of the importance of the proposed landscaping scheme to overcoming residual landscape and visual impacts).
10. The first error was to not include submitted detailed landscape plans in the list of approved details under Condition 2. The relevant plans (Ref F20142503pl - plan PRI 17891-11E-sheet1, PRI 17891-11E-sheet2, PRI 17891-11E-sheet3 and PRI 17891-11E-sheet4) were submitted to the appeal and in the possession of the Inspector.
11. Given the omission, the error was compounded by Appeal Decision Condition 15, which explicitly removed a requirement on the applicant (which had been specifically requested by the LPA in the appeal submission on conditions) to secure approval of landscape details prior to commencement.
12. The result was a condition (15) which required the development to be undertaken in accordance with approved details which were not specified in Schedule 1, nor in the condition and for which no further approval was required.
13. Approved plans 1978-01E and 1978-11B referred to in Condition 2 show areas of planting adjacent to development and within the development, which confirm that the areas outside the built development should be landscaped and planted. However, these are of a general nature and do not show clear boundaries.
14. Despite this lack of clarity, it is clear that the approved details referred to in Condition 2 include submitted documents not contained with Schedule 1. For example, Site Layout drawing 1978- 01E arguably contains insufficient detail for a clear interpretation of the specific requirements of Conditions 4, 5 and 6. Condition 7 refers to a drawing not on the Schedule 1 of condition 2. Other conditions refer to documents not on the schedule also. The condition does not say that the approved details are defined by or contained wholly within Schedule 1.
15. With regard to landscaping provision on this scheme, Landscape Officer comments in relation to Outline Planning Application 232704 for development on the site of the current Reserved Matters application refer to the non-completion of the landscape scheme on the Canberra Lake Way development where it adjoins that site. On the ground, this development has been implemented in close accordance with submitted plans PRI 17891-11E-sheet1, PRI 17891-11E-

sheet2, PRI 17891-11E-sheet3 and PRI 17891-11E-sheet4, except where it relates to the external boundary planting with the current application site.

16. There is a clear need for the completion of submitted and approved plans in all their respects in relation to the development scheme on the Canberra Lake Way.

Outline Planning Permission 232704

17. **Indicative Site Layout** – The boundary of outline planning application 232704, for up to 75 dwellings, overlapped the boundary of the planning consent for Canberra Lake Way (143292). As stated above, the consented landscaping scheme for 143292 was not implemented where this overlap occurred, but was in all other respects. The submitted indicative layout had some regard to the landscaping buffer to the rear of properties on Canberra Lake Way through its retention, except where this was removed behind nos. 8 to 10 Canberra Lake Way and the removal of some buffer behind no.22. This is shown on an extract from the indicative site layout below.



18. **Commitment to safeguard the privacy of existing dwellings** – The applicant's submitted Site Analysis Plan DWG.102 showed that the privacy of existing adjoining dwellings on Canberra Lake Way and the Hawthorns would be safeguarded through the incorporation of buffers and the development mid-density dwellings in these areas. These are shown on an extract of the plan below.



Response to planning application 253071, Charvil

Andrea Pellegrini Ltd.



19. **Extract from Landscape Officer Response to 232704** – *“I note the DAS discusses the deliberate retention of an open space between the rear of the dwellings on the adjoining scheme and the rear of houses as proposed on this site. This apparently is to enhance off road pedestrian routes between The Hawthorns, the nearby school and Canberra Lake Way. As stated in the point above this space has no active frontages as it runs to the rear of dwellings and doesn’t create a direct link through the northern part of the site into Canberra Lake Way. I consider this will create an unsafe space that will attract anti-social behaviour. A more appropriate design solution would be for the new dwellings to directly back onto the existing development with an attractive linear park created through the centre of the site.*
20. *The landscape scheme will need to be integral to the scheme design and incorporate structural tree planting in the public realm and especially in the street scene. The revised NPPF 2021 advocates the inclusion of trees within new streets (paragraph 131) and a high-quality integral landscape scheme is required by MDD Local Plan Policy CC03, therefore the site layout will need to address these requirements which will also benefit the scheme as whole.*
21. *It is noted that the landscape scheme approved at appeal on the adjacent site (143292) has not been fully implemented. The omissions appear to be the comprehensive native planting on the edges of the development to the rear of the dwellings. If this current application is approved, the layout will need to also incorporate additional planting associated with the landscape mitigation of the dwellings in Canberra Lake Way.”* (my underlining)
22. **Condition 31** - Outline Planning Application Planning permission 232704 set condition 31:
“31. Boundary Treatment - The reserved matters application for ‘Landscaping’ shall include a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected/ planted. Where appropriate, the boundary treatment shall include consideration of ecological permeability such as the provision of mammal gaps. The boundary treatment shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan before the development is

occupied.



Reason: In order to protect the privacy of adjoining and future occupiers and in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and local wildlife in accordance with Policy CP3 and CP7 of the Core Strategy.” (My underlining)

23. Comments – The Outline Planning Application 232704 makes a clear commitment to provide the landscape scheme similar to that consented and partly implemented under permission 143292. The commitment is explicit in seeking to safeguard the privacy of existing dwellings on Canberra Lake Way. Landscape Officer comments on the planning application proposal suggest the need to provide a different solution to address security issues. Condition 31 is applied in the decision notice in order to protect the privacy of adjoining and future occupiers in accordance with Policy CP3 and CP7. There is a clear requirement for Reserved Matters to set detailed site layout proposals such that a landscaping scheme can satisfy this requirement.

24. Residents of Canberra Lake Way request that the landscape buffer is provided as proposed in 232704 and security issues are addressed through the creation of gated access to the area.

Reserved Matters Application 253071

25. Comments on Landscape Masterplan (Drawing 2299.1001 Rev B) – The submitted landscape masterplan (see extract below) shows the removal of all landscaping provision between proposed new development and existing properties on Canberra Lake Way from that indicated at outline stage or consented in the previous planning permission. In view of previous commitments and planning conditions, this is inexplicable, unwarranted and unwelcome. The proposals do not respond positively to ensure implementation of consented provision for planning permission 143292, they do not respect the commitments made for the outline application to protect the privacy of adjoining and future occupiers in accordance with Policy CP3 and CP7. They do not respond positively to the comments of the landscape officer at that stage. They fail to address the purpose and reason for Condition 31 on outline planning permission for 232704.



Response to planning application 253071, Charvil

Andrea Pellegrini Ltd.



26. **Comments on Proposed Site Layout (DWG 100.F) – The Reserved Matters**
Proposed Site Layout is shown below.



27. **Safeguarding the privacy of existing properties** – The proposals place high density development directly adjacent to the rear of existing properties on Canberra Lake Way. The footprint of the proposed development is significantly closer than was proposed at outline



stage. This proposal is directly against the commitment made at outline stage set out on the site analysis plan and the indicative site layout. The proposals make it impossible to meet the requirement to safeguard the privacy of existing dwellings and represent a material and significant impact on the amenity of these properties.

28. As discussed below, there is a need to address the requirements of Policy CHARVIL3 and CHARVIL4 of the Draft Charvil Neighbourhood Plan in respect of ensuring that new development respects and has regard to adjacent existing development. The previously proposed buffer went some way to meeting this requirement and the current proposals do not.
29. **Security/Crime Concerns** - The proposed site layout introduces direct open access to the rear fences of existing properties on Canberra Lake Way, through the proposal to develop a car park and substation immediately to the rear of 24 and 25 Canberra Lake Way. This provides vehicular access up to the rear fence of properties and creates a security concern. The comments provided by Thames Valley Police to the outline application (12 November 2024) made it clear that, in relation to the indicative site layout, the creation of open sides and rears to properties would create clear vulnerability to burglary crimes which are mostly undertaken via the rear of properties.
30. Regarding the rear of properties on Canberra Lake Way, this concern (at the time) related to the provision of footpaths through the consented (appeal permission 143292) and proposed (outline permission 232704) landscape buffer, which would allow pedestrian access to the rear of properties and an alternative approach was requested. The Landscape Officer's comments echoed some of these concerns and requested a change of approach.
31. The provision of a car park in the location shown on the plan is not consistent with good design principles. The proposed site layout should be amended to remove the car park from this location. Proposed dwellings which are currently shown at 90 degrees to the rear of properties on Canberra Lake Way should be reorientated with a buffer between new and existing properties on the basis requested above. This will also address other amenity issues raised below.
32. The proposals in this location would introduce high-density development precisely where the outline indicated this would be highly sensitive to the adjacent development and where the density should be lower. The Reserved Matters approach should reflect the approach taken in the outline which was proposed then for sound reasons. However, if the area is to remain a higher density element of the proposed site layout then it should increase the separation distance between new dwellings and existing dwellings on Canberra Lake Way, in lieu of the consented/proposed landscape provision in previous schemes.
33. **Substation location** – A two-storey sub-station (as shown on the Storeys Height Plan 25.2208.3010 Rev A) is proposed immediately outside the rear garden fence of 24 and 25 Canberra Lake Way in the corner of the proposed car park. This proposal is shown on the substation plan (24.1911.4130). The substation has a pitched roof 4.3m in height to the ridge and 4m width x 4m length. Grills are set high in the walls.
34. Given previous comments about the need to ensure respect for existing development in

providing new development, the location of the proposed substation is particularly regrettable and confirms what appears to be an approach to development design which locates most of



the high density housing, visitor parking and development utilities infrastructure in a concentrated area of the site, very close to existing properties.

35. Impact on amenity of existing properties (25 degree rule) – An extract from the proposed site layout is set out below. Properties 8, 22, 23 and 24 Canberra Lake Way are affected by the proposed development of flank walls to two storey dwellings with pitched roofs on plot 26 and plot 36. These would present flank walls approximately 10m wide and over 9m high from finished floor levels, approximately between 10m and 12m from these properties. Based on a 12m distance ground floor windows at approximately 1m height, the angle of view to the ridge is approximately 33 degrees. No 23 Canberra Lake Way is particularly affected by this. The orientation of the view is south west. Given the width of the proposed flank wall, a significant mass of development would be placed close to the property creating significant overshadowing during the day into primary living space and over the gardens.

36. Request for site layout redesign - Multiple impacts on the amenity of existing properties arise Reserved Matters proposed site layout. These result from a failure to consider how existing and proposed developments will relate to each other in terms of character and amenity. The proposed development is a low-density development and yet has placed high-density development immediately adjacent to existing development on Canberra Lake Way along its edge. It is a direct contradiction of earlier proposals and pays inadequate regard to local plan and NDP policy requirements. The issues raised above would be best addressed through full reconsideration of proposed layout to address the issues raised more fully.



Draft Charvil NDP Policy

37. Policy CHARVIL3 of the Draft Charvil Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) says that development proposals should demonstrate how they respond to the design principles set out in the Charvil Design Guidance and Codes. This includes Code MS02 which seeks to maintain a sympathetic relationship to existing development in terms of scale, building orientation, building line, setback and use of materials and colours.
38. Policy CHARVIL4 addresses development form and densities. The policy requires new development to have regard to and take account of the character features of the parish. This includes key aspects of development design including building heights, boundary treatments, street patterns and development to complement existing development character. It seeks regard to be given to the density of existing development when proposing new development to ensure that proposals respect existing character and ensure this is addressed. Figure 23 of the Draft Submission Charvil NDP shows that South Charvil Estate Character Area (CA4) is an area of low-density development at an average density of 16.9 dwellings per hectare (ha).
39. The outline planning permission (232704) was for up to 75 homes on 6.97ha of land, providing a proposed density of around 10.8 dwellings per hectare. Given the available land and low densities proposed, there should be no requirement to compromise on good design. In accordance with Policy CHARVIL3 and CHARVIL4, the proposals should respect the transition in character between existing and new developments propose a development design that safeguards the privacy and amenity of existing properties. Previous proposals recognised this and there is scope to increase the separation between existing and new development to meet the same goals. Given that the proposals have placed the highest density development in precisely the area most sensitive to it, this change is needed to

OTHER MATTERS

40. **Pedestrian footpath link** - Pedestrian path from proposed development to Canberra Lake Way – the provision of a pedestrian walkway from the proposed development to Canberra Lake Way would give rise to the potential for spillover car parking in Canberra Lake Way as a result of potential under-provision in the proposed development (given car ownership rates among households in the area).
41. Within Canberra Lake Way, the main spine roads are adopted highway, whilst the parking spaces, greenspace and brick roads are owned and managed by a management company that residents pay for. These areas cannot be utilised for non-Canberra Lake Way parking. Parking provision includes some limited bays for visitors. There is insufficient capacity and no mechanism for management of impacts or maintenance to accommodate car parking from adjacent developments.
42. In addition, Thames Valley Police indicated some concern about security and crime resulting from the provision of a 'leaky cul-de-sac' from Canberra Lake Way. Because of these factors, it would be preferable to continue to omit the path from these proposals.

Appendix C: Redacted Formal Developer Correspondence Log (Emails with Bellway Homes Planning Manager)

Project: Land West of Park Lane, Charvil (Planning Application: 253071)

Dispute: Technical Layout and Northern Boundary Buffer (22 Canberra Lake Way)

Timeline: 17 May 2026 – 21 May 2026

Email 1: Initial Technical Proposal & Objection Notice

From: Sarah Beere [REDACTED]
To: Alex Hales [REDACTED]
Cc: Mike Cordrey [REDACTED] Kieran Neumann (WBC Case Officer) [REDACTED] Leon Cook [REDACTED]; Sam Akhtar [REDACTED]; Wayne Smith [REDACTED] Thames Valley - Customer Care [REDACTED]

Date: 17 May 2026, 10:57 BST

Subject: Technical Layout Proposal: Application 253071 – Land West of Park Lane, Charvil (Property: 22 Canberra Lake Way)

Attachments:

[Technical Layout Proposal Letter \(PDF\)](#)

[Annotated Masterplan Showing Technical Adjustments \(Image/PDF\)](#)

Dear Alex,

Please find attached our formal Technical Layout Proposal regarding the active Reserved Matters application 253071 (Land West of Park Lane, Charvil).

As the owners of 22 Canberra Lake Way, our property directly adjoins your northern boundary line along The Hawthorns. As detailed in the attached letter, we do not object in principle to the residential development of this land. However, we have a significant concern regarding the physical site layout, which currently places properties set against our boundary line.

This current layout completely fails to honour the Planning Inspector's explicit intent that a mandatory landscape buffer must protect our boundary. This omission has occurred due to a historic administrative error in the outline appeal documentation, which is now the subject of an active Stage 1 Corporate Complaint for Maladministration logged with Wokingham Borough Council.

We wish to resolve this issue collaboratively and productively. Our attached letter details a highly pragmatic, pre-determination Scheme Amendment that fully addresses this issue.

By utilising the unencumbered open zone on the western edge of the site along the Sonning Golf Course, an area your own reports show is free of statutory TPOs and RPAs, and where you already intend to landscape, your design team can shuffle the loop road and the row of properties (Plots 27–44) westward.

Our review show that this adjustment utilises available layout depth to reassign an extensive buffer back along our boundary, entirely resolving our maladministration complaint. Crucially, this layout tweak achieves this without reducing your overall housing density, total unit count, or premium asset mix.

We have copied the Planning Case Officer, our local Ward Councillor, and members of the Planning Committee into this correspondence to ensure full transparency. As this application is active and pre-determination, there is a clear opportunity for Bellway to formally submit an Amended Plan to the Local Planning Authority to secure this layout optimisation.

We welcome a discussion with your technical design team to structurally guarantee this reassigned buffer before revised plans are locked in with the case officer. We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Beere and Mike Cordrey
22 Canberra Lake Way, Charvil, RG10 9DH

Email 2: Developer Initial Response

From: Alex Hales (Planning Manager, Bellway Homes Ltd)

To: Sarah Beere

Date: 19 May 2026, 09:48 BST

Subject: RE: Technical Layout Proposal: Application 253071 – Land West of Park Lane, Charvil

Good Morning Sarah,

Thank you for your email and the attached plan.

I am sorry to read that you remain unhappy with the proposals. We felt the revised submission moved significantly from our initial submission and demonstrated a number of positive responses to comments received during the first round of consultation. The changes are significant and include the introduction of a landscaped buffer behind the properties in Canberra Lake Way and an increase to the separation distance between our new homes and those in Canberra Lake Way.

We will continue to work positively with WBC's planning officers as this application progresses towards determination and will be guided by them in respect of any further amendments that might be deemed necessary.

I note that you have copied in the case officer, Kieran Neumann, to this correspondence however I would encourage you to make sure that your letter is submitted as a formal response to the application consultation to ensure full account can be given to the points raised during the determination process.

Kind regards,

Alex Hales

Planning Manager

Bellway Homes Limited (Thames Valley)

Email 3: Resident Follow-Up & Technical Clarifications

From: Sarah Beere [REDACTED]
To: Alex Hales [REDACTED]
Cc: Mike Cordrey [REDACTED] Kieran Neumann
[REDACTED] leon.cook@[REDACTED];
sam.akhtar@[REDACTED]; wayne.smith@[REDACTED] Thames
Valley - Customer Care [REDACTED]
Date: 20 May 2026, 11:20 BST
Subject: Re: Technical Layout Proposal: Application 253071 – Land West of Park
Lane, Charvil (Property: 22 Canberra Lake Way)

Dear Alex,

Thank you for your response. However, we note with significant concern that your email completely fails to address any of the three direct technical questions we posed, nor does it acknowledge the viable layout solution we formally presented to you.

To clarify the record, your current submission cannot be characterised as an improvement. While we acknowledge the layout has changed, a physical reconfiguration does not automatically yield a planning benefit. The amendments you have introduced fail to deliver the sufficient, measurable mitigation required to be considered a genuine improvement. The "landscaped buffer" you refer to is entirely tokenistic—a narrow, unusable strip of residual space that fails to respect the Planning Inspector's explicit intent for a robust, protective mitigation screen.

Furthermore, the layout currently on the portal is physically worse for the northern boundary than the concepts originally presented to us during your Canberra Lake Way 'consultation'.

We are resubmitting our specific technical questions and expect a direct, professional response regarding the site's layout constraints:

- 1. What specific technical or engineering barrier prevents your team from shifting the internal loop road and Plots 27–44 westwards into the unencumbered blue zone running along the Sonning Golf Course?**
- 2. Given that your own Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirms the western boundary is entirely free of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and Root Protection Areas (RPAs), why have you chosen to crowd our active residential boundary instead of utilising this clear, open green space?**
- 3. Why is Bellway choosing to landscape and plant extensively at the golf course end of the site, while simultaneously forcing two residential properties tightly against our established boundary line?**

Your suggestion that you will simply be "guided by WBC's planning officers" is a clear attempt to bypass proactive developer engagement. As this application is pre-determination, your team possesses full autonomy to submit an Amended Plan to resolve this dispute collaboratively before the Council is forced to intervene.

Please be assured that this correspondence, along with your response, is being uploaded directly to the planning portal as a formal consultation objection. Furthermore, it will be added as supplementary evidence to our active Stage 1 Complaint for Maladministration against Wokingham Borough Council regarding the historic administrative omission of this mandatory buffer.

We remain open to a constructive, structured discussion to guarantee a reassigned buffer before your plans are locked in. However, if Bellway refuses to provide a technical justification for crowding our boundary when an unencumbered alternative

exists, we will ensure this pattern of evasion is brought directly to the attention of the Planning Committee members via copy correspondence. As the strictly limited public speaking slots at the committee meeting will not afford us sufficient time to detail this uncooperative engagement orally, full transparency before the voting members will be established in writing beforehand.

We look forward to your direct answers to our technical questions.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Beere and Mike Cordrey

Email 4: Developer Final Position

From: Alex Hales (Planning Manager, Bellway Homes Ltd)

[REDACTED]

To: Sarah Beere [REDACTED]

Date: 21 May 2026, 10:09 BST

Subject: RE: Technical Layout Proposal: Application 253071 – Land West of Park Lane, Charvil (Property: 22 Canberra Lake Way)

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for your email.

I am sorry to say that I can only reiterate what I have said in my previous email – I feel the current proposals represent a significant improvement to the previous plans and we will continue to work with WBC planning officers and be guided by them in respect of the need for any further changes.

The incorporation of a landscaped buffer and the increased separation distances both go beyond the requirements of the local plan and in my view will help deliver a sympathetic development which accords with the requirements of the outline planning permission. In these circumstances I do not feel that it is necessary, or appropriate, to comment on the potential for an alternative layout.

I would be grateful please if you could direct any future correspondence on this matter through the appropriate channels at WBC.

Kind regards,

Alex

Email 5: Resident Final Notice & Escalation to Planning Committee

From: Sarah Beere [REDACTED]
To: Alex Hales [REDACTED]
Cc: Mike Cordrey [REDACTED] Kieran Neumann
[REDACTED]; leon.cook@wokingham.gov.uk;
sam.akhtar@wokingham.gov.uk; wayne.smith@wokingham.gov.uk; Thames
Valley - Customer Care [REDACTED]
Date: 21 May 2026 [Final Exchange Chain Close]
Subject: Re: Technical Layout Proposal: Application 253071 – Land West of Park
Lane, Charvil (Property: 22 Canberra Lake Way)

Dear Alex,

Thank you for your response. We note your position that Bellway declines to comment on alternative layouts and will instead defer entirely to the direction of Wokingham Borough Council's planning officers regarding any further required design changes.

Because your team has failed to provide any technical or engineering justification for crowding our boundary, especially when your own reports prove that the western perimeter along the Sonning Golf Course is entirely unencumbered by TPOs or RPAs, we have escalated this matter directly to Wokingham Borough Council. For the avoidance of doubt, we are lodging comprehensive, standalone material objections on the planning portal. This formal submission includes:

1. Our complete email exchange, explicitly documenting your confirmation that Bellway will modify the plans if guided to do so by the council.
2. The Independent Planning Report by Lee Searles (MRTPI), verifying the Planning Inspector's original intent for a mandatory 10m buffer.
3. An annotated site layout schematic demonstrating that transferring the landscaping infrastructure from your underutilized western boundary to our eastern interface protects houses 22, 23, and 24 Canberra Lake Way with zero loss of housing density and a net improvement to site biodiversity.

As you have indicated that Bellway will be guided by the Case Officer, we will therefore formally request that Kieran Neumann issue an immediate directive for an amended layout.

Furthermore, we have copied our Ward Councillors on this final exchange. Should Bellway resist any directives by Wokingham Borough Council to adjust these

boundaries, this complete pattern of uncooperative developer engagement will be provided in writing directly to the Planning Committee members ahead of the public vote.

We consider our direct correspondence on this matter closed and will await the Case Officer's formal instruction to your design team.

Kind regards,

Sarah Beere and Mike Cordrey
22 Canberra Lake Way, Charvil, RG10 9DH

[End of Log]

Technical Layout Proposal Sent to Bellway on 17 May 2026

Subject: Technical Layout Proposal: Application 253071 – Land West of Park Lane, Charvil

Proposed Amendment: Western Layout Shift into Unencumbered Zone to Maximise Eastern Boundary Buffer

Dear Alex,

We're writing to you directly as the owners of 22 Canberra Lake Way, Charvil, RG10 9DH, the property immediately adjacent to your northern boundary line along The Hawthorns, regarding the active Reserved Matters application (253071) with Wokingham Borough Council.

We wish to state clearly at the outset that in principle, we do not object to the residential development of this land.

However, we have a significant concern regarding the physical site layout. A historic administrative oversight in the outline appeal documentation accidentally stripped the enforceable status of a mandatory landscaping buffer along our boundary, a mitigation that the Planning Inspector explicitly deemed essential for the development to be acceptable. We have formally logged a Stage 1 Complaint for Maladministration with Wokingham Borough Council regarding this omission.

Our understanding is that because this application is currently active and pre-determination, there is a clear opportunity for your team to formally submit an Amended Plan to the Local Planning Authority to make the necessary layout adjustments we are requesting.

As shown in our attached annotation, there is a substantial, unencumbered open zone on the western boundary of the site (highlighted in the blue triangle) running along the Sonning golf course. Your own submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirms this edge is completely free of statutory Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and Root Protection Areas (RPAs).

We are asking you to utilise this full available space. By shifting the entire internal loop road and the row of properties (Plots 27–44) completely into this western zone, you can reassign that full depth back along our northern and eastern boundaries (marked in orange).

This layout shift fully restores and enhances the original mitigation intended by the Planning Inspector. Crucially, it does so while completely preserving your developable footprint, overall housing density, total unit count, and premium asset mix. Alternatively (or additionally) you can reduce the rear garden depth of the new plots to achieve the required setback.

While we wish to resolve this issue collaboratively, looking at your current masterplan forces us to ask several direct questions:

- What is preventing your team from moving the row of housing to allow for a comprehensive landscaped buffer along our boundary, as per the Inspector's explicit intent?
- Why have you chosen to place two properties incredibly close to our neighbouring boundary when there is extensive open green space available at the completely opposite end of your plot?
- Why crowd our residential boundary when your own layout shows you already plan to landscape and plant extensively at the opposite end of our boundary along the Sonning Golf Course boundary anyway?

We wish to see this development progress smoothly. However, we will fiercely protect our residential amenity.

We look forward to hearing a clear technical explanation from your team as to why this full layout adjustment cannot be achieved via an Amended Plan, and we welcome a discussion to structurally guarantee this reassigned buffer before revised plans are locked in with the case officer.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Beere and Mike Cordrey

Attachment: Annotated Masterplan Showing Technical Adjustments