

PLANNING REF : 251396
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 47 Ryhillway
: Lower Earley Reading
: RG64AZ
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Ravi Varma Addala
DATE SUBMITTED : 24/06/2025

COMMENTS:

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a resident of 47 Ryhill Way to formally object to planning application 251396, which proposes converting the garage at 60 Ryhill Way into additional bedrooms, with the likely intention of using the property as a high-occupancy House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). We chose to move to this community for its calm, family-friendly character, and this proposal has become a source of significant stress and anxiety.

Our key concerns regarding this proposal are :

1. Overdevelopment / Over-Intensification: The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the property and over-intensification of use in a low-density residential street. No. 60 Ryhill Way was built as a single-family dwelling (approximately 200 m in size) with a certain intended occupancy. Cramming significantly more occupants into the house than it was designed for will exceed the capacity of both the property and the infrastructure of our street. This will place undue pressure on local services and utilities. It is also likely to create inadequate living conditions inside the property itself. Even the

previously refused plan for this property was deemed to amount to an overdevelopment of the site (in that case, due to an unsuitably converted outbuilding). We urge the Council to recognize that this new plan, by vastly increasing occupancy, similarly constitutes an unacceptable over-intensification.

2. Parking and Traffic Concerns: Ryhill Way is a narrow, no-through residential lane (a cul-de-sac) with very limited on-street parking available. Most houses here, including No. 60, have driveways for

only two cars. The application claims there is space for four cars on the driveway, but in practice it is unlikely to comfortably accommodate that many vehicles. An HMO at No. 60 could introduce 5-6+ vehicles owned by its residents, far exceeding the off-street capacity. The inevitable overflow of cars onto the street will worsen congestion and could block or choke our small road. This raises safety issues, as emergency or service vehicles might struggle to pass. It also increases hazards for pedestrians (especially children playing or walking to school) due to cars manoeuvring in a tight space.

Parking disputes and tension among residents are a real risk if this proceeds. Simply put, the street's design cannot handle the traffic load this HMO would generate.

3. Impact on Neighbourhood Character: Ryhill Way is, and always has been, a quiet, family-oriented neighbourhood composed of single-family homes. This character has remained intact since the estate was built, fostering a close-knit and stable community. Introducing a

high-occupancy HMO at No. 60 would be wholly out of keeping with the established character of the area. The transient nature of HMO tenancies (with frequent move-ins and move-outs) conflicts with the long-term residency typical on our street, potentially eroding community cohesion. Neighbours take pride in maintaining a peaceful environment; a multi-occupancy rental property could disrupt that

balance with increased comings and goings at all hours. Allowing this development would also set a worrying precedent. It could open the door for similar conversions on our road or nearby, fundamentally altering the makeup of our community over time.

Approving one such application makes it harder to refuse the next, so we ask the Council to prevent this precedent from being established.

4. Amenity and Wellbeing Impacts: A dramatic increase in the number of occupants at No. 60 will inevitably result in greater noise, urbane, and waste, which will negatively affect the amenity of neighbouring residents. The quiet enjoyment of our homes and gardens is at stake. With multiple unrelated tenants living in close quarters, the likelihood of frequent disturbances rises significantly.

Furthermore, more residents mean more refuse and recycling output. Excessive garbage or improper waste disposal could become an issue, potentially attracting pests or creating eyesores on collection days. Overall, the proposal threatens to diminish the peaceful, clean, and safe environment that existing residents have enjoyed for years. Elderly residents and families on the street would be especially

impacted by increased noise and activity at all hours, which can be very distressing to their wellbeing.

5. Lack of Community Consultation: We are disappointed by the insufficient engagement and consultation with local residents regarding this significant change. Such a major shift in property use should involve thorough communication with those who live nearby. Many of us on Ryhill Way learned of this application only indirectly or by our own efforts, rather than through direct notification from the

Council. Given the strong feelings and legitimate concerns in the community, more proactive consultation should have been undertaken. The lack of transparency has left residents feeling alienated from the decision-making process. We respectfully remind the Council that effective community consultation is key to maintaining trust and ensuring that developments integrate harmoniously. In this case, we feel the community's voice has not been adequately heard. Going forward, we request that the Council take our feedback seriously and keeps us informed on any developments with this application.

6. Suitability for Vulnerable Residents (Quality of Care): It has come to our attention via our local councillor that the intended occupants of this HMO might be vulnerable young people (such as unaccompanied minors or those in foster care). We want to emphasize that we support the provision of safe accommodation for vulnerable individuals. Our objection is not to the individuals in need, but to the overcrowded and unsuitable nature of this proposal. We are concerned that cramming a high number of young, vulnerable residents into a single dwelling will compromise their quality of life and care. These individuals often require a stable, nurturing environment. A property overfilled beyond its intended capacity is unlikely to provide the calm and space that such residents deserve. Overcrowding could lead to interpersonal conflicts, stress, and inadequate supervision or support. In short, we worry that this HMO setup would not be in the best interest of the very people it aims to house. A smaller-scale solution or alternative accommodation might serve them better. We urge the Council to consider whether approving this conversion truly aligns with its duty of care towards vulnerable residents.

7. Precedent and Cumulative Impact: Approving this application would have ramifications beyond just No. 60. It risks establishing a

precedent for similar high-occupancy conversions in our area. If one garage-to-HMO conversion is allowed on our street, others may follow suit. This trend would undermine the very character that makes our community desirable. We ask the Council to consider the long-term impact on the community: granting permission now might solve one housing need, but at the cost of eroding the fabric of a stable community for decades to come. Once the character is lost, it is extremely hard to reclaim. It is far better to avoid setting the precedent in the first place by rejecting proposals that conflict with established residential use.

In conclusion, for the many reasons detailed above, we strongly request that Wokingham Borough Council refuse planning application 251396. This development is clearly undesirable for our street and does not align with local planning principles or community interests. We moved to Ryhill Way because it is a safe, pleasant, family-centric place to live. The approval of this HMO-oriented conversion would fundamentally undermine that environment, leaving residents feeling unsafe, unsettled, and unheard. We believe the adverse impacts on parking, safety, noise, community character, and welfare far outweigh any potential benefit of the proposal. Thank you very much for considering our concerns. We respectfully ask for confirmation of receipt of this objection, and we would appreciate being kept informed of any updates or decisions regarding this application. We trust the Council will give substantial weight to the voice of the community in this matter and make the decision that preserves the wellbeing of our neighbourhood.