

PLANNING REF: 253071

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 22 Canberra Lake Way, Charvil, RG10 9DH

SUBMITTED BY: Ms Sarah Beere

Objection to Reserved Matters Application 253071 - Technical Layout Amendment

I do not object to the development of 75 properties on this site in principle, but I cannot support this Reserved Matters proposal as it stands. I'm writing to formally log my strong objection to the proposed development on the grounds set out below.

Please note that I reserve the right to submit further objections, evidence, and representations in due course.

This objection introduces critical site history, an annotated layout schematic (attached to this objection), the full expert planning report by Lee Searles, and Bellway correspondence (dated 17–19 May 2026). This evidence collectively establishes that the developer has no technical constraints preventing a layout amendment, but is wilfully refusing to engage constructively unless explicitly directed to do so by Wokingham Borough Council (WBC).

The current layout fails to protect the existing residential amenity of number 22 Canberra Lake Way. It must be amended or refused based on the following material planning grounds and non-compliance with the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan (CNP):

1. Material Planning History & The Inspector's Original Intent

The Planning Department must evaluate this Reserved Matters application against its foundational planning history. As established in the Report authored by Chartered Town Planner Lee Searles, submitted on the planning portal for this planning submissions on 23rd January 2026 ([full Planning Officers report](#)), the Planning Inspector originally granted the outline consent on the explicit premise that a 10-metre depth landscaping buffer would be implemented along our boundary. This was deemed mandatory to mitigate the residual visual, privacy, and amenity impacts on existing residents.

Due to a subsequent administrative error in the translation and wording of Conditions 10–12 on the final decision notice, this buffer was stripped of its legal enforceability. However, the planning necessity and the underlying material requirement to protect our residential amenity remain entirely unchanged. This necessity is reinforced by Policy CH1 (Sustainable Development and Character) of the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan ('CNP'), which mandates that developments must integrate smoothly with existing settlement patterns and protect local distinctiveness.

The Council has a clear, live opportunity to rectify this omission before a final layout is locked in. Approving the layout, without forcing alterations, allows a technical administrative loophole

to override established planning protections and contradicts the core spatial objectives of the CNP.

2. Developer Admission of Layout Autonomy and Reliance on LPA Guidance

In the attached email trail, Bellway's Planning Manager, Alex Hales, explicitly states that they will *"continue to work positively with WBC's planning officers... and will be guided by them in respect of any further amendments that might be deemed necessary."*

By their own admission, Bellway possesses the spatial capacity to alter the layout but is deflecting the design choice entirely to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The burden now rests on the LPA to safeguard residential amenity in line with national and local frameworks. If the Case Officer fails to formally instruct Bellway to submit an amended plan, the Council is actively choosing to permit an oppressive layout despite a known, viable, and unencumbered alternative.

The full email log between Bellway Planning Manager, Alex Hales and the residents of 22 Canberra Lake Way, including their request for a technical amendment is included as appendices at the end of this objection.

3. Spatial Feasibility, Net Biodiversity Gains, and the Annotated Plan

A technical review of the site geometry demonstrates that the required layout changes are entirely feasible, result in zero loss of housing density, and will actively enhance the site's ecological output. We direct the Case Officer to the attached annotated site layout schematic:

- **Utilisation of the Unencumbered Blue Zone:** The developer's own Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirms that the western perimeter running along the Sonning Golf Course (delineated by the blue triangle on the attached plan) is entirely free of statutory Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and Root Protection Areas (RPAs). There is no physical, environmental, or engineering constraint preventing Bellway from shifting the internal road loop and housing rows westward into this open zone.
- **Zero Impact on Net Biodiversity:** Shifting the green infrastructure creates no net loss in the site's ecological areas. It is a direct spatial transfer of landscaped land from one section of the development layout to another.
- **Net Biodiversity Improvement and Boundary Equity:** The current layout plan only allocates 5 new trees to be planted within the blue western zone. Transferring this intensive landscaping footprint directly over to the eastern perimeter (delineated by the orange triangle on the attached plan) will allow a far greater density of mature trees and hedgerows to be planted. This directly achieves the ambitions of Policy CH10 (Green and Blue Infrastructure and Valued Views) of the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to protect and enhance green infrastructure networks. It improves the overall Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of the site while providing essential, equitable screening to protect the amenities of houses 22, 23, and 24 Canberra Lake Way and 5 The Hawthorns.

Annotated Site Layout Schematic: Drawing detailing the Unencumbered Blue Zone (Sonning Golf Course boundary) and the Eastern Boundary Orange Interface.



4. Technical Deficiencies in the Proposed Layout and Boundary Interface

The current layout introduces several distinct, unmitigated harms to 22 Canberra Lake Way, breaching Policy CH2 (General Design Principles) of the CNP, which dictates that new layouts must not result in an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties:

- **Excessive Rear Garden Depths Overriding the Buffer:** A review of the garden depths and areas plan indicates that the proposed plots on our immediate boundary (Plots 25 - 14m+ and 26 - 12 - 14m) feature disproportionately large rear gardens that exceed baseline local plan minimums. The developer has actively chosen to allocate deep private lawns directly over the area intended for our landscape protection. We request that the Planning Authority instructs the developer to reduce these private garden lengths down to statutory policy minimums, utilising the salvaged space to re-establish the independent soft-landscaping buffer line.
- **Inadequate Width for Viable Tree/Screen Planting:** The narrow, residual strip of land currently shown behind Canberra Lake Way is entirely tokenistic. It is physically

incapable of supporting the root structures and canopies of the mature tree and hedgerow species required to form an effective visual and acoustic screen. Squeezing planting into an unviable, restricted space guarantees failure of the landscaping scheme within a few seasons, completely undermining the mitigation intended by the original planning framework.

- **Total Absence of a Detailed Landscaping Plan:** The applicant has failed to provide a comprehensive, scaled Landscape Specification Plan identifying specific species, planting densities, or soil depths for this boundary interface. The Planning Department cannot safely conclude that residential amenity is protected based on vague green shading on a masterplan. This directly conflicts with the detailed delivery expectations of CNP Policy CH2.
- **No Long-Term Management or Ownership Strategy:** The application is entirely silent on who will own and maintain this boundary strip. If it is carved up and handed to the private gardens of the new dwellings (Plots 25 and 26), it will inevitably be cleared or fenced off by future residents, permanently destroying the buffer.
- **Complete Lack of a Boundary Management Plan:** There are no drawings or detailed text specifying the exact physical boundary treatments (fencing types, acoustic barriers, or retaining walls) to be installed between the Canberra Lake Way residential line and the new Bellway plots.
- **Structural Massing Pinch-Points:** The angled footprint of Plots 25 and 26 relative to the boundary creates a severe, intrusive massing effect. The corners of these dwellings create sharp, overbearing pinch-points that maximise the loss of outlook and privacy for our corner plot.

5. Misleading Presentation of Pre-Application Consultation: Prioritising Profit Over Planning

The Planning Department must reject the developer's attempts to present their community engagement in a favourable light. Bellway's assertion that they conducted a meaningful, constructive pre-application consultation with the residents of Canberra Lake Way is fundamentally misleading and factually inaccurate.

In reality, the engagement session held on Thursday 26th March was entirely tokenistic—a perfunctory, "tick-box" exercise. During this meeting, Bellway's representatives sat in near silence, failed to take any notes, and refused to answer critical questions raised by the affected residents. Far from using this feedback to improve the design, the layout now proposed in this Reserved Matters application has **actively worsened the spatial impact on 22 Canberra Lake Way** compared to the draft plans shown to us during that very session. Specifically, the spatial gap between the new development and our property boundary has been significantly reduced.

This completely violates the core expectations of early, effective engagement mandated by the [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\)](#), which explicitly states that development plans

should be shaped by early and effective community engagement. Furthermore, Bellway's evasive conduct directly breaches the principles set out in Wokingham Borough Council's own recently adopted [Statement of Community Involvement \(SCI\)](#), which dictates that pre-application consultation must be used genuinely to understand local needs, incorporate resident feedback, and resolve design conflicts before submission.

By ignoring community concerns and actively reducing the separation distance to squeeze more dense infrastructure against our boundary, Bellway has demonstrated an approach that places **corporate profit over sound planning principles**. It is **highly disingenuous** for the applicant to cite the 26th March meeting as a positive compliance milestone when their subsequent action was to decrease our physical separation gap, severely compromise our residential amenity, and completely disregard local planning policies.

Conclusion & Explicit Action Required by Wokingham Borough Council

To satisfy WBC Core Strategy Policy CP3, Section 12 of the NPPF, and Policies CH1, CH2, and CH10 of the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan, a buffer cannot be an accidental byproduct of a cramped layout; it must be a robust, defensive screen.

Because Bellway has stated they will defer entirely to your instruction, we request that the Case Officer issues an immediate, formal directive to Bellway Homes to submit an Amended Layout Plan that utilises a dual-mitigation approach:

1. Reduce the excessive garden depths of the adjacent plots to create an immediate physical offset.
2. Shift the development footprint westward into the clear, unencumbered space along the Sonning Golf Course boundary (the blue triangle).
3. Transfer and expand the landscaping infrastructure from the blue triangle to the Canberra Lake Way/ the Hawthorns boundary zone (the orange triangle), creating a dense planting screen that protects houses 22, 23, and 24 Canberra Lake Way and 5The Hawthorns.

Appendix: Correspondence Log – Bellway Homes & Resident

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 <sam.akhtar@wokingham.gov.uk>; Wayne Smith
<wayne.smith@wokingham.gov.uk>; Thames Valley - Customer Care
<thamesvalley-customer care@bellway.co.uk>
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
[REDACTED]

Email 2: Developer Initial Response

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

To: Sarah Beere [REDACTED]

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]; [REDACTED]
sam.akhtar@wokingham.gov.uk; wayne.smith@wokingham.gov.uk; Thames Valley -
Customer Care <thamesvalley-customer care@bellway.co.uk>
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]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
sam.akhtar@wokingham.gov.uk; wayne.smith@wokingham.gov.uk; Thames Valley - Customer Care <thamesvalley-customer care@bellway.co.uk>
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]

Appendix: 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

