

PLANNING REF : 251862
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 80a Reading Road
:
:
: RG404RA
SUBMITTED BY : Ms w Rawso#2
DATE SUBMITTED : 07/10/2025

COMMENTS:

Ms Rawson 80a Reading Road, Finchampstead, Wokingham, Berkshire.
RG40 4RA
8th October 2025
Re: Planning Application 251862
Planning Department Wokingham Borough Council Shute End Wokingham
RG40 1BN

Dear Planning Officer,

Re: Objection to Planning Application 251862 at Land at 78 Reading Road and to the Rear of 80 Reading Road, Finchampstead. RG40 4RA
I again formally object to the above planning application: and list some points of clarification.

1. Garden Grabbing is not permitted under the National Planning Policy Framework. The owner associated with this application has over the past years purchased the land to the rear of 82 and 84 Reading Road (Document Submitted: Planning Statements and Reports 'Transport Statement (redacted)') Shown on the plan, page 14 is a Red area to the rear of 82 and 84 and boundaries with 'Tel EX' 80. This parcel of land was the garden of 82 Reading Road and has no permission other than. So would be classed as 'Garden Grabbing'. Opposite to this on the same plan outlined in part with 'Blue' and to the rear of 78 and 76 Reading Road the plan shows what was part of the rear gardens of the two houses. 78 is owned by the applicant and 76 was purchased by the same person who changed the boundaries before selling the house. This again is 'Garden Grabbing' and Policy Change in June (2010) removing gardens from the definition of "previously developed land" (UK Government under Decentralisation Minister Greg Clark.) is not permitted.

2. The application submits 'Planning Statements and Reports' (Doc Ref 'Planning Statement') 2.0 Background - Page 6 of 18 Section '2.5' They state - "Whilst there have been discussions between the applicant and the Council over activities on the site it has clearly been in constant use since at least 1099. This can be seen in available aerial photographic images." Submitting the photograph 'Source. Google Earth dated 12/1999. The image shows the illegal activities of a Mr S who was the previous owner. The photograph clearly shows the agricultural land enclosing Buildings '1' & '2' the illegally erected buildings and the illegal waist transfer site in operation. Wokingham Borough Council evicted the owner who I believe was imprisoned. The land was in part cleared (Much rubbish remains under ground) and some buildings demolished due to no planning permission. Thus proving the above statement is incorrect and the photograph is very misleading. Since then the only lawful use has been in the old turkey barn 'Building 2' this was to store over nights about six taxis that were under 3.5 tons with strict limitations set by WBC.

3. Lower down on the same image shows clearly the old orchard trees and field that the applicant purchased and then illegally cleared and removed the soil replacing it with hard standing. (old

road surface planings also known as road scalpings or tarmac planings / chippings) this will have polluted the land and does produces rain water runoff. The applicant was ordered to remove the thousands of tons of asphalt by order of WBC. However has to date failed to do so. (To dig out the hard standing to a depth of 20cm and reinstate with topsoil and sow with grass seed.)

4. Also on the same plan it is shown that the proposed access road (Owned by British Telecom and not the applicant) from the Reading Road is "6550mm wide" this is not correct and is just 4700mm at its widest narrowing down to 4100mm. Therefore it is impossible for two lorries to pass. It is also stated within ('Block Plan - Rev A) And within 'Planning Statements and Reports' 'Transport Statement (redacted) Page plan 135 and 137.

5. Submitted within this application is document 'Planning Statement and Reports' Doc Ref: Transport Statement (redacted) on page 137 of 150 the plan 'HGV VEHICLE TRACKING' shows the dimensions of the lorry to be 16.5m long and 2600mm wide. On page 139 of 150 it tries to demonstrate how two such HTV's would pass each other while on the Track. It is fact that the access track is just 4700mm at its widest narrowing down to 4100mm. Some how the applicant believes two vehicles with a total width of 5200mm can achieve this trick. At a very minimum the road would need to be at least 6100mm with no pedestrians as no path way exists. Therefore, taking the narrowest point of the proposed access road at just 4100mm it would simply be impossible to pass each other by the tune of -2000mm. (-2m) or about -3.5m with a pathway.

I trust that this application will be refused in full.