

PLANNING REF : 251359
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 145A Nine Mile Nine Mile Ride
: Wokingham, Bertshire
: RG40 4HY
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Alison Sands
DATE SUBMITTED : 08/07/2025

COMMENTS:

I'm writing to object to the planning application for a static caravan and associated hardstanding on the plot next to my home on Nine Mile Ride.

This proposal does not fit in with the character of the area. This is a residential street made up of permanent brick houses with clear front and rear gardens. The proposed caravan will be placed side-on to the road, constructed from completely different materials, and positioned on a plot that will be almost entirely hardstanding. It's starkly out of place and will stand out from the surrounding properties in a way that negatively affects the visual appearance of the street.

Putting the type of structure aside, the application is seriously lacking in key details. There is no scale drawing provided, no elevations, and no clear measurements from boundaries. I have no idea how tall the structure will be or how it will sit in relation to neighbouring homes. This lack of clarity makes it very difficult to assess the true impact of the proposal on the site and surrounding properties - including matters such as visual dominance and privacy. From what can be seen on the basic site plan, the caravan will be positioned side-on to the road, meaning its windows will directly face my property, without height measurements or elevation drawings, it is impossible to judge the full extent of the overlooking, but it is clear that this arrangement will have a direct and negative effect on our privacy and enjoyment of our outdoor space.

The plan mentions three parking spaces, but only two are shown. I'm especially concerned that the narrow strip of land running down the side of my property will be used for parking or vehicle access, which would bring noise, lights, and pollution right up to my boundary, again impacting on privacy and enjoyment of our outdoor space.

The biodiversity assessment adds to the misrepresentation. It assesses the site based on its current state after the clearance and felling not what was there before. This skews the environmental impact and underplays the harm already done.

Despite claims made in the application the site lacks the essential infrastructure to support the site, including proper access to sewage, water, and electricity connections. There are no drainage and sewage plans. If permission is given for hardstanding it could lead to issues in surrounding properties if drainage is not implemented correctly. Details on foul sewage is conflicting and does not have plans or details on implementation.

The proposal also impacts neighbouring homes in other ways most obviously, through the repositioning of replacement trees. When the original trees were illegally felled the council issued a replanting order. But in the application, the new tree locations don't match what was then proposed. All five replacement trees have been pushed to the site's boundaries. Three of the trees are shown right against my boundary fence, one of them is shown extremely close to my home, right next to a low roof. This isn't replanting for habitat it's tactical relocation for planning convenience.

These trees are not being returned to their original spots. They're being shoved onto neighbouring fences where they will cause obvious long-term problems: overhanging branches, root spread, leaf drop, building damage, blocked light, and all the conflict that comes with trying to manage protected trees you didn't plant. Every one of these new trees will carry a preservation order. The original TPO covered the trees as a group the replanting does not reflect this. That's not restoration it's offloading the problem.

The applicant's justification for the development is also based on false claims. They say there was a caravan on this plot in the 1990s, but that's not accurate. A caravan used as an office was located much further back on a different section of the property well-screened and not on this site. They also state that the site has always been hardstanding. Again, this is not true. Anyone familiar with the area knows that until very recently it was green space, with grass and mature trees.

Unauthorised work that has already occurred on the site:

- Protected trees were felled without consent.
- Pavement outside the plot was dug up to access water and power without permission.
- All vegetation and habitat have been lost, and the ground has been flattened and levelled.
- These works were done before any planning application had even been submitted.

This shows a clear disregard for proper planning processes. It raises serious concerns about whether this application can be trusted or enforced effectively going forward. In conclusion, this proposal is out of keeping with the surrounding homes, covers far too much of the plot in hardstanding, causes a direct loss of privacy, relies on inaccurate and misleading claims, and is built on a foundation of unauthorised activity. I strongly urge the council to recommend that this application be refused.