

To:
Planning Dept',
Wokingham Borough Council,
Shute End,
Wokingham,
Berkshire.

From:
Mr T. Ottlewski,
Uani, Hollybush Ride,
Finchampstead,
Wokingham,
Berkshire

15th October 2024

To Whom it may concern.

With regard to planning application 242440

I object to certain of the changes in conditions (see below) applied for in regard to the new build at Pennnywood, (formerly Kalevala) Hollybush Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham.

Objection to proposed boundary treatment at frontage with Hollybush Ride

Hollybush Ride, maintains a rural setting dominated by green frontages (see photos attached). Neighbouring properties are predominantly post & rail, chainlink, or chestnut paling that blend in to the rural setting with little or no negative impact on the visual appearance of the lane. Not only do the above fences have no detrimental impact on appearance, but combine well with hedging (that is of much value to wildlife and local character) and in most cases can grow through the fence.

The proposed iron railings are high, visually dominant, and would very much detract from the existing natural appearance of the property frontage that has prevailed throughout its developed life. Iron fences need painting so long term greenery is not an option, and planting is not enforceable in the future. If security is a concern, this can easily be achieved by, for example, a post & rail fence on the existing line, with a higher chainlink set further back planted between with hedging.

WBC should note that they refused permission for the neighbouring property Heathercot to have railings, and also refused permission at other nearby properties: Two Hoots (Hollybush Ride), Foxdale (Heath Ride) and most recently, Hollywood. Hollywood have used permitted development rights to erect a wall/railing boundary limited to 1 metre, a design that even at that height is at odds with the rural aspect of the lane.

Wokingham Borough's design guide favours fencing in sympathy with its surrounds and hedged frontages.

This design if passed would bring further unwelcome urbanisation into a predominantly natural landscape. As a replacement to a single storey cedar wood bungalow, the development has more than pushed the boundaries already, and approving this very long run of town style iron fencing would very much change the character of the frontage and detract from the appearance of the area.

Whatever fencing is ultimately installed, it should respect the line of the existing/previous fence.

Objection to re-designation of the upper room in the garage for leisure purposes.

The house has many thousands of square feet incorporating 4 floors and multiple rooms; it is hard to imagine that there is not an existing room somewhere that could be used for leisure. If permitted, this would open up the possibility that the garage could be used for a pursuit that would not be welcome in the main building eg involving excessive noise, or use as a sub-let, and if so could disturb the neighbours far more than the occupiers.

If classified for leisure, there would also appear to leave the property lacking in storage space.

The garage is a detached building set well away from the house, and I would urge that this re-designation be refused to ensure the garage in no way becomes part of the domestic arrangements of the main house, either for leisure purposes or as a dwelling of any sort.

Continued,

Objection to driveway surfacing/ drainage

The original property had a level area in front of the house from which water drained to the rear of the property and a shingle entrance drive that gently sloped down to the lane, even after heavy rainfall there were never any notable issues with regard to surface water run off.

The new surface is essentially non permeable and of considerable size, with driveway & parking area all falling away from the new build in the direction of the lane (Hollybush Ride). Within the margin of Pennywood's frontage is a shallow ditch, intended only for taking surface water away from the road, this runs under Pennywood's drive, into another shallow ditch to a point where it crosses sides via a conduit and continues until it reaches my neighbour's property, "Tall Trees". Out of good will "Tall Trees" laid a pipe to the rear of their property for the purposes of taking the small amount of surface water that found its way off the lane, rather than letting it pool on the lane surface further along. With modest or heavy rainfall, run off from the new hard surface at Pennywood seemingly overwhelms the capability of what was a previously effective design and this has already resulted in considerable flooding and damage to my neighbour's property (he has video evidence). This is surely unacceptable and doesn't respect WBC's design guide; either alternative porous surfacing needs to be considered, or substantially more effective drainage that is combined with pipework to take the water to the land at the rear of their property. Whatever scheme is decided upon, it must ensure that water does not accumulate below the surface and ultimately run below ground above the clay layer to affect the water level of neighbouring properties.

I hope WBC will agree the above are unwelcome changes and will refuse this application with regard to the above points.

Yours faithfully,

T. Ottlewski

See photos below:



Pennywood's existing chainlink fence within established shrubs/hedging

Continued.



Heathercot, riven post & rail (left of Pennywood)



Sylvan, sawn post & rail (right of Pennywood)



Diligence, rounded post & rail (next but one on right)



Uani, split chestnut paling (opposite Pennywood)



"Tall Trees", split chestnut paling (adjacent)