

PLANNING REF : 260921
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 12 De Vitre Green
: RG40 1SE
: Wokingham, Berkshire
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Caroline Burwood - Randall
: RG40 1SE
DATE SUBMITTED : 12/05/2026
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Caroline Burwood - Randall
DATE SUBMITTED : 12/05/2026

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS:

FINAL OBJECTION ON BEHALF OF RESIDENTS - This comment is made after extensive review of all documentation submitted by the applicant as part of this planning application.

I am submitting this final objection on behalf of my elderly parents who live on Harmar Close. Although I do not reside on the street myself, I visit them regularly and have witnessed firsthand the impact of the Three Frogs expansion.

I wish to highlight significant contradictions and material omissions in Greene King's planning submission that warrant careful consideration by the planning officer.

1. "Modest Scheme" Claim Contradicted by Application Form

Greene King describes this as a "modest scheme of works." However, their own application form reveals a floorspace increase from 331 sqm to 420.6 sqm (a 27% increase) and an outdoor seating increase from 48 to 150 seats (a 213% increase, tripling capacity). This is not modest. It represents a fundamental change to the use and scale of the premises.

2. Government-Approved Extended Licensing Hours for World Cup
The UK government has approved extended licensing hours for World Cup 2026 matches. For fixtures kicking off at 9pm-10pm, licensed premises can legally stay open until 2am BST. Greene King's application admits standard opening hours of 11am to midnight, but under government World Cup relaxations, the Three Frogs will be able to remain open until 2am during late-night matches running 11 June to 19 July 2026. This means matches kicking off at 9pm-10pm will generate noise until 2am. Residents will experience significant noise disruption during peak World Cup period.

3. Opening Hours Conflict with Residential Proximity
The application admits the premises will be open until midnight daily and until 2am during World Cup matches. The site plans clearly show this outdoor entertainment area is directly adjacent to residential properties on Harmar Close with minimal screening or buffering. Operating an outdoor sports entertainment venue until 2am metres from bedroom windows creates unacceptable noise impact on all residents whose health and wellbeing depend on peaceful sleep.

4. Parking Claims Contradicted by Resident Evidence
The application claims adequate car parking exists and no impact to parking. However, site plans show limited on-site parking relative to the expanded outdoor area of 150 seats. Multiple residents have

documented overflow parking on Harmar Close. The applicant admits customer numbers have increased substantially, and the mathematics of parking provision versus customer capacity do not support their claim. This displacement onto residential streets adds to the overall impact on neighbourhood character and amenity.

5. Impact on Young People's Education

Several households on Harmar Close include young children undertaking important examinations during the World Cup period (June-July 2026). It is entirely unreasonable and unfair that these young people should be forced to study and sit examinations whilst subjected to noise from late-night sporting events extending until 2am. Educational attainment should not be compromised by a business operating an unauthorised

: Wokingham, Berkshire

expansion in a residential area. This represents a material impact on the wellbeing and futures of young residents that the planning officer must consider.

6. Missing Mitigation Measures

The application provides no details of noise mitigation measures. Residents have documented that the applicant promised noise screening two years ago which was never delivered, and promised fence height increases which were never completed. No acoustic barriers are shown on the plans and no operational controls on noise are proposed. The development relies entirely on hoping residents tolerate the impact.

7. Admission of No Consultation

The applicant's own statement admits there was no public consultation prior to the works taking place. This reveals that the applicant knew planning permission was required, deliberately chose to proceed

without consultation, and is now seeking retrospective approval for development built in breach of planning control. This represents a deliberate circumvention of proper planning process.

8. Silence on Previous Application History

The applicant makes no mention of the 2012 application for similar works that was withdrawn. The fact that a similar proposal was previously abandoned following consultation with residents, yet the applicant later carried out the same works without permission, demonstrates that they were aware the proposal would be controversial. Rather than seeking the necessary consent, the applicant proceeded unlawfully and is now attempting to secure retrospective approval for an unauthorised development.

9. Impact on Residential Character and Wellbeing The application fails to address the transformation of a traditional local pub into a dedicated sports entertainment venue, the loss of acoustic and visual screening through tree removal, the intensification of use in a quiet residential area, the documented increases in anti-social behaviour, and secondhand smoke from the outdoor area drifting into neighbouring gardens.

10. Conclusion

Greene King's own application documents contradict their claims of a modest scheme with no parking impact and no community impact. The

government-approved World Cup extended licensing until 2am, combined with standard opening hours until midnight year-round, multiplied by 150-seat outdoor capacity directly adjacent to residential properties with minimal screening, creates the exact scenario of unacceptable noise impact that planning law under NPPF Paragraph 185 is designed to prevent.

Residents should be able to enjoy peace in their own home. Young children on the street should be able to sleep and study without disruption. This retrospective permission would deny residents those fundamental rights.

The 24 objections from residents and visiting family/friends, combined with the significant contradictions in the applicant's own submission, demonstrate material and ongoing harm to residential amenity that cannot be regularised by retrospective permission.

I strongly urge refusal of this application.

FINAL OBJECTION ON BEHALF OF RESIDENTS - This comment is made after extensive review of all documentation submitted by the applicant as part of this planning application.

I am submitting this final objection on behalf of my elderly parents who live on Harmar Close. Although I do not reside on the street myself, I visit them regularly and have witnessed firsthand the impact of the Three Frogs expansion.

I wish to highlight significant contradictions and material omissions in Greene King's planning submission that warrant careful consideration by the planning officer.

1. "Modest Scheme" Claim Contradicted by Application Form

Greene King describes this as a "modest scheme of works." However, their own application form reveals a floorspace increase from 331 sqm to 420.6 sqm (a 27% increase) and an outdoor seating increase from 48 to 150 seats (a 213% increase, tripling capacity). This is not modest. It represents a fundamental change to the use and scale of the premises.

2. Government-Approved Extended Licensing Hours for World Cup
The UK government has approved extended licensing hours for World Cup 2026 matches. For fixtures kicking off at 9pm-10pm, licensed premises can legally stay open until 2am BST. Greene King's application admits standard opening hours of 11am to midnight, but under government World Cup relaxations, the Three Frogs will be able to remain open until 2am during late-night matches running 11 June to 19 July 2026. This means matches kicking off at 9pm-10pm will generate noise until 2am. Residents will experience significant noise disruption during peak World Cup period.

3. Opening Hours Conflict with Residential Proximity
The application admits the premises will be open until midnight daily and until 2am during World Cup matches. The site plans clearly show this outdoor entertainment area is directly adjacent to residential properties on Harmar Close with minimal screening or buffering. Operating an outdoor sports entertainment venue until 2am metres from bedroom windows creates unacceptable noise impact on all residents whose health and wellbeing depend on peaceful sleep.

4. Parking Claims Contradicted by Resident Evidence

The application claims adequate car parking exists and no impact to parking. However, site plans show limited on-site parking relative to the expanded outdoor area of 150 seats. Multiple residents have documented overflow parking on Harmar Close. The applicant admits customer numbers have increased substantially, and the mathematics of parking provision versus customer capacity do not support their claim. This displacement onto residential streets adds to the overall impact on neighbourhood character and amenity.

5. Impact on Young People's Education

Several households on Harmar Close include young children undertaking important examinations during the World Cup period (June-July 2026). It is entirely unreasonable and unfair that these young people should be forced to study and sit examinations whilst subjected to noise from late-night sporting events extending until 2am. Educational attainment should not be compromised by a business operating an unauthorised expansion in a residential area. This represents a material impact on the wellbeing and futures of young residents that the planning officer must consider.

6. Missing Mitigation Measures

The application provides no details of noise mitigation measures. Residents have documented that the applicant promised noise screening two years ago which was never delivered, and promised fence height increases which were never completed. No acoustic barriers are shown on the plans and no operational controls on noise are proposed. The development relies entirely on hoping residents tolerate the impact.

7. Admission of No Consultation

The applicant's own statement admits there was no public consultation prior to the works taking place. This reveals that the applicant knew planning permission was required, deliberately chose to proceed without consultation, and is now seeking retrospective approval for development built in breach of planning control. This represents a deliberate circumvention of proper planning process.

8. Silence on Previous Application History

The applicant makes no mention of the 2012 application for similar works that was withdrawn. The fact that a similar proposal was previously abandoned following consultation with residents, yet the applicant later carried out the same works without permission, demonstrates that they were aware the proposal would be controversial. Rather than seeking the necessary consent, the applicant proceeded unlawfully and is now attempting to secure retrospective approval for an unauthorised development.

9. Impact on Residential Character and Wellbeing The application fails to address the transformation of a traditional local pub into a dedicated sports entertainment venue, the loss of acoustic and visual screening through tree removal, the intensification of use in a quiet residential area, the documented increases in anti-social behaviour, and secondhand smoke from the outdoor area drifting into neighbouring gardens.

10. Conclusion

Greene King's own application documents contradict their claims of a modest scheme with no parking impact and no community impact. The government-approved World Cup extended licensing until 2am, combined with standard opening hours until midnight year-round, multiplied by 150-seat outdoor capacity directly adjacent to residential properties with minimal screening, creates the exact scenario of unacceptable noise impact that planning law under NPPF Paragraph 185 is designed to prevent.

Residents should be able to enjoy peace in their own home. Young children on the street should be able to sleep and study without disruption. This retrospective permission would deny residents those fundamental rights.

The 24 objections from residents and visiting family/friends, combined with the significant contradictions in the applicant's own submission, demonstrate material and ongoing harm to residential amenity that cannot be regularised by retrospective permission.

I strongly urge refusal of this application.