

PLANNING REF : 262159
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Upper Culham Lane
:
: RG108NP
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Jamie Lawlor
DATE SUBMITTED : 02/10/2026

COMMENTS:

To whom it may concern,

I wish to object to this application.

What concerns me most is the way in which this development has been carried out. According to the applicant's own statement, the track and walkway were constructed in February 2026, yet no application was submitted at that time.

The works were only identified after an enforcement officer visited the site in August 2026 following a complaint relating to the wider polo proposal. By then, the development had apparently been in place for around six months without planning permission.

The fact that a retrospective application was only submitted once the unauthorised works had been identified raises concerns that the development proceeded in advance of the planning process being completed and may not have come to the Council's attention had a complaint not been made.

In my view, this should weigh heavily in the assessment of the proposal.

I also have concerns regarding the accuracy of the information submitted. The application form states that there are no trees or hedges on or adjacent to the site. However, the Landscaping Details Statement refers to established hedging surrounding the site, and photographs submitted with the application appear to show both hedging and a mature tree alongside the track.

These discrepancies call into question the reliability of the application documents and raise concerns about the accuracy of the information being relied upon to determine this application.

A further concern is the applicant's description of the works as "temporary measures pending determination of the main application". If that is genuinely the intention, it is unclear why no specific timescale for removal or restoration has been included within the application.

Without such a condition, there appears to be nothing preventing works described as temporary from remaining in place indefinitely and effectively becoming permanent.

Finally, whilst this application relates specifically to the exercise track and walkway, the applicant's own statement makes clear that the works were undertaken in readiness for the polo season. This reinforces the impression that the development is connected to the wider proposals for the site, despite those proposals not yet having

been determined. This, together with the retrospective nature of the application, raises serious concerns regarding the applicant's approach to the planning process.

For these reasons, I object to the application and ask that these concerns are fully considered before any decision is reached.

Jamie Lawlor