

PLANNING REF : 253113
PROPERTY ADDRESS : The Gables
: Wards Cross, Hurst
: RG10 0DS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr N Willson
DATE SUBMITTED : 24/01/2026

COMMENTS:

I write to object to the above planning application for the demolition of the existing dwelling at Clear View Cottage and its replacement with a substantially larger dwelling, together with a proposed car port and the retention of a large ancillary outbuilding.

My objection relates primarily to the scale, proportionality, cumulative impact, and lack of transparency in how the development has been presented and assessed. These matters are directly relevant to policies CP3 and CP11 of the Wokingham Core Strategy, TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery DPD, and the corresponding provisions of the emerging Local Plan Update, all of which require development to be proportionate, well-related to its context, and not to result in overdevelopment of a site.

- Lack of Transparent Existing vs Proposed Comparison

The application fails to provide a transparent comparison of existing and proposed development. While the proposed dwelling's GIA is clearly stated, no equivalent floorspace or volume figures are provided for the existing dwelling, nor is the substantial ancillary outbuilding quantified or assessed as part of the overall residential quantum. The cumulative effect of the replacement dwelling, car port, and large ancillary outbuilding results in a scale and intensity of development that goes well beyond a like-for-like replacement.

This omission is particularly significant in a replacement dwelling context, where interested parties must be able to objectively assess whether the proposal represents a proportionate form of development relative to what currently exists on the site. In the absence of this information, the proposal cannot be properly assessed against Core

Strategy policies CP3 and CP11, which require development to be appropriate in scale, form, and intensity.

- Scale and Proportionality of the Replacement Dwelling

The supporting Design and Access Statement refers to a "500m dwelling" without defining what the area metric is.. However, the submitted floor plans clearly identify GIA per floor, which when combined indicate a total floorspace of approximately 578m . This discrepancy is not reconciled or explained in the application documents. The lack of clarity materially hinders a proper assessment of scale, proportionality, and overdevelopment, particularly for those who may reasonably rely on the headline figure presented in the supporting narrative. This is contrary to the objectives of Policy TB21, which requires development proposals to be clearly justified and capable of proper assessment.

Even without a quantified GIA for the existing dwelling, the submitted plans and elevations clearly demonstrate that the proposed

house

represents a very substantial increase in built form, massing, and residential floorspace compared with the modest existing cottage.

This cannot reasonably be characterised as a modest or proportionate replacement dwelling. Instead, it represents a step-change in intensity and visual presence on the site, with a materially greater impact on character, spatial hierarchy, and the perception of development within the plot. Such a scale of change conflicts with the requirement under CP11 and the emerging Local Plan Update that replacement dwellings respect the character and scale of development in their surroundings.

- Cumulative Impact of Ancillary Development

The proposed car port and the large ancillary outbuilding must be assessed cumulatively with the main dwelling. I estimate that the ancilliary buildings increase the built area from 578 square meters to something between 778 and 838 square meters.

While the car port may appear modest in isolation, it nevertheless contributes additional built mass, site coverage, and residential infrastructure. When combined with the significantly enlarged dwelling, it reinforces a pattern of estate-style development rather than a simple replacement house. This cumulative approach is consistent with long-established decision-making under CP3 and TB21, which require the overall impact of development to be considered rather than its components in isolation.

The ancillary outbuilding is particularly concerning. It already exists and yet is being included in this planning application for approval. Is that because the existing outbuilding has no planning permission, or is it simply included for completeness?

Either way, in planning terms, this constitutes ancillary residential floorspace and should be treated as part of the overall residential quantum of development. Its scale is such that it materially adds to the intensity of development on the site and further undermines any suggestion that the proposal is a proportionate replacement dwelling. The failure to quantify or assess the outbuilding's floorspace alongside that of the main dwelling is a significant omission and risk s understating the true scale of the proposal, contrary to the requirements of TB21 and the spatial principles of the emerging Local Plan Update.

- Overdevelopment and Character Harm

Taken together, the replacement dwelling, car port, and large ancillary outbuilding create a cumulative level of built form that results in overdevelopment of the site. The proposal reads as a residential compound rather than a replacement dwelling and would materially alter the character and spatial balance of development ithin the plot. This level of development goes beyond what can reasonably be considered proportionate or sympathetic to the existing pattern of development and should be resisted on grounds of scale, overdevelopment, and harm to local character, in conflict with Core Strategy policies CP3 and CP11, Policy TB21, and the direction of travel set by the Local Plan Update.

For the reasons set out above, the application fails to provide the clarity and evidence required to properly assess the scale and proportionality of the proposed development. The cumulative impact of the enlarged dwelling and ancillary buildings represents an unjustified intensification of residential development and is not supported by a transparent or balanced assessment of existing versus proposed built form.

I respectfully request that WBC either refuse the application or require the submission of a comprehensive and transparent floorspace and volume comparison (including all ancillary buildings) before any determination is made.

Yours sincerely,

Nick Willson