

PLANNING REF : 251862
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Five Oaks
: 105 Reading Road, Finchampstead, Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG40 4RD
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Thomas Kirby
DATE SUBMITTED : 07/10/2025

COMMENTS:

Objection to Planning Application 251862 at Land at 78 Reading Road and to the Rear of 80 Reading Road, Finchampstead. RG40 4RA

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application on the following grounds, based on material planning considerations under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) and Wokingham

Borough Council's adopted development plan. This proposed site is not suitable for change of use and hopefully this application will not be considered:

1. Impact on Residential Amenity (Noise and Disturbance): The proposed change of use to light industrial (E(g)) and storage/distribution (88) would introduce additional vehicle movements and activities, leading to a substantial increase in noise and disturbance residences. The Noise Impact Assessment (dated 25 July 2025) indicates a +2 dB rating level above background, which 8S4142:2014+A1:2019 suggests could indicate low impact, but in this quiet countryside context, even minor increases would be perceptible and adverse. This contravenes Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (2010), which requires developments to protect residential amenity, and MDD Local Plan Policy CC06 on noise. The nature of the applicant's business could quite easily expose residents to asbestos and other hazardous materials.

The Applicant submits a 'Noise Impact Assessment; Headed (Indicative Site Plan 25 July 2025) This document shows the two positions of the noise monitors used to obtain the current noise level reports. 'Monitoring Position f is very misleading and irrelevant as it has been located to maybe obtain false high readings. Had it been located east, within the 'Application Site Boundary' and between 'building I & 2' the readings would be significantly less and show the level to be that of nor mal greenbelt countryside. The area benefits from little to no noise pollution with mainly the ambient sound of wind and wildlife. If this application was granted the noise levels would be very detrimental to my health and to that of the surrounding ence.

Highway Safety and Traffic Impacts: The Transport Statement (dated June 2025) predicts -19 daily vehicle trips, How would this be Policed including OGVs, (Other Goods Vehicles) but underestimates the noise intensification in a rural setting as they can be up to 6.6 metres long with a width of 2.55 meters and a weight of 44 tons. The access track that is owned by British Telecom and not by Mr Collard is shown outlined in red measures just 4.74 metres wide narrowing down to 4.10 meters. It is already in disrepair mainly to the applicant's illegal activities on the areas outlined in Red and blue over the last ten years. The track has no pedestrian pathway. Currently it is accurately estimated to be used by twenty seven

light vehicles a day and very seldom used by lorries. Any increased movements would exacerbate congestion and safety risks on Reading Road (4327), where ATC data shows 85th percentile speeds of 39-40 mph. This conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 111 (safe access) and C

Compatibility with Countryside Character and Local Policies: The site is outside development limits in the countryside, per the Policies Map and Core Strategy. Intensifying commercial use on brownfield land may conflict with Policy CP11 (proposals outside limits must protect environment) and Finchampstead Neighborhood Plan QAn) Policy AHD1 (development outside limits only if policy compliant). While precedent exists (lapsed ref. 193059), the Emerging Local Plan Update emphasizes protecting rural areas. This breaches NPPF Chapter 6 (rural economy) by not fully demonstrating sustainability.

Within the submitted documents (Planning Statements and Reports 'Transport Statement (redacted)) it is stated that; 'The site is currently vacant but was last used for a roofing contractors and minibus storage. This is not true as 'Building 1' shown in 'Planning Plans Location Plan - Rev A' was used many years ago for some storage of roofing materials but did not have planning consent to do so and was made to clear the land by Wokingharn Borough Council. Since then it remained empty.

The larger of the building (Building 2) has only been used to briefly store small minibuses of under 3.5 tonnes, (Three & Half) long before that was a chicken shed. Furthermore, part of the land outlined in 'Blue' directly adjacent to the area in 'Red' was a wonderful established fruit orchard with much wildlife of about three acres. This was completely bulldozed by the applicant. As above should have been reinstated by order of WBC but has not been done so to date. This document also omits the entrance to 80a Reading Road that is to the right of the proposed site entrance and at the end of the British Telecom track. There will definitely be bats roosting on the site.

There would also be the issue of noise and light pollution as floodlights would no doubt be required for operation especially in winter months.

Hours of operation. Those requested are completely unacceptable for the residential nature of the location. The only other business on this road has limitations of trading hours imposed upon it to limit the impact on residents. These are much less than those requested. Please see planning application number this information was recently supplied by a Council Officer. These reflect the permitted hours for property development to protect residents and should be followed as an absolute maximum.

No work of any sort shall take place and no machinery shall be operated on the premises before 7.30 am on weekdays and 7.30 am on Saturdays nor after 5.00 pm on weekdays and 12.30 pm on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. (786D)

08 REASON To protect the occupants of nearby properties from noise disturbance. (47R)

Additionally there is a stipulation that no lorries enter or leave the site without the presence of a banksman.

In summary, this application constitutes inappropriate development that conflicts with multiple core policies and must be declined.