

PLANNING REF : 260353
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 2 Aylesford Villas
: Wards Cross, Hurst, Berks
: RG10 0DT
SUBMITTED BY : Miss Gina Fisk
DATE SUBMITTED : 06/03/2026

COMMENTS:

Land North of Broadwater Lane (RG10 0DS) and West of Hogmoor Lane (RG10 0DH) Permission in Principle (PiP) for the erection of 5-7 dwellings and creation of access from Broadwater Lane

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to register my strong objection to Planning Application 260353, which seeks Permission in Principle (PiP) for residential development on land north of Broadwater Lane and west of Hogmoor Lane in Hurst. This application represents a renewed attempt by the same applicant following the refusal of Application 240583 and the subsequent dismissal of the appeal by the Planning Inspector in October 2025. The issues identified by the Inspector remain unresolved, and this proposal does not demonstrate any meaningful mitigation to his concerns.

In my view, the use of the PiP process for this sensitive, complex and previously refused site is inappropriate and undermines the extensive time, resources and public money already invested - particularly where there is no discernible public benefit, including no provision of

affordable housing. My rudimentary understanding is that the PiP process is designed for sites where development is considered straightforward and broadly acceptable in principle e.g.: brownfield sites in sustainable locations. This site does not meet those criteria. It is subject to numerous material planning constraints, previous refusals and an appeal dismissal. Using the PiP route appears to be a tactic intended to circumvent robust scrutiny, especially given the collapsing timeframe regarding the imminent adoption of the new Local Plan.

1.Heritage Assets. Although the boundary of the proposed site has been repositioned, the application still overlaps with the previously considered site and therefore still shares many of the previous material planning concerns. The applicant has not adequately

demonstrated how this proposal addresses the Inspector's reasons for dismissal of the appeal. The Inspector emphasised the need to preserve the setting of designated heritage assets located nearby. He stated: "I must give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings. Harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme." This new application moves development closer to several of these heritage assets (3 x Grade 2 listed and 2 x undesignated heritage assets) , increasing the conflict with Policy TB24 of the MDLP, which requires proposals to conserve and enhance the setting of heritage assets. No evidence is offered to demonstrate how that harm would be avoided or outweighed by public benefit.

2.Area of Special Character The inappropriate use of PiP makes it impossible to assess the impact on the AOSC.

3.Settlement Boundary The proposed site is outside the settlement boundary of Hurst in designated countryside. The proposal would represent unwarranted encroachment into open countryside and

contribute to harmful erosion of the rural character of the village.
4.Flood Risk There is long standing and well documented flooding and drainage failure in the immediate area of the site. Broadwater Lane, Hogmoor Lane and Poplar Lane suffer from foul and surface water

flooding, causing damage to property and significant distress to residents. The Environment Agency has reported an increased flood risk at this location within the last 12 months. Thames Water has made clear that it does not intend to address the inadequate pumping system serving the village. The drainage ditch on Hogmoor lane fills and overflows, rendering Hogmoor and Poplar lanes impassable. Additional hard surfacing and loss of permeable land from this proposal would worsen flood risk, yet no plan for any form of mitigation has been provided.

In conclusion, with the new Local plan very close to solving the local land supply challenges there is no requirement to permit speculative development in the countryside that offers no affordable housing, no infrastructure improvements, and no meaningful community benefit. I would ask once again, that you please refuse this application.