PLANNING REF : 262221
PROPERTY ADDRESS : The Granary
: Blagrove Lane, The Granary Blagrove Lane, Wokingham
: RG414AY
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Melissa Jordan
DATE SUBMITTED : 24/11/2026

COMMENTS:
1. SCOPE OF THIS OBJECTION
I object to this application. I accept that outline permission 222306 was granted on appeal on 29 May 2025 (APP/X0360/W/24/3354667), and that the principle of development and the approved accesses are not open to challenge here. This objection deals only with the reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, and the information put forward to discharge the outline conditions.
The applicant asks for this application to be determined together with RMA1 (262220), and several key documents are shared between the two. I have objected separately to 262220. The grounds set out in that
objection on groundwater, ecology, bats, badgers, lighting and biodiversity net gain apply equally here, and are summarised in section 4 below.

Summary of grounds:
1. The Planning Statement misdescribes the Inspector's findings. 2. The Planning Statement is not specific to this site: its ecology and arboriculture sections assess RMA1, and its conclusion describes a different application.

3. The shared ecology, drainage and biodiversity evidence is incomplete (Conditions 4, 6(k), 22, 23 and 30).
4. The applicant's own documents give two different ancient woodland buffers, 15 m and 20 m.
5. No assessment has been made of the detailed layout's effect on the setting of the listed buildings at Blagrove Farm and Hutt's Farm. 6. The layout, appearance and levels do not respond to the rural edge, Blagrove Lane, or Leslie Sears and Viking Field (Conditions 2, 7 and 24; CS CP3; MDD CC03 and TB21).

2. THE PLANNING STATEMENT MISDESCRIBES THE APPEAL DECISION
Paragraph 8.1.3 of the applicant's Planning Statement (Savills, September 2026) states that the development "would result in a relatively limited change in the appearance of the site and would etain its open character". The Inspector found the opposite: that the development would fundamentally change a largely undeveloped greenfield site, that visual harm would persist in the long term, and that there would be significant harm from the loss ofgreen infrastructure and from perceived coalescence. Paragraph 7.4.1 repeats the claim made for RMA1 that "no significant adverse effects were identified" at outline stage.

Paragraphs 6.2.3 and 6.3.2 state that the Core Strategy and MDD policies have been found out of date, and that "this position was confirmed at the appeal in relation to this site". My understanding of the decision is that the Inspector gave full weight to most of the relevant policies, including CP1, CP3, CC03 and TB21 (decision raph 56). The Council should assess the reserved matters against

those policies with the weight the Inspector gave them, and should not rely on the applicant's summary of the decision.

3. THE SUBMISSION IS NOT SPECIFIC TO THIS SITE
The RMA2 Planning Statement repeats text written for RMA1 without adapting it:
- Paragraph 7.6.1, the only ecology assessment in the statement, refers to "ecological surveys of the RMA1 site" and to "the RMA1 proposals". There is no ecology assessment of the land east of ove Lane.
- Paragraphs 7.5.2, 7.6.5 and 7.8.6 conclude on "the RMA1 proposals" in the arboriculture, ecology and transport sections.
- Paragraph 8.1.1 describes this application as providing "the remainder of the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace ... land West of Blagrove Lane". This application is for land east of Blagrove Lane, and paragraph 1.2.1 confirms that it contains no SANG.

The condition compliance information also contradicts itself. Paragraph 1.6.1 lists Conditions 10 and 22 for discharge with this application. Appendix A marks Condition 10 as not discharged and Condition 22 (LEMP) as "N/A (Prior to commencement condition)". Appendix A also states that the non-native invasive species plan (Condition 12) is "To be submitted with RMA1". The Council cannot discharge conditions on the basis of a statement that does not consistently say which conditions it seeks to discharge, or which site it assesses.

4. SHARED EVIDENCE: ECOLOGY, DRAINAGE AND BIODIVERSITY
The applicant relies on shared documents for both phases. The defects identified in my objection to 262220 therefore apply here:
- Ecology: the Planning Statement (paragraph 7.6.1) states that up-to-date ecological surveys "are being currently being undertaken [sic] and will be completedby early 2027". The shared LEMP (9081.LEMP.002) still cites "the 2020 surveys" for its conclusions on protected species. It reduces the bat baseline to one sentence describing "common and widespread" species, relies on stopping tree work only if a bat isfound during the work, and does not mention badgers at all. My household has seen bats in the area around Blagrove Lane. The application contains no survey of which species use this part of the site, or where they roost and feed. The layout should not befixed before the 2027 surveys are submitted and assessed
(Conditions 22 and 23).
- Lighting: the biodiversity lighting strategy (Condition 30) is deferred until before occupation. This phase lies along Blagrove Lane, a tree-lined lane that the applicant's own Landscape Design Document (section 02.2) describes as a green corridor for wildlife. Lighting at the new crossings of the lane should be assessed now.
- Groundwater: the shared Flood Risk Assessment (P25-1549) presents only the drier May and June 2026 readings. The applicant's own winter monitoring (Soils Limited, 22377/WGWMR) recorded water between 0.40 m and 1.03 m below ground on 7 April 2026, still rising in four of the eight wells, and monitoring continues until February 2027. Condition 4(a) cannot be discharged until the full year of results is assessed.

- Biodiversity net gain: the calculation relies on a February 2024 note with a broad-habitat gain of only 0.14%. Paragraph 7.6.4 states

that gains will come from new habitats "and if required by offsite measures". A recalculated, phase-specific metric is required by Condition 6(k).

5. THE ANCIENT WOODLAND BUFFER: 15 METRES OR 20 METRES?
The Landscape Design Document (Aspect, section 02.3, "Buffer zone and Soft Edges") commits to "a 20m woodland buffer" around the ancient woodland. The Tree Protection Plan submitted with RMA1 (Aspect, 12876_AMS.001 Rev B) marks an "Ancient Woodland Minimum 15m Buffer". The two documents cannot both be right. The Standing Advice of Natural England and the Forestry Commission treats 15 m as a minimum, to be increased where impacts extend further. The 20 m buffer described in the Landscape Design Document should be secured by condition across both phases, shown on all approved drawings, and kept free of gardens, paths and drainage features.

6. SETTING OF THE LISTED BUILDINGS AT BLAGROVE FARM AND HUTT'S FARM
The Planning Statement (paragraph 2.1.3) confirms that "two groups of listed buildings are located outside but close to the northern and western edges of thesite". The presentation layout (102505-BEL-TV-201) shows Blagrove Farm immediately north of the site, next to a drainage basin and new homes, and Hutt's Farm to the west. The Planning Statement deals with heritage only by referring back to the outline assessment (paragraph 7.4.1). Layout, scale and appearance are exactly the matters that determine the effect on the setting of these
buildings, and they were not fixed at outline stage. I could find no heritage assessment of the detailed proposals among thesubmitted documents. The Council must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings. It should require a heritage statement assessing the detailed layout, building heights, materials, boundary treatments and drainage features nearest to both farm groups before determining the application.

7. LAYOUT, APPEARANCE AND THE RURAL EDGE
The site lies between Blagrove Lane and the open land of Leslie Sears Field and Viking Field. The Landscape Design Document describes rove Lane as "a tree lined rural route" whose hedgerows give "a strong sense of enclosure" (section 02.2), and promises a "softer landscape transition" to the east to "reduce the visual relationship between the new development and Viking Field" (section 02.3). The submitted
details do not deliver that:
- Appearance: Street Scene 201 (102505-BEL-TV-SS201) shows a run of red-brick detached houses with garages, labelled "Parkland Character". This is a standard suburban design that does not respond to a rural lane edge or to two listed farm groups.
- Scale: paragraphs 4.3.1 and 7.2.3 say building heights will be only "broadly in accordance" with the Building Heights Plan PP06 Rev C, including 2.5-storey buildings. Condition 2 requires the reserved matters tobe "substantially in accordance". The applicant should show where any building exceeds the parameter plan.
- Levels: the street scene notes state that "ground levels and finished floor levels are indicative only and subject to engineers' detailed design". The levels plan required by Condition 24 has not been submitted. Given the shallow groundwater on this site, raised levels could affect existing homes in Roberts Grove and Blagrove Drive to the north. Levels should be fixed and assessed before approval. - Viking Field and Leslie Sears Field: the layout shows

new path connections through the eastern boundary into this open space. Local residents have previously pointed out that the trust terms for Viking Field require a substantial boundary on its western side and the
protection of the boundary oaks. The Council should confirm that the proposed connections and boundary treatment are consistent with those terms, and that the eastern planting belt is deep enough to provide the transition the applicant describes.

8. CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC

This phase is reached from Blagrove Lane. Blagrove Lane, Evendons Lane, Doles Lane and Edneys Hill are narrow lanes that already carry more traffic than they were built for. The CEMP (Condition 16) should require all construction traffic for this phase to use the Barkham
Road access and the new spine road, with no construction traffic on those lanes. The phasing plan (Condition 13) should require the spine road to be complete before construction starts in this phase.

9. CONCLUSION AND REQUESTS

The Planning Statement for this application misstates the Inspector's findings, assesses the wrong site in its ecology and arboriculture
sections, and contradicts itself on which conditions it seeks to discharge. It relies on sharedevidence that is incomplete by the applicant's own account. I ask the Council to refuse the reserved matters, or not to determine them, and not to discharge Conditions 4, 6, 7, 10 and 22, until the applicant has:
1. Submitted a corrected Planning Statement that assesses this site, and states consistently which conditions it seeks to discharge.
2. Completed the 2027 ecological surveys, including bat, badger and reptile surveys covering the land east of Blagrove Lane, and revised the LEMP accordingly.
3. Submitted a lighting strategy for Blagrove Lane and its crossings.

4. Completed the full year of groundwater monitoring and submitted a levels plan under Condition 24.
5. Committed to the 20 m ancient woodland buffer across both phases.
6. Submitted a heritage assessment of the detailed proposals on the setting of Blagrove Farm and Hutt's Farm.
7. Revised the appearance of the homes along Blagrove Lane and the eastern edge to reflect the rural setting, and shown compliance with the Building Heights Plan.
8. Confirmed that the connections to Viking Field and Leslie Sears Field are consistent with the land's trust terms.
9. Submitted a phase-specific biodiversity metric.

Please notify me of the committee date if the application is to be determined by the Planning Committee.