

Formal Planning Objection: Reserved Matters Application (Ref: 253071)

Submitted Date: 26th July 2026

PROPERTY ADDRESS:

22 Canberra Lake Way

Charvil

RG10 9DH

SUBMITTED BY : Mr Mike Cordrey

Primary Submission Objective: Adoption of the *Planning Voice* Alternative Layout (document “Planning Voice on behalf of 22 and 23 Canberra Lake Way - 253071” submitted to the WBC planning portal on 09/06/2026) as a Policy-Compliant Spatial Solution.

Supporting Enforceability Requirement: Securing Detailed, Legally Binding Landscaping & Management Conditions (Remedying Deficiencies of Appeal Permission 143292)

Policy Framework: Wokingham Core Strategy (CP3, CP7), MDD Local Plan (CC03, TB21, TB23), Charvil Neighbourhood Plan (CHARVIL 3, CHARVIL 4), Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD, and NPPF Chapters 4, 12, and 15.

1. Primary Objective & Executive Summary

As a neighbouring resident whose property directly borders this proposed development, I state clearly that I support the **principle** of developing this site for housing. I am not seeking to block housebuilding in Charvil, nor seeking to obstruct Wokingham Borough Council in meeting its local housing allocation targets.

However, sustainable development dictates that new housing must not be delivered to the severe, unnecessary detriment of established boundary homes.

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE: I formally request that Wokingham Borough Council require Bellway Homes to adopt the **Planning Voice Alternative Layout**.

This professionally engineered alternative scheme proves that a win-win solution is readily deliverable. It retains Bellway’s full quantum of **75 dwellings** while resolving the fundamental spatial conflicts of the submitted scheme by:

1. **Delivering a uniform, widened landscape buffer** protecting residents along both **Canberra Lake Way** and **The Hawthorns**.

2. **Shifting the new development** a few metres towards Sonning Golf course, into an area already set aside for landscaping, and rebalancing over-deep private gardens down to a fully compliant 11-metre standard to release the required spatial buffer footprint.
3. **Eliminating overbearing outlooks and direct overlooking** caused by angled building footprints.
4. **Establishing a functional, dark wildlife and bat corridor** in accordance with local ecological policy.

To ensure this spatial layout achieves long-term success, my **secondary requirement** is that Bellway be conditioned to back this alternative layout with fully detailed, scaled, and legally enforceable landscaping and management specifications, preventing a repeat of historical planning failures on this site.

2. The Primary Objective: Why the *Planning Voice* Layout Must Be Adopted

The submitted Bellway scheme compresses housing tightly against established boundaries, leaving a narrow, irregular, and unmanageable residual strip. The *Planning Voice* alternative layout demonstrates that this harm is completely unnecessary.

Boundary Impact Comparison Analysis		
Boundary Interface	Bellway Submitted Scheme (253071)	Planning Voice Alternative Layout
Canberra Lake Way (Eastern Boundary)	Squeezed, irregular micro-strip; angled footprints (Plots 25/26) creating an overbearing outlook.	Uniform, deepened green buffer; parallel building lines; eliminated direct, intrusive overlooking.
The Hawthorns (Northern Boundary)	Squeezed domestic boundary gaps; risk of tree loss and boundary encroachment on existing plots.	Expanded buffer footprint; continuous root protection and enhanced screening for northern neighbours.
Housing Quantum	75 Dwellings	75 Dwellings (100% Retained)

Rebalancing Surplus Garden Depth

The spatial room required to establish the buffer exists entirely within Bellway's site control. Bellway's own *Garden Depths Plan* shows Plots 25, 26, and 41–43 with rear gardens exceeding **14 metres** (far above the Council's 11-metre standard).

Reallocating this surplus garden depth back down to a fully compliant 11-metre standard releases the exact physical footprint required to deliver a continuous, adequately dimensioned communal landscape buffer along both established residential edges, satisfying **Charvil Neighbourhood Plan Policies CHARVIL 3 and CHARVIL 4**.

3. Procedural Frustration: "Salami-Slicing" vs. Real Solutions

I must formally record my frustration with the developer's approach to consultation regarding the buffer. Across successive iterations, Bellway has deployed a tactic of "salami-slicing"—offering minor, tokenistic tweaks between submissions while cover notes disingenuously claim that local residents view these changes "positively."

To be clear: **I do not view marginal buffer revisions positively when fundamental layout flaws remain unaddressed.**

The overriding feeling amongst the community is that Bellway's initial layout was intentionally designed to be as dense and intrusive against existing boundaries as possible, solely so that any subsequent, minor adjustment could be presented to planning officers as an "improvement through positive engagement."

Under **NPPF Section 4**, real engagement requires addressing core layout flaws when a complete, viable, and professionally designed alternative layout is sitting on the table.

4. Supporting Enforceability: Learning the Lessons of Appeal 143292

While securing the *Planning Voice* spatial layout is my primary objective, ensuring it is backed by **enforceable documentation** is essential to protect residents from past failures.

The primary driver of resident concern regarding Application 253071 stems from **Planning Reference 143292** (approved on appeal). When outline permission 143292 was granted, residents were promised a protective landscape buffer. However, because that buffer was represented only through high-level illustrative shading and lacked explicit, binding landscape conditions in the decision notice, its enforceability was lost.

WBC must not repeat this mistake.

Adopting the *Planning Voice* layout provides the necessary physical space. However, to guarantee its execution, Wokingham Borough Council must require Bellway to submit fully detailed, scaled planting and management plans for this layout, explicitly conditioning them in the **Schedule of Approved Plans on any and all future Decision Notices**.

5. Technical & Ecological Advantages of Adopting the Alternative Scheme

1. **Operational Maintenance Access:** The widened buffer in the alternative layout provides proper access to manage the buffer. This will allow a management company, or WBC, to service, water, and maintain planting throughout the entire

buffer - rather than being restricted to areas which are wide enough to bring machinery through.

2. **Allows for appropriate species selection:** The alternative layout provides sufficient spatial depth to deploy and care for **species** (e.g., Pleached Photinia or Pleached Holm Oak) that not only provide screening in the short term,, but will thrive and provide a long lasting screening and biodiversity net gain. These offer immediate, 365-day privacy screening at window level with a narrow root footprint, eliminating the subsidence risks on clay soils and gutter encroachment associated with Bellway's proposed forest canopy trees (*Alnus glutinosa*, *Acer campestre*).
3. **A Functional Dark Bat Corridor:** Under **MDD Local Plan Policy TB23**, **Core Strategy Policy CP7**, and **NPPF Chapter 15**, new development must protect linear habitat corridors. Bellway's narrow residual gap suffers from heavy domestic light spill and noise. The widened *Planning Voice* buffer creates a genuine, unlit "dark corridor" for foraging and commuting bats, alongside multi-tiered planting for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

6. Legal Materiality under Planning Case Law (*Mount Cook*)

Wokingham Borough Council officers and Planning Committee members have a clear legal mandate to weigh the *Planning Voice* alternative scheme as a material consideration of substantial weight.

As established by the Court of Appeal in ***R v Westminster City Council ex parte Mount Cook Land Ltd [2003] EWCA Civ 1346***, an alternative layout is a key material consideration when:

1. The submitted application gives rise to clear planning objections and policy conflicts (demonstrated here under **CP3**, **CC03**, **CHARVIL 3 & 4**, and **SPD Requirement R15**).
2. The alternative scheme is concrete, realistic, and has a real prospect of implementation.

The *Planning Voice* scheme meets every criterion: it is fully engineered, lies entirely within the applicant's red-line boundary, maintains full vehicle tracking compliance, and **delivers 100% of Bellway's 75 proposed homes**. There is no commercial, technical, or planning justification for the Council or applicant to reject it.

7. Summary of Requested Actions

We respectfully request that Wokingham Borough Council **defer or refuse approval** of Reserved Matters Application 253071, directing the applicant to secure the following non-negotiable modifications:

1. **PRIMARY ACTION — Adopt the *Planning Voice* Layout:** Require Bellway to adopt the structural adjustments set out in the *Planning Voice Alternative Layout*, realigning internal road loops and reallocating surplus garden depth (Plots 25, 26, 41–43) to create a continuous, widened buffer along the eastern and northern boundaries while retaining all 75 dwellings.

2. **Require Detailed Landscape Specifications for the Approved Layout:** Require Bellway to submit scaled, detailed planting plans specifying exact plant locations, soil volumes, root barrier positions, and stilted pleached evergreen species for the new buffer area.
3. **Enforce a Binding Boundary Management Plan (BMMP):** Impose an enforceable pre-commencement condition requiring a legally binding BMMP detailing buffer ownership (Council or Management Company), legal access easements, irrigation schedules, and maintenance obligations, explicitly listed on the Decision Notice.
4. **Protect the Dark Ecological Corridor:** Condition a strict lighting scheme prohibiting direct light spill onto the boundary buffer to preserve its function as a foraging bat corridor under Policy TB23.