

PLANNING REF : 251862
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 72 Reading Road
: 72 Reading Road, Finchampstead, Wokingham
: RG40 4RA
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Matthew Morgan
DATE SUBMITTED : 05/10/2025

COMMENTS:

Objection to Planning Application Reference: 251862
Matthew Morgan, 72 Reading Road, RG404RA Mattmmorgan@hotmail.com
[5th October 2025]
Planning Department Wokingham Borough Council Shute End Wokingham
RG40 1BN

Dear Planning Officer,

Re: Strong Objection to Planning Application 251862 - Full
Application for Proposed Change of Use to Provide Light Industrial
(Use Class E(g)) and Internal and External Storage and
Distribution (Use Class B8) with Associated Parking at Land at 78
Reading Road and to the Rear of 80 Reading Road, Finchampstead
I am a resident of Reading Road, Finchampstead, in this semi-rural
area, and I strongly object to the above planning application. The
proposal, submitted by a company involved in waste removal, skip
hire, and hazardous materials handling, is incompatible with the
site's countryside location and would cause significant harm to the
local environment, residents, and infrastructure. This objection is
grounded in material planning considerations under the National
Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Wokingham Borough Council's
Core Strategy (2010), Managing Development Delivery Local Plan
(2014), and Finchampstead
Neighbourhood Development Plan (Made Version, 2023). I urge
refusal to protect our community's rural character and quality of
life.

The key grounds for objection, each with strong policy alignment
likely to support refusal, are as follows:

1 Countryside Protection The site is outside defined development
limits in designated countryside, where Core Strategy Policy CP11
strictly limits non-essential developments to preserve rural areas.
The proposed industrial and storage use would urbanize this open,
semi-rural land, eroding its intrinsic character and risking
coalescence with nearby settlements. This directly contravenes NPPF
paragraphs 174-180, which protect the countryside's beauty and
openness, as well as Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy
TB21 (Landscape Character) and Finchampstead Neighbourhood
Development Plan Policies IRS4 (Preserving Identity) and D2
(Rural Character).

Historical rejections in Wokingham often cite such landscape harms
in semi-rural settings, making this a high-impact objection.

2 Residential Amenity Impacts The development would severely
degrade amenity for nearby residents through noise, vibration, dust,
odours, and visual intrusion from heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and
waste operations, including hazardous materials like asbestos. In a
quiet residential area, this would create unacceptable living
conditions, violating Core Strategy Policy CP3 (General Principles
for

Development) and Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan
Policy LPU/DH2 (Safeguarding Amenity), which prohibit such
disturbances. Amenity-based refusals are common in council decisions
for residential zones, especially where pollution risks are evident,
aligning with NPPF paragraph 185 on mitigating noise and pollution.

3 Highway Safety and Traffic Impacts Increased HGV traffic on the busy A327 (Reading Road) would exacerbate congestion, road wear, and safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders, particularly at local pinch points. The site's access, including to the rear of 80 Reading Road, lacks demonstrated suitability for commercial vehicles, contravening Core Strategy Policy CP6 (Managing Travel Demand) and Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy GA1 (Traffic Pollution and Health). Severe highway impacts lead to 20-40% rejection rates nationally for similar rural proposals, per NPPF paragraph 111, which requires refusal if effects are unacceptable without mitigation.

4 Environmental Risks Waste storage and distribution pose risks of soil contamination, water runoff pollution, air quality degradation, and harm to local biodiversity, including nearby woodlands and green corridors. No adequate safeguards are proposed, failing Core Strategy Policy CP7 (Biodiversity), which demands net gains, and Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy IRS5 (Biodiversity), requiring at least 10% net gain and habitat protection. Policy GA1 further addresses traffic-related pollution. Hazardous waste amplifies scrutiny under NPPF paragraphs 174 and 186, often causing refusals where environmental protections are insufficient.

5 Policy Incompatibility with Local Employment and Sustainability The proposal does not align with Core Strategy Policy CP15 (Employment Development), which directs such uses to designated zones, not isolated countryside sites. It fails Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy TC1 (Supporting Business) criteria for small-scale, proportionate rural conversions that avoid amenity, noise, emissions, or traffic impacts. The site's remoteness promotes unsustainable transport, contrary to NPPF paragraph 105. This reinforces the proposal's overall unsuitability, strengthening the case for refusal as scattered industrial uses in rural areas are rarely approved.

In summary, this application constitutes inappropriate development that conflicts with multiple core policies, with no overriding material considerations. It would irreversibly damage Finchampstead's semi-rural identity, resident well-being, safety, and environment. I strongly recommend refusal and request acknowledgment of this objection, updates on any amendments or decisions, and consideration at committee if applicable.

Yours sincerely, Matthew Morgan