

PLANNING REF : 261624
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 2 Gloster Cottage
: Whistley Green, Hurst
: RG10 0DY
SUBMITTED BY : Group Captain S Gregory BSc MA RAF
DATE SUBMITTED : 03/08/2026

COMMENTS:

1. As you are aware there are now multiple and different applications from Shorewood Homes for the same site (subject application and 6011047 which is still ongoing and has yet to be determined). My primary reason for objection is the unreasonable approach by the developer by creating confusion and disorder for the Authority and residents with a saturation of planning considerations. The developer is thoughtful only for a sliver of success with his application. That unreasonable approach deserves minimal balance in any decision: the Developer has own interests at mind and is evidentially not working with the community.
2. The Developer is seeking to argue that heritage and landscape harms would not apply through a reduced number of houses (to 1 or 2). This idea is fundamentally wrong and serves to evidenced the Developer's principal aim to gain permission at any cost. Development, especially under a concession seeking applicant, serves to undermine the landscape, character and heritage aspects of this valued site. Heritage assets such as Long Barn and Munfin House, along with the rural character of Hogmoor Lane, would be permanently harmed by this inconsiderate and unengaged development.
3. The Developer seeks to build on the site as an infill location, yet it is an unplanned application outside of the settlement limit of Hurst in designated countryside. This is therefore contrary to the spatial objectives of the WBC Development Plan. It is contrary to Policies CP1, CP9 and CP11. The site is expansive and of standalone character: the proviso that this is infill should be rejected.
4. The Developer seeks the introduction of large houses of modern construction on the Application Site. This would fundamentally damage the historic character of Hogmoor Lane. It would replace open land with modern suburban development. My house is adjacent to the site, and the planned 0.5m + elevation of the houses above my property worries me for a prospect of oversight and visual domination by the new-builds. I can also only surmise that the reason for such elevation is that the flood mitigation scheme is utterly insufficient for the certainty of annual standing water accumulation. The Developer has (again) failed to act on a particular and well documented risk of the Site's natural condition for flooding.
5. The Applicant's Flood Risk Assessment contains several errors and omissions, not least at para 3.5.3 that 'There are no records of Hurst flooding due to groundwater listed in the WBC SFRA.' This evidently not true. It has been a consistent and well illustrated testimony of the residents, charting back to all of the Developer's many

applications, that this area of Hurst routinely (= bi-annually) floods with standing water for weeks upon end.

Conclusion. The Developer is seeking to mislead. This is certainly perceived by the residents. The principles of my Service extol respect and integrity. Throughout the Developer has shown none of these for the residents, and with two concurrent ambitions for this site, founded on unsupportable facts, Shorewood Homes cannot be reckoned a respectful or genuine force for local planning.

The Authority is strongly recommended to reject this latest plan.