

DATE SUBMITTED : 15/05/2026

COMMENTS:

Planning Application 260917

Objector:

Karl Haughton

9 Yeosfield

Riseley

RG7 1SG

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to planning application 260917, which seeks outline permission for up to 44 dwellings with access submitted for approval. As a resident of 9 Yeosfield, Riseley, I will be directly affected by the impacts of this development.

The proposal is unsafe, unsustainable, environmentally harmful, and legally deficient. It conflicts with the Wokingham Borough Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and relevant planning case law.

My objections are summarised below.

1. Highways, Parking & Traffic Impact - Technical Failures + Case Law
The Transport Assessment (TA) claims 25 peak hour trips and 199 daily trips with no significant impact. This is not credible.

Technical Failures

TRICS uses an inappropriate "neighbourhood centre" classification that does not reflect the constrained rural network around Riseley, Basingstoke Road, and the A33 corridor.

The TA ignores existing congestion at A33 junctions, which fall under Wokingham's highway authority.

No meaningful cumulative impact assessment has been undertaken.

No mitigation is proposed for the A33, which is already at or near capacity.

Case Law

R (Corbett) v Cornwall Council [2020] - permission quashed for inadequate highway safety assessment.

Mansell v Tonbridge & Malling BC [2017] - cumulative traffic impacts must be properly assessed.

Direct Impact on Yeosfield

Residents at 9 Yeosfield will face increased traffic, reduced safety, difficulty entering/exiting the street, and increased noise and pollution.

Policy Conflicts

NPPF 114 & 115

Wokingham Policy CP6 - Managing Travel Demand

Wokingham Policy CC07 - Parking

The proposal fails all relevant tests.

2. Flood Risk & Drainage Failures - Local Evidence + Case Law

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) claims the site is low risk. This contradicts real world evidence.

Local Flooding Evidence

I have personally witnessed floodwater from this field enter neighbouring gardens.

Standing water and drainage failures are common along Bull Lane.

The Swallowfield Parish Council Flood Risk Group (April 2025) documents ongoing flooding issues.

Technical Failures

Over reliance on Flood Zone 1

No proper surface water modelling

No infiltration testing

No demonstration that runoff will not increase downstream risk within Wokingham's drainage network

Case Law

Redhill Aerodrome Ltd v SSCLG [2014] - flood risk is a material consideration even with mitigation.

Samuel Smith Old Brewery v North Yorkshire CC [2020] - environmental impacts must be assessed holistically.

Policy Conflicts

NPPF 173 & 174

Wokingham Policy CC09 - Flood Risk

Wokingham Policy CC10 - Sustainable Drainage

The FRA is inadequate and does not reflect local conditions.

3. Public Safety - Pedestrians, Cyclists & Vehicles

The application does not demonstrate:

Safe pedestrian access

Adequate visibility splays

Safe crossing points

Protection for cyclists

Emergency vehicle access

This increases collision risk and fails to protect vulnerable road users.

Policy Conflicts
NPPF 114 & 130

Wokingham Policy CP6 - Managing Travel Demand

PLANNING REF : 260917
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 9 Yeosfield
: Risley, Berkshire
: RG71SG
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Karl Haughton
Wokingham Policy CC01 - Sustainable Development

4. Cumulative Impact - Not Assessed

The appli cant has not assessed cumulative impacts from:

Existing and committed developments in the Wokingham area

A33 corridor pressures

Local drainage constraints

Shared infrastructure capacity

Case Law

Mansell v Tonbridge & Malling BC - cumulative impac ts must be assessed.

Policy Conflicts
NPPF 115 & 174

Wokingham Policy CP1 - Sustainable Development

The omission is material and undermines the validity of the assessment.

5. Ecological Harm - Deer & Wildlife Use the Field

The field is regular ly used by deer, indicating:

A functioning wildlife corridor

Habitat connectivity

Likely presence of protected species

The ecological assessment is inadequate.

Case Law

Wealden DC v SSCLG [2017] - ecological impacts must be assessed cumulatively.

Prideaux v Buckinghamshire CC [2013] - ecological information must be available before permission is granted.

Policy Conflicts
Wokingham Policy CP7 - Biodiversity

NPPF 180

6. Landscape & Rural Character Harm

The development would:

Urbanise a rural edge

Erode the character of Riseley

Introduce massing out of scale with Yeosfield

Reduce tranquillity and visual amenity

Case Law

Forge Field Society v Sevenoaks DC [2014] - landscape harm is a standalone refusal reason.

Mevagissey PC v Cornwall Council [2013] - urbanising effects justify refusal.

Policy Conflicts

Wokingham Policy CP3 - Character of the Environment

NPPF 174

7. Outline Application Deficiencies - Legally Insufficient Information

The application reserves all matters except access but fails to provide essential information:

Layout

Housing mix

Building heights

Parking

Landscaping

Amenity assessments

Case Law

Loader v Rother DC [2016] - outline applications must contain enough information.

Wingfield v Canterbury CC [2019] - councils cannot approve applications lacking essential detail.

This application is not legally capable of approval.

8. Personal Observations - Real World Evidence

As a resident of 9 Yeosfield, I regularly observe:

Congestion on Basingstoke Road and the A33

Standing water and drainage failures

Deer and wildlife using the field

Peak hour traffic queues

Road safety issues at local junctions

These conditions contradict the applicant's assessments.

Conclusion

The proposal presents unacceptable impacts in relation to:

Highway safety

Flood risk

Public safety

Ecology

Landscape character

Cumulative impacts

Legal adequacy of submitted information

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Wokingham Borough Council refuse planning permission for application 260917.

Yours faithfully,

Karl Haughton

9 Yeosfield

Riseley

RG7 1SG

DATE SUBMITTED : 15/05/2026