

PLANNING REF : 261859
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Bunglers Hill
:
: RG7 1UL
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Jassy Benn
DATE SUBMITTED : 21/09/2026

COMMENTS:

I object to application 261859 and ask Wokingham Borough Council to refuse it. My principal concern is the scale of the proposed encroachment into the countryside and the resulting harm to the rural character of Farley Hill, including views experienced from the nearby public footpath.

Excessive intensification outside development limits

The proposal is not a modest adjustment to an established holiday park. It would increase the number of caravans from 8 to 17, an increase of 112.5 percent, together with further hardstanding, internal roadways, parking, lighting, bins, a site office and associated activity. On a site of approximately 0.43 hectares, that represents a concentrated and distinctly developed form of use in an otherwise rural setting.

Core Strategy Policy CP11 states that development outside development limits will not normally be permitted and requires countryside

enterprises to avoid excessive encroachment or expansion away from original buildings. This proposal does the opposite. It extends an already contentious use across the site and creates a closely packed compound of caravans and vehicles. The applicant has not shown why expansion to this scale is necessary in this particular countryside location or why the claimed demand could not be met at a more sustainable and less sensitive site.

The current NPPF must be applied because it took effect for decision-making on 17 August 2026. Policy S5 only supports rural business and tourism development outside settlements where the need for an out-of-settlement location is shown and where benefits are not substantially outweighed by adverse effects. Policy E4 also requires the siting and design of rural business development to be appropriate to the character of its surroundings. The Planning Statement, dated 3 August 2026, predates this Framework and does not undertake that current policy assessment.

Visible harm is not removed by boundary planting

As someone who regularly uses the nearby public footpath, I do not accept the assertion that there are 'extremely minimal public views' into the site. There are views of the site and its occupation from the surrounding public realm. The effect is not limited to the physical caravan structures. Parked cars and commercial vans, lighting, refuse areas, people moving around the site and frequent vehicle movements all contribute to the perception of an intensified residential-style enclave in the countryside.

Screening cannot be treated as a complete answer. Existing vegetation varies with the seasons and can be cut back, damaged or lost. Even if planting partly filters a view, it does not remove the change in

landscape character or the intensity of use. Core Strategy Policy CP3 requires development to be appropriate in scale and character, without detriment to landscape or adjoining users. MDD Policy TB21 requires proposals to retain or enhance the landscape condition, character and features. Policy CC03 also expects public rights of way and green

links to be protected and enhanced. The submitted material does not

demonstrate that these requirements are met.

Area of Special Character and heritage setting

The applicant acknowledges that the site lies within an Area of Special Character and that adjacent open sloping land contributes to the setting of a Grade II* listed building. It also acknowledges that the rural setting, remoteness, hedgerows, mature trees and traditional field boundaries contribute strongly to the significance of that

heritage asset. Those acknowledgements are difficult to reconcile with the conclusion that another nine caravans and their associated infrastructure would cause little or no harm.

MDD Policy TB26 says that development affecting an Area of Special Character should retain and enhance its traditional, historical and special character and its setting. Current NPPF policies HE4 to HE6 require the contribution made by the setting of a heritage asset to be assessed, harm to be avoided or minimised, and substantial weight to be given to conservation, with greater weight for more important assets. The short heritage discussion in the Planning Statement is not a proportionate assessment of the cumulative effect of 17 caravans, hardstanding, vehicles and activity on this acknowledged sensitive setting.

Conclusion

The existing eight-unit permission does not establish that an expansion of any scale must be accepted. The Council must assess the cumulative effect of the whole proposed operation. In my view, 17 caravans would urbanise this countryside site, erode the experience of the public footpath and fail to retain or enhance the Area of Special Character and heritage setting. The proposal conflicts with CP3,

CP11, CC03, TB21 and TB26 and with current NPPF policies S5, E4, N2 and HE4 to HE6. I therefore ask that permission is refused.