

PLANNING REF : 262222
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 22 Charvil
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG10 9DH
SUBMITTED BY : Ms Sarah Beere
DATE SUBMITTED : 29/09/2026

COMMENTS:

Formal Planning Objection / Representation - Reserved Matters
Application Ref: 253071 (Pursuant to Outline Ref: 232704)

I'm writing to submit a formal objection and representation regarding Reserved Matters application 253071, specifically concerning the design, layout, finished floor levels, and boundary treatments proposed along the interface with 22 Canberra Lake Way.

As someone born and raised in this area and a long-standing resident under Wokingham Borough Council, I feel desperately and utterly let down. While the principle of residential development is established under outline consent, the detailed reserved matters submitted conflict directly with statutory planning frameworks and local design policy, specifically violating:

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): Paragraphs 130 and 135 (securing high-quality design and a high standard of amenity for existing users) and Paragraph 185 (mitigating and reducing adverse impacts on health and quality of life).

Wokingham Borough Council Core Strategy (Policies CP1 and CP3): Which mandate high-quality design that respects local context, protects existing residential amenity, and prevents unacceptable overlooking or visual overbearing.

Wokingham Borough Council Managing Development Delivery (MDD) Local Plan (Policy TB07): Which governs internal and external space standards and the protection of residential amenities.

The Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Which explicitly requires new developments to maintain appropriate privacy distances, respect natural topography, and avoid severe visual dominance over neighboring properties.

Compounded Vertical Height Discrepancy, Cut-and-Fill Feasibility, and Policy Breaches on Privacy
A technical review of the submitted site plans, finished floor level (FFL) schedules, and the developer's cut-and-fill analysis reveals an alarming vertical discrepancy directly adjacent to our boundary that directly breaches the aforementioned amenity and design policies:

*The Level Discrepancy & Cut-and-Fill Proof: The existing baseline ground level at our shared property boundary is established at 45.39m, while the proposed Finished Floor Level (FFL) for the adjacent Bellway dwellings is set at 45.850m. The developer's cut-and-fill analysis (calculated against existing levels minus a 150mm site scrape) shows extensive positive level changes (fill) across the site. This proves that earthworks are flexible and that lowering these specific plots is entirely achievable within the

master site's cut-and-fill balance, violating design guidance which expects developers to work with natural contours rather than artificially elevating platforms.

***Topographical Amplification & Fence Geometry:** Crucially, our property and garden sit on a downward gradient stepping away from the boundary fence line. With a standard 6-foot fence sitting on the 45.39m baseline, the top of the fence sits at 47.22m. Because the adjacent indoor floor level is elevated to 45.850m, the vertical distance from their floor to the top of the fence is just 1.37 meters.

***Multiple Adjoining Properties & Cumulative Overlooking:** While our baseline calculations highlight the immediate impact from the closest plots, this issue is heavily multiplied across our boundary because we have multiple new houses peering directly into our private space. Instead of a single point of overlooking, multiple elevated properties will cast an unremitting line of sight into our home and private rear garden.

***Direct Policy Conflict:** This means that virtually the entire adult population, as well as teenagers and children from the age of approximately 12 years old, will have their eye level meeting or clearing the top of the 6-foot fence. Combined with our downward slope, multiple households looking down at a steep angle creates an oppressive, compounding loss of privacy. This severely compromises the environment where our young children live, depriving them of their basic human right to privacy and breaching the Borough Design Guide SPD and NPPF amenity protections.

Inadequacy of the 3-Meter Buffer Zone and Appeal to Local Governance

It is widely understood by all parties that a protective buffer was originally proposed for Canberra Lake Way. Navigating this process has been deeply disheartening; despite attempting every avenue, including writing directly to Bellway, who have stonewalled us for the past 6 months, our concerns continually feel ignored, leaving us facing what was accurately characterised as a 'nightmare' (a direct quote from a Councillor at the WBC planning committee which approved this development) for existing residents.

***A Call for Fair Representation:** Given that the developer refuses to engage, we respectfully ask whether someone within the planning department can step forward to actively support tax-paying residents and represent our interests against avoidable harm.

***Absence of Enforceable Planting & Structural Risks:** Currently categorised with vague "scrub" designations, the plans lack a binding, high-performance landscaping specification containing heavy, mature evergreen species capable of blocking elevated sightlines, failing to satisfy local landscaping policy requirements. Furthermore, the "dropping gradient" within this narrow strip risks destabilising existing boundary treatments without proper engineering safeguards.

Conclusion and Context

Had we been offered a proper, substantive buffer and robust

screening between our property and the new builds from the outset, we would have been entirely supportive of a well-considered scheme. Instead, after months of stonewalling from the developer, we are left fighting for our basic right to privacy.

We respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority withholds approval of application 253071 in its current form due to its direct conflict with the NPPF, the Core Strategy (CP1/CP3), and the Borough Design Guide SPD. The application must be amended to either reduce the FFLs to match the 45.39m boundary baseline (utilising the master site's cut-and-fill capacity to absorb any displaced soil) or mandate a legally binding, robustly conditioned landscaping and structural buffer.