

PLANNING REF : 252257
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Mulberry Cottage
: Blakes Lane, Hare Hatch
: RG10 9TA
SUBMITTED BY : Mr James Scott
DATE SUBMITTED : 09/11/2025

COMMENTS:

Subject: Objection to planning application for new homes at Ladds Garden Village.

I write to object to the above-mentioned planning application for the proposed development (c.19 homes at the Ladds Garden Village site. While I recognise the need for housing in the borough, I believe the proposal in its current form gives rise to unacceptable harms and should be refused or substantially amended. My concerns are as follows:

1. Light Pollution and External Lighting

The scheme appears to propose new street lighting and external lighting that will increase night-time glare, sky-glow and light-spill into neighbouring residential properties and surrounding countryside. - Under the emerging Local Plan Update for Wokingham, Policy HC7

(Pollution) stipulates that outdoor lighting proposals should be sensitively designed and appropriately located to avoid obtrusive light and protect the amenity of both existing and future residents. ?

- Furthermore, the borough's Sustainable Design & Construction SPD states that "light fittings should be carefully designed and located so as to minimise light pollution, to avoid light nuisance to neighbouring properties" and calls for downward-directed lighting, avoidance of upward spread beyond horizontal, and energy-efficient controls. ?

- I believe the cumulative effect of 19 new dwellings plus associated lighting infrastructure in a currently more tranquil semi-rural setting will compromise local dark-sky amenity, disturb wildlife corridors and reduce the residential amenity of nearby homes (e.g., bedrooms receiving stray light, increased glare).

- I therefore request that any permission be conditioned to require a detailed Lighting Appraisal (in line with Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance), horizontal/vertical lux levels be limited, full shielding provided, and uplighting avoided or better still that lighting be minimised consistent with safety and security needs.

2. Excessive Height of Homes and Overdensity / Impact on Local Character

The proposed heights appear to be out-of-scale with the prevailing built form in the locality and risk creating an over-dominant appearance.

- Large building development proposals such as this should respect the character of surrounding development, blend appropriately, and avoid excessive bulk, height or massing so as not to dominate the streetscape or reduce the amenity of neighbours.

- The application lacks clarity on how the height regime of homes responds to existing nearby properties, views, overshadowing, or visual transition from lower-density areas.

- Without clear plans demonstrating that the proposed height and massing is appropriate in context, the risk of harm to character, sense of place and neighbour amenity remains significant.

3. Insufficient Infrastructure: Schools, Doctors, Dentists and Community Facilities

The proposed development places further demands on local infrastructure which, as currently proposed, appear to lack adequate mitigation or timing assurances.

- existing local schools, GP surgeries and dental services are already under strain; adding further dwellings without guaranteed, timely provision of new education and health infrastructure risks unacceptable stress on local services and a poorer quality of life for both existing and future residents.

- National planning policy under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that developments should ensure the provision of infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development (see paragraphs 34-35 in the NPPF).

- In the absence of binding guarantees, I respectfully submit that the proposal fails to demonstrate that education, health, dentistry, and community service capacity will be in place in time to serve the new homes.

4. Conclusion and Request

For the above reasons light pollution risk, impacts of excessive buildings height, insufficient supporting infrastructure and zero affordable homes - I conclude that this development is currently unacceptable and should be refused or at minimum deferred until the following issues are resolved:

- A fully detailed and binding infrastructure delivery plan covering schools, GPs and dentists, with timing, funding and phasing tied to the phased occupation of homes.

- A detailed site-specific lighting design and appraisal demonstrating low-impact lighting consistent with Policy HC7 and the SPD.
- Revised height plans and massing drawings showing how the homes will respond to local context, reduce dominance, preserve amenity of neighbouring properties and comply with local character.

Thank you for taking these comments into account. I would like to be notified of the decision and any appeals.

Yours,

Mr J Scott