

PLANNING REF : 261695  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 15 Hart Dyke Close  
: Wokingham, Berkshire  
: RG41 2HQ  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Michael Robson  
DATE SUBMITTED : 02/09/2026

COMMENTS:

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION: 261695

Site: Luckley House School, RG40 3EU

Nature of Objection: Severe Impact on Residential Amenity,  
Unacceptable Flood Risk, Detriment to Protected Wildlife Corridor,  
and Public Safety Risks.

1, Issues with pitch planning,

The orientation and location of the cricket pitch is Dangerous. The plans show an artificial cricket pitch running East-West. This is considered unsafe due to setting sun and is a real injury threat, ECB explicitly state pitches should be orientated between 195-250 or 15-70 degrees to avoid the setting sun.

Size, the field does NOT allow enough space for a cricket field to be safely used. Referencing MCC guidelines, the total playing circle diameter for a cricket field is 125-145m (60m boundary minimum from square +2.74m run off with no fencing, or obstructions within that run off area, as a fielder will often cross the boundary in the act of fielding. Having studied the basic drawing the application has provided, I conclude there is only 109m. There is also a plan for a 3.5M acoustic fence, within the run off space of the boundary, a player collision with this would cause serious injury. The ECB has updated its boundary safety rules after multiple injuries caused by fielders running backward and colliding with metal perimeter poles, fencing, or tarmac walkways. This is clearly not accounted for within this application as the huge fence, and potentially rugby/football goals are well within this space.

I note that Lancashire county cricket club turned their pitch for this exact reason, and recently Fleetwood Cricket Club were refused planning permission for an east-to-west orientation facility on safety grounds.

Ball strike issue. The risk of ball strike at high velocity from this cricket pitch is extremely high. There should be a huge run off distance from a newly constructed cricket pitch to an existing residential garden to prevent risk of ball strike and allow the existing resident to allow safe and peaceful use of their garden. It is not possible to 'turn the pitch' as it will mean no other rugby/football pitches can be used.

Rugby/ Football pitches.

Dangerous, again due to space restrictions the applicant has added 'catch nets' however, these catch nets are positioned on the run off area. Similar to cricket, in playing the sport it is normal for a participant to slide, or be pushed off the playing field out of control of their momentum. The poles for catch nets, will have significant foundation, and if collided with, will cause significant injury. I also note that minimum requirement for Rugby pitch is 113M, the size of the pitches on this scale drawing do not seem to fit size.

References for recent serious injuries at sports pitches that have

been caused as a result of unsafe perimeter fencing/ walls/ pillars

Billy Vigar, semi professional football player, died.

Alex Fletcher, semi professional football player, fractured skull

In conversation with the bursar of the school he has confirmed the pitches will be used for football as well as rugby.

## 2, Drainage

From a groundskeeping point of view, during winter months, the objective is to keep the ground as dry as possible. I note in a previous application for development of the field, Luckley house school themselves objected due to additional risk of flooding. I understand the applicant has suggested use of an underground rainwater harvesting tank to mitigate the run-off water the pitches will create. However, the field has a very high water table, consistently flooding every winter. This means I think this measure is unsuitable as if installed the tank will float and burst out of the ground. Overall will cause severe flooding of the existing properties on Luckley Wood. There is no detail on the size of this tank, a 50,000 litre tank (the size of a shipping container, roughly the size of the markings on the plan) would fill within 5-10 minutes of a heavy rain, 25mm of rain on the 5 acre site would generate 505,858 litres of water, the other 450,000 litres will flood the remaining fields, and culvert, then into peoples houses.

## 3, Fencing

I note following conversation with the applicant, they do not want to construct the 3.5M fence due to cost. As a resident, I do not want it built either, as it will have serious safety issues, cause significant damage to root systems of existing protected trees and hedging, and have a marked effect on the movement of local wildlife including bats, of which this is a designated bat corridor, deer, slow worm and ground level nesting birds such as skylarks all often seen in the fields.

4, Confusion over what the company making the application is actually doing: In reading the report the applicant makes various statements including references to Bearwood Lakes Golf Club, there is no explanation or reason for this, and leads assumptions that the application has been produced using AI tools, and hasn't been properly researched, and therefore should be dismissed at planning stage.

### 1. Loss of Daylight and Severe Overshadowing

My garden directly faces east, meaning my property relies entirely on the morning sun rising over this specific rear boundary. A structure of 3.5 metres is exceptionally high nearly double the standard 2-metre permitted development limit. Due to the low angle of the morning sun, a barrier of this height will cast a massive, disproportionate shadow across my entire garden and into the rear windows of my home, causing an unacceptable loss of natural daylight. [1]

### 2. Overbearing Impact and Sense of Enclosure

The sheer scale, height, and massing of a 3.5-metre solid fence right on the boundary line is completely out of character for a residential area. It will create a highly oppressive, domineering, and

claustrophobic wall along the back of my garden. This creates a severe 'sense of enclosure' that will ruin the open outlook and enjoyment of my private outdoor space.

### 3. Negative Impact on Local Character

There is no precedent for a 3.5-metre boundary structure in the immediate vicinity. This over-scaled barrier conflicts with the open layout of the surrounding gardens and will negatively harm the visual appearance of the local area. For reference large sections of the Berlin Wall were 3.6M, just 10CM different to this proposal. For these reasons, the proposal fails to protect neighbour amenity and contradicts local planning policies regarding design and scale. I respectfully urge the planning committee to refuse this application.