

PLANNING REF : 261695
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 3 Bradley Drive
: Wokingham
: RG40 3HZ
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Alison Griffin
DATE SUBMITTED : 02/09/2026

COMMENTS:

I wish to object to this planning application for the following reasons.

1. A similar proposal was part of a previous planning application (PA190286) which was refused on appeal (APP/X0360/W/19/3235572). Some of the reasons for the refusal include protection of countryside and wildlife, maintaining the settlement boundaries between Wokingham and Finchampstead, adverse impact on neighbouring properties and harm to the local landscape and nothing in this application changes these reasons, so they still apply.
2. Impact to local residents adjacent to the site. This plan includes an acoustic fence 3.5m high across the width of the two proposed pitches as well as netting of nearly double that height behind the two rugby goal posts. As the plans show, these will be very close to the boundary of the neighbouring houses and will be a significant detrimental visual impact on their properties as well as the impact of noise and the risk of damage from balls that could come over their boundaries. The pitches are too close to residential properties.
3. Flooding, the land is known by local residents to be subject to flooding and this risk to both the proposed sports pitches and the surrounding area has not been adequately assessed. If the construction of the pitches is such that rain runs off the land, there is a greater flood risk to the surrounding residential roads, particularly Luckley Road which has a history of severe floods.
4. There is already a significant issue with traffic for the school and as this application does not include any additional parking or mitigation of the current issues, the effect on local residential roads will be adverse and significant.
5. Biodiversity. The ecological report does not appear to have covered the impact on the known species in the area. Birds and bats will be negatively impacted by the netting and barriers proposed, ground based species including protected ones like great crested newts (which are known to be in the area) will be evicted and have been excluded from the assessment.
6. Settlement gap. In the local plan this site is defined as the countryside and it is a green field, part of a defined green gap between the settlements of Wokingham town and Finchampstead. This scheme would cause significant erosion of the gap and would be a change of character to the area.
7. Trees and Hedges. There are inconsistencies in the plans in different documents in the application, for example the proposed acoustic fence has not been included in the Tree Protection Plan in Appendix 1. Looking at the equivalent plan in the Proposed Site Plan document I see that the acoustic fence will abut the RPAs of 3 trees and cut across the RPAs of 3 trees. This would necessitate the cutting of the tree canopies to accommodate the barrier and as 4 of these 6 trees are protected by TPOs, the exclusion of this factor is a serious omission. There is also no assessment of the acoustic

effect of having tree canopies around an acoustic barrier and I assume that noise will ensue from the tree canopies brushing or hitting the barrier depending on the wind speed and direction. An acoustic barrier needs to be far enough outside the canopy area of adjacent trees to allow for 10, 20 or more years of growth of the canopies. 8. Tree Root Protection Areas. Demarcation of protective barriers around the tree RPAs has been included in the plan in Arboricultural Assessment Appendix 1. However, for tree 70, a tree with a TPO, and for tree 71, these barriers are significantly within the RPA and for tree 70 nearly a quarter of the root area will be subject to

construction damage, ground compaction and potential canopy damage as well. RPA means a protected area and this plan will have a high negative impact on a significant protected tree. Also the ion of the acoustic barrier will also require ground penetration across the RPAs of the 6 trees along the western boundary, including tree 70 and nearly half of it's canopy diameter. Not only are these significant factors, but there is no discussion of them or mitigation plans included in the application.

9. Safety. In talking to rugby players and particularly ones who have sons who play and who have coached junior teams, they are very concerned over several aspects of this pitch design. Firstly, they are very concerned that significant tree trunks are close to the pitch, particularly at the corners where inexperienced players may tackle and roll some distance. Tree 70 is too close to the corner of the pitch for the players to be safe. Secondly, they believe that any trees close to the pitch and certainly any that overhang it require significant ground maintenance to ensure the pitch surface is cleared of all leaves and tree debris before matches. Thirdly they strongly advise that ball-stopping netting is needed for a wider length than just behind the goal posts as younger and inexperienced players can kick balls high and wide and this would be a threat to the properties bordering the pitch, and potentially to any people enjoying their private gardens. I have not seen a safety assessment for this

application from the school for their players and visiting teams, nor for the neighbouring properties and their owners and guests.

10. I also note that Sports England have objections to aspects of the proposed pitch designs.

For these reasons I would ask the planning team and the planning committee to reject this application.