PLANNING REF : 262443
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 34 Butts Hill Road
: Woodley, Berkshire
: RG5 4NH
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Kathirgamanathan Balendran
DATE SUBMITTED : 17/11/2026

COMMENTS:
Formal objection to planning application 262443 - proposed development associated with 30 Butts Hill Road
Dear Planning Officer,
I strongly object to this application and support the objections submitted by neighbouring residents. The proposal raises substantial concerns about overdevelopment, loss of privacy, disturbance, access safety, environmental harm and its wider effect on the established community.
I ask that this representation is recorded as a formal objection and that the matters below are expressly addressed in the officer's assessment.
1. Overdevelopment and inappropriate back land development
The construction of three substantial four-bedroom dwellings, together with parking, a shared access road, cycle storage and a play area,
would introduce a significant concentration of development into an established rear garden setting.
My concern is that the proposal attempts to accommodate too much within a constrained site. The combined footprint of the houses, access and associated facilities would replace the openness of existing garden land with a substantially more intensive residential use.
Wokingham's Core Strategy Policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Policy TB06 provide relevant local policy considerations concerning design, character and back land development. I ask the Council to assess explicitly whether this proposal respects the surrounding pattern of development and protects neighbouring amenity. The Council has previously relied on these policies when refusing back land development involving unacceptable overlooking.

2. Impact on the wider community
The effects would extend beyond the application boundary. Three additional family dwellings would bring further vehicle movements, visitors, deliveries, servicing requirements andconstruction activity into an established residential neighbourhood.
The Council should consider the combined effects on local road safety, parking, pedestrian movement, drainage and the character of the surrounding area. Any assessment of pressure on local services should be proportionate and supported by evidence, including consideration of other relevant development nearby.
The statutory framework is clear: section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, read with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, requires planning decisions to accord with the development plan unless material considerations indicate
otherwise. I therefore request a reasoned assessment of the proposal against the relevant development plan policiesand the material effects identified by residents.
The wider community impact should form part of that assessment, rather than the application being considered solely in terms of whether three houses can physically fit within the land available.
3. Loss of privacy, overlooking and overbearing impact

I support the concerns about upper-floor windows overlooking existing gardens and rear-facing rooms. Neighbours have identified particularly close relationships between the proposed buildings and their private outdoor spaces.
The Council should verify the separation distances, relative ground levels, window positions and building heights. It should also assess the effect of the proposed buildings on daylight, sunlight and the outlook from neighbouring properties.

Fencing and planting should not be assumed to resolve overlooking from upper floors. Any proposed screening needs to be assessed realistically, including its height, effectiveness throughout the year and long-term maintenance.
4. Noise, headlights and disturbance

The shared access would introduce regular vehicle movements alongside existing homes and gardens. Engines, doors closing, deliveries,
manoeuvring vehicles and headlights would change the nature of what is currently a quiet garden environment.

The access, parking, cycle storage and play area should be assessed together. Their combined position and use could create a concentration of disturbance close to neighbouring boundaries.
I request proper consideration of external lighting and intrusion into neighbouring rooms and gardens, particularly during the evening and at night. National planning policy requires the suitability of development to be considered in light of pollution risks and its effects on surrounding uses.
5. Restrictedaccess and emergency arrangements

The objections already submitted raise a specific discrepancy between the access width shown on the drawings and the usable clearance once existing guttering and other building projections are taken into
account.
These measurements should be independently checked. The assessment should establish the actual horizontal and vertical clearance and demonstrate safe arrangements for pedestrians, emergency vehicles, deliveries and refuse collection.
I ask that the appropriate highways and fire-service consultees address these concerns expressly. The Council should establish which emergency access requirements apply to this particular layout and whether they can be met in practice.
6. Parking, turning and management of the access

The Council should verify whether the parking and turning arrangements are sufficient for the proposed dwellings, visitors and servicing
requirements.
The layout must work when parking spaces are occupied. Any reliance on passing places or turning areasremaining unobstructed should be supported by credible management arrangements.
The Council should also clarify whether refuse vehicles would enter the site or whether residents would be required to move bins to Butts Hill Road, and assess the practical consequences of either arrangement.
7. Trees, habitat and landscaping
I support the concerns raised about the removal of established trees

and vegetation and the resulting loss of screening and wildlife habitat.
The Council's trees and ecology officers should consider historical photographs and aerial imagery alongside the present condition of the site. They should establish what was removed, whether any relevant protection applied and whether the submitted environmental information adequately addresses the site's history.

Any replacement landscaping should provide meaningful screening and environmental value without creating avoidable maintenance burdens or encroachment onto neighbouring land.
8. Extent of the site and construction impacts
The acquisition of additional parcels of land associated with the site adds to my concern about the overall extent of the intended development. I ask that the application clearly identifies all land included and that any relevant associated proposals are considered where material to this decision.

Construction would itself create risks and disruption in such a restricted location. The Council should assess how deliveries, machinery, excavation, materials storage and contractor parking could be accommodated without obstructing access or affecting neighbouring property. Any construction arrangements must respect adjoining ownership and access rights.
For these reasons, I ask the Council to refuse planning permission. In my view, the proposal would introduce an excessive and intrusive form of development into a constrained back land setting, with lasting consequences for neighbouring residents and the wider community. Please ensure that the decision addresses the substantive concerns raised in this and the other objections. I also request notification of amended plans and any further opportunity to comment.