

PLANNING REF : 251862
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 92 Reading Road
: Finchampstead
: RG40 4RA
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Mahesha Suriarachchi
DATE SUBMITTED : 08/10/2025

COMMENTS:

Strong Objection to Planning Application 251862 - Full Application for Proposed Change of Use to Provide Light Industrial (Use Class E(g)) and Internal and External Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8) with Associated Parking at Land at 78 Reading Road and to the Rear of 80 Reading Road, Finchampstead

I am a resident of Reading Road, residing less than 100 meters from the site covered by this planning application, and I strongly object to it.

The proposal, submitted by a company involved in waste removal, skip hire, and hazardous materials handling, is incompatible with the site's countryside location and would cause significant harm to the local environment, residents, and infrastructure.

Key Grounds for Objection

My objection is firmly grounded in material planning considerations under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and relevant local policies, including Wokingham Borough Council's Core Strategy, the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan, and the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan.

In addition, I wish to outline the following:

1. History of Planning Breaches

I note that the applicant (Palmarium Properties Ltd, linked to Collard Group Ltd) has a documented history of non-compliance with planning controls on this site, including enforcement notices APP/X0360/C/15/3138106 and APP/X0360/C/15/3138109 issued in 2015 for unauthorized hard-standing and operational development on land rear of 76 and 80a Reading Road.

Despite a 2017 court case where the applicant pleaded guilty and was fined (13,670 and 8,670), full compliance has not been achieved - e.g., hardstanding was not removed and reinstated with topsoil to 20cm depth, and land was not sown with grass seed as required. As a direct result of this my garden and the BT track often flood with rainwater runoff.

Recent complaints (e.g., refs RFS/2022/087752) highlight ongoing unauthorized storage and use, with the Council failing to escalate enforcement despite risks to highway safety (e.g., unwidened access leading to reversing onto A327).

A company with a history of non-compliance should not be granted planning permission for extending its current operation.

2. Historic Trading Restrictions

Importantly, the council has already recognised the site's unsuitability for unrestricted industrial activity. Under planning application 37740, the following condition was imposed:

"No work of any sort shall take place and no machinery shall be operated on the premises before 7.30 am on weekdays and 7.30 am on Saturdays nor after 5.00 pm on weekdays and 12.30 pm on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Reason: To protect the occupants of nearby properties from noise disturbance."

However, within this Planning Application, in the "Hours of Opening" it states.

Monday to Friday: Start Time - 07:00; End Time: 21:00
Saturdays: Start Time - 07:00; End Time: 21:00

Sunday / Bank Holiday: Start Time - 08:00; End Time: 14:00

At present, SIG Roofing Ltd operating at No. 94 Reading Road, and their permitted operating hours for SIG Roofing are:

Monday to Friday - 7.30 to 5.00 pm
Saturdays - 7.30 am to 12.00 pm
Sundays & Bank Holidays - Not permitted

Even with a client facing operation, SIG Roofing's operation is far less disruptive than what is proposed in this Planning Application and is totally unacceptable.

When in a previous application, the council has already recognised the site's unsuitability for unrestricted industrial activity and a less destructive commercial operation (ie. SIG Roofing) has much less operational days/hours permitted, the proposed days/hours of operation via this Planning Application is totally and utterly unacceptable.

3. Residential Amenity Impacts

Within the "Noise Impact Assessment", it states:

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION & PROPOSALS

3.8 Proposed operating hours for the site are 07:00 - 19:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 -13:00 hours on Saturdays.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.4 On the basis of a BS4142 numerical assessment and associated context, the proposed change of use is not expected to give rise to adverse sound impact at nearby sensitive receptors.

It appears there is a disconnect between the Hours of Operation used for assessing noise impact, and the intended hours of operation as

stated in the Planning Application, as they do not align.

A similar disconnect is within the Transport Statement as well.

In the Transport Statement, there is only a reference to a Pre-application submission validated on 8 April 2019 and in that, under Proposal, it states:
"nominated hours of use of 7am-7pm Monday to Friday and 8am-1pm on Saturdays."

Therefore, I'm unsure if the Transport Statement was developed based on the extended Hours of Operation (as presented in the Application) or the limited one in the pre-application. In either case there seems to be a disconnect and needs to be verified.

With the requested extended hours of operation, Light Spill would also be a significant concern for those nearer to the site. Reading Road in its entirety has only 3 streetlights, all added purely on safety grounds around key road-intersections.

Being a semi-rural area, minimal light pollution is a key component and any further light pollution is unwelcomed and should not be granted. Light pollution needs to be avoided at all costs.

4. Highway Safety and Traffic Impacts

Increased HGV traffic on the busy A327 (Reading Road) would exacerbate congestion, road wear, and safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders, particularly at local pinch points. The site's access, including to the rear of 80 Reading Road, lacks demonstrated suitability for commercial vehicles.

Within the "Noise Impact Assessment", it states:

7.4.3 CSA has undertaken an assessment based upon the transport consultant's TRICS data for the proposed use. The TRICS data indicated a daily total of 19 vehicle movements (either arrivals or departures), with 2 movements predicted in a peak hour. Typical vehicles accessing the site are expected to be a mixture of cars and light commercial vehicles, with occasional OGV access.

However, these figures are nowhere to be found within the Transport Statement, where there is only references to 16.5m articulated lorries.

I'm also unsure if a Transport Statement is the same as a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). I reckon what we'd want is a TIA.

Summary

This Planning Application is fundamentally flawed with many discrepancies and falsifications.

As demonstrated above, it represents an inappropriate and unacceptable development that conflicts with a multitude of core local and national planning policies, and many falsehoods presented within the application and the supporting material submitted.

It constitutes inappropriate industrial development in the countryside that poses a significant and demonstrable threat to the safety of road users, the quality of life for residents, and the integrity of the local environment.

I strongly recommend the Council refuse this application.

I request confirmation of receipt of this objection and notification of any future developments or decisions regarding.