

PLANNING REF : 262339
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 32 Rectory Road
: Wokingham
: RG40 1DN
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Malcolm Fullbrook
DATE SUBMITTED : 07/10/2026

COMMENTS:

Proposed telecommunications base station development at Land off Hogwood Lane, Hogwood Industrial Estate, Finchampstead, RG40 4QQ

To whom it may concern,

I write to object to the above prior approval application concerning the proposed telecommunications installation at Berkeley Business Park. The developer's notice states that the issue for determination is the siting and appearance of the proposed development, comprising a 20m lattice mast, antennas, dishes and equipment cabinets. This objection is directed accordingly to those planning issues.

1. Siting - excessive proximity to Unit 1

The principal objection is the proposed siting of the mast and associated compound immediately next to Unit 1. The position as presently understood is that the development is intended to be erected "tight next to unit 1" and within approximately 2.5 feet of Unit 1. On any ordinary view, that is an exceptionally close relationship for a structure of this nature and scale.

A 20 metre lattice mast, together with associated cabinets and ancillary equipment, sited in such close proximity to an existing business unit is an inappropriate and unduly harmful location. The Local Planning Authority is requested to consider not merely the mast in isolation, but the combined effect of the full installation, including its compound and equipment cabinets, when placed so near to an occupied unit.

2. Effect on the use and operation of Unit 1

There is a real concern that the siting would adversely affect the practical use and operation of Unit 1. That concern is material. In assessing siting, the Authority is asked to consider whether the proposed location would prejudice the ordinary and efficient use of the unit and its immediate surroundings, including circulation, servicing, and access insofar as those matters are affected by the position of the mast and compound.

Even if the Authority considers the principle of telecommunications development acceptable in this area, that does not mean that this particular location is acceptable. The issue is whether this installation has been placed in the least harmful practicable position. On the material available, there is reason to conclude that it has not.

3. Appearance and visual impact

The proposal is for a 20m lattice mast in galvanised grey steel, with antennas, dishes and two equipment cabinets. By reason of both its height and industrial form, the installation would be a prominent and visually intrusive feature. That visual impact is materially worsened by the alleged proximity to Unit 1.

The Authority is therefore asked to consider the appearance of the proposal in its actual context at ground level, including the effect of the mast, cabinets and compound when viewed from and in relation to Unit 1 and the immediate business park environment.

4. Less harmful alternative siting appears available

A specific alternative has been identified by the objector: the mast should be moved further along the grass recreational ground and car park by about 50 yards, where there is said to be only a car park. The letter already identifies alternative siting as a potentially significant objection point. If there is a realistic alternative location within the wider site that would reduce the impact on Unit 1 while still meeting the operator's objectives, that is a matter which should weigh heavily against approval of the present siting.

The application should not be approved simply because a mast may be capable of being located somewhere on the land. The relevant question is whether this precise siting has been properly justified when a less harmful position may be available.

5. Property value concerns

The objector also has understandable concerns that the development may devalue the property and reduce rental value. Those concerns are commercially real from the owner's perspective. However, this objection is principally advanced on planning grounds relating to siting, appearance and impact on the use of Unit 1, which are the matters the developer's notice identifies for consideration.

6. Alternative Location

There is said to be an existing telecommunications mast in close proximity to the proposed site, visible in the photographs already provided by the objector. This existing mast is approximately 50-70 yards away from the proposed location. In those circumstances, the Authority is requested to consider whether the proposed apparatus could instead be accommodated by way of use.

7. Possible bridleway impact

The Authority is respectfully asked to consider is the possible presence of a bridleway near, or potentially affected by, the proposed site. Without overstating the position, if such a route exists in the vicinity, it may be relevant to the assessment of siting, access, visual impact and the effect of the proposal on the character of the locality.

8. BBPMC position

It is understood that Berkeley Business Park Management Company has indicated that it does not intend to oppose the planning permission. That does not resolve the planning merits of the current siting, nor does it remove the Authority's obligation to assess the

acceptability of the proposal's siting and appearance in light of the specific impact on Unit 1 and given Jansu Group Limited own one third of the estate freehold.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, prior approval ought to be refused in relation to the proposed siting and appearance of this development. In the alternative, the Authority is requested to require the applicant to relocate the mast and associated equipment to a less harmful position, including proper consideration of the alternative location further along the recreational ground near the car park.

Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and place it before the planning officer determining the application.

Yours sincerely,

Mr M Fullbrook