

Canberra Lake Way

Charvil

READING

RG10 9DH

1 June 2026

Planning Application 253071

To whom it may concern,

I wish to object to the latest iteration of the planning application 253071. Although it has been very pleasing to see that the footpath has been removed, the proposal continues to fall short of Wokingham Borough Council policy requirements and the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan.

The buffer behind Canberra Lake Way remains far too narrow (as little as 2.5–5m) and lacks structural planting. It cannot provide meaningful long-term screening, acoustic protection, or ecological value. As stated previously, I have sought the opinion of two different tree surgeons who advise that a consistent buffer of an absolute minimum of 5m would be required to provide ease of access for maintenance, as well as preventing overhanging for both current and future residents. A narrow strip with isolated trees cannot function as an ecological corridor or deliver biodiversity net gain. Pre-commencement conditions would also be essential to avoid past failures experienced during the Canberra Lake Way development. The initially proposed, **10-metre-wide**, densely planted buffer is what would be required to protect privacy, reduce noise, and deliver genuine green infrastructure. The Planning Voice layout that has been submitted is a good example, in certain parts, of the size of buffer that is required. If this could be reflected as a minimum size of buffer surrounding the Canberra Lake Way estate, it would realistically reflect what was part of the selling process to the current residents.

The proposed two-storey homes sit at a higher ground level and back directly onto existing gardens, creating unacceptable overlooking and visual dominance. The latest proposal disappointingly confirms that minimum separation distances are relied upon instead of designing a neighbourly layout. High-density housing is concentrated along the Canberra Lake Way boundary, out of keeping with the surrounding detached-housing character. Also, affordable units remain grouped together and should be dispersed across the site to ensure tenure blindness. Parking provision is insufficient for 75 homes, likely causing overflow into neighbouring streets and East Park Farm car park.

As I've stated on the three previous proposals, I have no issue with the 75 houses being built the need for them, but the proposal does not protect residential amenity, fails to meet key planning policies, and does not provide adequate green infrastructure. I respectfully request refusal from the Council to this latest iteration unless the required amendments are made.

Yours faithfully,

Matthew Bowler