

PLANNING REF : 252856
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 297a
: 297A Nine Mile Nine Mile Ride, Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG40 3NL
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Paul Phelps
DATE SUBMITTED : 04/01/2026

COMMENTS:

Objection to Planning Application 252856

I submit a formal objection to this planning application and respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuse permission. The proposal fails to comply with the development plan when read as a whole and gives rise to significant and demonstrable planning harm, as set out below.

1. Severe Overdevelopment and Conflict with Character

The site has already been subject to excessive and unjustified overdevelopment when assessed against the scale and form of the original modest dwelling. The cumulative scale, massing, footprint and intensity of development now bear no reasonable relationship to the host property.

As such, the proposal conflicts with development plan policies that seek to ensure new development respects local character, is proportionate to its setting, and does not constitute overdevelopment.

2. Unacceptable Encroachment Beyond the Established Building Line

Successive permissions and amendments have progressively extended both the front and rear elevations well beyond the original footprint of the dwelling. These extensions have already caused material planning harm to neighbouring properties, including increased overshadowing and a loss of outlook.

The current proposal advances development even further beyond the established building line of the street. This encroachment would result in an incongruous and visually disruptive form of development that fails to respect the established pattern of development, undermines the coherence of the street scene, and causes further harm to neighbouring amenity. The proposal therefore fails to meet the requirement that development should integrate positively with its surroundings.

3. Unacceptable Harm to Residential Amenity

The proposal fails to safeguard the living conditions of adjacent occupiers and would result in demonstrable harm to residential amenity. In particular, the development would give rise to:

- Loss of privacy through increased overlooking

- An overbearing and oppressive impact due to scale and proximity
- Increased noise and general disturbance

These impacts are material planning considerations and, either individually or cumulatively, amount to an unacceptable level of harm that is inconsistent with development plan policies and

national planning guidance which require development to create a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

4. Incremental Development and Failure to Assess the True Impact of the Scheme

The planning history of the site demonstrates a clear pattern of incremental development, whereby permission has been sought for smaller elements that, when viewed in isolation, mask the true scale and intended outcome of the development.

I previously objected to the garage proposal on the basis that it was not genuinely intended to serve as a garage but as a precursor to a separate residential unit. The current application confirms those concerns. This gradual approach has prevented the Local Planning

Authority and affected neighbours from properly assessing the full extent and impacts of the development at an earlier stage.

Planning decisions must be based on the substance of development proposals rather than their form, and applications should not be considered in a vacuum. The Authority is therefore required to assess the proposal in the context of the site's planning history and the evident trajectory of development.

5. Misuse of the Non-Material Amendment Process

Of serious concern is the unusually high number of "non-material amendments" approved in relation to earlier permissions on this site. Several of these amendments have resulted in tangible and material impacts on neighbouring properties, including changes to scale, siting and relationship with boundaries.

The cumulative effect of these amendments has materially altered the nature of the approved development, yet they were approved without consultation or proper scrutiny. This raises significant concern as to whether the non-material amendment process has been used appropriately, given that non-material amendments should not result in material planning harm.

6. Failure to Properly Consider Cumulative Impact

The Local Planning Authority is required to consider the cumulative impact of development. When the current proposal is assessed alongside all previous permissions and amendments, it is evident that the site has been pushed well beyond what is reasonable, proportionate or acceptable within a residential setting.

The cumulative harm to character, visual amenity and residential amenity is substantial and should carry significant weight in the determination of this application.

Conclusion

The proposal results in unacceptable planning harm arising from overdevelopment, conflict with the established character of the area, significant loss of residential amenity, and a gradual approach that undermines transparency and proper planning assessment.

As the harms identified are not outweighed by any public benefits, the application fails the planning balance and should be refused in accordance with the development plan and national planning policy.