

PLANNING REF : 260986
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 17
: Lytham Road, Woodley, Reading, Berkshire
: RG5 3BT
SUBMITTED BY : Mr DAVID SCEARCE
DATE SUBMITTED : 13/06/2026

COMMENTS:

FULL PLANNING COMMITTEE OBJECTION

Technical Details Consent pursuant Permissions in Principle Ref:
251580

For submission to Wokingham Borough Council Planning Committee

To: Planning Services, Wokingham Borough Council
Re: Objection To Planning Application 260986

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to formally object to the planning application and respectfully request that the Planning Committee carefully consider the following concerns before determining the application. While the principle of the residential development may have been established through Permission in Principle reference 251580, the current application fails to demonstrate that the detailed design, environmental impacts, infrastructure requirements and technical constraints can be safely addressed.

Taken individually and collectively, the issues outlined below raise serious concerns regarding biodiversity compliance, drainage, ecology, tree protection, residential amenity, highway safety and conformity with the scope of the Permission in Principle. I therefore request that the application be refused or deferred pending submission of the outstanding technical information.

1 Biodiversity Net Gain Deficit

The statutory requirement under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Environment Act 2021) is a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain.

The Wessex report dated 27th May 2026 explicitly confirms that the proposed development will result in a 14.5% net loss in on-site biodiversity. The applicant proposes to address this deficit through a 0.02 of site habitat units from a registered Biodiversity Net Gain provider. However:

- . No provider has been identified
- . No legal Agreement is in place
- . No evidence has been submitted that suitable units are available .

The metric results indicate that the biodiversity trading rules have not been fully satisfied

Approving a development where mandatory compliance relies entirely on unconfirmed future off-site purchases would set a concerning precedent and may not satisfy the legal requirements at the point of determination.

2 Drainage- Inadequate Assessment

The drainage assessment prepared by Colony Architects is repeatedly described as preliminary and indicative only and does not constitute a detailed drainage design.

The following critical work has not been undertaken.

- . No Topographic Survey
- . No ground Investigation
- . No Infiltration testing
- . No hydraulic Modelling
- . No utility investigations
- . No sewer capacity assessment.
- . No pre-application enquiry to Thames water

- . No section 104 or section 106 discussions or agreements

The proposed drainage strategy relies entirely on discharge by the Thames Water surface water sewer on Lytham Road. Thames Water have not confirmed network capacity, acceptable discharge rates or whether reinformment works would be required. Infiltration has been ruled out due to surrounding tree Root Protection Areas and no watercourse is available. The only viable solution is therefore dependant upon third party approvals that have not yet been sought. The application fails to demonstrate compliance with Policy CC02 regarding water service Management

3 Trees-Risk to Protected and Adjacent Trees

The arboricultural report identifies eight individual trees and groups on the adjacent site.

Ash Tree T2 is already exhibiting signs of ash dieback (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*). including crown decline and poor fork. Its Root

Protection Area overlaps with proposed construction and access areas. Construction activity may accelerate decline or compromise structural stability.

Further concerns relate to:

- . T6 (Sycamore, Category B1)
- . T7 (Oak Category B1)
- . T8 (Horse Chestnut, Category B)

These off site treasure of moderate-to-high quality and there root Protection areas extend into the development site.

The report acknowledges that:

- . Access roads require specialist no-dig construction
- . No structural engineer has designed the required solution
- . Utility routes have not been confirmed
- . Protective fencing positions remain unresolved
- . A pre-start meeting with the councils arboricultural officer has not taken place.

The Statement that there is no reason to assume services cannot avoid RPAs is not evidence that they can. Any damage to these mature trees would permanently harm local character and amenity.

4 Overlooking and Loss of Privacy

The proposed two-storey building contains first floor windows facing

neighbouring properties, including properties on Crockenwell Road. Residents of Nos 15-17 are likely to experience overlooking into gardens and rear-facing rooms. Although some windows are proposed as obscure glazed, this treatment is selective and does not eliminate all potential lines of sight. The Council should carefully assess compliance with residential amenity standards relating to privacy and overlooking.

5 Loss of Light and Overshadowing

The constrained nature of the site and proximity to neighbouring dwellings create a significant risk of overshadowing and loss of daylight.

Despite this, no daylight assessment, sunlight assessment or shadow study has been submitted. The omission prevents a full assessment of impacts on neighbouring gardens and habitable rooms.

6 Scale and Massing Out of Character

The surrounding area is characterised by spacious detached and semi-detached dwellings within relatively generous plots.

The proposal introduces a building containing three residential units on a site of only approximately 724 square meters. The density of development proposed is disproportionate to the surroundings and represents overdevelopment that is out of keeping with local character.

7 Backland Development and Visual Amenity

The site constitutes backland development on land previously experienced as part of the open gardening brownfield environment of existing properties.

The proposal would:

- .Reduce visual openness
- . Alter established views
- .Erode the spacious garden character
- . Change the appearance of the area when viewed from neighbouring properties.

The development would permanently alter the character currently experienced from surrounding gardens and properties.

8 Construction Impact

Construction activity likely to generate significant disruption through:

- .Heavy goods vehicle movements
- . Noise
- . Dust
- . Vibration
- .Traffic Disruption

The access arrangements from Lytham Road are constrained and located immediately adjacent to residential properties.

No construction management plans have been submitted, preventing proper assessment of these impacts.

9 Parking and Highway Safety

Although additional parking spaces are proposed , great concerns remain regarding highway safety.

The layout relies on a shared turning area acted directly from Lytham Road. No independent highway safety audit or swept-path analysis has been submitted to demonstrate that vehicles can safely enter, manoeuvre within and exit the site without conflict with pedestrians (especially as the proposed exit is next to a pedestrian crossing which is used by the public, elderly, children and staff and pupils from Addington School) and other road users.

10 Noise and Disturbance to other Residents

The communal parking are, cycle storage and refuse storage are all positioned close to neighbouring boundaries.

Noise arising from vehicle movements, residents activity and waste collections likely to affect neighbouring residents. No acoustic assessment has been submitted to quantify or assess these impacts.

11 Inadequate Pre Development Ecology Survey

The baseline habitat survey relied upon for Biodiversity Net Gain calculations undertaken on the 15th July 2025, nearly a year before the submission of the application.

The ecology report acknowledges that the red line boundry was later extended northwards to include the existing car park area. that area was not re-surveyed and were made regarding its ecological value.

Assumption-based assessments do not provide a robust ecological baseline for the full application site.

12 Permission in Principle-Scope of Consent

The application seeks Technical Details Consent pursuant to Permission in Principle reference 251580.

While the proposed three units fall within the approved range of two to four dwellings, concerns arise regarding the application boundary.

The current red line boundary appears to extend beyond the area considered under the original Permission in Principle, particularly th rough the incorporation of the northern car park area. Any development outside the approved boundary would not benefit from the Permission in Principle and this matter should be clarified before consent is granted.

13 Affordable Housing and Developer Contributions

No Affordable housing provision has been discussed within the submitted documentation.

The Council should satisfy itself that all relevant obligations and contributions have been considered, including Community Infrastructure Levy Liability. The subMITTED CIL documentation appears incomplete in several respects and the validity of the application should therefore be confirmed.

Conclusion

The application is not supported by sufficient technical evidence to justify approval at this stage. Significant unresolved issues remain

regarding biodiversity compliance, drainage, ecology, tree protection, residential amenity, highway safety and conformity with the scope of the Permission in Principle

For these reasons I respectfully request that Wokingham Borough Council either:

- 1 Refuse the application
- 2 Defer determination until the outstanding technical information has been provided and independently assed

Yours Faithfully

David John Searce
17 Lytham Road
Woodley
Reading
RG5 3BT