

PLANNING REF : 261695
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 7 Hart Dyke Close
: Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG41 2HQ
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Philip John Sturdy
DATE SUBMITTED : 03/09/2026

COMMENTS:

I object to the planning application 261695 primarily in regard to the change of use of the land / town boundary creep issue, but also the amenity impact from the inappropriate sports pitch layout and supporting infrastructure.

With respect to change of use:

This area of land was previously part of a larger application to change the use of the land from countryside and extending the Wokingham town boundary, turned down by the council, appealed, and eventually denied by the inspector in 2020. Whilst the Planning & Design Statement calls out SS5: Development in the Countryside, this is a bit of a stretch from a "necessary reasonable and proportionate for the use" perspective when there are already sports facilities nearby either existing or with planning permission granted such as the sports hub on the Gray's Farm site. I'd also argue it does not meet the "reasonable" requirement due to the plot of land is insufficiently sized to safely implement a cricket oval (see my later loss of amenity point re cricket ball strike risk).

With respect to loss of amenity:

1) Risk of injury or damage to property from cricket balls

The application does not include a Cricket Ball Strike Risk Assessment covering statistically likely shots from each crease over the full 360 degrees.

Luckley School cohort spans years 7 to 13 not "aged 7 to 13 years" as stated in the Planning & Design Statement, and declares a private school sports achievement ethic, hence it would not be unreasonable to expect the pupils to be able to hit a cricket ball beyond the property boundary. The statement also implies availability of the new facilities for community use which could include adult players.

The risk is heightened by the nature of the properties, 1990s era development on smaller plots with correspondingly small gardens, hence very little additional buffer between the property boundary and the houses, patios, windows, etc. Residents cannot reasonably be expected to avoid using their own gardens, or to install their own protective screening.

*** I request that the application not be determined until a comprehensive Cricket Ball Strike Risk Assessment has been submitted, consulted on, found satisfactory and the installation of any resulting mitigation is a requirement of consent which is apparently not without precedent in similar cases. Also any mitigation is not implemented in a manner where it can become overlooked or forgotten like the all weather sports pitch lighting times conditions at the school.

2) Loss of amenity due to the acoustic barrier

The acoustic barrier parallel with the property boundary both blocks light and the view for those immediately in proximity and would fail to attenuate sound at the ends unless the barrier wrapped around the side of the pitches. It also would not attenuate sound on the first floor of the properties regardless.

Thank you