

PLANNING REF : 261722
PROPERTY ADDRESS : One Willow
: 30 Hartley Court Road, Reading, Berkshire
: RG7 1NS
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Suzanne Buckner
DATE SUBMITTED : 16/08/2026

COMMENTS:

My name is Suzanne Buckner of 30 Hartley Court Road, Near Three Mile Cross, Reading, Berkshire, RG7 1NS. I write in full support of the planning application No: 261722 made by James and Josh Frankham.

My family lived next to James and Joshua Frankham and their family for circa 10 years and found them pleasant and supportive neighbours.

Having lived at Carosal House, Great Lea Common, Near Three Mile Cross, Reading, Berkshire, RG7 1NP since I was 6 years old, I have lived in the neighbourhood for 53 years (I moved to 30 Hartley Court in 2003) and have had no issues with the Frankham's nor have I had an issue with their family. In fact, it has been the reverse and particularly throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, I would have struggled without their support as at the time I had 3 disabled people living in my household.

I have been particularly disturbed by a document which was put through my door on 3rd August 2026, I now find that this document was sent by the occupants of Lea Farm house. Because of the highlighted passages referencing "one residential Gypsy and Traveller pitch" (which I find unbelievable that someone would feel the need to highlight this) many of my neighbours who are new to the area have been upset and scared by this.

Furthermore :-

1. The AWE Exclusion zone. Having now studied this and the Aldermaston zone in detail and having had a father who worked at AWE, the exclusion zone is dependent on one's interruption and would seem to prohibit any of the future development plans that Wokingham Borough Council, Reading and West Berkshire have. Indeed with thorough examination one could question retrospectively the granting of planning applications that have been granted in Spencer's Wood and Three Mile Cross. The Richborough application for 420 homes etc would appear unable to be approved if this zone is applied strictly.
2. The use of the land. It is called Great Lea Common for a reason, it is common ground and has been under trees for the 53 years I have lived here. The word "Lea" or "Leah" is an Anglo-Saxon word signifying a "clearing in a wooded area", at best the land would only be fit for grazing and nothing more. Most of the deeds for the houses around here will testify this - my parents' house noted that their land and those surrounding could only be used for the grazing of pigs. The land's topography is low-lying and flat common-edge terrain situated near local drainage systems and feeder streams of the River Loddon catchment. It has not been used for any agricultural purpose and would not be fit to be used as such. If you look in the past it was used for grazing for animals.

3. Historically Leafields House: The name Leafields transitioned into a specific property residential marker (Leafields / Leafields House) nestled alongside fellow historical plots like Lea Farm House, Carosal House (my parents' house which was historically the laundry building for the Benyon estate), and Trehane along the Great Lea lane.

4. The ecology point that has been made is ludicrous as there was never a pond there. The land is a flood plain area and as such when the trees covered the ground it developed a "swamp" area when it rained which could not drain due to the trees.

5. The issuing of flooding is now taken care of by two points. Firstly, the land has been cleared and secondly, the "two caravans" which will be static will not be anywhere near the area that has the potential to flood.

6. In relation to the plot and the plans that have been submitted, I find them wholly agreeable. I would question if this application was not granted that this is due to racism by the local people, and they should remember various high court precedents in relation to the protected characteristics of the group known as Gypsies. These precedents include but are not limited to: Casey and Smith v Secretary of State [2025], the High Court quashed planning refusals for Traveller sites after finding that inspectors made fundamental mistakes regarding flood-zone risks and miscalculated evidence from statements of common ground. Furthermore, In Mole Valley DC v SSHCLG [2025], the High Court dismissed a council's challenge and upheld a planning inspector's decision to grant permission for Gypsy and Traveller pitches, ruling that appropriate developments do not inherently harm Green Belt openness

7. In relation to the notion that there will be increased traffic and demand on local amenities, this seems a strange objection in light of the fact that the applicants currently live at Mere oak park.

Therefore, there will be no heavier demand on the local amenities than there are now. In terms of the increase in traffic, it will simply be deferred traffic from Mere oak Park and will be circa two vehicles.

To conclude, I believe there is no sustainable reason in which this planning application should be refused. I am in full and unwavering support of this application being approved.