
Interested party 27

Comments

My wife and I have lived in Hurst for over 30 years. Our two sons went to school here. Much has changed in those years particularly with regard to flood risk and traffic density, both of which have increased visibly in the last ten years.

1. Permission in Principle (PiP) is, in theory, a simple way to streamline the approvals process. In practice the granting of PiP gives the applicant a sense that full approval is a mere formality. As a result, this site has now seen three refused applications and two dismissed appeals. PiP should never have been granted for the following reasons:

1.1 Previous Inspectors have stated that Hurst is unsuitable for major development as currently defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In order to qualify as a medium or minor category the area of the proposed development must be below 1 hectare. In order to comply with this requirement this proposal claims a site area of 0.96 Ha. This has been achieved by cutting a "Magic Circle" from the centre of the plot.

1.2 Similarly, the Attenuation Basin, an integral part of the flood and drainage strategy, sits outside the Redline Area. In reality the Attenuation Basin would require a trapeze shaped plot to the Northwest of Plots 6 & 7 shown on DRG No.8543 F04 dated 1 January 2026.

1.3 If the "Magic Circle" and the Attenuation Basin had been included within the Redline Area the correct plot area would be at least 15% higher than the 0.96 Ha shown. When CAD allows pinpoint accuracy, such "inaccuracy" shows a cynical manipulation of the rules.

2. Flood Risk

2.1 The Supplementary Statement on Flood Risk (SSFR) Para 3.1.2, states.

"...run off [surface water] would be stored, controlled and released at rates less than exiting greenfield rates." This carefully controlled flow is then going into a drainage ditch system which the report declares is blocked. See paras 3.3.3/4/5.

This Appeal is a blatant attempt to brush aside flooding concerns and to play the system in order to obtain planning permission. It should be rejected accordingly.

James Kiddie

13th July 2026. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 28

Comments

Planning Appeal: APP/X0360/W/25/6011047
Wokingham Borough Council Application: 260353
Interested Party: Mr D Wilkinson
Challenge Cottage
Lodge Road
Whistley Green
Reading
Berkshire
RG10 0ES

Formal Objection

I wish to register my strongest objection to the above Planning Appeal and the associated Application for Permission in Principle (PiP).

This proposal represents yet another attempt to secure development on this site despite previous planning applications having been refused and, most significantly, the most recent appeal having been dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate in October 2025. The current application does not overcome the fundamental planning objections previously identified. Instead, it appears to be an attempt to obtain development consent through the Permission in Principle process rather than addressing the substantive planning concerns that have consistently led to refusal.

Permission in Principle was introduced to establish whether the fundamental principles of development are acceptable before technical details are considered. However, it is not an appropriate mechanism for a site with such significant and well-established planning constraints. The suitability of this site cannot be separated from its environmental, landscape, flooding and infrastructure impacts. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and national planning policy in several important respects.

The site is a greenfield site located outside the defined development limits of Hurst, within open countryside. Development in this location would erode the rural character of the village and would be contrary to Wokingham Borough Council Core Strategy Policy CP11, which seeks to protect the countryside for its own sake and restrict development outside established settlements unless specific policy exceptions apply. None of those exceptions apply in this case. Furthermore, the site has been identified as unsuitable for development within the emerging Wokingham Local Plan Update. While the emerging plan may carry limited weight depending on its stage of preparation, it nevertheless demonstrates that the Council has assessed this location and concluded that it is not an appropriate site for future housing growth.

The proposal is also inconsistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly those relating to achieving sustainable development, protecting and enhancing the natural environment, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and ensuring that development is genuinely sustainable in terms of location and infrastructure. The site lies within an area well known for flooding. Hurst has experienced repeated flooding issues over many years, and this site is among those most affected. Replacing permeable agricultural land with roads, hard standing and built development will inevitably increase surface water runoff and place additional pressure on existing drainage systems. Even if technical mitigation is proposed at a later stage, the principle of development on such a flood-sensitive site remains highly questionable. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that flood risk can be satisfactorily managed without increasing risk elsewhere, contrary to national planning policy.

The proposal would also cause significant harm to the landscape character of the area. Having lived in Hurst for the past eight years, I have seen first-hand the importance of this open countryside in defining the identity of the village. The site contributes positively to Hurst's rural setting, the Area of Special Character, and the wider landscape surrounding several Grade II listed buildings. Development would permanently urbanise this landscape, resulting in an unacceptable loss of openness and visual amenity. In addition, the site provides valuable agricultural land and habitat for wildlife. It also forms part of a wider network of public footpaths and bridleways that are used daily by walkers, dog owners, horse riders and cyclists. The enjoyment of these recreational routes depends upon the open rural landscape that this proposal would fundamentally alter.

I am also concerned that the proposed access road extending through open countryside between existing developments is indicative of future incremental or phased expansion beyond the current proposal. Such infrastructure is rarely provided without facilitating additional development, raising legitimate concerns that this application represents the first stage of a much larger scheme. The cumulative effects of such expansion should not be ignored. This proposal is fundamentally speculative and appears to be driven primarily by commercial gain rather than any identified planning need. Hurst is classified as a minor settlement with limited services and infrastructure. It is not a sustainable location for further significant housing growth and has already made a substantial contribution towards the Borough's housing supply.

Additional development in this location would place further pressure on roads, drainage, local services and community infrastructure without delivering corresponding public benefits.

The previous Planning Inspector carefully considered these issues and concluded that the development was unacceptable. The current proposal does not resolve those concerns and, in many respects, presents an even less appropriate form of development through the use of the Permission in Principle process. Allowing this appeal would undermine confidence in the planning system by permitting repeated speculative applications on a site that has consistently been found unsuitable for development.

For all of these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Inspector dismisses this appeal and refuses Permission in Principle.

Yours faithfully,
Mr D Wilkinson [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 29

Comments

I do not support this appeal.

The reasons for this include:

1. There is a significant flood risk in this area. Adding more properties will increase the risk and the plans do not provide mitigation.
2. Hurst already lacks infrastructure. Adding more homes will add to the pressure on the road network, schools and amenities.
3. This development is unsuitable for a rural area. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents
