

PLANNING REF : 252297
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 6 Hermitage Drive
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG10 9HS
SUBMITTED BY : Ms Merryn Pearce
DATE SUBMITTED : 28/10/2025

COMMENTS:

Planning Department
Wokingham Borough Council
Civic Offices
Shute End
Wokingham
RG40 1BN

Subject: Objection to Planning Application No. 252297 - 26 Wargrave Road, Twyford

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to Planning Application No. 252297 for the proposed development at 26 Wargrave Road, Twyford. My objection is made on the following grounds, taking into account the plans submitted and the relevant planning policy context:

1. Detrimental Impact on Residential Amenity

- The proposed scale, bulk and proximity of the buildings will cause unacceptable loss of light to the neighbouring properties.
 - Under the adopted Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD) Policy CC06 (Noise) of the Borough, development must safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
<https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Adopted%20MDD.pdf>
 - Further, Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010) requires that development "maintains and enhances the high quality environment" of the Borough.
https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Final_adopted_Core_Strategy%5B1%5D.pdf
 - The NPPF (2021/23) states at Paragraph 130(e) that developments should ensure "a high standard of amenity for existing and future users".
 - The area is one of detached houses and significant garden space. The loss of the garden space here would close in and impact the street scene significantly. It would also be set back from the current street. If it is to be developed, it would be more appropriate to open into Lincoln Gardens.
 - The fact that on three sides it is the absolute legal minimum distance from the boundary is incongruous with an area of mixed housing that is low density.
 - The proposed scheme fails to meet these requirements because it would harm the residential amenity of existing occupiers.
2. Overdevelopment
- The density, massing and footprint of the proposed scheme appear excessive for the site. It results in a cramped form of development which is out of keeping with the character of neighbouring plots.
 - The closeness to boundary lines already mentioned shows overdevelopment for the area.
 - MDD Policy CC02 (Development Limits) and Policy CC03 (Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping) emphasise that new development must respect the character of its surroundings and allow for adequate landscaping and separation.

<https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Adopted%20MDD.pdf>

- The Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3 require new developments to respect the character, landscape and setting of the area.

https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Final_adopted_Core_Strategy%5B1%5D.pdf

- The new development would therefore conflict with these policies by dominating the site and reducing the openness and spacing typically seen on Hermitage Drive.

3. Inappropriate Layout

- The layout proposed fails to respect the established pattern of development in Hermitage Drive. The siting of buildings, the orientation of access and the relationship to the street and neighbouring plots appear inconsistent with the streetscape. - The layout seems odd considering what they have stated the internal layout to be. If it is a bungalow that they truly intend to build, then some of these objections would be reduced by having the roof lower. A typical height of roof for a bungalow is 2.4 meters but the ridge height in these drawings is about 6 meters high. This is much closer to the typical height of a 2-storey house. The low end of which is 6.1 meters.

- Under MDD Policy CC03 and TB21 (Topic Based - Landscaping & Garden Development) the scheme must retain existing landscape features,

provide appropriate separation, and ensure the layout integrates with its surroundings. [https://](https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Adopted%20MDD.pdf)

[wokingham.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s70264/180711.pdf](https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Adopted%20MDD.pdf)

The submitted layout does not provide sufficient separation or landscaping as required by these policies and therefore fails the test of good design as required under CP3.

4. Highway Safety

- The access and parking arrangements raise serious concerns for highway safety. The additional traffic movements proposed will add to congestion and the risk of conflict with pedestrians and cyclists. - Parking is at an absolute premium in Twyford and the loss of parking area and turning circle in Hermitage Drive will cause significant detriment. It would mean that in the 22 hours of the day when there are no parking restrictions it will be all too easy to have no passing or turning space between Anchorite Close and Pine Grove, a distance of 119 meters.

- MDD Policy CC07 (Parking) requires adequate parking and turning to reduce on-street overspill and improve safety.

<https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Adopted%20MDD.pdf>

- Further, the borough's Local Transport Plan sets out that new development must provide layouts, street designs and associated measures that are "safe, suitable and convenient for all users" and must not have a "severe adverse impact on the local and strategic highway networks".

<https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Adopted%20MDD.pdf>

- The access shown appears inadequate in terms of visibility and manoeuvring, and could result in unsafe conditions, contrary to these policy requirements.

Considering the above concerns and the conflict with the adopted development plan policies (Core Strategy and MDD) and the NPPF, I respectfully request that the Council refuse Planning Application No. 252297. The proposed development would cause unacceptable harm

to
residential amenity, constitute overdevelopment, have an
inappropriate layout for the context, and raise unacceptable highway
safety risks.
Thank you for taking my views into account and for giving full
weight to the policies cited in this objection.

Yours faithfully,

Merryn Pearce