

PLANNING REF : 260353
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Challenge Cottage
: Lodge Road Whistley Green, Reading, Berks
: RG10 0ES
SUBMITTED BY : Mr David Wilkinson
DATE SUBMITTED : 06/03/2026

COMMENTS:

PLANNING REF : 260353
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Challenge Cottage, Lodge Road, Whistley Green
RG10
0ES.
SUBMITTED BY : Mr D Wilkinson
DATE SUBMITTED : 06/03/2026

COMMENTS:

RE: Planning application: 260353 Land North of Broadwater Lane and West of Hogmoor Lane, Hurst. Permission in principle application for the proposed erection of a maximum of 7 no. dwellings (or a minimum of 5 no. dwellings), including the formation of an access road from Broadwater Lane.

Further to my previous objections to the various guises of these planning applications on this site. I wish to strongly object to the latest planning permission in principle: 260353

Permission in principle is not suitable for this sensitive site. It is clearly playing "the game" a poor attempt by the developers to gain permission on a technicality, despite the most recent application for the site having been dismissed at appeal in October 2025, and obviously refused previously. The various guises the developer puts forward, all fail to address the Issue's that have been raised by my fellow residents.

This development will destroy the rural character of the area, It is development of a greenfield site, which lies outside the village development limit in a countryside location and does not fit with the identity of the area. It is against WBC planning policy CP11, this site lies outside the village envelope within the countryside and has also been assessed as unsuitable for development in the emerging new WBC Local Plan Update. I am sure there are other policies it would fall foul of. Hurst is a hotspot "known" for flooding in Wokingham borough, with the application site being one of the worse affected areas, adding more concrete to the area would only exacerbate an already problem area.

The road running through an open field between two developments is a strong, intentional indicator of future, incremental, or phased development. No developer has ever wasted money building a road to know where, unless it serves a purpose as this one surely does in the future if planning was passed.

I have lived in the village for 8 years. Building here will be detrimental to the visual character of Hurst's Area of Special Character, the setting of several Grade II listed buildings, loss of agricultural land and wildlife. With out doubt just a blot on a

beautiful landscape. The area is enjoyed by walkers with or without dogs, horse riders and cyclists. The wider area has a whole network of walkways paths and bridal ways, all used on a daily basis.

This is a speculative development purely for profit and is not necessary in Hurst, which has been identified as a minor settlement due to its poor infrastructure. Hurst has already exceeded its expected contribution to WBC's housing land supply. I thought common sense had prevailed when the appointed Inspector ruled against this developer's application last time around. This re-application renders the process somewhat confusing and pointless. Particularly since it presents far worse outcomes than the previous proposal did.

I respectfully request that Application 260353 is refused.

PLANNING REF : 260353
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Challenge Cottage
: Lodge Road Whistley Green, Reading, Berks
: RG10 0ES
SUBMITTED BY : Mr David Wilkinson
DATE SUBMITTED : 06/03/2026

COMMENTS:

PLANNING REF : 260353
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Challenge Cottage, Lodge Road, Whistley Green
RG10
0ES.
SUBMITTED BY : Mr D Wilkinson
DATE SUBMITTED : 06/03/2026

COMMENTS:

RE: Planning application: 260353 Land North of Broadwater Lane and West of Hogmoor Lane, Hurst. Permission in principle application for the proposed erection of a maximum of 7 no. dwellings (or a minimum of 5 no. dwellings), including the formation of an access road from Broadwater Lane.

Further to my previous objections to the various guises of these planning applications on this site. I wish to strongly object to the latest planning permission in principle: 260353

Permission in principle is not suitable for this sensitive site. It is clearly playing "the game" a poor attempt by the developers to gain permission on a technicality, despite the most recent application for the site having been dismissed at appeal in October 2025, and obviously refused previously. The various guises the developer puts forward, all fail to address the Issue's that have been raised by my fellow residents.

This development will destroy the rural character of the area, It is development of a greenfield site, which lies outside the village development limit in a countryside location and does not fit with the identity of the area. It is against WBC planning policy CP11, this site lies outside the village envelope within the countryside and has also been assessed as unsuitable for development in the emerging new WBC Local Plan Update. I am sure there are other policies it would fall foul of. Hurst is a hotspot "known" for flooding in Wokingham borough, with the application site being one of the worse affected

areas, adding more concrete to the area would only exacerbate an already problem area.

The road running through an open field between two developments is a strong, intentional indicator of future, incremental, or phased development. No developer has ever wasted money building a road to know where, unless it serves a purpose as this one surely does in the future if planning was passed.

I have lived in the village for 8 years. Building here will be detrimental to the visual character of Hurst's Area of Special Character, the setting of several Grade II listed buildings, loss of agricultural land and wildlife. With out doubt just a blot on a beautiful landscape. The area is enjoyed by walkers with or without dogs, horse riders and cyclists. The wider area has a whole network of walkways paths and bridal ways, all used on a daily basis.

This is a speculative development purely for profit and is not necessary in Hurst, which has been identified as a minor settlement due to its poor infrastructure. Hurst has already exceeded its expected contribution to WBC's housing land supply. I thought common sense had prevailed when the appointed Inspector ruled against this developer's application last time around. This re-application renders the process somewhat confusing and pointless. Particularly since it presents far worse outcomes than the previous proposal did.

I respectfully request that Application 260353 is refused.