

To all members of Planning & Highways Committee

Notice is hereby given and you are summoned to attend a meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on Wednesday 8th April 2026, at the School Green Centre, RG2 9EH, commencing 19:30.



Bruce Winton
Chief Executive and Clerk to the Parish Council
1st April 2026

Members: Cllrs Boyer, Hoyle, Jahromi, James, Masseron and Peer (Chair)

Agenda

34. Public Questions

- 34.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** public questions

35. Apologies and declaration of members' interests

- 35.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** approval of apologies for absence
35.2 To **RECEIVE** members' declarations of interest, and any related person interest in respect of the agenda

36. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 36.1 To **RECEIVE** and **APPROVE** the minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee held on 18th March 2026 as a correct record of the meeting and to authorise the Chair to sign the same*
- 36.2 To **CONSIDER** matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 18th March 2026

37. Schedule of Deposited Plans

- 37.1 Planning applications are being reviewed weekly. Plans deposited following the most recent Thursday planning email which require urgent attention will be forwarded as received

38. Appeals

- 38.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** planning inspectorate appeals relating to Shinfield Parish*
- 38.2 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the decision of the planning inspectorate for Gravelly Bridge Farm*

39. Enforcement Notices

- 39.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the Closed Enforcements tables for March 2026* (for information only)
- 39.2 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** the Outstanding Enforcements tables for March 2026* (for information only)

40. Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

- 40.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal update on Footpath 12
- 40.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal report from the Traffic Working Party meeting with Wokingham Borough Council held on 25th March 2026
- 40.3 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal report on any other Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

41. Renewal of Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 41.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal update from the Neighbourhood Plan Renewal Working Party meeting held on 26th March 2026
- 41.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** any update on registering Assets of Community Value

42. Monitoring Officer

- 42.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on the appointment of a monitoring officer

43. Correspondence

- 43.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** a Wokingham Borough Council Press release: Help shape the future of Loddon Valley Garden Village – draft Strategic Design Code*

44. Future Meetings

- 44.1 To **NOTE** the next meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee meeting is Wednesday, 13th May 2026

*** indicates papers attached**

**** indicates papers to follow**

Minutes of a meeting of
Planning & Highways Committee
Held on Wednesday 18th March 2026
At School Green Centre commencing at 19:30

Present: Cllrs Boyer, James, Masseron and Peer (Chair)

Attending: B Winton (Clerk)

One member of the public

26/PC/23 Public Questions

23.1 There were no public questions

26/PC/24 Apologies and declarations of Members' Interest

24.1 Receive and consider approval of apologies for absence

Apologies had been received from Cllrs Hoyle & Jahromi and the Deputy Clerk

24.2 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of members' pecuniary interests.
There were no declarations of related person interest in respect of the agenda.

26/PC/25 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

25.1 The minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee held on 11th February 2026 were approved and signed as such by Cllr Peer.

Proposed: Cllr Boyer
Seconded: Cllr James
Approved: Unanimously

25.2 Actions and Matters Arising from the meeting held on 11th February 2025

26/PC/12.1 Clerk to invite the member of public to join the Traffic Working Party

This had been done. The meeting was arranged for 25th March at 4.00pm.

26/PC/14.2

26/PC/7.1

Clerk to follow up dates for a meeting with BCllr Betteridge to discuss outstanding highways and footpath issues

See minute 12.1 above.

26/PC/15.3 ➤ Clerk to circulate the draft report from ET Planning, once received, to members of the committee

This had been done and was on the agenda – minute 26.2

➤ Clerk to send the final report to Nigel Frankland, University of Reading (UoR)

This will be done.

➤ Clerk to arrange for the response to be published in the Shinfield Parish Council (SPC) electronic newsletter

This Clerk will arrange promotion of the council's submission in response to the Loddon Garden Village planning application 252498.

ACTION – Clerk to arrange promotion of the council's submission in response to the Loddon Garden Village planning application 252498

➤ Deputy Clerk to add the draft response to the Loddon Garden Village planning application to the agenda of the next Planning and Highways Committee meeting

This was on the agenda – minute 26.2

➤ Deputy Clerk to add to the agenda of Full Council meeting to be held in March

It was agreed that this did not require a specific agenda item at Full Council. All members were sent the draft response on Monday and made aware that it will be discussed at this meeting.

26/PC/16.1 Clerk to amend the monthly planning inspectorate appeals report to cover the last years only, therefore 2023/2024 financial years onwards.

This had been done.

26/PC/17.1 Clerk to share the link to the Planning Applications and Enforcement Investigations Dashboard to members of the Committee

This had been done.

26/PC/18.1 Clerk to investigate options and costs for installing CCTV on footpath 12

This was on the agenda – minute 29.1

26/PC/18.3 WBC consultation on bus services

- Clerk to obtain more detailed information relating to the request for a contribution towards funding

The Clerk would arrange a Teams meeting with Rebecca Brooks including Cllrs Boyer and Peer

ACTION – Clerk to arrange a Teams meeting with Rebecca Brooks including Cllrs Boyer and Peer to discuss potential improvements to bus services

- Clerk to add bus services to the agenda of the Finance and General Purposes Committee

This had been done, then referred to Full Council and finally back to Planning & Highways

- Clerk to arrange for awareness with residents by publishing in the newsletter and on social media encouraging responses to the consultation

This had been done.

- Clerk to raise the issue of signage of the cycleway from Spencers Wood via Lidl to Church Lane at the meeting with BCllr Betteridge

The issue of signage of the cycleway from Spencers Wood via Lidl to Church Lane will be raised at the meeting with BCllr Betteridge.

26/PC/18.5 Clerk to request WBC to install an additional streetlight on Cutbush Lane

The Clerk advised that WBC were considering the possibility of additional street lighting in this area.

26/PC/19.2 Clerk to submit the requests for Assets of Community Value for the Manor Ground Pavilion and land; and High Copse Pavilion

This was on the agenda - minute 30.2

26/PC/26

Schedule of Deposited Plans

26.1 Planning applications were circulated to members weekly. Plans deposited following the most recent Thursday planning email which require urgent attention will be forwarded as received.

26.2 Planning Application 252498 – Loddon Garden Village

Members had received the initial draft response last week and submitted comments. This had resulted in a revised version which was circulated to all members of council on Monday 16th March. Active travel considerations in the response should be linked to the safer streets initiative launched by WBC and covered at minute 29.3.

After discussion, members agreed to submit the revised version to WBC prior to the extended deadline for submission of 20th March 2026.

Proposed: Cllr Boyer
Seconded: Cllr Peer
Approved: Unanimously

The Clerk advised that the total consultancy costs were below the anticipated budget by approximately £5,000

ACTION – Clerk to arrange the submission of the council's response to Planning Application 252498 to Wokingham Borough Council

ACTION – Clerk to share the submission with Clerks of adjoining parishes and towns and the University of Reading as a courtesy

26.3 Planning Application 242484 – Land to North of Arborfield Road – 191 dwellings and Planning Application 252138 – Land East and West of Hyde End Road – 183 dwellings

Members NOTED that both applications had been approved by Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) at their Planning meeting on 11th March 2026

26.4 Planning Application 250517 – Land off Basingstoke Road to the South and West of Spencers Wood

Members NOTED that a second submission on this had been submitted before the closing date of 17th March 2026.

26/PC/27

Appeals

27.1 Planning inspectorate appeals relating to Shinfield Parish

There had been no new cases in February.

26/PC/28

Enforcement Notices

28.1 Closed Enforcements tables for February 2026

This month there were

- 2 cases deemed no breach
- 4 cases had applications submitted
- 1 case – other
- 1 case - TBC

Members **NOTED** the Closed Enforcement Tables

28.2 Outstanding Enforcements tables for end February 2026

It was noted that there were now 9 live enforcement notices for Bismillah House

- Storage of vehicles and containers – investigation ongoing
- Construction of extended area of hard standing – investigation ongoing
- Tree works application 223088 replanting not undertaken – investigation on going
- Unauthorised workshop
- Refusal of 252320

NEW for this month

- TPO removal to facilitate hard standing at the rear
- Unauthorised siting of portakabins
- Erection of annexe
- Unauthorised fencing

7 new cases in addition to those outlined above.

Members **NOTED** the outstanding Enforcement tables

26/PC/29

Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

29.1 A verbal report on Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath matters

Footpath 12

Cllr Masseron advised that Vistry were proceeding with the development of 7 houses meaning that they would also be responsible for an element of the path. Discussions were ongoing with WBC. At the previous meeting the Clerk had been tasked with identifying potential solar powered CCTV cameras for this area. The Clerk had identified a potential option, and it was agreed that he use his designated authority to acquire a single unit to test at Ryeish Green Pavilion where there was a recurring ASB issue.

ACTION – Clerk to acquire a single unit of the solar powered CCTV camera for testing at Ryeish Green Pavilion

29.2 An update on the footpath from Lailey Path to Shinfield Infant and Nursery School - Planning

The Clerk reported an update from the WBC officer working on this case. Listed building consent had been approved, and WBC were still awaiting the remaining two permissions although there had only been comments in support of each.

29.3 Putting People First on our Streets – Safer Speed Limits Progress

Members considered the Safer Speed limits initiative launched by WBC. The Clerk reported on a Teams meeting arranged by WBC for town and parish clerks which had been very positive. WBC set out the criteria for assessing Expressions of Interest and were initially looking for options based on “lines and signs” changes.

The initiative would also extend to rural roads as well as areas suitable for 20mph limits.

It was agreed that SPC would persist with the remaining speed reductions identified some years ago by the Traffic Working Party and also submit Expressions of Interest for specific housing developments following the meeting scheduled for 24th March.

Further changes could be put forward in future years.

ACTION – Clerk to submit Expressions of Interest for the Safer Speed Limits programme

29.4 Bus improvements

There was nothing further to discuss at this point in time.

29.5 Other Highways, Street Lighting and Footpath Matters

The Clerk advised that WBC had received objections in the statutory consultation for the proposed reduction in speed limit in Grazeley. The timescales were such that this meant it could not be considered for an Individual Executive Members Decision (IEMD) until after the May WBC elections.

16/PC/30

Renewal of Neighbourhood Development Plan (SPNDP)

30.1 A verbal update from the Neighbourhood Plan Renewal Working Party.

There was no update to provide since the last meeting. The consultant had been in touch to confirm her attendance at the meeting on the 26th March.

- 30.2 A verbal update on registering Assets of Community Value (ACV)

These had now been submitted to Wokingham Borough Council.

ACTION - Clerk to report back to committee when a decision had been made on the Assets of Community Value submissions

26/PC/31

Monitoring Officer

- 31.1 The proposal for a developer paid Monitoring Officer working on behalf of the town and parish councils to represent their interests in future discussions on Reserved Matters for Loddon Garden Village had been included with the council's submission.

26/PC/32

Correspondence

- 32.1 Public consultation for a Proposed solar farm on land adjoining Fullers Lane, Grazeley, Reading, RG7 1LR on 11th March

Members NOTED the information relating to the public consultation

- 32.2 Invitation to Hatch Farm Lane / Loddon Garden Village workshop

Members NOTED the Invitation to Hatch Farm Lane / Loddon Garden Village workshop

25/PC/33

Date of the next meeting

- 33.1 The date of the next meeting will be Wednesday, 8th April 2026

The meeting ended at 20.20

List of actions

Reference	Action	Responsibility
15.3	Clerk to arrange promotion of the council's submission in response to the Loddon Garden Village planning application 252498	Clerk
18.3	Clerk to arrange a Teams meeting with Rebecca Brooks including Cllrs Boyer and Peer to discuss potential improvements to bus services	Clerk
26.2	Clerk to arrange the submission of the council's response to Planning Application 252498 to Wokingham Borough Council	Clerk
26.2	Clerk to share the submission with Clerks of adjoining parishes and towns and the University of Reading as a courtesy	Clerk
29.1	Clerk to acquire a single unit of the solar powered CCTV camera for testing at Ryeish Green Pavilion	Clerk
29.3	Clerk to submit Expressions of Interest for the Safer Speed Limits programme	Clerk
30.2	Clerk to report back to committee when a decision had been made on the Assets of Community Value submissions	Clerk

Planning Inspectorate Appeals for RG2 & RG7 within Shinfield Parish as at :-

30th March 2026

Item 38.1

Case Reference	Site Address	Post Code	Case Type	Linked	PA	Status	Decision Date	Comments
APP/X0360/C/25/3374730	Land at Gravelley Bridge Farm	RG7 1LG	Enforcement Notice Appeal		N/A	3	10/03/2026	The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.
APP/X0360/W/23/3329586	Land adjacent to 176 Hyde End Road	RG2 9ER	Planning (W)		231229 223646	3	22/05/2024	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/D/24/3337926	253 Shinfield Road	RG2 8HF	Householder (HAS)		232141	3	05/04/2024	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/23/3326997	Belamie Gables, 210 Hyde End Road	RG7 1DG	Planning (W)		223802	3	08/02/2024	WBC refused PA. Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/C/23/3314060	Uplands, Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AP	Enforcement Notice	L2	222052	3	17/11/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI succeeded in part. WBC Enforcement Notice modified to allow for wall to be reduced in height
APP/X0360/W/22/3309384	Uplands Basingstoke Road READING	RG7 1AP	Planning (W)	L2	222052	3	17/11/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal to PI was dismissed
APP/X0360/W/22/3311543	Parkside House Lambs Lane READING	RG7 1JE	Planning (W)		222478	4	23/05/2023	WBC refused PA. Developers Appeal was upheld. Change of use of land to residential and erection of detached building to house domestic garaging and ancillary storage with first floor games room

KEY	
1 =	New case not previously report
2 =	Case in progress
3 =	Complete - WBC original decision upheld
4 =	Complete - WBC original decision overturned
5 =	Complete - Appeal withdrawn
Lx =	Linked cases
xxxx	Indicates changed since previous report



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2026

by **A Walker MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/C/25/3374730

Land at Gravelley Bridge Farm, Grazeley Green Road, Grazeley, Reading RG7 1LG

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Tim Evans on behalf of Gravelley Bridge Shooting Association against an enforcement notice issued by Wokingham Borough Council.
- The notice was issued on 12 September 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the material change of use of the Land to a shooting club facility (Sui Generis) and unauthorised operational development (erection of fencing, hardstanding and buildings) and engineering operation (creation of bunds).
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 - (i) Cease the use of the Land for use as a shooting club facility/ range.
 - (ii) Remove from the Land all buildings and structures, including disconnecting all utilities, shown in blue in the approximate locations on the attached Plan 2.
 - (iii) Remove from the land all chattels, fences, hardstanding and bunds, shown in blue in the approximate locations on the attached Plan 2.
 - (iv) Remove from the Land all other paraphernalia associated with the unauthorised shooting club facility.
 - (v) Remove all the resultant materials associated with steps (i) to (iii).
 - (vi) Restore the Land to its former condition prior to the breach of planning control taking place.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is nine months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

The ground (a) appeal and the deemed planning application

Preliminary Matter

1. The Council confirm that the Local Plan Update (LPU) is at Regulation 22 stage as it has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. Whilst as a whole, the LPU is to be given limited weight, due to it still undergoing examination and there being unresolved objections to a number of policies, the Council identify several emerging policies that have less objections and therefore should be attributed moderate weight. However, there is no evidence before me to indicate what these outstanding objections are. Accordingly, as with the remainder of the LPU, I attribute these policies limited weight.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are as follows:

- Whether the development is located in a suitable location, having regard to the development plan, including the effect on the character and appearance of the area and accessibility to alternative forms of transport to the private car;
- The effect of the development on the adjacent Public Right of Way (PRoW);
- The effect of the development on flooding;
- The effect of the development on the emergency off-site plan for the Atomic Weapons Establishment site at Burghfield;
- The effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of nearby residential properties, with regard to noise; and
- The effect of the development on public health, with regard to land contamination.

Location

3. Policy CC02 of the Wokingham Borough Managing Development Delivery Local Plan 2014 (the LP) sets out that planning permission for proposals at the edge of defined settlements will only be granted where they can demonstrate that the development, including boundary treatments, is within development limits and respects the transition between the built up area and the open countryside by taking account of the character of the adjacent countryside and landscape.
4. The appeal site is not located within, nor near to, the development limits of a defined settlement. Policy CP11 of the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy 2010 (the CS) permits development outside development limits subject to specific exceptions.
5. Exception 1) of Policy CP11 requires development to contribute to diverse and sustainable rural enterprises within the borough, or in the case of other countryside based enterprises and activities, it contributes and/or promotes recreation in, and enjoyment of, the countryside.
6. Shooting *per se* is clearly a countryside recreational activity requiring open spaces, such as for clay shooting or wildlife. However, a shooting club facility is different. The appeal development comprises a building that consists of a reception/seating/gallery area that leads to the shooting range at the rear. The shooting range has a fence along the western boundary and large earth bunds along the northern and eastern boundaries. The site also contains numerous storage containers; a toilet block; large hardstanding area; and various paraphernalia associated with the use.
7. Typical of shooting ranges, there are targets set within the confines of a range which are physically contained, as they are in this instance by a fence and earth bunds. Moreover, shooters are stationary and in this instance under cover. I note that there are no facilities within the appeal site, as identified on the plan attached to the notice, for clay pigeon shooting.
8. Whilst there are no doubt shooting ranges in countryside locations, that is not to say they must be based there. They could be located within an urban environment without any loss of experience to the users. Therefore, I do not find that the

shooting range is a countryside based enterprise or activity. Accordingly, I find the development fails to satisfy exception 1).

9. Exception 1) is one step to achieving compliance with Policy CP11; exceptions 2) and 3) must also be satisfied. However, as exception 1) is not satisfied, I need not go onto consider exceptions 2) and 3). There is no dispute the development does not satisfy any of the other exceptions set out in Policy CP11.
10. Notwithstanding the failure to satisfy any of the exceptions identified in Policy CP11, it is important to consider whether the development satisfies the general objective of Policy CP11, which is to protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain the quality of the environment. The appeal site is not near any settlements and therefore does not affect the identity of any settlement.
11. In terms of maintaining the quality of the environment, the appeal site is in a countryside location characterised by open, agricultural fields interspersed with sporadic pockets of development comprising various residential and commercial uses.
12. Immediately to the south of the appeal site is a small industrial estate comprising a number of commercial units. These buildings are arranged in an intimate complex adjacent to Grazeley Green Road. It is through this site that access to the appeal site is gained. The appeal site is located some distance past these buildings and beyond the extent of land associated with the uses carried out within the estate.
13. Overall, the development represents an unacceptable encroachment into the countryside and has an incongruous urbanising effect that erodes the rural character and appearance of the area.
14. In terms accessibility of the site to alternative forms of transport to the private car, due to its secluded location and distance from Grazeley Green Road, the nearest bus stop is approximately 1.7 km from the site and is therefore not within reasonable distance. There is a PRow that runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the appeal site.
15. The access road leading to the appeal site off Grazeley Green Road is composed of crush-and-run/rubble and is in a very poor condition. At the time of my site visit, the track was proliferated with very large potholes, particularly near the beginning of the track where large lorries frequently use it. The stretch of track towards the appeal site is in a better condition.
16. Grazeley Green Road has narrow verges with no footways and is unlit. Therefore, users of the shooting range would unlikely visit the site by walking along Grazeley Green Road. The PRow runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the appeal site. However, this too is unlit and does not connect to any public transport services within reasonable walking distance. Therefore, users of the site would unlikely walk along the PRow to access the site.
17. I have had regard to a travel plan and the proposition of car sharing. However, there is no evidence before me of how this would work, particularly with regard to visitors. Accordingly, I am not satisfied that a condition requiring as such would be appropriate.
18. Consequently, the shooting range has very poor access to alternative forms of transport to the private car. Therefore, users of the site would be heavily

dependent on the use of the private car. This further emphasises the unsuitability of the location for the development.

19. I therefore find the development is not located in a suitable location, including the harm it has on the character and appearance of the area and its lack of access to alternative forms of transport to the private car, and therefore undermines the spatial strategy of the development plan as set out in Policies CP1, CP3, CP6, CP9 and CP11 of the CS and Policies CC01 and CC02 of the LP, which, amongst other things, seek to ensure development is in existing settlements or allocated development sites; protects the quality of the environment; and, is located where there are or will be at the time of development choices in the mode of transport available.

PRoW

20. The PRoW is a footpath for walkers only. The only access to the site is along the track that runs parallel to the site. Therefore, walkers utilising the PRoW and users of the shooting range driving to the site are both using the PRoW. As the track is unlit it may be difficult for drivers to clearly see walkers using the PRoW, particularly when it's dark. This risk would be exacerbated by the poor condition of the track as drivers would likely be focusing on avoiding potholes rather than looking for walkers.
21. As well as the physical aspect of the PRoW, the development also effects the experience of walkers that use it. Having to share the PRoW with vehicles means walkers must be vigilant for oncoming vehicles, which would not have previously been present, at least not to the current extent. This would diminish the experience of walking along this stretch of the PRoW.
22. The appellant contends that they have made improvements to the PRoW by clearing vegetation. However, there is no evidence before me that the vegetation was restricting the use of the PRoW.
23. The use is limited to certain times of the day and only open a few days a week. This reduces the harm I find above to the safety and experience of the users of the PRoW. Nevertheless, I find the development has an unacceptable harmful effect on the PRoW, contrary to Policy CP3 of the CS, which seeks to ensure development provides a safe scheme. It would also be contrary to paragraph 105 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that planning decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.

Flooding

24. The appeal site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3a. The Framework requires applications for development to be supported by site specific flood risk assessments, as well as a sequential test and exception test if applicable. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that the Sequential Test should be applied to non-major development proposed in areas at risk of flooding. Given the appeal site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3, this is an area at risk of flooding and therefore a Sequential Test is required.
25. Footnote 62 of the Framework confirms that changes of use do not require a Sequential Test to be carried out, except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park. Whilst the appeal development

includes a change of use, it also includes operational development and engineering works and therefore a Sequential Test is required. No Sequential Test has been carried out. Furthermore, there is no evidence of a flood risk assessment before me.

26. Consequently, the appellant has not undertaken a sequential approach and locate the most vulnerable development in the areas at lowest risk of flooding; there is no consideration of how a range of flooding events (including extreme events) will affect people and property; it has not been demonstrated that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere; and, there is no consideration of how people will be kept safe from any flood hazards.
27. I acknowledge that the development is classed as less vulnerable development and that the Exception Test does not need to be applied. However, that does not negate the need for a Sequential Test and flood risk assessment.
28. I have had regard to the imposition of a condition, in the event I allow the appeal, requiring an assessment of climate change, raised finished floor levels, appropriate flood storage compensation and resistant/resilient measures. However, I cannot be certain that such measures could sufficiently mitigate any risk to flooding.
29. With regard to surface water drainage, the appeal site comprises a large area of hardstanding and a number of solid roof buildings and structures. As such, there is likely to be a greater degree of surface water run-off. There is no evidence before me confirming how this is mitigated, which further adds to the concerns regarding flooding.
30. I am not satisfied that the development avoids unacceptable flood risk. As such, it is contrary to Policy CP1 of the CS, Policies CC09 and CC10 of the LP and the Framework which seek to avoid increasing risks of or from all forms of flooding.

Emergency plan

31. The site lies within the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) for the Atomic Weapons Establishment at Burghfield. Policy TB04 of the LP states that development will only be permitted where the applicant demonstrates that the increase in the number of people working and/or visiting the proposal (including at different times of the day) can be safely accommodated having regard to the needs of "Blue light" services and the emergency off-site plan (EOSP) for the Atomic Weapons Establishment site at Burghfield. It goes on to require the appellant to provide this information where the proposal includes more than one person working and/or visiting the development if it lies within the Inner Consultation Zone, which the appeal development does.
32. The appellant contends that the development is only small in scale, accommodating a maximum of 18 shooters in addition to the small number of staff. All staff and visitors arrive by their own means of transport and therefore, in the event of an emergency, they could self-evacuate. If they cannot self-evacuate they could use the club house as a temporary shelter. As such, the appellant considers there would be no undue pressure on blue light services.
33. However, self-evacuation is discouraged as it can lead to congestion that can hinder the effective operation of blue light services. Even within the site itself and

the track leading to Grazeley Green Road, up to 18 cars plus those of staff trying to exit the site simultaneously along a poorly conditioned track would likely take a substantial amount of time for everyone to evacuate safely, before they even get to the main highway network.

34. Despite the number of site users being relatively small, small developments have a cumulative effect. Each one increases demand on the resources available to implement the EOSP in the event of a radiation emergency. This demand would be in addition to the needs of existing people requiring assistance in the locality in the event of an evacuation. This can have a detrimental effect on the effectiveness of the EOSP.
35. The club house is a timber building and therefore would be treated as a priority site as it would not provide suitable protection for occupants to shelter in for up to 48hrs. As such, it would have an impact on blue light services resources, for which there is no justification.
36. I therefore find, the development would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the emergency off-site plan for the Atomic Weapons Establishment site at Burghfield. As such, it is contrary to Policy TB04 of the LP and Policy CP3 of the CS, which seeks to ensure that development provides a safe scheme. It would also fail to accord with paragraph 102 of the Framework, which promotes public safety.

Living conditions

37. On the evidence before me, the only shooting activity that takes place on the appeal site is the use of air rifles on the shooting range. Whilst clay pigeon shooting equipment is stored within the confines of the appeal site, the clay pigeon shooting itself takes place elsewhere. From the observations I made during my site visit, this appears to take place in a field adjacent to the appeal site. However, as the field falls outside the appeal site and no shotguns are fired within the appeal site, my consideration of the effects of noise on nearby residents is limited to the use of air rifles only within the appeal site.
38. There are no immediate residential properties that neighbour the appeal site. The nearest properties, along Mere oak Lane, Grazeley Green Road and Kybes Lane are separated from the appeal site by expansive fields.
39. The Council's Environmental Health department contends that a noise impact assessment is required. However, they make this comment in the context of clay pigeon shooting. They make no comment on the use of air rifles.
40. Although I note the comments received from a nearby resident outlining the effects the noise from shooting has on their health and wellbeing, it is not clear whether the noise they refer to is from air rifle or clay pigeon shooting. Given the proximity of the field that clay pigeon shooting appears to take place to the residential property concerned, I suspect clay pigeon shooting is the primary concern.
41. It is reasonable to conclude that firing an air rifle creates significantly less sound than firing a shotgun. The earth bunds and fencing that bound the shooting range would likely absorb some of the sound generated from the air rifles. Even though the range can accommodate up to 18 users at once, in the unlikely event that 18 air rifles are fired simultaneously I find it unlikely that it would generate a level of

noise that could be discernibly heard at the nearest residential properties, let alone to such an extent that it would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupants of these properties.

42. I therefore find the development does not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupants of nearby residential properties, with regard to noise. As such, it complies with Policy CC06 of the LP and the Framework, which seek to ensure development does not harm neighbouring residents.

Land Contamination

43. The Council raise concern about the implications lead and other metals may have in respect of land contamination. However, it is not clear whether this concern relates solely to clay pigeon shooting and the use of lead shot, or pellets fired from air rifles, or both.
44. Air rifles typically use pellets. The shooting range is enclosed and therefore the vast majority of the pellets fired would likely be contained within the range. I find therefore, in the event I allow the appeal, an appropriately worded condition could be imposed requiring a management plan to mitigate any potential risk of pellets contaminating the land.
45. As such, I find the development does not have an unacceptable effect on public safety with regard to land contamination. As such, it would comply with Policy CP1 of the CS, which seeks to minimise the emission of pollutants into the wider environment.

Other Matters

46. I have had regard to the imposition of a condition restricting the use to operate, and the operational development and engineering works to remain, for a temporary period of time, in effect a temporary permission. Notwithstanding there being no temporary period suggested, there is no evidence before me to justify imposing such a condition that would allow the unacceptable harms I have identified above to continue, albeit temporarily.

Conclusion on the ground (a) appeal and the deemed planning application

47. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all material considerations, I conclude that planning permission should not be granted in response to the ground (a) appeal against the enforcement notice and deemed planning application.

The ground (f) appeal

48. This ground of appeal is that the steps required by the notice to be taken, or the activities required by the notice to cease, exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control which may be constituted by those matters or, as the case may be, to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such breach.
49. The appellant contends that the fences could be erected under permitted development rights. However, the fence was clearly erected as part of the overall development of the shooting range, which would undoubtedly have been constructed as a single operation. As part of the shooting range required planning

permission, all of it required planning permission. Therefore, the fence was not permitted development.

50. Moreover, the fence is not of a design that is typically found in a rural location such as this. Even if the fence alone was retained, it would appear as an incongruous urban feature that would detract from the rural character and appearance of the area.
51. Accordingly, as the fence forms part of the overall breach of planning control, it is not excessive to require its removal in order to remedy the breach of planning control. In addition, it would not exceed what is necessary to remedy the injury to amenity caused by the breach.
52. The ground (f) appeal therefore fails.

Formal Decision

53. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

A Walker

INSPECTOR

Closed Enforcement Notices - as at 30th March 2026

Reference Number	Site Address	Received Date	Description	Closed Date	Outcome
RFS/2025/090896/04	Bismillah House (formerly Foxglade) Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	27/01/2026	register PCN	24/03/2026	Notice served
RFS/2025/090949	Willow Tree House Brookers Hill Shinfield Reading	03/12/2025	The siting of a mobile home without permission and storage of vehicles	10/03/2026	Voluntary compliance
RFS/2026/091051	Shire Hall, Shinfield Park Shinfield Reading RG2 9XY	15/01/2026	Breach of hours of operation	23/03/2026	Voluntary compliance
RFS/2026/091109	282 Hyde End Road Spencers Wood RG7 1DN	04/02/2026	Breach of condition 6 (bats) of 240105	04/03/2026	Application submitted
RFS/2026/091114	Shire Hall, Shinfield Park Shinfield Reading RG2 9XY	05/02/2026	concrete rubble lined by trees - not as per permission	23/03/2026	Voluntary compliance
RFS/2026/091133	Shire Hall, Shinfield Park Shinfield Reading RG2 9XY	13/02/2026	Non-compliance with site management conditions	23/03/2026	Voluntary compliance
RFS/2026/091168	Bismillah House (Granny Annexe) Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	26/02/2026	Erection of annexe	06/03/2026	No breach
RFS/2026/091180	Land East of Croft House Croft Road Spencers Wood Wokingham RG2 9EY	03/03/2026	Breach of condition 15 of 232333.	20/03/2026	No breach

Outstanding Enforcement Notices - as at 30th March 2026

Reference Number	Site Address	Received Date	Description
Reported last meeting			
RFS/2025/090264	Bismillah House Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	10/04/2025	Tree works application 223088 replanting not undertaken.
RFS/2025/090266	Bismillah House (formerly Foxglade) Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	10/04/2025	Construction of extended area of hardstanding.
RFS/2025/090778	9 Pattinson Road Shinfield Wokingham RG2 8QJ	01/10/2025	tree works undertaken on TPO-0426-1988 without PP
RFS/2025/090858	Land North of Church Lane Church Lane Three Mile Cross	03/11/2025	Non-compliance with conditions on 250435
RFS/2025/090880	Land At Stanbury House Basingstoke Road Spencers Wood Reading RG7 1AJ	10/11/2025	U/A works on site without PP
RFS/2025/090896	Bismillah House (formerly Foxglade) Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	14/11/2025	Storage of vehicles and containers
RFS/2025/090909	Land To The North Of Croft Road Spencers Wood Reading	18/11/2025	death of these trees on site
RFS/2025/090934	Land North Of Croft Road Spencers Wood Reading RG2 9EX	27/11/2025	BofC re landscaping
RFS/2025/090984	Bismillah House Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	15/12/2025	Unauthorised workshop
RFS/2026/091036	Land North of Church Lane Church Lane Three Mile Cross	12/01/2026	Erection of poles with lighting and cameras
RFS/2026/091040	Bismillah House Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	14/01/2026	refusal of 252320
RFS/2026/091130	Blackmoor Three Mile Cross Basingstoke Road	11/02/2026	High brick wall across frontage of the house.
RFS/2026/091137	Bismillah House Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	13/02/2026	TPO removal to facilitate hardstanding at the rear
RFS/2026/091138	Bismillah House Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	13/02/2026	unauthorised siting of portakabins
RFS/2026/091155	Riding Stables Land adjacent Blackmoor Basingstoke Road Three Mile Cross Wokingham RG7 1AS	24/02/2026	fence over 1m in height erected adjacent to the highway
RFS/2026/091169	19 Salmond Road Shinfield Reading RG2 8QN	26/02/2026	Outbuilding in rear garden without PP
RFS/2026/091170	Bismillah House Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	26/02/2026	Unauthorised fencing
RFS/2026/091185	12 -14 Grovelands Road Spencers Wood Wokingham RG7 1DP	03/03/2026	PP 251536 withdrawn re amenity lane
RFS/2026/091186	14 Grovelands Road Spencers Wood Wokingham RG7 1DP	03/03/2026	Breach of condition re replacement tree planting
New since last meeting			
RFS/2026/091193	Land Adjacent to Lane end House Shinfield Road Shinfield RG2 9BB	06/03/2026	Breach of Condition 12 (CEMP) of 222304
RFS/2026/091195	Bismillah House Brookers Hill Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9BX	06/03/2026	Extensions to existing outbuilding
RFS/2026/091258	6 Marlow Place Shinfield Wokingham RG7 1UF	26/03/2026	Installation of CCTV without permission

Press release: Help shape the future of Loddon Valley Garden Village
Wokingham Borough Council – received 23rd March 2026

HELP SHAPE THE FUTURE OF LODDON VALLEY GARDEN VILLAGE

Residents are being invited to help shape the future of Loddon Valley Garden Village by taking part in a consultation on its draft Strategic Design Code.

As part of the emerging [local plan update](#), Loddon Valley Garden Village has been identified as the largest strategic site for new development. [Several planning applications](#) have now been submitted for the new Garden Village, which is proposed to include 3,930 homes with 40 per cent affordable housing, new employment space and the facilities and infrastructure needed for a growing community.

The design code sets out the rules and guidance that will give the proposed new village a consistent look and feel. It will guide future development across the site.

The consultation focuses on how the proposed new village could take shape, rather than on whether the site should be developed. That decision sits with the local plan examination. Instead, this is an opportunity to help influence the design if the site is allocated as part of the new local plan. Feedback will help make the design code clearer, easier to use and more locally informed.

The plan is built around four ideas: landscape, buildings, community life and travel. It emphasises working with the natural environment, creating walkable neighbourhoods, providing accessible community facilities and ensuring walking, cycling and public transport are the easiest ways to move around. A future rapid bus system is also proposed.

“We want to make sure that any development at Loddon Valley Garden Village leads to a welcoming, sustainable and well-designed neighbourhood that works for people now and in the future,” said Cllr Stephen Conway, leader of the council.

“This consultation is a chance for residents to help shape the plans. I encourage everyone to have a look at the draft design code and share their views. What you tell us will help inform the final document, which will guide planning decisions for the site alongside the local plan.”

The draft design code has been prepared in line with national guidance and the local plan update requirement for a design code. It draws on local insight gathered through walking tours and engagement sessions.

Have your say

Residents can read the draft Strategic Design Code and complete the online survey through the [Council's Engage platform](#).

The consultation closes on 11 May, at which point feedback will be reviewed.

If you wish to take the survey but are unable to do so online, contact the council's customer services team on 0118 974 6000 or visit a borough library for support.