

PLANNING REF : 253071
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 10 Canberra Lake Way
: Charvil, Berkshire
: RG10 9DH
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Anna Short
DATE SUBMITTED : 25/05/2026

COMMENTS:

25th May 2026

Planning ref: 253071

I wish to formally object to the planning application to the land off Park Lane, Charvil. In particular, the proposed footpath.

Objection no. 1

Proposed footpath could link a non adopted area to adopted.

It will provide easy access to available visitor car parking spaces to the new development (which has minimal visitor parking bays). The footpath will increase pedestrian and vehicle traffic through CLW and the managed estate.

Will the residents of the Bellway development using the CLW facilities contribute to the management costs of the CLW cul de sac?

Objection no. 2

No clear reason or purpose for the footpath.

The path runs parallel to Park Lane which is approx 200m away.

How much would the path cost to maintain for Charvil Parish Council or WBC? Could the budget be better used on improving the Park Lane footpath, maintaining the vegetation throughout the year and ensuring Park Lane path remains viable for the school? Especially given its close proximity?

Objection no. 3

The current ground levels of the path are uneven and varying widths. The ground level difference between no 10 and no 11 is approx 1m and the land drops to the Bellway development area. The topographical study indicates the fall could be approx. 5m.

The objection is based on the insufficient detail and evidence to demonstrate the footpath can be constructed in compliance to Building Regulations Part M, for minimum width, minimum gradients for accessibility and provision of drainage in its proposed location.

The path design could result in gradients exceeding building regulations (greater than 1:40 and desirably 1:20) for wheelchair users, a narrow entrance at the CLW end below the minimum width advised in the Building Regulations and combined with the fall, there is significant risk for non compliance to Building and CDM Regulations in the design, building and maintenance of the path and ensuring safety to all users.

Objection no.4

Privacy, security and safety of no. 10 is compromised by the footpath and/ or undermining to no. 11's garage footings.

To overcome the height difference and change in levels, either the path will be raised or lowered in comparison to the ground levels of no.10 and 11 respectively.

The objection raised is in relation to the lack of details contained in the planning submission to demonstrate the safety, security, privacy and structural integrity of the effected properties is not compromised and the path can be constructed in accordance to the Building Regulations.

There is a section with no physical boundary or fence which opens directly into no 10's garden from the proposed path. The planning submission does not consider the boundary gap and how the privacy and security of no. 10 will not be compromised by the footpath.

The plans also do not offer details of the drainage, who will be responsible for the maintenance and ensure there is no flooding to no 10, especially in the event the drains are not maintained adequately.

Objection no. 5

A footpath of this nature will require lighting.

In the event the path is constructed, the Police have recommended the lighting to in compliance to BS5489-1:2020 in their report dated 12th November 2024. Compliance to this Standard would introduce light pollution into the rear gardens of no. 10 and 11, and primarily into the main sleeping room of no. 10, compromising the privacy, well being and safety of the occupants.

Objection no. 6

The current planning submission has insufficient details and does not consider the recommendations from the Police by offering a boundary treatment, to improve safety and security to the properties adjacent to the path with the use of defensible space between private and public areas. How can this be achieved, allowing vegetation and stand off areas, as recommended by the police report?

Objection no. 7

The police report states the addition of the path creates a leaky cul de sac and increased crime. The Police report recommends the footpath should be avoided. The report also references three separate reports, to support the recommendation with case studies. Based on this Police recommendation, the inclusion of the footpath could result in increased risk to personal safety of the CLW residents and additional insurance costs.

Objection no. 8

It's wonderful to see children playing in a safe and secure environment created by the cul de sac of CLW. The narrow entrance into CLW ensures traffic speeds are reduced, providing further guarantees the children can play safely. The addition of the footpath would compromise the safety and security of the children and give parents more unnecessary concerns.

Objection no. 9

It is understood from the Bellway covering letter the inclusion of the footpath was requested by Wokingham Borough Council on 16th April

2026. As I commented to the outline planning application, the exclusion of the path was a welcome change. This objection is raised towards WBC and requests clarity and explanation from the council for their reasons to include the path, the perceived benefits and why these would outweigh the risks and the issues outlined in my earlier 8 objections.

Please can these objections be considered by WBC and Bellway and responses provided?

I am not against the development but I am against to the inclusion of the footpath, especially when there is no clear benefit or purpose for the path and the impact of the path on the cul de sacs safety and security is significant. I ask for WBC to openly consider these objections in a transparent and fair manner against their reasons for the inclusion of the footpath.