

Date: 7 October 2025
Application: 252257



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

WBC Highways

Development Management &
Compliance

P.O. Box 157

Shute End, Wokingham

Berkshire, RG40 1BN

Tel: (0118) 974 6000

Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991

Dear WBC Highways,

Full Planning Approval Consultation

Application Number: 252257

Applicant: -

Site Address: Ladds Garden Village, Bath Road, Hare Hatch, Wokingham, RG10 9SB

Parish: Wargrave

Grid Reference: Easting - 480689, Northing - 177888

Type of Development: Major Dwellings (10+)

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of 19no. dwellings with associated landscaping and access following demolition of existing buildings.

Case Officer: Marcus Watts

Development Management has received the above application, and we require your comments on the proposal using the recommended memorandum below. The documents associated with this are available to view in NEC DM using the application number 252257. Alternatively, public documents are available to view on the Council's planning application search page: [Wokingham Borough Council Online Planning](#).

Please index your response into NEC DM against the application. If you are recommending conditions, you should give a reason with reference to relevant policies. A list of standard conditions can be requested from the case officer.

Your observations are required in respect of this application by **4 November 2025**.

Yours sincerely,
Development Management & Compliance

MEMORANDUM

From:	JP		
Service	WBC Highways	App No:	252257
Address:	Ladds Garden Village, Bath Road, Hare Hatch, Wokingham, RG10 9SB.		
Proposal:	Full application for the proposed erection of 19no. dwellings with associated landscaping and access following demolition of existing buildings.		
Type of Development:	Major Dwellings (10+)		
Site Visit Made:	Yes/No		

Summary Of Recommendations

- ☐ No comment
- ☐ No objection
- ☐ No objection subject to conditions (and reasons) **stated below**
- ☒ Request further information before determination as **stated below**
- ☐ Objection due to the reason(s) **stated below**

Comments On Proposal

General

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing garden centre and erect 19 no. dwellings, which includes 2 no. dwellings with two habitable rooms, 2 no. dwellings with 3 habitable rooms, 2 no. dwellings with five habitable rooms, 9 no. dwellings with six habitable rooms and 4 no. dwellings with seven habitable rooms.

The existing vehicular access will be retained with proposed widening and improvement works on crossing points.

Traffic Impacts

Traffic flows have been assessed in the Transport Statement, which is welcomed. TRICS data has been used for the proposed trip rates.

While the Highways would have expected the approved trip rates in WBC transport model (WSTM4) to be used for assessment, the proposed trip generation of 10 and 9 two-way movements in the AM and PM peak, respectively, is mostly similar to the total trip generation by applying the approved trip rates, which can be acceptable for this instance.

Sustainability

Sustainability assessment has been included in the transport statement with actual walking and cycling distance from the mid-point of the site, which is welcomed.

Walking

There are very limited local facilities within acceptable walking distance from the site. All closest day-to-day local facilities are located beyond the acceptable walking distance (with majority of these local facilities to be over 2km), making the site an unsustainable location for housing development.

It is noted that Gear Change, published by the DfT, has been referenced. The document states that in urban areas, more than 40% of journeys were under 2 miles and that such journeys are perfectly suited to cycling and walking.

However, the document does not suggest that 2 miles should be taken as a benchmark for an acceptable walking distance. It would be a misinterpretation to conclude that most day-to-day journeys of up to 2 miles (3.2 km) represent a reasonable or 'maximum' walking distance.

With reference to Image 5.5 of the Transport Statement, the proportion of walking trips decreases significantly from around 80% for journey distances under 1 mile to 30% for journey distances between 1 and 2 miles, with car use becoming the dominant mode of travel.

The Highways therefore consider the walking distances set out in the IHT's Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot to be the most applicable reference for assessing pedestrian accessibility. These distances are understood to apply broadly, including within rural areas and for journeys such as commuting and school travel.

Cycling

Cyclists are typically reliant on cycling in the road, which the LTN1/20 defines these as 'mixed traffic' conditions.

The speed limit along the site frontage is 50mph. While the applicant proposes to contribute to the reduction on this section of the A4 Bath Road to 40mph, 'mixed traffic' conditions with speed limits of 40mph and 50mph are considered as "Provision suitable for few people and will exclude most potential users and/or have safety concerns". The applicant has acknowledged the A4 Bath Road is not designed for cyclist.

If the applicant would consider cycling to be the major sustainable travel mode, appropriate protection from motor traffic on highways shall be proposed along the A4 Bath Road according to Figure 4.1 of LTN 1/20.

Alternatively, the applicant shall consider diverting the cyclist traffic onto 'quiet lane' to the south of the site. The applicant will have to provide survey data results to justify the proposals, works to improve the cycling environment and to propose measures to ensure low traffic flows and speed can be retained.

Public Transport

The nearest bus stops at Hare Hatch Grange are circa 400m from the mid-point of the site, which is within acceptable walking distance. The bus stops in both

directions are served by routes 127, 227 and 227A. However, not frequently than hourly services are currently available. Late evening and Sunday services are also not available, which does not meet the requirement for good public transport services.

Summary

While a new pedestrian refuge island crossing on the A4 Bath Road is welcomed, the distance to local facilities and the frequency of bus services are not attractive for considering sustainable travel mode.

Based on the information currently available, the Highways unlikely support this proposal due to unsustainable location. However, if this proposal would be approved on tilted balance, other required details for the proposal are listed below.

Access

The site will utilise the existing access onto the A4 Bath Road, and two pedestrian accesses onto the A4 are also proposed. A new pedestrian refuge island is proposed on the A4 Bath Road, to the west of the site access.

Traffic Data

The details in summary table in Table 3.3 does not align with the traffic survey data provided in Appendix A. It is uncertain how the 85th percentile speeds in Table 3.3 have been derived. Clarification is required.

Table 3.3: Observed Traffic Flows and Speeds – A4 Bath Road

Direction	Traffic Volumes		Vehicle Speeds (mph)	
	Morning Peak (0800-0900)	Evening Peak (1700-1800)	Average Speed	85 th Percentile Speed
Eastbound	733	581	40.2	43.9
Westbound	572	837	42.5	46.6

	Eastbound	Westbound
Total	57716	58567
Mean Speed	40.2	42.6
85%	44.7	48.2

	Eastbound	Westbound
Total	57443	58092
Mean Speed	41.8	42.5
85%	47.1	47.8

It is stated that the 85th percentile speeds along the site frontage have been assessed by speed surveys, and the assessed visibility splays of 2.4m x 118m (SSD for 43.9mph) and 2.4m x 132m (SSD for 46.6mph) have been provided to the west and east of the junction, respectively, from the proposed access onto the A4 Bath Road.

However, given the 85th percentile speeds along the site frontage would be in between 44.7mph and 47.1mph for EB and in between 47.8mph and 48.2mph for WB, the assessed visibility splays are unlikely to be sufficient. Revision is required.

Meanwhile, as the site access is located at a bend and does not cover the intervisibility with the proposed crossing point, the visibilities along the tangent to the bend shall be assessed, to ensure that the required SSD on the nearside edge of the carriageway can be provided. The sightlines shall be across land within the applicant's control or highway land, and shall be clear of obstructions to visibility exceeding 0.6m in height.

Pedestrian Refuge Island

To improve pedestrian and cyclist safety, the Highways will welcome the proposal of extending the existing 40mph speed limit zone to cover the site frontage. The applicant is invited to provide further details for the proposed speed reduction.

A Stage 1 RSA has been carried out, which the LHA would have expected a Road Safety Audit Brief Report (Prior to completion of the Stage 1 RSA) to be agreed as required by DMRB GG119. The details of the auditor's qualifications shall also be submitted to the LHA to demonstrate the independent auditor is suitably qualified.

While the applicant has accepted the RSA recommendation to provide a splitter island within the taper to the east of the right turn lane, the proposed pedestrian visibility on the southern side of the A4 Bath Road to the east has not been assessed properly, in particular when the A4 Bath Road observes a high percentage of HGV traffic.

The applicant is expected to measure the intervisibility (to the east) at the proposed crossing point on the southern side of the A4 Bath Road along the tangent to the bend.

As stated in the 'Sustainability' section, if the applicant would consider cycling to be the major sustainable travel mode, appropriate protection from motor traffic on highways shall be proposed along the A4 Bath Road according to Figure 4.1 of LTN 1/20. The proposed width of the shared use refuge island shall also increase to a minimum of 3m.

Internal Access Road

Information on whether or not the primary site roads will be offered for adoption will need to be supplied. Whatever the case, the road will need to be built to highway standards. If the site roads are to remain private, this will also need to be included in a s106 agreement. Any S106 will need to include an obligation that the site road will be maintained as a private road in perpetuity.

The internal roads are proposed to be shared surface with a minimum width of 5.5m along the primary access road to accommodate two-way traffic, with reduced width of 4.2m wide for Plots 10-11 and 14-15, which are welcomed.

A 2m service margin shall be provided on both sides of the road where development is being proposed, to align with the borough's highway design guidance.

While the swept path analysis for fire tender has been submitted to demonstrate the manoeuvring of a fire tender vehicle entering and leaving the site access in forward gear to within 40m reach to the furthest point of any dwelling, the applicant is expected to assess with the following adopted dimensions for fire tender:



DB32 Fire Appliance
Overall Length
Overall Width
Overall Body Height
Min Body Ground Clearance
Max Track Width
Lock to Lock Time
Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius

8.680m
2.180m
3.452m
0.337m
2.121m
6.00s
7.910m

Pedestrian accesses are solely provided onto the A4 Bath Road along the northern boundary. While the applicant proposed that the internal roads will be shared surfacing, this is no direct internal pedestrian/cycling route for the future occupiers to access to the pedestrian accesses from the south of the site, Plots 9-12 in particular. The applicant is therefore required to improve the connectivity within the site.

The applicant may wish to consider providing a 3m wide shared footpath/cycle path between Plots 6 and 7 to improve the connectivity within the site.

Given the application red line has been extended to Scarletts Lane, the applicant may also wish to explore the opportunity to provide a cyclist access onto Scarletts Lane if it justifies for a 'quiet lane' for cycling. The access road shall be designed in accordance with the requirements in LTN 1/20.

Parking

According to the WBC Car Parking Standards, the demand of parking for residential dwelling is subject to the numbers of habitable rooms. Each parking space shall have minimum dimensions of 5.0m x 2.5m, and the minimum internal sizes of a single garage/carport for parking to be 6m x 3m. The minimum dimensions for parallel parking space are 6m x 2.5m.

The proposed 6.5m wide aisle width for Plots 1-4 will be sufficient for vehicle manoeuvring at forwards gear, which is welcomed.

The applicant has provided a parking assessment for Village location, with 46 allocated parking (including 16 carport bays and 2 garage bays) and three unallocated visitor parking. However, the proposed site is classified as Town and Fringe location. The proposed numbers of habitable rooms also not aligned with the submitted floor plans.

The Highways have reassessed the parking requirements based on the submitted floor plans, which will require 4 visitor parking spaces and 2 unallocated parking. The proposed unallocated/visitor parking provisions are insufficient.

As provisions of unallocated parking can affect the efficiency of the use of spaces and layout of the development, and allows the changes in car ownership between individual dwellings over time, additional capacity within private driveway will not serve the same purpose. Reallocation of parking provision is required.

The proposed dimensions of the driveway parking spaces are acceptable. However, the applicant shall review the dimensions of all carports and garages with minimum internal sizes of 6m x 3m for single bay parking.

Meanwhile, to prevent additional parking that obstruct the access road, the Highways recommend reducing the driveway length for Plots 8, 17 and 18 to no more than 8m, Plots 12-14 for to no more than 13m, measured from the carriageway edge.

EV Charging Points

Each new dwelling will be expected to provide a minimum of one EV Charging Point under the Building Regulations (Approved Document S). It is confirmed that all homes at the site will be provided with an EVCP, which is welcomed.

However, the applicant is required to indicate the position of EVCP on the revised parking plan.

Cycle Provisions

According to the WBC Parking Standards, one cycle parking allocation will be required per dwelling for three or less habitable rooms, two will be required for dwelling with 4-5 habitable rooms and three will be required for dwelling with 6+ habitable rooms.

While it is stated in the Transport Statement that the proposed development includes cycle parking in sheds in rear garden, or garages where presents, there is no mention of where the cycle parking spaces will be provided on the site plan. Direct access to the rear garden, cycle store or garage of suitable sizes (7m x 3m) shall be indicated for cycle storage. It can be conditioned if the cycle parking details are not provided in this proposal.

Refuse Collection Strategy

While it is uncertain if the proposed site roads will offer for adoption or remain private, the applicant has submitted the swept path for refuse vehicles entering and leaving the site with refuse vehicle of adopted dimensions, which is welcome. The Highways will therefore assume council refuse collection will be applicable for this site.

The Highways also expect to review swept paths showing that a refuse vehicle and a large can pass each other.

It is relevant to note that the vehicle body and chassis of the refuse vehicle will overrun the edge of the carriageway at Plot 13. Minor revision on road alignment will be expected.

According to Manual for Streets, the maximum carrying distances for households (30m) and refuse collection operators (25m) from the collection point. Such standards will apply to all plots within the site and shall be measured from the dwelling. The proposed carrying distance of 30m for Plot 11 has been measured from the centre of the driveway. The proposed refuse collection arrangement along the shared drive for Plots 9-13 likely have to be revised.

Meanwhile, with reference to WBC's Waste and recycling Guidance Notes for Developers, the distance between the bin store for flats and the parked refuse vehicle shall be no more than 10 metres. The proposed carrying distance for Plots 1-4 is not acceptable.

To avoid overspilling of wastes and recyclables to the driveway, the required area of the proposed bin store shall be confirmed with the council's Cleaner & Greener team.

Framework Construction Management Plan

A framework plan is expected to be submitted along with the planning application. This is required.

Summary

The Highways can unlikely support the proposal due to unsustainable location.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)

Date:	9/10/2025	Signed:	JP
--------------	-----------	----------------	----