

PLANNING REF : 260746
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Arborfield Village Hall
: Eversley Road, Arborfield
: RG2 9PQ
SUBMITTED BY : Arborfield & Newland Parish Council
DATE SUBMITTED : 21/05/2026

COMMENTS:

Arborfield & Newland Parish Council objects to this planning application.

The proposal is fundamentally non compliant with Wokingham's adopted planning policies and the Arborfield & Newland Neighbourhood Plan, despite the claims made in the submitted Planning Statement .

The site lies outside settlement limits and therefore conflicts with CP11, with no landscape or visual impact assessment to demonstrate that the rural character, openness, or the designated Green Route along Eversley Road would be protected.

The Planning Statement asserts that the site is "well enclosed" and will not impact landscape character, yet provides no evidence, contrary to CP3, TB10(e), and ANP policies on countryside protection and landscape setting.

The application also fails CP6 and TB20, as it provides no visibility splays, no swept path analysis for refuse or emergency vehicles, no assessment of pedestrian safety on a road with no footway, and no drainage or gradient details, despite claiming the access is acceptable simply because it "exists" .

The Planning Statement acknowledges that ecology, biodiversity and BNG are "to be provided", meaning the application is incomplete and fails statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, as well as CP7 and TB23.

The proposal also fails to demonstrate compliance with CP8 regarding Thames Basin Heaths SPA mitigation, offering only a generic statement that contributions "can be secured" without any supporting assessment.

Assertions of compliance with TB10 are unsubstantiated: the site does not demonstrate safe access, sustainable pedestrian links, or landscape integration, and therefore fails several TB10 criteria.

The Arborfield & Newland Neighbourhood Plan requires protection of rural lanes, landscape character, and safe movement, none of which are evidenced here. Overall, the Planning Statement relies on unsupported assertions rather than technical evidence, and the application fails to meet multiple mandatory policy requirements; it should therefore be refused.