PLANNING REF : 262318
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 54 Barons Court
: London, London
: W149DU
SUBMITTED BY : Ms Leite Mirella
DATE SUBMITTED : 15/10/2026

COMMENTS:
FORMAL OBJECTION - PLANNING APPLICATION 262274

Proposed Data Centre Development - Thames Valley Park, Earley, Reading

I wish to register my strong objection to planning application 262274, concerning the proposed large-scale data centre development at Thames Valley Park.

My objection arises from serious concerns regarding the environmental sustainability of the development, its energy requirements, associated emissions, potential impacts on biodiversity and wildlife, and the cumulative consequences ofexpanding energy-intensive digital infrastructure.

1. Environmental sustainability and climate impacts

Large-scale data centres place substantial demands on energy infrastructure. The environmental consequences of such developments must be assessed comprehensively, including their direct and indirect greenhouse-gas emissions, operational energy requirements and reliance on additional power-generation infrastructure.

Of particular concern is the proposed inclusion of on-site energy generation and backup power facilities.

The Council must establish the nature, capacity, anticipated operating hours and environmental consequences of these installations, including their contribution to air pollution and greenhouse-gas emissions.

It is insufficient to consider the data centre in isolation from the infrastructure required to sustain its operation.

I request a rigorous assessment of the development's operational emissions, construction-related emissions, energy demand and compatibility with applicable climate policies.

2. Biodiversity, wildlife and ecological protection

The protection of wildlife and biodiversity must be treated as a fundamental planning consideration, not a secondary concern to be addressed after development has been approved.

The Council should examine whether the proposed development, including its construction activities, lighting, noise, emissions and associated infrastructure, could adversely affect local habitats, ecological corridors, protected species or other wildlife.

Particular attention should be given to the ecological sensitivity

of the wider Thames Valley Park area.

The assessment should address not only direct habitat loss but also indirect and cumulative ecological effects.

Artificial lighting, continuous mechanicalnoise, construction disturbance and changes to the surrounding environment may affect wildlife even where development takes place on previously developed land.

I request that the Council scrutinise the ecological surveys, biodiversity assessments and proposed mitigation measures, ensuring that they are sufficiently comprehensive, independently verifiable and enforceable.

The absence of immediately visible wildlife must never be treated as evidence of an absence of ecological value.

3. Energy infrastructure and cumulative environmental impacts

The environmental implications of major data-centre developments cannot be confined to the boundaries of individual planning sites.

Their energy demands, associated infrastructure and cumulative resource consumption have consequences extending beyond the immediate locality.

The Council should consider the cumulative impacts of this proposal alongside existing and reasonably foreseeable developments, particularly where they place additional demands on electricity infrastructure, water resources and environmental capacity.

I request clear evidence demonstrating how the proposed development's energy requirements will be met and whether additional infrastructure or generation capacity will be necessary.

Any environmental assessment must account for the full operational characteristics of the proposed development rather than relying on general assurances of efficiency or sustainability.

4. Water consumption and resource protection

Water is an essential ecological resource, and its consumption by industrial infrastructure must be carefully scrutinised.

The applicant should provide transparent information concerning the proposed cooling systems, anticipated water demand, water efficiency, wastewater management and potential effects on local water resources.

Where the development relies on water-intensive cooling technologies, the Council should consider whether less resource-intensive
alternatives are available and whether the proposed arrangements are environmentally sustainable.

The protection of water resources must take precedence over

unsupported assumptions that sufficient capacity will remain available indefinitely.

5. Noise, air quality and effects on the surrounding environment

Data centres can generate continuous operational noise from cooling systems and other mechanical equipment. Backup generators and on-site power-generation facilities may introduce additional noise and
emissions.

The Council should require robust assessments addressing:

Continuous operational noise, including nighttime conditions.

Emissions from on-site generation and backup power facilities.

Construction-related noise, dust and traffic.

Potential effects on neighbouring communities and wildlife.

The effectiveness and enforceability of proposed mitigation measures.

These assessments should reflect realistic operating conditions, including periods when multiple systems may operate simultaneously.

6. Transparency, necessity and consideration of alternatives

The applicant should demonstrate that the environmental consequences of the proposed development have been properly assessed and that reasonable alternatives have been considered.

This includes opportunities to reduce energy demand, emissions, resource consumption, ecological disturbance and reliance on additional power-generation infrastructure.

Assertions of economic benefit should not be accepted as sufficient justification for environmental harm without a transparent and evidence-based assessment of the competing considerations.

Economic development cannot be considered sustainable merely because it generates investment. Its wider environmental costs must also be examined.

7. The wider public interest

I also wish to emphasise that the environmental consequences of major data-centre developments are not exclusively local matters.

The effects of increasing energy consumption, greenhouse-gas emissions, resource depletion and biodiversity degradation extend beyond individual administrative boundaries.

The natural environment is an interconnected system. Damage to its ecological integrity cannot reasonably be treated as a concern belonging only to those residing within a particular postcode.

Every citizen has a legitimate interest in the responsible stewardship of shared environmental resources and in ensuring that developments with potentially significant ecological consequences receive proper
scrutiny.

The geographical distance between an individual and a proposed development does not diminish the importance of environmental protection or the legitimacy of raising relevant planning concerns.

8. Request to the Council

In light of these concerns, I respectfully request that Wokingham Borough Council:

Subject the proposed development to rigorous scrutiny ofits environmental, ecological, climate and resource impacts.

Ensure that all relevant technical assessments are sufficiently detailed, transparent and supported by reliable evidence.

Examine the cumulative effects of the development and its associated e nergy infrastructure.

Give substantial weight to biodiversity protection, climate considerations, air quality, water resources and the prevention of environmental harm.

Require any material deficiencies or uncertainties in the supporting environmental evidence to be resolved before determination.

I strongly object to the proposed development and request that planning permission be refused.

The protection of the natural world must not be reduced to a calculation of how much destruction society is prepared to tolerate in exchange for commercial or technological expansion.

I reject the premise that environmental harm becomes acceptable merely because measures have been proposed to reduce its severity. Mitigation does not erase the consequences experienced by living beings, nor does it restore the intrinsic value of lives, habitats and ecological relationships that may be irreversibly damaged.

Every living being exists within an interconnected ecological system. The destruction or disturbance of habitats affects not only individual animals and plants but also the intricate relationships upon which entire communities of life depend. These consequences cannot be adequately measured through financial valuations, economic projections or calculations of commercial benefit.

The fundamental obligation must be to prevent environmental harm, not to determine how much of it may be permitted.

Where a proposed development threatens wildlife, biodiversity, natural resources or ecological integrity, the appropriate response

is to avoid that harm, rather than legitimise it through mitigation measures or assurances of reduced impact.

The lives of non-human beings are not expendable, and their continued existence should not be treated as subordinate to the commercial
ambitions of our species. Their intrinsic value does not depend upon their economic usefulness to humanity.

Environmental responsibility requires more than managing the consequences of destruction. It requires the moral recognition that certain harms should never be inflicted in the first place.

I therefore urge Wokingham Borough Council to refuse this application and uphold the principle that the protection of life, biodiversity and ecological integrity must take precedence over developments that eaten their continued existence.
The natural world is not ours to sacrifice. It is a living community to which we belong, and whose destruction ultimately diminishes us all.
The continuing expansion of resource-intensive infrastructure demands a corresponding commitment to environmental responsibility, transparency and public accountability. Such development must never proceed at the expense of living beings, biodiversity or the ecological systems upon which life depends.

The natural world is not an expendable resource whose destruction can be justified by commercial demand, economic growth or technological advancement. Its protection is a fundamental moral and ecological
responsibility owed not only to present and future generations, but also to the countless non-human lives whose intrinsic value and right to exist must not be subordinated to human interest
s.