

PLANNING REF : 242484
PROPERTY ADDRESS : School Green Centre
: Shinfield, Berkshire
: RG2 9EH
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Sally Herring
DATE SUBMITTED : 27/11/2024

COMMENTS:

SPC wish to object to planning application number 242484 - Land north of Arborfield Road, Shinfield. The reasons for our objection are as follows:

- The planned development should not have a through route accessing the northern (already built) estate. The creation of a straight road all the way from Cutbush Lane to Arborfield Road will lead to rat-running through the estates at high speed and will significantly increase vehicle speeds and danger to residents.

- No real attempt is made to keep vehicle speeds low on the development, instead relying totally on parked cars and side roads to provide visual clues to drivers. Instead, the development should aim to have a maximum limit of 20mph across the whole development; physical road layouts should be used to regulate the speed, incorporating narrow pinch points and winding roads. The straight line approach for all site roads is a poor design by the developers.

- The entrance onto Arborfield Road includes two islands. The footpath / cycleway leading through the new development should line up with the eastern island to allow simple crossing to the southern side of

Arborfield Road accessing the SANG and Shinfield schools. The Transport Assessment Part 2 document does not permit a detailed examination of the junction and highway geometry nor does the Engineering Layout Sheet 1. The pedestrian crossing and associated central refuge to the east of the junction does not look like it conforms to the latest regulations, given that it is intended to provide safe crossing for pedestrians, cyclists, wheeled disabled users and notably schoolchildren, all of which should be defined under S258 commitments. Similar concerns exist over the central refuge to the west of the junction which has no supporting dropped kerbs. - It is unclear from the plans whether a footpath will exist alongside the northern side of Arborfield Road towards the School Green roundabout. This is absolutely necessary to enable safe pedestrian access to the development. A full path should be built before any

dwelling is occupied to avoid pedestrians having to cross over the road to access a safe walking route towards the schools, shops and bus stops. This application seems to be designed totally as a car accessed development and so fails on the sustainability criteria.

- The Arborfield Road must be changed to a 30mph limit from the Magpie & Parrott roundabout to the School Green roundabout as this proposal will extend the boundary of the village eastwards considerably. This should be accompanied by suitable village gates to reinforce this

change, as well as signage changes on the A327 to keep all through-traffic on the Eastern Relief Road. These changes have been discussed with WBC Highways and the SPC Traffic Working party.

- The surface water management via the SUD includes weirs to a 300mm pipe running eastwards under the Shinfield Eastern Relief Road but the long term monitoring and free-running of this mechanism appears to be vague and should be a detailed condition of any approval of

the application.

- The building of three story apartments is totally out of place compared to the rest of Shinfield, especially in the edge of village development such as this. The sloping of the site towards the river will lead to a large visual blot on the hillside, showing a very ugly view for people approaching from the Arborfield direction. The houses surrounding the site, particularly Oatlands Road, contain many single story dwellings so incorporating larger three story apartments would not be in keeping with the surrounding area.

- The boundary treatment alongside the Arborfield Road allotments needs to be clarified to ensure those allotment holders are not affected by the development

- The boundary treatment for plots 15, 16, 17, & 18 needs to be carefully checked to ensure the safeguarding of children in the adjoining nursery is not compromised.

- The foul water / sewage system for the area is already over subscribed, with frequent lorries being used to empty the pumping station at the Magpie & Parrott. This development would need to guarantee that it would not impact the current system. If any upgrades to the sewage system are required offsite, then no dwellings should be occupied until this is completed.

- The energy strategy is confusing, and it is unclear whether solar PV and/or ground source heat pumps will be implemented for all properties.

- The development needs to demonstrate how the children living there will be educated in both primary and secondary provision (including 6th form) . The current local schools are over subscribed at present and this development needs to ensure that the situation is not increased.

- Phasing of the development in 17 parcels beginning in the south is counterintuitive to the wellbeing of the occupiers of dwellings since it requires the increasing numbers of residents to enter/exit the development past the construction compound and mingling with the construction traffic. At a public consultation meeting with Shinfield Parish Council, this was raised and the proposal put to the Bellway representatives that dwelling construction should be phased from the north, thereby separating residential and service traffic from all construction traffic as the newly occupied homes use the access/egress through the existing roads to the northern (completed) development. It is suggested that this is a detailed condition of any approval of the application.

- S106 monies from this development should be clearly identified as being spent for the benefit of the Shinfield residents, as the LPU submission Enclosure 5 - Local Plan and CIL viability Study - clause 4.27 states: "It is important to note that S106 costs are very site specific and the actual amounts will of course be subject to site-specific negotiations when schemes are brought forward through the development management process".

It is for these reasons that Shinfield Parish Council cannot support the application in its current form.