

PLANNING REF : 261695  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Manor Road  
:  
: RG41 4AR  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Harry Stubbs  
DATE SUBMITTED : 25/08/2026

COMMENTS:

I am writing to object to planning application 261695. I live within a two-minute walk of the application site and use Finchampstead Road and the surrounding footways regularly. My objection is primarily on transport and highway safety grounds.

1. The application's transport impact has not been properly assessed

The applicant's Planning & Design Statement states that highways matters are not considered relevant because the proposal does not increase the capacity of the school and involves no change to parking provision. WBC Highways' consultation response (24 July 2026) accepted this framing, recording "No comment" on the basis that there is no change in the capacity of the school for staff and pupils.

This assessment is incomplete. The application is not only for school use. The Planning & Design Statement itself confirms that the school already hires its facilities to a list of outside community groups, and states that the primary purpose of the new pitches is complemented by potential for wider community use outside school hours. Sport England's consultation response (5 August 2026) goes further: it records the Rugby Football Union's comments that a local club, Bracknell RFC, may seek weekend access to the new pitches for age-grade rugby, and recommends the school's existing Community Use Agreement be extended to cover junior rugby and junior cricket.

This means the proposal will generate additional vehicle trips from non-pupils, at weekends and potentially on weekday evenings, that fall entirely outside the "no change in school capacity" test WBC Highways applied. No assessment of this trip generation, and no assessment of how visiting players, spectators or officials would travel to the site, has been submitted or requested. This is a material omission. I ask that the application not be determined until a proper transport assessment covering community-use trip generation, and the sustainable travel options available to those trips, has been submitted and consulted on.

2. The site is poorly served by safe walking and cycling routes, on a road the council has already identified as a priority for intervention

The application form answers "No" to every question on new or altered pedestrian/vehicular access, new roads, and rights of way. Taken with the point above, this leaves the practical reality that anyone travelling to the site other than by car including local students who could walk or cycle from Wokingham has no safe, direct active travel route. Finchampstead Road, which serves the site, has no continuous cycle lane and is difficult to cross on

foot at multiple points.

This is not merely a local observation. It is already documented by the Council's own evidence base. Wokingham Borough Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), approved March 2023, specifically identifies Finchampstead Road as one of only 19 named area-based improvement schemes in the borough. During the LCWIP's public engagement, the Eastheath section of Finchampstead Road was logged by residents as unsafe, congested, and affected by speeding traffic and poor air quality, with specific requests for a segregated cycle path and a widened footway. Finchampstead Road also appears among the LCWIP's top-ranked locations for new crossing points and footway widening, and is separately mapped as a speeding-vehicle hotspot. A direct walking/cycling desire line "Finchampstead to Wokingham Town Centre" was also raised during LCWIP stakeholder engagement.

The Council has therefore already accepted, through its own adopted evidence base, that Finchampstead Road requires exactly the kind of intervention this application should be prompting: safer crossings, a widened footway, and cycle provision. The LCWIP's stated vision is for walking, cycling and wheeling to become "the natural choice for shorter distance journeys" across the borough, developed in support of the Council's climate emergency declaration and its commitment to "achieving a carbon neutral Wokingham Borough by 2030." Approving additional trip-generating development on this corridor without requiring any active travel mitigation is inconsistent with the Council's own adopted transport policy and climate commitments.

What I am asking the Council to do

Given the above, I request that the Council either:

(a) Refuse the application, or defer determination, until a transport assessment addressing community-use trip generation and active travel provision has been submitted and properly consulted on; or, if the application is to be approved,

(b) Secure concrete active travel mitigation on Finchampstead Road as part of any approval specifically: pedestrian crossing improvements, traffic signal re-phasing to reduce pedestrian wait times, footway widening, and cycle lane provision along Finchampstead Road between the site and Wokingham town centre, delivered in line with the Council's own adopted LCWIP scheme for this corridor; and, at minimum,

(c) If the Council considers that the full corridor scheme cannot lawfully be required of this specific application (given the tests in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 and paragraph 57 of the NPPF, which require obligations to be necessary, directly related, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development), secure a proportionate Section 106 financial contribution from this application towards delivery of the adopted Finchampstead Road LCWIP scheme, reflecting the additional trips the community-use element of this development will generate on that corridor.

I recognise that requests (a) and (b) may extend beyond what can lawfully be attached to a development of this scale. I make them because the underlying road safety and active travel deficiency is real, already evidenced in the Council's own LCWIP, and directly relevant to how people will reach this site, and I ask that the Council's decision notice explicitly address why they have or have not been adopted, so that residents have a clear record of the Council's reasoning. Request (c) is, in my view, a proportionate minimum that should be secured regardless.