

PLANNING REF : 261859
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Church Lane
: Farley Hill, Berkshire
: RG7 1UP
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Peter Beeching
DATE SUBMITTED : 21/09/2026

COMMENTS:

I am writing as a regular user of Church Road to object to application 261859. My concern is based on my own experience of the surrounding roads, including their narrow sections, restricted visibility and regular use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. This is already a difficult highway environment, and increasing the site from 8 to 17 caravans would introduce substantially more traffic into a location where there is no realistic alternative to travelling by car.

My reasons for objecting are as follows.

1. The surrounding roads are unsuitable for the proposed increase in traffic

There is no pavement or continuous safe walking route to the site. Vehicles frequently have to negotiate narrow stretches of road, limited visibility and difficult passing points, often while sharing the carriageway with pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.

I have personally experienced or witnessed near-miss situations on these roads. There is very little room for error when vehicles encounter vulnerable road users or oncoming traffic. The additional arrivals, departures, visitors, deliveries, servicing vehicles and waste-collection movements associated with 17 caravans would inevitably increase these risks.

The fact that the access already exists does not demonstrate that it can safely accommodate the much greater level of use now proposed. It was previously considered in connection with 8 caravans. The present application would increase that to 17 caravans, together with a site office, visitor movements, deliveries and cesspool-emptying tankers.

Vehicle noise and late movements are also noticeable in what is otherwise a quiet rural area. These effects can reasonably be expected to increase if the operation is permitted to more than double in scale.

2. The transport information submitted with the application is inadequate and inconsistent

The application form proposes increasing the recorded parking provision from 8 to 18 spaces. However, the Planning Statement deals with the resulting traffic effects in only a few sentences and compares the development with a "five-pitch certified caravan site".

That description conflicts with both the planning history and other parts of the same statement, which confirm an existing permission for 8 static caravans.

This inconsistency calls the applicant's transport conclusions into question. It is also unclear how providing approximately one parking space per caravan would contain the actual parking demand, particularly when local observations show numerous cars and commercial vans already using the site.

No proportionate assessment has been provided covering:

likely daily vehicle movements; arrival and departure patterns; visitor and staff parking; commercial vehicles and deliveries; servicing and refuse collection; cumulative traffic effects; movements at relevant or busier times of day; or the additional tanker journeys required to empty the proposed cesspool.

The drainage strategy depends upon periodic emptying by tanker, yet neither the likely frequency nor the resulting number of heavy-vehicle movements has been quantified.

Current NPPF Policy TR6 requires development likely to generate significant movement to be supported by a proportionate transport statement or assessment and, where appropriate, a travel plan. That assessment should consider realistic future scenarios, relevant times of day, cumulative effects, multimodal trip generation and opportunities for sustainable travel. The submitted information does not provide the evidence required to undertake that assessment reliably.

3. Almost every journey generated by the development would be made by private vehicle

The site is not served by a local bus route, and there are no shops or everyday facilities within a safe and convenient walking distance. Anyone staying at the site would therefore be dependent upon a car for food, leisure and other routine needs.

The Planning Statement suggests that car use "should not be seen as unreasonable". However, that assertion does not overcome the absence of sustainable transport choices and cannot substitute for a proper transport assessment.

NPPF Policy TR3 requires development generating significant movement to be located where the need to travel by private car is limited and where a genuine choice of transport modes is available, unless the nature of the development makes this impractical.

Core Strategy Policy CP6 similarly requires development to provide sustainable transport choices, minimise travel distances, improve pedestrian and cycling provision, mitigate its effect on the transport network, enhance road safety and avoid highway or traffic-related environmental problems. Paragraph 4.57 supporting Policy CP11 expressly recognises that development outside settlement limits is likely to increase private-car use because such locations are poorly

served by other forms of transport.

This application conflicts with those objectives because it proposes a substantial intensification of an inherently car-dependent use without providing any meaningful improvement to public transport, walking or cycling provision.

4. The Council has already found this location to be unsustainable

The Council's refusal of Section 73 application 251246 is directly relevant. Its third reason for refusal concluded that this same site occupies an unsustainable and isolated edge-of-village location, characterised by long distances to facilities and services, limited public transport and a poor environment for walking and cycling.

Nothing about the physical location of the site has changed since that decision. Increasing the number of caravans from 8 to 17 would intensify the very impacts previously identified by the Council, and the current application proposes no mitigation capable of overcoming that earlier conclusion.

For these reasons, the Council should not approve application 261859. Approval would directly conflict with its own adopted Core Strategy Policies CP6 and CP11, current national policies TR3 and TR6, and the Council's previous findings that this is an isolated and unsustainable location with poor walking and cycling conditions. In the absence of a robust transport assessment, verified vehicle-movement data and an independent road-safety audit, the Council cannot reasonably conclude that the proposal is safe or policy-compliant. Granting permission regardless would knowingly expose local residents, pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to increased and inadequately assessed highway danger. The only defensible decision on the evidence presently available is refusal.