

PLANNING REF : 252498  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 4 Wyatt Crescent  
: 4 Wyatt Crescen Lower Earley, Reading, Berkshire  
: RG6 3WH  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Matthew Parkinson  
DATE SUBMITTED : 17/11/2025

COMMENTS:

My comments relate to material considerations including:

Noise - made in some detail in the statement below. Not solely regarding construction but also ongoing and future noise pollution levels.

Parking, highway safety and traffic impact - Traffic impact for 100+ houses and likely more on Lower Earley way \*ALONE\*. Safety - BMX track immediately next to Lower Earley way will now have a noisy dual carriage way. Recent reports of noise affect health to be considered.

Conservation and heritage issues - Conservation of the green space and its CURRENT noise levels - no consideration has been given

Design, appearance and materials - Materials as mentioned below - Acoustic fences and low noise tarmacs - force developer AT THIS STAGE to commit to using these materials and future upkeep from the council

Wildlife and ecological impacts - Noise impacts will affect wildlife as well as a dual carriageway

Environmental impacts

Who the applicant is/their background - this impacts me and ALL those on my estate and that of padick drive

Loss of property value - Significant and no consultation has been provided for the VERY significant size development

Strength or volume of local opposition - significant

Construction noise/disturbance during development - Significant

Maintenance of property - We as residents pay to maintain our green space in front of Barn Croft drive - you will be devaluing this space with the traffic noise of a dual carriageway.

Boundary disputes, covenants or other property rights - Did I not have the right to turn right out of my road when I bought the house, and now i wont?

Rights of way and ownership disputes over rights of way - as above

I wrote the comments at the foot of this statement almost exactly 12 months ago and I intended to present this arguments to the inspectorate. Crucially I have not recieved any response to the comments below the line since their submission over 12 months ago. My abrievated notes are here and I shall seperate the old detail with hyphens -----below:

Note to planning officer:

I would like to take part in this event if for no other reason to present the same document I present here which I delivered to the

LPU before the previous deadline and still awaiting a response.

Further to the this letter (I apologise very long) attached here, there are further considerations I would also like to present. The change in road prioritations - namely that of Lower Earley way becoming a dual carriageway presents a number of impacts that have not been considered or presentd back to resifents. If these alterations are not at the very least mandated during a planning phase then it is certain no developer will deliver afterwards:

Travel Aside from the fact that these proposed developments will add and additional 5% of homes in a very tight space there is no plan in fact a distinct lack of plan for trains and no funding for bus routes. Therefore it is safe to assume as laid out in my letter the vast majority of these journeys will be using cars as no public transp ort (train or buses) are being provided.

Delays An additional load on Lower Earley is envevitable and the significant impact to those on (or off) Paddick Drive and Barn Croft Drive will be substantial. Left turn only adding significant journey delay.

Noise The noise from this now arterial road not being mitigated when this natural green space become natural noisy car space. The late night car noise where cars already use this stretch of road to test their eccleration.

Financial impact The obvious property price impact that all of traffic will have on 100+ homes so that 20x that number of people can live on a flood plain does not seem to make sense? All of these impacts does not improve the borough - why do we aim for medicrity?

None of my points have been responded from the letter attached when submitted this time last year why?

As I read the council planning application again today, the only mention of noise is with regards to construction - this is not the only issue with regards to noise. I want my quiet green spaces to be free of noise for my own health and that of others. Article attached:Noise: The invisible killer in all our lives

Noise: The invisible killer in all our lives

The BBC's James Gallagher investigates the invisible killer all around us.

Best regards

Matt

-----  
-----  
  
As I have said previously, I and many more live less than 100 metres from very significant changes to many areas of their life. The plan makes clear that its intention is to improve things across the borough and although it acknowledges the pain it is undoubtedly going to cause for those who live nearby it does not going into any

detail about how impacts will be mitigated. In fact furthermore although the local council staff I have spoken with were helpful and "fielded" my questions give me little confidence that the development will improve the borough. Speaking about mitigations the member specifically said "we cannot guarantee mitigations to avoidable issues". This does not sound like a Sound plan to me. Many things aren't considered, mitigations have not been thought about or committed to. Any upside that the developer has "sold" us has been harnessed but concerns by residents have not been heard.

Does not improve the borough.

The plan states that it will improve the surrounding area and be good for the borough. How? How exactly is it improving it? Yes we need houses, and a developer making thousands of houses and billions (likely) in profit should be expected to invest in improvements to the borough. My specific objection here for example on the "open evening" was as follows:

Flooding concern

In the plan and in representations to the council concerns were raised about the obvious flood risk and indeed the upstream and downstream risks. The plan talks about the mitigation of the risks on site with the addition of a flood defence "wetland". When asking the team what this means is that you can store water and release it.

Great, is there a possibility that could actually increase the flood risk? Response I don't know.

Should it not be impingent on the developer to offer some level of guarantee? Probably yes. But they haven't.

Already the "Showcase roundabout" floods for weeks at a time the extra run of from 1000's of homes and miles of tarmac will clearly increase run off. This WILL affect the two upstream roundabout what mitigations have been put in place for this. Response - it doesn't flood for weeks,- perhaps 3 or 4 days at most!!!!!! Hilarious, so the response is yes this area does flood Mr resident but not for weeks just days ??

So what are you going to do about? Response - well all we can say at this stage is that the developer will be taking measurements (the phrase gamekeeper turned poacher springs to mind) and will measure throughout the project and make sure that "it is no worse". The plan for this proposal is to improve the borough. To ensure its no worse in 2040 feels like an opportunity missed and definitely not a sound plan.

Borough wide Travel

Traffic is an inherent problem in all medium / large towns and cities so what public options are available as part of this plan? Essentially none. My questions about travel were basically answered with "we'll encourage people to walk or ride". Ok, and those that can't for lots of reasons? Well we can't guarantee buses as they need to be self sustaining otherwise the council won't support them. We know this doesn't and won't work as proven in lots of other areas but this is a conversation for another day. So what are the options to travel into Reading? Cycle - because you're going to make cycle paths. Really? The average distance of a cycle commute in the UK is less than 30 minutes. If you want to travel to Reading to get a "big

train" or to work, where lets be clear that's where people from this site are primary going to go, is 42 minute commute from Arborfield via bike as it stands today. The response from colleagues was "our modelling says people will also go elsewhere". Yes, they will but Reading is the UK's Largest town with amazing connections to London, so where are people communiting to? - Reading town centre or maybe London, VIA READING!! To suggest that people living in an RG1 postcode are not going to commute through or via Reading is ridiculous. So, people are not going to cycle then from this new estate. So what train improvements are being built, improvements to stations, frequency or services from "nearby" (that's a joke) stations? None. In fact the nearest station Winnersh triangle station is barely mentioned in your proposal.

What is the answer here? Cars. There are 67000 homes in Reading this estate adds a further circa 4000 homes so probably at an educated guess that an additional 10% of non-town centre houses added in 10 years and associated cars.

Bus services from where I live (RG63WH) as I write take 40 minutes to get to our from the station in Reading and even longer when out of

hours with a very sporadic service (every hour or half hour) which is not conducive to using it. With the additional traffic from this site that is likely to go up in commute time please you are not planning any additional services.

So how long will it take from the further away garden village with all this traffic? Longer, obviously. What's the average bus commute in the UK? 28 minutes so will people use the bus? No.

How does this constitute a sound plan?

Traffic noise

The plan / modelling says it doesn't work without the roundabout - so it guarantees a HUGE traffic increase particularly down the newly proposed Dual carriage way of lower earley way. This feels like a very significant changes and no proposals have been made to residents. At my address we already suffer with significant road noise

especially in the very early morning when roads are quiet from people taking advantage of a "fast road". There are lots of loud motorcycles and equivalent cars that use the area an "enjoyable" road to drive on and you can hear them driving with less care than should be given. If this development goes ahead there will now be a duel carriage way for anti-social driving behaviour.

Of course there will be significant traffic at peak times. The road is already gridlocked in the morning and evening rush hour and of course there will be noise concerns about traffic at these times too. So when asked about what mitigations have been planned and improvements provided for the existing residents? None, "we can get the developer to do a review and make sure it is no worse". Once again how does this improve for the whole borough and provide a sound plan?

If this plan rolls ahead should we not expect, as a minimum noise mitigation strategies like acoustic fences and as a minimum acoustic road coverings like those use on the M4 for similar reasons? Not, "if it creates an impact we'll do it having our arms twisted?" This should be a requirement for the whole borough and ALL of those located along the lower early way - in my case less than 100 metres from this new duel carriage which WE HAVE NOT BEEN TOLD ABOUT. Noise and safety mitigation should be guaranteed regardless of road routes.

#### Access

Getting onto Lower Earley way is already a challenge in the morning getting out of the estate to cross the flow of traffic is hugely problematic. What plans have been put into place to consider these access issues? Now with a dual carriage way to cross we will inevitably have to turn left (east bound) into the traffic and wait to then use the already over crowded roundabout at mill lane.

No

consultation or thought has been given to residents on these roads as no consultation has happened. Not a sound plan.

#### Traffic Flow

Traffic getting into Reading has recently had a huge overhaul with the new bus lane to the east of Reading taking traffic down to one lane. This has moved significant traffic onto the more urban roads and impacted bus journeys more generally. The traffic from this estate will then add to these urban roads and of course NOT use the A329 into reading further impact those on Meldreth way.

#### Playground and BMX track

Although the Playground and BMX track are expected to remain in the plan, quite rightly there has been no consideration for protection of these areas from the noise and risks of being less than 50 metres from a new dual carriageway. In the case of the BMX track for kids it has an access of less than 20 metres from a (assume 60/70mph) dual carriage way? Mitigations for noise pollution and risk of injury need to be protected and in my opinion no route across the M4 should be provided to protect this area. No mitigations are guaranteed and this is a HUGE oversight in my opinion.

#### Existing Lower Early way flooding.

Significant flooding already occurs on this route is there a guarantee that any development of a dual carriage way will only absorb land to the south of the existing infrastructure? There are more points to be made but I am conscious this is already 1500 words so thanks for reading!