

Date: 13 March 2025
Application: 250517



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

WBC Highways

Development Management &
Compliance

P.O. Box 157

Shute End, Wokingham

Berkshire, RG40 1BN

Tel: (0118) 974 6000

Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991

Dear WBC Highways,

Outline Planning Approval Consultation

Application Number: 250517

Applicant: Mr Marc Wilson

Site Address: Land Off Basingstoke Road, To the south and west of Spencers W

Parish: Shinfield

Grid Reference: Easting - 471901, Northing - 166069

Type of Development: Major All other developments

Proposal: Outline planning permission is sought with all matters reserved for future determination, save for the means of access via Basingstoke Road, for: up to 420 dwellings (Use Class C3), an 80 bed care home (Use Class C2), 1ha of employment land (Use Class E(g), primary school (Use Class F1), local centre (Use Classes E(a), (b), (c), (f)), GP Surgery (Use Class E(e), sports pitch and changing facility, public open space, SANG provision and associated infrastructure.

Case Officer: Helen Maynard

Development Management has received the above application and we require your comments on the proposal using the recommended memorandum below. The documents associated with this are available to view in NEC DM using the application number 250517. Alternatively, public documents are available to view on the Council's planning application search page: [Wokingham Borough Council Online Planning](#).

Please index your response into NEC DM against the application. If you are recommending conditions, you should give a reason with reference to relevant policies. A list of standard conditions can be found on the Z Drive at: [Z:\Standard Planning Conditions](#).

Your observations are required in respect of this application within **10 working days** of the above date or **15 working days** if the development type is classed as a major development.

Yours sincerely,

Development Management & Compliance

MEMORANDUM

From:	Gordon Adam Development Control		
Service	WBC Highways	App No:	250517
Address:	Land Off Basingstoke Road, To the south and west of Spencers W.		
Proposal:	Outline planning permission is sought with all matters reserved for future determination, save for the means of access via Basingstoke Road, for: up to 420 dwellings (Use Class C3), an 80 bed care home (Use Class C2), 1ha of employment land (Use Class E(g), primary school (Use Class F1), local centre (Use Classes E(a), (b), (c), (f)), GP Surgery (Use Class E(e), sports pitch and changing facility, public open space, SANG provision and associated infrastructure.		
Type of Development:	Major All other developments		
Site Visit Made:	Yes/No		

Summary Of Recommendations

- ☐ No comment
☐ No objection
☐ No objection subject to conditions (and reasons) **stated below**
☒ Request further information before determination as **stated below**
☐ Objection due to the reason(s) **stated below**

Comments On Proposal

General

1. Highways understands that this outline application is for up to 420 dwellings, 80 bed care home, a local centre, employment and a 2FE primary school off Basingstoke Road.
2. Highways welcomed the opportunity of providing pre-application comments under 243014.
3. Due to the size of the proposed development, highways would have expected to have had technical meetings.
4. This application is supported by a Planning Statement, a Transport Assessment (including junction assessment) and a Framework Travel Plan, which are welcomed.

Parking

5. The planning statement states that sufficient parking spaces would be provided for all uses which is welcome.

6. The proposed parking allocation for residential and other uses are specified in Appendix F, which is welcome.
7. All parking spaces would need to be 5m x 2.5m or 6m x 2.5m if parallel spaces.
8. If parking courtyards are proposed, these would need to have at least 6m behind the spaces for safe manoeuvring.

Residential Parking

9. Highways requested as part of pre-application comments that the Borough's parking calculator be used based on an illustrative masterplan and housing mix. This has not been submitted. The illustrative masterplan will need to be submitted.
10. Highways understand that the number of habitable rooms of dwellings have not been confirmed.
11. That being said, highways have carried out an assessment using the parking calculator and based on the information submitted there would be 662 allocated spaces, 84 visitor spaces and 75 unallocated spaces.
12. In addition, there is also proposed to be 160 garages.
13. There would need to be a good distribution of visitor spaces across the development.
14. Each garage would need to have minimum internal dimensions of 6m x 3m, or 7m x 3m for cycle storage.
15. The private drives would need to be at least 3.1m wide to ensure a cycle or rubbish wheelie bin can pass a parked car.
16. The proposed 10 flats above the proposed community hall, as shown in F-3 in Appendix F would need to be included in the residential parking calculations and not with the non-residential.

Non-Residential

Highways would have expected to see a framework car parking management plan to be submitted.

17. The proposed parking provisions for residential care home, GP surgery, primary school and outdoor pitches would need to be provided in line with the current Borough Parking Standards which are set out below and not the size of the proposed provision.

Use Class	Car Parking Allocation
Residential Car Homes	1 per full time equivalent staff member and 1 visitor space per 3 residents
Health Centre	1 per full time staff and 3 per consulting room
Primary School	1 per full time staff
Outdoor Pitches	20 spaces per pitch and 1 per 10 spectator seats

18. While the land allocations of the non-residential uses have not been identified, an illustrative masterplan would need to be submitted to ensure sufficient space on site have been reserved for the proposed uses.

19. For the school, care home and health centre an indicative level of full-time equivalent staff would need to be submitted.
20. For the other proposed land uses, based on the illustrative mix, the parking is in line with Borough standards which is welcome.
21. All parking spaces would need to be 5m x 2.5m and there would need to be at least 6m behind the spaces for safe manoeuvring.
22. As part of any reserved matter applications of the primary school, pick-up and drop-off spaces would be expected.
23. Disabled spaces for non-residential uses would need to be provided in line with standards and be located in close proximity to the main accesses.
24. Highways would have expected to see a framework car parking management plan to be submitted.

Cycle Parking

25. Cycle parking for other uses would be in line with the parking standards set out in Table 3 of the TA, which is welcomed.
26. Sheltered and secured on-plot cycle parking would be proposed for each dwelling, either in sheds or in garages. For any provisions in garage, the minimum dimensions of the are at least 7m x 3m.
27. For flats, cycle parking would need to be in secure communal cycle stores. Each space would need to be 2m x 0.9m. Highways would also recommend that cycle visitor cycle parking.
28. The communal cycle stores would need to be accessible and close to the entrances to each block of flats.

Electric Vehicle Charging

29. The transport assessment states that charging points would be provided in accordance Brough Standards.
30. However, Borough standards have been replaced by Building Control Regulations Approved Document S as set out in highways pre-application comments.

Accesses

31. Highways understand that two access points are proposed onto the B3349 Basingstoke Road, the main access point would be conversion of the existing priority junction at Back Lane to a 4-arm roundabout and the secondary access would be a new priority junction north of the proposed roundabout.
32. The PIA assessment suggests that PIAs were usually due to excessive speed. Highways would recommend that the speed limit from Beech Hill Road to south of the proposed roundabout be reduced to 30mph. Highways would also recommend that in support of this reduction in the speed limit, there would need to be speed reduction measures.
33. Lamp columns and telegraph poles would need to be moved as part of this design and at the applicant's expense.
34. Once the modelling and the design have been agreed, then and only then will a Road Safety Audit and designer's comments be required to be submitted

Proposed Roundabout

- 35. The access road width of the roundabout is proposed to be 6.5m, with 2m wide footways on both sides of the carriageway tying to the existing footway network on Basingstoke Road.
- 36. Highways is concerned with the alignment of the proposed access road and would prefer to see a straighter alignment as highways would have expected to see swept paths of two refuse vehicles passing each other.

Proposed Priority Junction

- 37. A secondary vehicular access would be via a new priority junction with the B3349 Basingstoke Road, circa 300m north of the proposed roundabout.
- 38. The access road width of the priority junction is proposed to be 6m, with 2m wide footways on both sides of the carriageway tying to the existing footway network on Basingstoke Road.
- 39. No right-turn from Basingstoke Road south into the site would be proposed for the priority junction.
- 40. The proposed priority junction is close to the existing dwelling "Three Pots" on Basingstoke Road. The Traffic Management team recommend a minimum distance of 10m between a junction and a dropped crossing. As the proposed junction would be adjacent to an existing driveway, clarification will be required that the proposed junction is outside the 10m distance. This will need to be shown on a plan.

Strategic Modelling

- 41. A scoping report for carrying out the strategic modelling for this proposed development was submitted and agreed.
- 42. The applicant paid for the modelling to be run, and the outputs requested were provided to the consultant.
- 43. Please note that the modelling was carried out for 480 dwellings, 4,000sqm of employment and a 1 form entry primary school (210 pupils) .
- 44. The current proposal is for 420 dwellings, 80 bed care home, 2 form entry primary school, retail, employment, GPs surgery. Highways would have expected to see an assessment of the differences between the level of trips between what was modelled and what is proposed.
- 45. That being said, it appears that the traffic flows included in the TA were those from the Strategic Modelling.
- 46. The rerouting between B3349 Basingstoke Road and Grovelands Road will lead to 30% increase in link flows along The Square during the AM peak in 2032. Similar applies to diverted traffic along Lamb Lane between Beech Hill Road and B3349 Basingstoke Road. The capacity of these links shall be reviewed.

Local Junction Modelling

47. As part of the approved modelling scoping report and pre-application comments, the following junctions would need to be assessed using local junction modelling software, namely :-

- B3349 Basingstoke Road / Back Lane priority roundabout (new site access);
- B3349 Basingstoke Road / Site Access priority junction (new junction);
- B3349 Basingstoke Road / B3349 Hyde End Road traffic signal junction;
- Basingstoke Road / Church Lane proposed signalised junction.
- A33/Basingstoke Road traffic signal junction; and
- M4 Junction 11

48. The turning movements for these junctions have been provided to the applicant's consultants.

49. Highways have reviewed the outputs and have identified that no additional junctions need to be assessed.

50. Highways have recommended that a numerical assessment of the changes in flows for M4 Junction 11 and Basingstoke Road/A33 would be acceptable.

51. All the remaining junctions would need to be modelled and that full modelling output, plans showing the geometries of the junctions and turning flow plans would need to be submitted.

52. Highways have also recommended that full turning count surveys would need to be carried out for the existing junction for input into the junction modelling

53. Highways realise that some of the flows in the flow diagrams and junction model outputs are different from the strategic model outputs, particularly for flows along Basingstoke Road. Clarifications of model inputs are required.

54. All agreed junctions operating above 85% and with a positive increase in V/C values are expected to be modelled and the net increases in V/C shall be mitigated.

55. It is disappointed that the junction model outputs for these junctions have not been provided, and mitigations are not proposed.

56. In particular, the existing T-junction at B3349 Basingstoke Road/Back Lane is expected to be modelled as part of the base junction models.

57. Please note that no future year junction modelling will be assessed until the base junction models have been approved.

58. The Borough does have junction models for the Hyde End and Church Lane signalised junctions. These can be provided on request.

Traffic Data

59. It is welcomed that ATC data was collected in December 2023 over a 7-day period at the proposed vehicular access, for the total number of vehicles per hour and traffic speed data in both directions in Appendix B.

60. Highways would have expected the period of collection to have been over a 2-week period to ascertain whether or not there were any obvious trends. However, a 7-day period is acceptable.

61. The 7-day speed data for survey site have been provided and a summary of the mean speed and 85%ile speed have also been provided, which is

welcomed. However, highways would have expected the survey data also to include the weekday AM and PM flows to ensure a quicker assessment.

Trip Rates

62. The Borough's approved trip rates were used in the Transport Assessment which is welcome.

Distribution

63. The strategic modelling distribution was adopted for this assessment which is welcome.

Pedestrian and Cycling

64. A 3.5m wide segregated pedestrian and cycle access are proposed to the north of the priority junction, which is welcomed, this would need to be secured by bollards. Highways would recommend that the width of this be increased to 3.7m so that this could be used for an emergency access.

65. It is proposed that in addition there would be segregated pedestrian/cycle accesses connecting to Barracks Lane, the existing PROW off Hyde End Road and the park via Century Drive. The PROW to the north of the site that connects with Hyde End Road is proposed to be improved to provide all-weather surfacing and lighting. This is welcome, though discussions will need to be had with the PROW officer regarding lighting.

66. Pedestrian access connects with the existing bus stops (Grovelands Road) along Hyde End Road is proposed, which is welcomed.

67. The proposed roundabout will have dropped kerbs and tactile paving which would provide pedestrian access to bus stop on Basingstoke Road, Primary school and employment.

68. As this is an outline application with all matters reserved apart from access, full details of how these routes connect with the existing network will need to be provided.

Sustainability Assessment

69. A sustainability assessment has been undertaken to local services and bus stops, which is welcomed.

70. Included in the assessment are walk distances to local services which is welcome. However, clarification is required on where the distances have been calculated from. For this assessment, highways would need to see the distance from a midpoint in the site and that actual walk distance are used.

71. Highways would also expect to see the walk distances to the nearest bus stops.

Active Travel Modes

72. A LTN 1/20 route audit has been submitted with potential improvements are identified, which is welcomed. However, the audit focuses on cycling route. The Highways would still expect to see an Active Travel Assessment for the

routes to the external services and suggested improvements to be carried out, which would cover all active travel modes.

73. As the land allocation are reserved for future determination, Highways would need to see actual walk distances to local services such as shop, schools, surgery, employment and bus stops from a mid-point of the wider site.
74. It is true that local services such as the nursery, primary school, bus stops, industrial estates and some local shops are within an acceptable walk distance from parts of the site. However, for more day-to-day activities such as work, secondary schools and weekly shopping that would imply longer journeys less likely made by active travel modes.

Public Transports

75. The bus service (600) runs between Reading and Spencers Wood calling at two pairs of bus stops on Basingstoke Road (Back Lane and Barracks Lane). Another route 600 runs between Thames Valley Science Park to Reading calling at the bus stops on Hyde End Road (Grovelands Road).
76. The existing bus stops north of Back Lane would probably be affected by the proposed roundabout, therefore relocations for these bus stops would be expected.
77. Bus routes of 600 are running hourly on Mondays to Saturdays and no service on Sundays and therefore cannot be described as a good service as set out in CP6.
78. Enhancement on existing bus stops (Back Lane (both directions), Barracks Lane (SB) and Grovelands Road (both directions)) would need to be considered.
79. Highways would be seeking a contribution to improve the bus services of £368 per dwelling. In addition, a contribution of £25,000 for each of the 4 nearest stops. These will be included in the s106 agreement.
80. Highways would recommend that the walking environment to these bus stops would need to be improved.

Active Travel Assessment

81. Active Travel England requested that the Borough carried out an Active Travel Assessment using their toolkit. This is required to be carried out and submitted to the Borough.

Visibility Splays

82. Visibility splays for the proposed new vehicular accesses have been submitted with reference to the speed limits of 40mph.
83. Due to the nature of Basingstoke Road, highways would have expected to see speed survey data.
84. It is welcome that 2 sites were surveyed, one in the vicinity of the location of the proposed priority junction (Site 1) and one to the north of the proposed roundabout (Site 2) which is welcome.
85. This data produced 85th %ile speeds for site 1 of 41.5 and 40.9 mph and (North and southbound respectively) and for site 2 40.8 and 41.2 mph (north and southbound accordingly).

86. The visibility splays would need to be based on the 85th %ile. The calculations of the visibility splays would need to be submitted.
87. For proposed roundabout, visibility is expected to be measured in accordance with the requirements of DMRB CD116.
88. For proposed priority junction, forward visibility splays along the bend shall be provided.
89. Any landscaping within the splays would need to be maintained so that it is less than 0.6m high.
90. Pedestrian and cycling visibility splays need to be provided for the proposed access onto Basingstoke Road as well as the other pedestrian accesses.

Swept Path Analysis

91. Swept paths for a refuse vehicle with acceptable dimensions have been submitted which is welcome.
92. All movement swept paths for the roundabout would be required as only some movements have been submitted.
93. The swept paths of a refuse vehicle and a large car passing each other on the site roads are provided, which is welcomed. In addition, highways would need to see 2 refuse vehicles passing each other on the bend of the proposed access road at the roundabout.
94. Swept paths of a refuse vehicle for the 3 allowed movements at the secondary access have been submitted. These have been reviewed and are acceptable.
95. Highways would also need to see the swept paths for the fire tender accessing and egressing the main access as well as the secondary access.
96. Please note that the dimensions of the fire tender approved by the Borough are as follows:



DB32 Fire Appliance	
Overall Length	8.680m
Overall Width	2.180m
Overall Body Height	3.452m
Min Body Ground Clearance	0.337m
Max Track Width	2.121m
Lock to Lock Time	6.00s
Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius	7.910m

97. As this outline application does not include an illustrative site plan, Highways would need to see swept paths of the above vehicles travelling through the development in reserved matters stage.
98. The proposed configuration of the roundabout could potentially be too tight for 16.5m long articulated vehicle to manoeuvre. Minor revision of configuration would need to be considered

Site Roads

99. All roads would need to be built to Borough standards.
100. It is proposed that the primary, secondary and tertiary site access roads and all footways/cycleways would be offered for adoption, and the final extents

for adoption would be confirmed as part of a reserved matters application, which is welcomed.

101. For site roads to be adopted, these would need to be delivered through s38 agreement with the Borough. The Borough would also require agreement on inspection fees and commuted sums. The adoption plans, fees and commuted sums would need to be included in the s106 agreement.
102. For any remaining site roads are to remain private, this would also need to be included in a s106 agreement, including details of the management company set up to look after the maintenance of the roads, the Borough's inspection fee and the APC Bond.
103. 2m wide pavements would need to be provided on the site roads.
104. Forward visibility splays would need to be provided at any proposed bends.

Lighting

105. As part of this planning application a lighting strategy would need to be submitted.

Delivery and Servicing Plans

106. Separate framework delivery and servicing Plan would need to be submitted for each of the land uses.

Framework Travel Plan

107. A Framework Travel Plans has been submitted which is welcome.
108. Comments that have been included above on walk distances to local services are relevant for this document.
109. Highways would have expected to see indicative mode shares based on the 2011 Census data and indicative targets to have been included in this document together with the first travel plans surveys to be carried out within 6 months of occupancy.
110. Due to the size of the development, highways would have expected to see car clubs mentioned.
111. It is welcome that a travel plan co-ordinator would be about prior 3 months prior to occupation. This role would need to have sufficient time and resources for the role.
112. An indicative action plan has been submitted which is welcome. Highways would have expected to see included in the plan, indicative travel plan, travel plan surveys and delivery of full travel plan.
113. Highways would recommend a contribution of £612 per dwelling for MyJourney in lieu of a residential travel plan.

Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan

114. Due to the size and location of the proposed development, highways would have expected a framework Construction Environmental Management Plan to have been submitted. This document needs to be submitted.

Section 106 contributions

- 115. Bus service contribution for bus route 600 at £xxx per dwelling.
- 116. MyJourney Contribution pf £612 index linked per dwelling.
- 117. A contribution of up to £6500 index linked for speed limit reduction.
- 118. A contribution of £100,000 for improvements to the two nearest pairs of bus stops.
- 119. There may be other contributions required that may be identified through the review of highway impacts.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)

Please use this section to detail any conditions that are required to make this development acceptable in planning terms. All conditions should be accompanied by reasons.

Date:	9 th April 2025	Signed:	Gordon Adam
--------------	----------------------------	----------------	-------------