

PLANNING REF : 251814
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 24 Chiltern Crescent
: Earley, Berkshire
: RG6 1AN
SUBMITTED BY : Ms Judith Mortimer
DATE SUBMITTED : 11/09/2025

COMMENTS:

I object to the above proposal on the following grounds.
This Planning Application proposes to introduce housing into a business park and nature reserve.
This would have a number of detrimental impacts on the environment and on traffic flows and movement.

Firstly the resultant increase in traffic on the Thames Valley Park will lead to potential risks to wildlife on the wider Park estate. Due to the plan to allow for 32 households, there will be an inevitable increase in traffic entering, leaving and moving around the Park. This rise in traffic will be constituted of residents' vehicles, but also their visitors' vehicles, and service vehicles such as maintenance vans, delivery vans and refuse collection lorries.

The additional traffic could lead to the risk of injuries to the mammals such as deer and foxes which currently live on or pass through the park.

The Planning Application has not made sufficient provision for protecting the important wildlife habitats which form part of the area outlined in the site map (PD001).

At present the site PD001 includes a large number of semi-mature trees, hedgerows, bushes and grass sward and isolated trees within the existing car park.

The Ecological & Bat Roost Appraisal Survey minimises the value of these habitats, the range of flora and fauna present and the true impact of the construction process on wildlife.

The Survey author states that a "biological records data search has not been undertaken". This, I believe, is an oversight. For example, the survey states that to the north and west of the site is a flat area of "neutral grassland" and "no ecological niches". This is not an accurate description of this particular area. The rare bee orchid (*Ophrys apifera*) has been observed by myself and by other local residents growing here immediately to the north and west of Regus House (photographs can be provided if necessary). Bee orchids are protected, as are all wild flowers, under Section 13 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981). This section of the Act prohibits unauthorised and intentional uprooting of any wild plant. In

addition, because orchids are particularly slow growing and may only flower once in their lifetime, it is important to never pick or uproot or damage these plants. These rare plants could be destroyed by

construction traffic, construction workers, and plant moved through or onto these verges. There is no provision or condition in the Planning Application for the protection of these important species. The survey, which took place on only 1 occasion in June 2024, states that there was no evidence of bats or badgers.

However it omits to mention that a wide range of other wildlife is thriving within and near to site. I frequently visit the Thames Valley Park nature reserve which involves my walking past the proposed site of this planning application. Even in daylight hours

I have observed foxes and fox cubs and only today I observed a roe deer which crossed the service road in front of me and disappeared into the hedges which surround the Regus building.

This whole area surrounding 400 Regus House serves as an important wildlife corridor for mammals, birds and insects.

This balanced ecosystem would be jeopardised by the development of this building.

Wildlife on the site is currently well managed by Thames Valley Park (TVP). According to their web site, the whole park is described as "A special place for wildlife, home to almost 40 species of birds, with extensive areas of wildflower-rich grassland, dragonflies and lflies, the common toad, the harmless grass snake, and just the occasional Otter. Pontoons and other viewing areas offer visitors a privileged glimpse into a fascinating world".

This short description gives a brief picture of the importance and beauty of the Thames Valley Park. The introduction of residential housing into these spaces would change this irrevocably.

The Planning Application summarises the social infrastructure which would be accessible to the households in the proposed development. Although it lists shops and supermarkets and 1 doctors' surgery, it omits to mention any primary schools in the vicinity. The nearest primary school within the Wokingham District is Earley St Peter's School CE a school which is 2.5 miles or 32 minutes' walk away. The school is not served by any bus route from the proposed site and therefore the most natural means of transport for primary school aged pupils to use would be private car, thus increasing congestion on the A4 and the B3350.

The nearest community centre within the Wokingham District, The Oakwood Centre, is 2.7 miles or 39 minutes' walk.

The proposed site is accessible by foot and cycle from the A4 via a tunnel underneath the GWR railway line. However this tunnel is poorly lit and in reality would not be an attractive or safe route for

potential residents, young, old or elderly, after dark or during a winter commute to school or work.

This proposal for housing on a business park will create a small enclave, separate to the rest of north Earley, poorly served by the local infrastructure and lacking the social and cultural amenities required by the potential residents who would be likely to comprise of both 1 and 2 person households and households with children.

On the basis of the above considerations, it is not a suitable site for residential housing.