

PLANNING REF : 252498  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Spring Copse Julkes Lane  
: Spring Copse Ju Rg29jj, Arborfield, Berkshire  
: RG29JJ  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Michael Heard  
DATE SUBMITTED : 26/01/2026

COMMENTS:

I would like to make the following points in relation to this planning application:

1. Wokingham Borough Council has failed to properly consider the National Infrastructure which exists in the area (Rail facilities at Twyford) and has made unrealistic assumptions relating to transport in its Transport Assessment report. Specifically in respect of walk, cycle and bus use. The Williams Rail Review in Great Britain recognises the importance of rail links because it connects individuals to work opportunities which would be slow, expensive and otherwise inconvenient to reach by other modes. It also recognises that better transport links (Elizabeth Line and London Links) makes more land attractive for housing development and brings employment opportunities closer together. It states that more than 1 in 5 households do not have access to a car. Access to public transport, including rail improves access to education, employment and leisure opportunities. Most importantly it has the benefit of easing road congestion with reduction in greenhouse gases, air quality and noise pollution. The full Williams Rail Report is included in my previous consultation submission.

2. In October 2021 Berkley Group consulted on a proposal to develop 2500 homes in Ruscombe including a new railway station with adequate parking. It was rejected by Wokingham because it involved the use of greenbelt land on the periphery of the village. I believe that there are exceptional benefits to be had by capturing the benefits of the investment that has already been made nationally and that Wokingham Borough Council has failed to give full weight to this which I believe would justify the Berkeley Group development on green belt and would give the benefits outlined above.

3. I note that at present WBC are trying to find a solution to the parking problem at Twyford which could have been resolved as a function of 2 Above,

4. In order to deliver Loddon Valley Garden Village there is a need to invest a huge amount of money in infrastructure particularly with regard new roads, schools, sewage plant etc which is clearly evidenced in the submission that has been made although I believe that the real cost has been understated. Appendix 5 -viability assumptions for Twyford shows much lower infrastructure costs and again this has not been fully considered when contrasting the options. Concreting over large sections of the countryside and increasing road use does nothing for the environment and has a detrimental effect on climate change by increasing green house

gases, air and noise pollution.

5. 97% of development in Wokingham has been in the South of the Borough and then the proposal for Loddon Garden Village, in addition, by 2036. Clearly the infrastructure which is under strain already from existing developments will be strained further. There is always a time lag between the development being built and the provision of the infrastructure and this puts considerable strain on existing already overstretched resources. Within any area there has to be a balance as to where development is done and Wokingham have singularly failed to provide this balance which results in an unbalanced position across the Borough.

6. The Local plan update failed to include Carters Hill House which is a grade II listed building and where landscape character was the reason for refusal by Wokingham Borough Council of a Wind Farm application in 2010.

7. In looking at the viability of various sites for development scant regard was paid to the value of the agricultural land at Hall farm. The assessment of the value of land at Hall Farm, Ashridge and

Twyford was subjective and led to an on balance decision to put forward Hall Farm and the Loddon Garden village as the favoured solution. I believe that the assumptions were wrong and led to the wrong conclusion.

8. The University of Reading have been consulting on the proposed development of Loddon Garden Village but have failed to provide proper information, They have produced glossy maps that purport to show where various things will be sited. They have been asked on numerous

occasions both verbally and in writing to ensure that the maps they show have legends because without this they are just pictures with little or no meaning. There is an element of showing the picture they would like to see rather than what is reality. At least one of their

promotional maps is wrong showing a byway as a green leafy lane. The public deserve better and if you are going to consult make sure what you present is accurate.

9. The Local Plan update failed to consider fully the Arborfield and Barkham Neighbourhood plan which was 5 years in the making, was passed at a Referendum and approved by the Planning Inspectorate. Notably in respect of gaps between settlements, the importance of heritage assets and the significant value that the residents of Arborfield, Barkham and surrounding areas place on the local environment which is beneficial to people's physical and mental wellbeing.

10. The plan in its present form fails to ensure that Wokingham Borough Council has an adequate land supply for the next 5 years because the development as proposed requires such a lot of expensive infrastructure and the speed of housing delivery is inhibited by the speed with which this can be completed.