

PLANNING REF : 250517
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Sideways
: Church Lane, Three Mile Cross, Reading, Berkshire
: RG7 1HD
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Darrell E A Lias
DATE SUBMITTED : 17/04/2025

COMMENTS:

Objection to the Bodys Farm application 250517

To begin with, a statement of facts regarding the current application:

1. The application is not an allocated site in the existing nor submitted LPU.
2. The site is outside of the South of M4 SDL and is within the Burghfield AWE DEPZ.
3. There is an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017) for Shinfield Parish, and there is ongoing preparation of an update to this taking cognisance of NPPF2025 and other recent changes.
4. This application seeks to achieve outline planning consent by concentrating on the access to the development site but this cannot be considered in isolation from the development itself.
5. The Environmental Statement contains many errors and misinformation that are described later in this objection.

This objection is to this application for access only but also to the entire principle of the development location in terms of design and Environmental Impact.

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

This document completely fails to recognise that the Basingstoke Road speed limit has been 30 mph for since 30th April 2024, which demonstrates a clear lack of appreciation of the local area. This is repeated throughout table data and text.

Clause 2.8 quotes the WBC definition of a 'Good public transport service' which includes an hourly Sunday service. Table 10 shows that this does not exist, and nothing in this proposal remedies this failure beyond item 4.5 which mentions a potential discussion on a s106 contribution.

Section 4.11 refers to Barracks Lane without any acknowledgement that this is a private access road. There is an apparent presumption that changes can be made without seeking any agreement with interested parties.

In Table 5, item 'C2 - Mitigation of transport impacts and highways safety and design' is not met in any practical form and WBC proposed contribution to My Journey of 612 per dwelling (section 1.5) provides no mitigation of the impact on local roads.

Section 3 provides a summary of personal injury accidents, but it has no reference to near-miss events. Similarly, nowhere is there any

summary of the damage only accidents that are a frequent feature on the local roads - this should be available from insurer data under freedom of information and is an indication of congestion and road characteristics.

Section 5

The traffic modelling uses generic trip calculations that bear no relation to the local experience, nor local traffic movement recording. It also uses a peak hour that ignores the earlier starts implicit with the existing traffic delays from 07.30 onwards. Some days it can take between 30 minutes to an hour to travel from

Spencers Wood to Junction 11 of the M4 on the B3349. Indeed, since section 5.12 acknowledges that c70% of site traffic will use this route, this is a material consideration.

Since 5.13 identifies 15 - 20% of site traffic will head south on the B3349 but fails to suggest what the effect of this would be past Swallowfield and on to Riseley where the traffic delays at the T-junction onto the B3349 between the A33 and Wellington Country Park.

Section 5.14 identifies that the remainder (i.e. 10 - 15%) of site traffic would use local roads such as Back Lane and Beech Hill Road. Using their own figures, this would add 56 to 84 vehicle movements onto those country lanes during the morning time window when children/parents and staff are arriving Lambs Lane School. Increased two-way traffic via Back Lane/Lambs Lane is utterly unacceptable, particularly construction HGV's:

- o A possible solution would be to make one-way from Grant and Stone yard to the access to the school parking area, removing all eastbound HGV and through traffic past the school entrance, whilst allowing unimpeded access for staff and parents.

There are questionable figures given:

- Table 15 shows a negative effect (-5%) on Northbound traffic on the B3349 from Swallowfield, which is nonsense, for at least two reasons:

- o The Trowes Lane development in Swallowfield will add 81 dwellings therefore potentially produce additional traffic

- o The proposed Primary School will attract children from Swallowfield - Table 15 also shows a negative effect (-11%) on Westbound traffic Hyde End Road between B3349 Basingstoke Road and Grovelands Road, which is also nonsense, for at least two reasons:

- o There are 191 dwellings in application for North of Arborfield Road (Bellway), with at least some of the resulting vehicle movements adding to this route

- o There are at least 190 dwellings (LPU allocated sites) either side of Hyde End Road (Bloor Homes), with at least some of the resulting vehicle movements adding to this route not least because resulting children will need Primary School places.

- Less than 1 vehicle per house between 8a.m. and 9a.m. appears wholly understated

There is no consideration shown of the co-existence of construction vehicles and new residents at the two access points onto the Basingstoke Road. The hazards associated with this will increase as occupations occur and should be a major component of risk assessments and mitigations.

- 6.12 admits that "Similar re-routing is forecast along Beech Hill Road where NB traffic is forecast to decrease by c.4% to avoid congestion at the B3349 Basingstoke Road/Beech Hill Road junction. The traffic is forecast to re-route via Lambs Lane/Back Lane where it joins Basingstoke Road at the proposed roundabout site access.". This is wholly unacceptable as Back Lane is the primary access to Lambs

Lane School and additional traffic routing into/out of this is a safety issue whilst the school remains in use, which would be at a minimum for the duration of the proposed construction of the new Primary School.

FRAMEWORK TRAVEL PLAN

2.1 States: The main site access for vehicular traffic is proposed as a new 4-arm roundabout junction with the B3349 Basingstoke Road and Back Lane. A secondary site access for vehicular traffic is

proposed via a new priority junction with B3349 Basingstoke Road, c.300m north of the proposed roundabout junction. However, there is no explanation as to why the roundabout should be located where indicated, since:

- Back Lane is the primary access to Lambs Lane School and additional traffic routing into/out of this is a safety issue whilst the school remains in use (see also 6.12 in the Transport Assessment).
- The Basingstoke Road southbound from this position has restricted vision due to the left hand bend, and also only has a single eastern side footpath with restricted width.
- The original David Wilson Homes proposal for developing this site had a four-way roundabout at the entrance of the Heron Industrial Estate and this makes much more sense, as it incorporates an existing traffic load that would otherwise access/egress between the two new junctions.

REDACTED EDUCATION LANDSCAPE REVIEW

The Education Landscape document (page 11) identifies the relocation of Lambs Lane into one of the two-form entry Primary School's provisions. What is not dealt with, is where children arising from occupations of the dwellings will be educated whilst the proposed Primary School is being built?. Given that Lambs Lane is Full, this will generate vehicular movements to reach other Primary Schools with spaces. This issue can only be resolved by the completion of the Primary School before any dwellings are occupied, thus allowing the relocation of Lambs Lane at the earliest opportunity.

DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

The design of the development is a series of compromises and missed opportunities:

- The two proposed vehicular junctions with Basingstoke Road, especially the roundabout at the entrance to Back Lane, which is a wholly unacceptable location:
 - o Back Lane is the primary access to Lambs Lane School and additional traffic routing into/out of this is a safety issue whilst the school remains in use.
 - o The Basingstoke Road southbound from this position has restricted vision due to the left hand bend which has a single footpath with restricted width .
 - o The original David Wilson Homes proposal for developing this site had a four-way roundabout at the entrance of the Heron Industrial Estate and this makes much more sense.
- The location of the 3G sports pitch and its changing facilities, plus adjacent parking, are separated from the Pavilion and the two 'sport' fields i.e. Multifunction Open Space and Informal Kick-About Space. This requires players/users to cross a primary route in the development, which makes no sense whatsoever.
- Mentioned in 3.3.4 of the Environmental Statement- Chapter 3 - Site and Surroundings, the route of the Exolum high pressure aviation fuel pipeline, running East-West between Aldermaston and Walton on Thames, is shown in the drawing. However, there is a huge conflict between this and Figure 5.9, where the northern houses encroach the 3metre restricted excavation zone, which should be a critical EIA criteria given the 'Managing Development and Works in

Proximity to Exolum Pipelines' guidelines [GCGU.0011.NWE.UK Version 1.0 - 2022]. o 3.3.5 of the Environmental Statement - Non-Technical Summary states: "Additionally, the discovery of the Exolum Pipeline located across the northern part of the Site and running east to west necessitated amendments to avoid provide appropriate separation between the pipeline and built development." Which makes the layout in Figure 5.9 a real concern.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT - NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

4.1.3 states that the visual amenity effects are restricted to within the site and its environs. However, the Employment area, is presented as a positive part of the development, but there is a total failure to acknowledge that such areas are almost exclusively to the west of the B3349, and that this late addition to the development is completely out of character for the eastern character of the B3349 and the visual aspect. Since the buildings are designated as 12m to the ridge line, the area is completely against the local setting.

4.1.4 and 4.15 brush aside the effects on neighbouring properties, with out of character 2.5 and 3 storey buildings deliberately placed in proximity of those properties.

4.2.4 makes the ridiculous assertion that the development will "assist the Local Authority through several mitigation measures" but fails to recognise the greatest assistance being not to add in excess of 1000 residents to the DEPZ.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT- CHAPTER 2 - EIA APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY Table 2.2

Water and Drainage seeks to defer any discussion of this to a later planning application, but the Thames Water comment on this application demonstrates the multitude of issues associated with the proposed

development, not unexpected given the current experiences of residents. The siting of the two access points to the B3349 will be integral to this and it is disingenuous to separate the considerations.

The Traffic and Transport section acknowledges the focus required on severance, delay, amenity and safety, but then proceeds to ignore this by scoping it outside of the EIA, despite the fact that vehicular

access/egress is entirely via the Basingstoke Road and integral to consideration of such.

Section 2.7.2 completely omits four other developments that will impact on this application:

- The approved Trowes Lane development in Swallowfield will add 81 dwellings.
- The Reserved Matters application for 191 dwellings North of Arborfield Road (Bellway).
- The (at least) 190 dwellings (LPU allocated sites) either side of Hyde End Road (Bloor Homes)
- The development of 63 dwellings at Land West of Stanbury House (screening application 243226), an extension to the quoted approved application 143279.

Environmental Statement- Chapter 4 - Proposed Development

4.3 purports to demonstrate alternative designs but in fact gives none.

4.4 states that impacts have been fully explored but elsewhere in this objection it is demonstrated that this is either a mistaken

statement or downright obfuscation.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT - CHAPTER 5 - LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

This application is in direct conflict with Wokingham policy CC02 regarding developments bordering existing settlements.

5.3.13 admits that lighting effects may be an issue, which is patently obvious when comparing the existing situation to a delivered

development. In association with other concerns this makes the development environmentally untenable.

5.4.7 and 5.4.8 refer to the Section 15 NPPF criteria and it is the contention of this objection that this proposed development fails completely to meet these criteria.

5.5.56 States: "There is no adopted Neighbourhood Plan for Shinfield Parish which defines local landscape character or identifies key local views in the vicinity of the site." - this is utter rubbish since the 2017 adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan includes Policy 1 and Policy 2 which specifically refer to local landscape character.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT - CHAPTER 6 - HUMAN HEALTH EFFECTS

Katmal Ltd are serial deniers of the potential risks that REPPiR 2019 require addressing.

The DEPZ restrictions must be applied and the OSEP be credible. The installation of a digital landline in all dwellings does not provide a solution unless the maintaining of it with a suitable handset are restrictive conditions of occupation.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT - NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

5.2.7 States that: "In addition, the local centre for Spencers Wood is proposed to provide potential community spaces and several small retail units"

Since this was aspirational, and no funding was ever earmarked for this, there must be s106 monies allocated to provide it, and the effects included in the Transport Assessment.

3.2.13 States that: The EIA has been based on two parameter plans submitted for approval as part of the outline planning application. These are:

- Land Use Parameter Plan (Drawing Number P23-2449_DE_012-1), and
 - Building Heights Parameter Plan (Drawing Number P23-2449_DE_015-1)
- These are commented on below:

THE BUILDING HEIGHTS PARAMETERS PLAN contains unresolved issues:

- It totally misses the opportunity to locate the northern dwellings away from existing residences, with the 'up to 3 storey' area at the area adjacent to the Solar Farm.

- Conflict between this and Figure 5.9, and the Development Framework Plan, with this showing 'up to 2.5 storey' in the area immediately south of the Bodys Farm cottages which is marked as '(10) Maximum Retention of existing Vegetation', suggesting that this will become extra dwellings in any Reserved Matters application.

3.3.6 States that: The Development Framework Plan also sought to improve the design of the SANG greenspace proposed following consultation and feedback from Natural England. The Proposed Development has been amended to include circa 8.13ha of SANG, supplemented by new tree planting, biodiversity enhancements,

structural landscaping and a sustainable urban drainage system.

Figure 5.10 - Illustrative SANG layout

- This layout totally misses the opportunity to locate SANG as a buffer between existing residences and the overbearing buildings of the proposed development.

- Since no alternative is offered, there is no opportunity to consider the optimal solution to SANG provision, not even the options discarded.

4.1.5 States that: Overall, the design of the proposed development, the context provided by the existing settlement edge of Spencers Wood, and the combined screening effects of topography, existing vegetation and built form mean that effects on landscape character and local visual amenity would be very limited in scale. Therefore, on balance, the proposed development is considered acceptable in landscape and visual terms.

- This layout totally misses the opportunity to locate SANG as a buffer between existing residences and the overbearing buildings of the proposed development.

- This layout completely ignores Policy 1 and Policy 2 of the 2017 adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan, which specifically refer to local landscape character. Not surprisingly, since 5.5.56 of Environmental Statement - Chapter 5 - Landscape and Visual erroneously states: "There is no adopted Neighbourhood Plan for Shinfield Parish which defines local landscape character or identifies key local views in the vicinity of the site."

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT PARTS 1 TO 8

In an obvious display of ignorance of the local road network:

3.7 (Page 16 of Part 1) states: "The {presumably site?} is also close to the A33 which runs north-south around 1km west of the site, providing vehicular connections to Reading, Basingstoke and the M3 motorway.

To access the A33 requires one of three routes:

1. Northbound on the B3349 to the Mere Oak traffic lights, usually aiming for Junction 11 of the M4 or the Mere Oak Park & Ride.
2. Southbound on the B3349 through Riseley and the tortuous access at the Wellington Monument roundabout.
3. Via Beech Hill Road (or Back Lane/Lambs Lane) and Whitehouse Lane, which is a narrow single track road and is restricted to a southbound entry onto the A33.

This is not an objective assessment of practical routes and again brings into question the validity of the application.

Page 22 (part 2) purports to show historic developments around Spencers Wood, with yellow highlighting Recent Developments. It is a complete misrepresentation of the area, since it completely misses the majority of the South of M4 SDL building (target 900 dwellings) and the majority of the rest of the total of 1840 approvals in the locality since 2010.

Parts 4, 5 and 6 all show the Employment area, but fail to acknowledge that such areas are almost exclusively to the west of the B3349, and that this late addition to the development is completely out of character for the eastern character of the B3349 and the visual

aspect. Since the buildings are designated as 12m to the ridge line, the area is completely against the local setting.

Part 7 includes the description of 'Side parking' otherwise known as 'Tandem Parking' which has been the source of much complaint on other developments and encourages parking of the dwelling's second vehicle on the roadside. This is exceptionally true where vehicle dimensions do not fit in the space to allow vehicle entry and access. For evidence of this visit the Mitford Fields development in Three Mile Cross.

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Section 2 fails to mention any of the questions raised in open forum at the 8th July 2024 Spencers Wood Pavillion event preferring to cite only the written feedback form. For instance, the (now approved) Solar Farm was raised and dismissed out-of-hand, as was the Exolum fuel pipeline which was a surprise to the presenters.

Section 4 fails to identify any of the issues raised by Shinfield Parish Council in the two meetings, nor any modifications to the proposal that may have arisen.