

PLANNING REF : 261059
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Arborfield Village Hall
: Eversley Road, Arborfield
: RG2 9PQ
SUBMITTED BY : Arborfield & Newland Parish Council
DATE SUBMITTED : 17/06/2026

COMMENTS:

Arborfield and Newland Parish Council Formal Objection to Planning Application 261059

Site: Land south of Langley Common Road,
Arborfield Green

Proposal: Outline application for up to 660 dwellings, elderly care accommodation, SANG, open space and associated works

Applicant: Crest Nicholson Operations Ltd

1. Conflict with the Wokingham Local Plan Core Strategy

1.1 CS1 – Sustainable

Development Locations

The Core Strategy directs major development to designated Strategic Development Locations (SDLs).

The application site is not within an SDL and lies outside the settlement boundary.

A proposal for 660 dwellings is therefore not supported in principle and conflicts with the spatial strategy of CS1.

1.2 CP11 – Development Outside Development Limits

CP11 permits only small scale, rural character development outside limits.

This proposal is:

- Large scale
- Urban in form
- Transformative of open countryside

It therefore fails CP11.

1.3 CP3 – General Principles for Development

CP3 requires development to:

- Respect local character
- Avoid overbearing massing
- Protect landscape setting
- Provide safe access

With all matters except access reserved, the applicant has not demonstrated that a development of this magnitude can be accommodated without significant landscape and character harm.

1.4 CP6 – Managing Travel Demand

The Transport Assessment documents listed on the planning portal do not demonstrate:

- Safe access
- Cumulative impact

assessment

- Adequate mitigation

The proposal therefore fails CP6.

2. Conflict with the Managing Development Delivery (MDD) Plan

2.1 TB20 / TB21 – Landscape & Countryside Protection

The site forms part of the rural setting south of Arborfield Green.

A 660 unit scheme

would:

- Extend the settlement footprint
- Erode rural character

- Create coalescence pressure

This is contrary to TB20 and TB21.

2.2 TB23 – Biodiversity & Nature Conservation

No Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) plan is visible in the listed documents.

SANG provision alone does not satisfy statutory BNG requirements. The application therefore fails TB23.

3. Conflict with the Arborfield & Barkham Neighbourhood Plan

3.1 Countryside Protection Policies

The

Neighbourhood Plan emphasises:

- Maintaining rural character
- Preventing settlement sprawl
- Protecting landscape setting

A major urban extension of 660 dwellings is directly contrary to these principles.

3.2 Housing Policies (H1)

The Plan

supports:

- Infill
- Proportionate growth
- Development within

boundaries

This proposal is far beyond the scale contemplated by the Neighbourhood Plan.

3.3 Transport & Movement (T1)

The Transport Assessment does not demonstrate:

- Safe pedestrian/cycle connectivity – particularly between the site and Arborfield Green SDL
- Junction capacity modelling
- Mitigation for increased traffic

The proposal therefore fails T1.

4. Conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

4.1 NPPF 110 – Safe & Suitable Access

The application provides no detailed access design, despite access being the only non reserved matter.

Without:

- Road safety audit
- Active travel assessment
- Junction modelling
- Mitigation strategy

...the proposal fails NPPF 110(a-d).

The suitability of the access must also be

considered. Although the proposal is to consider this application as part of the Arborfield Green SDL, the site is separated by lack of access to the existing SDL and its infrastructure. The need for direct transport connections into the existing SDL has been overlooked and the lack of such connections does not precipitate a bus route.

The rationale for the location of the allotments is unsure as their position promotes car use rather than active travel.

4.2 NPPF 111 – Unacceptable Cumulative Impacts

The NPPF requires decision makers to consider cumulative impacts for example, the infrastructure for

Arborfield Green SDL was designed to support the original SDL not all the additional extensions that have been made to it (e.g. Hogwood Farm, Barkham Square and Arborfield Studios). The Transport Assessment does consider cumulative impact. The proposal therefore fails NPPF 111.

4.3 NPPF 174 – Protecting Valued Landscapes

The site is open countryside forming part of Arborfield's rural setting.

A development of this scale would cause significant landscape harm, contrary to NPPF 174.

4.4 NPPF 194 – Heritage Impact

A Heritage Statement is listed but not visible.

Without a demonstrable assessment of heritage impact, the application fails NPPF 194.

4.5 NPPF 34 – Infrastructure Delivery

The application does not demonstrate:

- School capacity
- Healthcare provision
- Public transport improvements
- Highway mitigation

Major development must show infrastructure deliverability.

This proposal does not.

5.

Environmental & Ecological Failures

5.1 Biodiversity Net Gain

(Environment Act 2021)

No BNG calculation or plan is visible.

This is a statutory requirement for major development.

5.2 SANG

Provision

While SANG is referenced, there is:

- No evidence of Natural England approval
- No demonstration that SANG is appropriately
- No assurance that SANG is sufficient for 660 dwellings

SANG

cannot justify otherwise unacceptable countryside development.

6. Cumulative Transport Impact – Additional Statement of Concern

Arborfield has experienced substantial incremental development over the past decade, including:

- The Arborfield Garrison

SDL

- Ongoing infill and windfall sites
- Expansion of educational and commercial facilities
- Multiple speculative applications on the village periphery

Despite this, no comprehensive, up to date cumulative transport assessment has been undertaken.

The Transport Assessment for application 261059 considers traffic in isolation, failing to account for:

- Existing congestion on Langley Common Road, Eversley Road, and the A327
- Increased school traffic associated with Bohunt School
- The constrained nature of rural lanes and junctions
- Lack of continuous, safe pedestrian and cycle routes

- The cumulative impact of committed and emerging developments

This

piecemeal approach is contrary to national and local policy, including:

NPPF 111-112

Requires assessment of cumulative impacts and avoidance of unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

Core Strategy CP6

Requires demonstration that development will not create severe residual cumulative impacts.

Arborfield & Newland Neighbourhood Plan (Transport Policies)

Requires:

- Safe movement within the village
- Protection of rural lanes
- Avoidance of increased traffic through residential areas

Without a cumulative analysis, these policies are not met.

Key Cumulative Concerns

- Traffic is being assessed development by development, not village wide
 - Rural roads are already at or beyond safe capacity
 - No strategic transport mitigation is proposed
 - The cumulative impact is materially harmful and unsustainable
- Until a comprehensive, village wide cumulative transport assessment is undertaken, no further major development should be approved.

In Conclusion Planning Application 261059

represents a major, unallocated, countryside development that conflicts with the Local Plan, MDD, Neighbourhood Plan, and the NPPF.

It fails to demonstrate:

- Policy compliance
- Safe access
- Infrastructure capacity
- Environmental mitigation
- Biodiversity Net Gain
- Landscape protection
- Heritage assessment
- Cumulative transport impact assessment

Arborfield and Newland Parish Council considers that given these substantial and unresolved conflicts, the application should be refused.