

PLANNING REF : 261177
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 261177

Site: Land off Baird Road, Arborfield

Proposal: Full application for creation of new vehicular access and timber access gate

Reference: 261177

1. The Proposal is an Enabling

Development Outside the Plan Led Strategy

Although the application is described as a simple "vehicular access", the submitted drawing (turn0browsertab1) clearly shows:

- A 4m wide engineered access
- 11m of hard surfacing
- 10 dropped kerbs
- A timber vehicular

gate

- Visibility splays cut through existing vegetation

This is not an agricultural gate of incidental use.

It is a strategic access point capable of enabling future development of the land behind.

Policy conflict:

- Core Strategy CS1 – development must follow the plan led spatial strategy.
- Creating a new engineered access to unallocated land pre empts future development and undermines CS1.

2. Highway Safety Concerns – Non Compliance with NPPF 110 & 111

The access drawing (turn0browsertab1) shows:

- A gate positioned immediately behind the highway boundary
- No evidence of a set back to allow a vehicle to pull clear of the carriageway
- Requirement for vegetation removal to achieve visibility
- Visibility splays of 2.4m x 28m, 2.4m x 34m, and 2.4m x 56m
- Reliance on 22mph 85th percentile speeds to justify reduced visibility

Key safety issues:

2.1 Vehicles will have to stop in the carriageway to open the gate

This creates a known collision risk, especially on residential roads with on street parking and pedestrian activity.

2.2 Visibility splays are constrained and dependent on vegetation removal

The drawing confirms that existing hedges must be cut back to maintain visibility.

This is not guaranteed or enforceable long term, making the access unsafe.

2.3 No swept path analysis

There is no evidence that:

- Refuse vehicles
- Emergency vehicles
- Delivery vans

...can safely enter or exit without overrunning the footway or opposing lane.

2.4 No pedestrian or cycle safety assessment

The proposal provides no improvements for non motorised users.

Policy conflict:

- NPPF 110(a-d) – safe and suitable access not demonstrated
- NPPF 111 – development should be refused where highway safety is compromised
- Core Strategy CP6 – failure to demonstrate no severe residual impacts
- MDD Local Plan (CC07 / access standards) – safe geometry and visibility not proven

3. Harm to Residential Character – Conflict with CP3 and Neighbourhood Plan

Baird Road is a quiet residential street.

The proposed access

introduces:

- A wide engineered junction
- A large timber gate
- A suburbanised frontage
- Increased vehicle movements

This is out of keeping with the established character.

Policy conflict:

- Core

Strategy CP3 – development must respect character and avoid harm to amenity

- Arborfield & Newland Neighbourhood Plan – protect residential streets from inappropriate traffic and urbanisation

4. Cumulative Transport Impact Not Assessed

The applicant relies solely on MfS visibility splays and a single speed survey.

There is no assessment of:

- Existing congestion on Baird Road and surrounding streets
- Interaction with traffic from the Arborfield Garrison SDL
- Cumulative impact of other applications (including 261059)
- Safety impacts of increased turning movements
- School

traffic associated with Bohunt School

Policy conflict:

- NPPF 111 – cumulative impacts must be assessed
- Core Strategy CP6 – requires demonstration of no severe cumulative impact
- Neighbourhood Plan T1 – requires safe movement and cumulative consideration

5. Environmental and Landscape Harm

The drawing (turn0browsertab1) confirms:

- Removal of existing vegetation
- Reduction of hedgerow height to maintain visibility
- Introduction of hard surfacing and fencing

This erodes the green frontage and harms the rural edge of the settlement.

Policy conflict:

- MDD TB21 – protect landscape character
- NPPF 174 – protect valued landscapes and green features
- Neighbourhood Plan – retain rural edges and hedgerows

6. The Application is Premature and Lacks Justification

No agricultural justification is provided

for:

- A 4m wide engineered access
- 10 dropped kerbs
- A timber

vehicular gate

- 11m of tarmac surfacing

This is far beyond what is required for agricultural access and is clearly intended to facilitate future development, which has not been applied for or assessed.

Policy conflict:

- NPPF plan led approach (paras 15-16)
- CS1 – prevents unplanned expansion
- CP11 – protects countryside from unjustified development

7. Conclusion – Application Should Be Refused

Based on the submitted plans and policy assessment, Planning

Application 261177:

- Fails to demonstrate safe and suitable access
- Creates highway safety risks
- Harms residential character
- Damages landscape and vegetation
- Fails to assess cumulative impacts
- Undermines the plan led strategy
- Appears to be an enabling access for future unallocated development

For these reasons, the application is contrary to:

- NPPF: 110, 111, 112, 174
- Core Strategy: CS1, CP3, CP6, P11

- MDD Local Plan: TB21, CC07 (access standards)
- Arborfield & Newland Neighbourhood Plan: Transport & Character policies

The application should therefore be refused.