

PLANNING REF : 252498
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 102 Fullbrook Avenue
:
: RG7 1FJ
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Akmal Khodjaev
DATE SUBMITTED : 13/11/2025

COMMENTS:

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Planning Application 252498 - Hall Farm, Arborfield - Objection

I am writing to object to the above hybrid planning application for up to 2,800 residential units and associated infrastructure at Hall Farm, Church Lane, Arborfield.

While I recognise the need for appropriate, sustainable development, this proposal is far beyond what the local area can reasonably accommodate. My objection is based on several material planning grounds:

1. Severe Traffic and Highways Impact

The proposals would introduce thousands of additional daily vehicle movements onto an already highly constrained road network.

The A327, Lower Earley Way, Church Lane, and surrounding rural lanes are already at or over capacity at peak times.

The scale of the new access junctions, bridges, and connecting roads will fundamentally alter traffic patterns in a way that risks persistent congestion and road safety issues.

The transport assessments significantly underestimate the cumulative impact of this development together with other major schemes recently approved in the wider area.

2. Lack of Infrastructure Capacity - Schools, Healthcare, and Community Services

Although the application describes new primary and secondary schools, there is a well-established track record locally of school provision not being delivered as promised.

Specifically:

The major developments in Shinfield and Spencers Wood were approved with similar commitments to new schools, yet those schools have not been delivered, leaving residents with long travel distances, oversubscribed classrooms, and significant strain on existing schools.

This recent history seriously undermines confidence that the proposed schools at Hall Farm will be delivered on time, or at all, given the complexity of a phased build of 2,800 homes. Early housing phases could be occupied for years before any meaningful educational infrastructure arrives, placing unacceptable pressure on current schools already struggling with capacity.

Likewise:

GP surgeries, dental practices, and other healthcare services are already operating at capacity.

No evidence has been provided that the NHS/RBH has confirmed funding or commissioning for any required expansion.

3. Flood Risk and SUDS Concerns

The site lies adjacent to the River Loddon, a known flood-prone area with a history of severe flooding.

Large-scale hard surfacing and changes to the valley's drainage patterns risk pushing floodwater downstream, creating new risks for existing communities.

Reliance on SUDS over such a large and hydrologically sensitive area carries considerable uncertainty, especially as extreme weather events intensify.

The flood alleviation and SUDS details remain high-level and unproven at this scale.

4. Landscape and Heritage Harm

This development would fundamentally alter the rural character of the Loddon Valley landscape, effectively merging Arborfield, Shinfield, and Lower Earley into a continuous urban corridor.

The setting of St Bartholomew's Church (Grade I listed) is particularly sensitive, and the proposed scale of associated built development nearby is inappropriate.

Visual and landscape harm will be substantial and irreversible.

5. Ecological and Biodiversity Impacts

Despite proposed SANG and Biodiversity Net Gain measures, the scheme involves:

Extensive loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat across a large landscape block.

Disruption of established ecological corridors across the Loddon Valley.

Significant long-term disturbance from construction over many years.

The claimed ecological gains do not adequately compensate for the scale and permanence of the losses.

6. Over-Intensive and Unsustainable Scale

A development of 2,800 dwellings effectively the size of a small town will place enormous pressure on local infrastructure, countryside character, and transport networks.

The application lacks convincing evidence that this location is suitable for a development of this magnitude or that the surrounding communities and landscape can absorb the impacts.

Conclusion

This proposal is premature, excessively large, and insufficiently supported by credible infrastructure guarantees. Recent local experience in Shinfield and Spencers Wood demonstrates that promised facilities particularly schools too often fail to materialise, leaving existing and new communities with severe capacity problems.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Wokingham Borough Council refuse planning application 252498.

Yours faithfully,
Akmal Khodjaev