

PLANNING REF : 253117
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 1 Park Lane
: Charvil, Reading
: RG10 9TR
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Douglas Caiger
DATE SUBMITTED : 14/01/2026

COMMENTS:

Objection: Parking & Transport impacts - Land west of Park Lane, Charvil (Bellway Homes RM for 75 dwellings)

I object on parking and transport grounds. The Reserved Matters material makes clear that all vehicular access is via Park Lane, concentrating every car and delivery movement through the village, with knock-on effects for safety, amenity and on-street parking stress for existing residents.

1) Likely car ownership far exceeds what the layout can accommodate safely off-street

- The scheme is heavily weighted to larger family homes (53 of 75 are 4-5 bed: 32 x 4-bed, 21 x 5-bed). Larger homes in edge-of-village locations typically have 2-3+ cars per household, generating multiple daily trips and high visitor demand. The applicant's own dwelling mix evidences this car-led profile.

- Although the Parking Layout totals 112 allocated spaces + 59 unallocated/visitor + 52 garage spaces (223 overall), garages are counted as "spaces" despite well-known low utilisation for car parking once occupied by household storage. Counting garages inflates supply on paper and risks overspill onto Park Lane when real-world car ownership materialises.

2) Overspill and displacement parking onto Park Lane will harm residential amenity and safety

- The Planning Statement confirms the development relies on a street hierarchy with parallel bays "along the streets" for visitors.

Visitor bays within the estate are limited relative to 75 dwellings and a family-led mix; when visitor bays are full or garages unusable, parking will spill onto Park Lane and nearby residential streets already used for school runs and daily village activity.

- The scheme's design intent to "reduce the need for on-street and potentially hazardous informal parking" is asserted, but no mechanism ensures this outcome once real household car numbers exceed the notional count. That risk falls on Park Lane residents.

3) All car trips are funneled up and down Park Lane - cumulative impacts not addressed

- Access is only via a single Park Lane junction, so 100% of car, visitor, delivery, servicing and refuse movements route through the village spine. No secondary/relief access is proposed. The applicant's reliance on internal circulation does nothing to mitigate the external concentration on Park Lane.

- The Outline permission did not grant carte blanche on day-to-day parking effects; the RM layout still must demonstrate no unacceptable transport harm. The submission does not quantify daily resident + visitor movements from a 4-5 bed-heavy mix nor modelling/side-friction once overspill occurs on Park Lane.

4) Public transport claims are overstated for this car-oriented scheme

- The Statement presents the site as "sustainably located with good access to local bus services" and "frequent connections" from Twyford station. This is generic and untested against the actual resident profile the scheme creates (predominantly family housing needing multi-purpose, time-flexible trip making). Without binding, funded measures (e.g., bus service enhancement, car-club vehicles

on site, controlled parking to protect Park Lane, robust travel plan sanctions), the development will be car-led in practice, undermining the paper claim of "sustainable" travel.

- The Transport Statement is referenced but not evidenced in the Planning Statement with mode-share targets, monitoring, or remedial triggers. In the absence of enforceable public-transport improvements, the over-played bus/rail proximity cannot mitigate the additional private car traffic that Park Lane residents will bear.

5) Policy conflict

- MDD Policy CC07 (Parking) expects proposals to meet standards and avoid harmful on-street conditions. Counting garages as reliable supply and leaning on limited visitor bays risks non-compliance in operation, to the detriment of existing residents.

- Core Strategy CP6 (Managing Travel Demand) requires developments to prioritise sustainable travel and enhance road safety. Concentrating all movements through Park Lane while banking on optimistic public-transport assumptions fails that test.

Requested outcome / conditions

Given the above, the RM application should be refused on parking and transport grounds. If the authority is minded to approve, it should only be with robust, prior-to-occupation conditions and obligations that (at minimum):

1. Re-baseline parking so garages only count where internal dimensions and independent evidence demonstrate high likelihood of car use, with a contingency plan for additional on-plot or off-street visitor parking if overspill is observed.
2. Secure a funded Residential Travel Plan with binding mode-share targets, independent monitoring for 5 years, and financial sanctions/mitigation if targets are missed (e.g., on-site car-club vehicles, additional visitor bays, contributions to local bus frequency).
3. Implement a Park Lane parking protection scheme (consulted CPZ or similar), funded by the applicant, to safeguard existing residents from displacement.
4. Require a Construction Traffic Management Plan that prevents construction parking and HGV conflict on Park Lane during school and peak hours.

As submitted, the proposal will increase car ownership and daily trips, funnel them exclusively up and down Park Lane, and over-rely on overstated public transport, to the detriment of current village residents.