

PLANNING REF : 253116
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 1 Park Lane
: Charvil, Reading
: RG10 9TR
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Douglas Caiger
DATE SUBMITTED : 14/01/2026

COMMENTS:

Objection - Construction traffic, cumulative HGV routing via Park Lane/Charvil, and interaction with existing depot traffic

I object to the application on construction-traffic grounds. As submitted, the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) provides no workable construction traffic strategy, defers key transport matters to another document, and fails to address the cumulative HGV burden created by (i) construction of this scheme, (ii) A Better

Service (ABS) operations using the same local routes, and (iii) the recently proposed fuel depot traffic, all of which concentrate movements through Charvil and along Park Lane.

1) No construction traffic detail is provided - transport impacts are explicitly "out of scope"

Section 2.6 of the CEMP states that "issues relating to the methods of construction including access, vehicle movement, noise and vibration control will be detailed within the Construction Method Statement and do not form part of this document." In other words, the submission before you contains no routing, no HGV numbers, no peak-hour controls, no staff/contractor parking plan, and no delivery booking system.

Approving the RM/CEMP on this basis would leave residents exposed to unmanaged construction traffic on Park Lane.

2) All site access is via Park Lane - but the CEMP does not manage HGVs on this residential spine

The plans show the construction area and site access locked to Park Lane, yet the CEMP does not set any cap on HGVs/hour, convoy controls, or waiting restrictions to prevent queuing on Park Lane. The only stated traffic-adjacent measure is that a road sweeper will be used "outside of peak network and school hours," which acknowledges

peak-time sensitivity but offers no binding management of HGV movements themselves.

3) Cumulative impact with ABS and the fuel depot is ignored

Residents already experience daily HGV activity from ABS (A Better Service) and other operators using the same Charvil routes. In parallel, the fuel depot proposal would add further tanker/HGV movements along the same short corridor. The CEMP is silent on cumulative impact and offers no coordination (e.g., time-windowing) to avoid

overlapping peaks between construction deliveries and existing/commercial HGV flows. Given the single access via Park Lane, this omission is material.

4) Sensitive setting makes unmanaged construction traffic unacceptable

The CEMP itself highlights the site's proximity to ancient woodland and a stream, requiring wheel-wash, spill controls and other measures. More HGV traffic means more mud/debris, greater risk of surface-water run-off and pollution events, and more frequent wheel-washing

discharges to manage, again without a specified traffic plan or routing that minimises these risks on Park Lane and adjacent

receptors.

5) Working hours noted, but no linkage to traffic controls While the document mentions daytime working hours (weekday/Saturday), it still does not translate those hours into deliveries embargoes, school-street protections, or peak-hour blackouts on Park Lane. Without enforceable delivery windows and routing, the stated hours offer no practical protection to residents.

Conclusion

Because the submission omits a construction traffic/routing strategy, fails to assess or manage cumulative HGV effects with ABS and the fuel depot, and relies entirely on Park Lane for access with no enforceable controls, the proposal would result in unacceptable

highway, amenity and environmental impacts for Charvil residents. The application should therefore be refused on construction-traffic grounds.

If the authority is nevertheless minded to proceed, the following pre-commencement condition set is essential (minimum):

1. Comprehensive Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) for approval, to include:

- o Fixed HGV routing avoiding residential frontages where possible and expressly managing movements through Charvil/Park Lane.
- o Daily and hourly HGV caps, with delivery booking system, no-waiting/no-idling rules, and prohibition on convoy arrivals.

- o Peak-time embargoes (school start/finish and commuter peaks) and event-day controls.

- o Staff/contractor parking plan off-street (no on-street parking on Park Lane or nearby streets).

- o Named traffic marshals/banksmen at the access during delivery windows.

2. Cumulative-impact coordination protocol: the CTMP must demonstrate time-window coordination to avoid overlap with known HGV generators in Charvil (including ABS) and any consented fuel-depot operations

sharing the same routes, with an obligation to adjust delivery slots if conflicts arise.

3. Environmental protection linkage: wheel-wash siting, run-off containment and road-cleaning tied to delivery volumes (trigger thresholds for additional sweeps, vacuum tankers, or temporary drainage protection), with monitoring and reporting to the LPA.

Absent these safeguards and in the face of known HGV pressures from ABS and the fuel-depot scheme, the residual construction-traffic impact would be severe and unacceptable for Park Lane and Charvil.