

Planning Comments on the Reserved Matters Application (253071)

Land West of Park Lane, Charvil

Third submission – comments on the current layout, from Alan Simpson of Charvil

I am writing as a resident of Charvil to comment further on the third version of the Reserved Matters application, and to add my personal support to the concerns already raised by the Parish Council. I share the Parish Council's view on each of the points below, and have set out where I understand these relate to commitments already in place through the Section 106 Agreement, the Reserved Matters conditions, and the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan (NHP), so the Council can see where each point relates to an existing obligation, and where it is a new request. Under each point I have set out, specifically, what I am asking the Council to do.

1. Footway connections to The Hawthorns and Canberra Lake Way

I support the Parish Council's view that it is disappointing a separate footway from the development to either The Hawthorns or Canberra Lake Way (CLW) has not been included in this submission. I recognise there are site-specific constraints — I understand the minimum 2 metre path width cannot be achieved within the current land ownership at the Hawthorns/CLW junction, that a route along the highway verge was not considered safe, and that an alternative alignment would require a private landowner's agreement — but, like the Parish Council, I do not think these constraints close off the issue entirely. I would ask that the current layout be reviewed to explore whether the long, blind cul-de-sac can be improved from a design and accessibility perspective, even where a CLW link itself cannot be secured immediately.

Reference: Reserved Matters Condition 18 (Walking Strategy); NHP Design Code AM02 (Cycling Networks & PRow).

MY REQUEST TO THE COUNCIL

Please confirm, before the Walking Strategy is approved under Condition 18, how the layout will be tested to ensure it does not unnecessarily prevent future connectivity to Hawthorns/CLW, and provide an update on the land ownership position at that junction, so the alternative path option is kept open rather than closed off by this consent.

2. Play provision for teenagers

I understand the developer's reluctance to provide a pump track or other teenage facility on this site. However, I agree with the Parish Council that a further conventional playground is a missed opportunity: based on conversations with neighbours and a recent local survey of residents, there is little appetite for another playground but strong and consistent support for a good-quality pump track (of around 254 responses, 160 specifically favoured a pump track/BMX facility). I support the Parish Council's request to work with the Council and the developer to identify a suitable off-site location for a pump track within the village.

Reference: S106 Schedule 8 (Play Area — on-site provision or a Play Area Contribution in lieu, at the Owner's election); NHP Policy 1 (Village Facilities).

MY REQUEST TO THE COUNCIL

Please explore, with the developer, whether an off-site Play Area Contribution could fund a village pump track as an alternative to further on-site playground equipment, and take the local survey evidence into account when the final play specification is approved.

3. Walking and cycling links to local facilities and Twyford Station

I understand it is a requirement of both the Reserved Matters conditions and the S106 Agreement that the developer ensures walking and cycling provision from the site is properly linked to bus stops, local shops and other facilities, and to Twyford Station, and demonstrates how these routes will be improved. Like the Parish Council, I do not think this requirement has yet been adequately addressed in the submitted details, and I would like to see a clear commitment to align any proposed changes with the priorities set out in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), so far as they relate to Charvil, and Park Lane in particular.

Reference: Reserved Matters Condition 18 (Walking Strategy — routes to Twyford Station, bus stops and local shops, to be approved before first occupation); S106 Schedule 6 (My Journey Contribution — pedestrian/cycle links and bus infrastructure improvements); NHP Design Code AM02; Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan and Local Transport Plan 4 (Park Lane identified as a priority corridor).

MY REQUEST TO THE COUNCIL

Please require the developer to resubmit Walking Strategy details that clearly demonstrate alignment with LCWIP priorities for Charvil and Park Lane before Condition 18 is discharged, and confirm how S106/CIL receipts from this development will be aligned with LCWIP delivery in this corridor.

4. Adoption of open space

I am satisfied with the quantum and type of open space proposed, but I share the Parish Council's concern that its ongoing management could default to a private management company rather than being adopted by the Borough or Parish Council. I agree this would not be in the best interests of new residents or the village, and I support the Parish Council's request that these areas be adopted by the Borough or Parish Council, in the interests of village cohesion. This approach also aligns with WBC view to “adopt” open spaces managed by Management Co’s – under clear transfer and financial agreements.

Reference: S106 Schedule 7 (Open Space — Owner to offer transfer to the Council or a body nominated by the Council, failing which Schedule 10 provides for a Management Company); Reserved Matters Condition 36 (Open Space quanta).

MY REQUEST TO THE COUNCIL

Please confirm, in writing and ahead of the Owner's Schedule 7 transfer offer, whether the Council will accept the open space itself or formally nominate Charvil Parish Council to receive the transfer, so a management company arrangement is not allowed to arise by default.

5. Local spend of S106 and CIL contributions

I share the Parish Council's concern that other financial contributions secured under the S106 Agreement may ultimately be allocated to facilities outside Charvil. I support the Parish Council's request that, wherever the terms of the S106 Agreement allow, contributions generated by this development are spent within the village itself, where the need they are intended to address has arisen. Very little S106 and CIL contributions have historically been spent in the Parish.

Reference: S106 financial contribution schedules generally (including the Play Area and My Journey/Travel Plan contributions referred to above), which are typically expressed by reference to the development's local catchment.

MY REQUEST TO THE COUNCIL

Please provide a clear statement of the Council's intended allocation policy for each financial contribution secured under this S106 Agreement, CIL and confirm how local residents can be consulted before funds are committed to projects outside Charvil.

6. Impacts on land east of Park Lane

I share the Parish Council's continuing concern about the potential impacts of this development on the land to the east of Park Lane — including East Park Farm and its car parks — as well as on Park Lane itself. I support the Parish Council's request that further surveys should be conducted and be objective and thorough, and investigate a wider area than the site alone, including these facilities. I would like to see the results of any surveys and investigations before they are relied upon, so that residents can be satisfied these interests are not compromised by this development.

Reference: No further highway obligations can be secured through a Reserved Matters application; a more substantial traffic management scheme would need to be pursued through the Council's Report a Road Safety Concern process; the evidence base underpinning the original outline permission dates from 2022; NHP Policy CHARVIL 11 and Design Code AM03 (pedestrian and highway safety, traffic calming).

MY REQUEST TO THE COUNCIL

Please commission or oversee updated 2026 traffic, pedestrian and cumulative-impact surveys covering Park Lane, East Park Farm and its car parks; share the survey scope and results before they are used to inform any decision; and confirm how a monitor-and-review mechanism, funded through this development's S106/CIL contributions, will be put in place.

Summary of my requests

Issue	What I am asking the Council to do
1. Footways	Confirm the layout safeguards future connectivity to Hawthorns/CLW and update on land ownership.
2. Teen play	Explore an off-site pump track funded via the Play Area Contribution.
3. Walking/cycling	Require LCWIP-aligned Walking Strategy details before discharging Condition 18.
4. Open space	Confirm whether the Council or the Parish Council will accept the Schedule 7 transfer offer.
5. Local spend	State the allocation policy for S106 and CIL contributions and how residents will be consulted.
6. Park Lane	Commission wider, updated surveys and share results before they are relied upon.

I am happy to discuss any of these matters further.