

PLANNING REF : 253071
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 30 Park View Drive South
: Charvil, Wokingham
: RG10 9QX
SUBMITTED BY : Charvil Parish Council
DATE SUBMITTED : 22/01/2026

COMMENTS:

Planning Comments on Application Number 253071, Reserved Matters for Land West of Park Lane

Charvil Parish Council has various concerns around the proposals in this application, which are set out below.

1. Housing layout and size. There is much disquiet from existing residents of Canberra Lake Way about the proposed layout, and it does appear that this current plan is not in accordance with either CP3 of the Core Strategy, Charvil Neighbourhood Policy 4

(development form and densities), or Policy 3 regarding local design codes, and

particularly design code MS02, in that it will adversely impact on the amenity of the existing dwellings and not be sympathetic in density to the existing area. This would be relatively easy to amend, by incorporating some landscaping between the existing and new

developments and would also provide valuable green corridors for wildlife.

A further concern is around affordable housing. The Parish Council welcomes the inclusion of 40% affordable housing, but feels the current layout is contrary to the S106 agreement signed in May 2025. The agreement states that there should be no clustering but instead the affordable homes should be spread around the site; these homes are largely all together, around the perimeter of the existing Canberra Lake Way, although there are small pockets elsewhere. It also states that these homes should be indistinguishable from market price homes, but it will be very clear in most cases, because the only homes that are not four or five-bedrooms are affordable in the current plan. The Parish Council would like to see some market value smaller homes as per its emerging Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2, Meeting Local Housing Needs. There also needs to be some three-bedroom homes rather than the current concentration of four and five-bedroom homes. This would then allow the developer to meet the terms of the S106

agreement. One further concern is the lack of commitment to solar panels - if these were included in tandem with the promised air-source heat pumps, then the properties would be the most sustainable in the village, and this is a missed opportunity as well as contrary to both the emerging Local Plan, and the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan.

2. Active Travel and village integration. In the Design and Access statement, the developer states that they fully support walking and cycling

infrastructure, but even within the development, the proposals are intermittent and will not encourage walking and cycling. From a wider village perspective, there is also no support; the footpath suggested in the indicative plan provided as part of the outline application into Canberra Lake Way has not been taken forward, and the design of the crossing of Park Lane is conspicuously absent from these reserved matters. This is contrary to AM02 of the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan that wishes to encourage walking and cycling permeability throughout the village. It is important to improve and maintain community

cohesion and to allow a free flow of pedestrians and cyclists around the village in a safe and pleasant environment, and this development needs to support that in the limited ways it can.

3. Village

Facilities. All but one or two of the substantial developments in the village since the 1960s have been allowed on appeal, and consequently there have been limited options for the Borough or Parish Council to influence what additional facilities are provided to support the growing population. It was hoped that this development would be different, providing two facilities currently lacking: some allotments, and a space for older children to enjoy. Initial conversations around the proposed development indicated both could be included but unfortunately this plan, if adopted, will be a missed opportunity to provide two facilities that the village sorely needs that could reasonably be provided alongside a development of this size.

4. Concerns around the site geology report. Perhaps the greatest concern the Parish Council has is around the results of the Geological survey that was commissioned as a condition of the outline planning permission being granted. This was to protect the health and safety of residents and others going forward. The conclusion of the report suggests that there needs to be quite a lot of further

investigation before any safe development in various areas of the site, and that some areas will need very deep foundations to mitigate the effects of ground desiccation, while others will only need normal foundations. Another suggestion is that if soakaways are provided,

they need to be a substantial distance from the houses and roads to mitigate any adverse effects. SUDS are to be at a depth of at least a metre above the flooding level of the wettest areas; this could be difficult as the ponds are very close to the flood zones 2 and 3. It is also a concern that when this site was assessed for its suitability after the call for sites in 2019, the whole field was categorised as Flood zone one, so there was no concern around flooding. There were still no concerns even when the site was given outline planning permission a year ago, but now the lowest-lying areas are flood zones 2 and 3. Does this re-classification have implications for the viability of the site for development, and have all the possible impacts been explored, particularly as to how it affects The Homestead to the south, and East Park Farm car park and sports facilities to the east? Moreover, although the report mentions the well-publicised sink hole in the East Park Farm car park, it

glosses over the cause, even suggesting that it was down to poor workmanship, but fails to mention that there was one, and possibly two earlier sink holes on the sports pitches on the same line, and how these may be an effect of the chalk dissolution. Some local geologists have suggested that more research needs to be done on the effect of a narrow water channel travelling parallel with the existing stream, into which the overlying gravels are collapsing. This would have been too narrow to have been picked up using the survey methods applied and are likely to be the cause of the sink holes on the western side of Park Lane. This is to do with the feathering of the Lambeth group

which overlaid the chalk essentially the rock thins and at the interface between the two a spring line sees water from the aquifer flow out across the chalk. These zones are long recognised and

notorious for causing sinkhole problems. Although the report states that the responsibility of the stability of the site falls solely on the developer, will this be the case on land that is not part of the development and in different ownership, such as the East Park Farm car park and the sports facilities? There seems to be too much uncertainty and possible repercussions to determine this application at this stage, and as the leaseholder of the land east of Park Lane that could be most adversely affected, the Parish Council feels that there needs to be a cast-iron agreement that any further sink hole damage there is paid for by the developer, or steps taken to reduce the likelihood of such events to a minimum.