

PLANNING REF : 252769  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 27 Harrow Way  
: Sindlesham, Berks  
: RG41 5GJ  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr steven john Everton  
DATE SUBMITTED : 11/01/2026

COMMENTS:

Mr S J Everton  
27 Harrow Way, RG41 5GJ  
Application 252769

I object to the proposed application on the basis of traffic implications of the construction works in particular, and how the developer has considered this.

The Local Plan hearings in 2025 at Wokingham Council offices explicitly made the point several times : that the traffic numbers used by the Developers /WBC were "robust" and "appropriate for the local plan stage". They were questions repeatedly on the relevance of the traffic numbers used, and they repeatedly and defensively just repeated that they were "robust". They refused or could not when asked, provide any indication of levels of certainty and sensitivity and error in the numbers used. The statement was made on more than one occasion occasion by the developer, the KC and WBC that it would be the Planning Application stage that more robust traffic numbers and modelling should be considered. That time is now. Accordingly, as Planning Authority WBC must rigorously challenge the numbers, the assumptions and the outcome of the Traffic Assessments of this and the other 2 applications to come, and in conjunction.

2) It is unclear how the applicant has considered the closure of Mill Lane to traffic during the periods it is intended to construct the roundabouts on Mill Lane and the road to Hatch Farm. This applicant has mentioned this closure in 11.2.3(4) and (5) in particular. They then go on to say that 11.3.26 "... there is immaterial change in delay at the Nirvana Spa roundabout... !? This conclusion is very worrying as to whether they have undertaken any validation whatsoever on their conclusions. Every year we have a full scale demonstration of the impact of closure of Mill Lane, when it floods for about a week once or twice a year. When this happens, the traffic in both AM and PM queues stationary all the way back towards Arborfield circa 2.6km+, and sometimes even to the Arborfield X roundabout! Yet this situation is not at all mentioned in the transport assessment. Why have these foreseeable and significant queues from the development proposals mentioned in this assessment report NOT been considered. This is a huge impact on the area here; it is understandable for a week each year when we flood, but NOT acceptable for EVERY day for several years.

These points apply also to the other 2 applications for LCGV because it is the cumulative impacts which are really important, and therefore the traffic impacts need to be considered combined, not just on their own.

S J Everton

January 2026