

PLANNING REF : 250517
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 9 Hunters Way Spencers Wood
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG7 1HW
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Brian Billsberry
DATE SUBMITTED : 09/03/2026

COMMENTS:

I already commented upon this application on 11/04/25 and previously, on the related screening proposal [241261]. The comments made in both remain wholly relevant and valid and I know, are supported by the majority of other respondents. I am therefore, at a loss to understand why more time and money is being wasted on yet another round of consultation.

From my reading of the documents, none of the valid objections have been satisfactorily addressed, which makes me question the efficacy of this whole consultation process.

The arguments against this proposal, made by me and the majority of other respondents are compelling and clearly argue why the imposition of yet another large development, on yet another of our rapidly disappearing greenfield sites, is wholly unsuitable. In my opinion this round of consultation demonstrates a reckless disregard of the objections already raised by so many of us. For example, on:

1. Traffic Congestion:

Nothing has been proposed that effectively addresses the concerns previously raised, including the recommendation that infrastructure should be built before housing & other facilities. In fact, I understand that work on improving access to the M4.J11 will now not start until at least 2038! All the mitigating measures included in the proposal are just tinkering around the edges of the problem and do nothing to address the root cause of the already severe congestion we are all enduring. I know some measures have been taken but these are inadequate and just (literally!) move the congestion problem further down the road.

2. Air & Other Pollution:

A direct consequence of the ever-increasing traffic levels through our villages. This is only set to get worse if this proposal is approved.

3. Village Character:

It is not an exaggeration to state that almost every one of the major housing developments made in our already over-developed area, certainly in Spencers Wood, have been on greenfield sites: Beham Drive, Norman Rise, Priors Gardens, Appleton Way, and the huge housing estate north of South Reading Surgery and near Lidl in Shinfield; all on greenfield sites. Villagers' enjoyment of our rapidly diminishing, semi-rural environment and the safety, in particular on pedestrian traffic and cyclists but also our school children and other vulnerable residents, will be severely eroded if this development is approved.

4. Pressure on Infrastructure of Other Types:

All the objections I raised in the previous consultation remain valid but, again, none appear to have been addressed. I note that

the surgery proposed in the previous application has now been removed.

Given its proximity to the proposed care home, with its population of vulnerable people, who will inevitably have a high demand for medical services, its removal is totally illogical and is, I suspect, a

bizarre response to the many previous comments made about the difficulties likely to be encountered staffing the facility. It discounts the already high pressures on the existing medical facilities in our area!

5. AWE Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ):

In addition to my comments on the earlier application, I believe the measures proposed by the developer to mitigate them, i.e., installation of sirens, fixed air monitors and on-site 24/7 response co-ordinators, absolutely demonstrates the increased risk to us all if this development and consequent increase in population in the DEPZ is allowed. It also indicates that the AWE site is potentially more hazardous than was suggested in the 2025 developer plan.

6. If only for this reason, this application should be rejected outright and no further time, energy or taxpayers' money wasted on it. The fact that the developers believe these three measures are adequate or acceptable demonstrates their lack of concern for our welfare and their clear focus on financial gain. But then again, they don't live here, do they?

7. Local Development Plan (DLP):

The site is not in the Local Development Plan (DLP), is not sustainable and is contrary to the council's own policies: CC01; CC02; CC04. Further, it does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or meet the conditions required to support 'presumption in favour of development'.

Conclusion:

I could raise many more objections and reiterate those raised previously but the above address my increased concerns associated with this updated application.

This version increases my belief that the developer has a total disregard for the concerns or well-being of the people impacted by their application. The scale and location are wholly inappropriate for our semi-rural location or the capacity of existing infrastructure of all types. In fact, their solution to a potential nuclear accident occurring at the AWE and the removal of the surgery and its consequent impact on the care home residents and our already hard-pressed local medical services, clearly demonstrates that their only concern is financial gain. I have no objection to companies making a profit but I do if this is at the expense of the enjoyment of our environment or quality of life.

I therefore, urge those concerned to consider the impact this proposal will have on the long-term well-being of our local population and our local infrastructure. Please reject this application in its entirety.