

PLANNING REF : 251086
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 25 The Square
: Spencers Wood, Berks
: RG7 1BS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Andrew Churchill
DATE SUBMITTED : 20/05/2025

COMMENTS:

Re: Planning Application Reference 251086

Land at Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1AJ

Dear Planning Officer,

I write to formally register my objection to the above-referenced planning application. Having reviewed the proposal documentation, I must express significant concerns regarding several material planning considerations that warrant the refusal of this application.

Reduction of Designated SANG Area

Of paramount concern is the applicant's apparent modification of the originally approved Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) allocation. The proposed reduction of the SANG area constitutes a direct contravention of the previously established planning agreement and undermines both the ecological mitigation measures and the public amenity provisions that were fundamental to the original consent. This retroactive diminishment of green infrastructure represents an unacceptable departure from the approved parameters and raises serious questions regarding the enforceability of planning conditions. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) avoidance

strategy explicitly requires the provision of adequately sized and appropriately situated SANG areas. Any reduction in this provision may constitute a breach of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and potentially undermine the original Appropriate Assessment conducted under those regulations.

Infrastructure Capacity Deficiencies

The locality is demonstrably experiencing significant infrastructure strain that would be exacerbated by further residential development:

Educational Provision: Local educational facilities are operating at or near capacity. The most recent School Capacity Survey (SCAP) data confirms that existing schools cannot accommodate additional pupil yield from the proposed development without compromising educational standards. Section 72 of the Education Act 1996 places a duty on local authorities to secure sufficient education, a requirement that would be compromised by permitting further development without appropriate mitigation.

Healthcare Services: Primary care services in the vicinity are experiencing unsustainable pressure. The current GP-to-patient ratio significantly exceeds the recommended guidelines established by NHS England. Wait times for appointments now regularly exceed four weeks, indicating a system at capacity. The development would further intensify this pressure without proportionate healthcare infrastructure investment, contrary to Paragraph 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which requires planning decisions

to enable and support healthy lifestyles.

Highways and Transportation Impacts

The transportation assessment accompanying the application fails to adequately address:

Strategic Road Network Capacity: The M4 corridor is already operating at peak capacity during commuting periods. The cumulative impact of incremental development in this locality has not been properly

assessed in accordance with DfT Circular 02/2013. Journey times to Junction 11 regularly exceed 30 minutes from the application site during peak hours, with no viable mitigation proposed.

Road Safety Concerns: Empirical evidence demonstrates existing road safety issues on the local network, particularly regarding vehicle speeds during off-peak periods. Speed surveys conducted on adjacent roads indicate regular exceedance of posted limits, creating significant safety hazards. Introducing additional traffic without comprehensive calming measures would be contrary to Paragraph 110 of the NPPF which requires developments to create places that are safe.

Cumulative Impact Assessment

The application fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of this development when considered alongside other approved and pending applications in the vicinity. The incremental approach to development in this area has resulted in significant infrastructure deficits that have not been properly addressed through either Community

Infrastructure Levy contributions or Section 106 agreements.

The Planning Practice Guidance is clear that the cumulative effect of multiple developments within an area must be taken into account when assessing individual applications. No such holistic assessment has been conducted, rendering the application fundamentally flawed.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully submit that this application should be refused as it:

Fails to conform with relevant development plan policies regarding infrastructure provision and environmental protection;
Constitutes unsustainable development under the terms of the NPPF;

Would result in material harm to public interests that would not be outweighed by any purported benefits.

I trust that these concerns will be given due consideration in determining this application.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew Churchill

07966984566

achurchill@nvidia.com

25 The Square, RG7 1BS