

PLANNING REF : 250517
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Wolsey Cottage
: Church Road, Swallowfield, Berkshire
: RG7 1TH
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Catherine Drew
DATE SUBMITTED : 09/04/2025

COMMENTS:

I wish to object to the proposed development for the following reasons and also to raise the following issues and points:

1. The increase in traffic which will increase rush hour delays at various locations which are already significant bottlenecks including the Riseley junction with the A33, the traffic lights with Hyde End Road, the junction near the BP garage (given also the development already approved at Kingfisher Grove) and the Three Mile Cross

junction with the A33. It is also likely that frustrated drivers will use shortcuts across Beech Hill Road to White House Lane to access the A33. All this will increase the likelihood of accidents.

2. The reduction in the separation between Swallowfield and Spencers Wood. The proposed development and the solar farm to be installed immediately to the south of the Body Farm site will halve the green separation between the two villages, reducing it to less than 750m.

3. The proposed commercial development opposite the existing Lambs Lane Business Park - the height of the projected buildings would likely create a "tunnel" effect between the existing buildings on Lambs Lane Business Park and those proposed on a stretch of road which is already dangerous (with a largely blind bend). This would also be the 4th business park on the B3349 within about a mile (the Wellington Business Park, the Heron Industrial Estate and Lambs Lane Business Park). Given the other traffic issues referred to above, adding to the weight of traffic with vans and HGVs on a road (the B3349) which is not a satisfactory road for traffic now, additional van and HGV traffic should not be encouraged. It would be better to leave this section undeveloped to maintain a small vista of open countryside views as now.

4. The site is in the DEPZ. Although the developers have made suggestions here, a number of these seem unrealistic; for example, all the evacuation routes lead back towards Burghfield as there is no route out of the proposed estate to the east whilst there are inevitably likely to be traffic issues on the B3349. Evacuating a care home is likely to be unrealistic on the basis proposed whilst, if there is a lockdown pending an evacuation, it would be very difficult to move new staff, food etc to the care home when access is either forbidden or heavily restricted.

5. The proposed pedestrian routes from the development to the Basingstoke Road and Hyde End Road appear to include Barracks Lane which is a private road and unsuitable for access (too narrow and dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists meeting cars going to the existing houses at the end of Barracks Lane with no safe refuge spaces). Will the developers improve and then maintain the paths from Hyde End Road which are unmetalled, muddy in winter, overgrown from hedges etc? Why does the eastern access route appear to traverse the children's playground on Century Drive (do the

developers have the right to do this?)?

6. There seems to be no provision for allotments but there are no allotments in Spencers Wood south of Hyde End Road. If the development does proceed, it should include a sufficient number of allotments to cater for local residents.

7. If the development is approved, then any infrastructure should be installed at the beginning and not towards the end of the development including, for example, the school, SANG and GP surgery.

8. As indicated above, the proposed primary school should be introduced as soon as possible at the initial stage to ease pressure on Lambs Lane School (have the developers held any discussions with Lambs Lane School?). There should be a sufficient number of forms entry in each year to provide sufficient spaces for the surrounding local areas including Swallowfield and Riseley as well as Spencers Wood. Significant funding towards the provision of secondary schooling should also be provided in addition to the primary school either by upgrading and improving Oakbank School including the provision of sixth form facilities or by building a new secondary school for the local areas.

9. The developers should build (and not just make space for) sufficient medical facilities to ease the already significant pressures on Swallowfield Medical Practice.

10. Given the well-known issues of access to housing by young adults in the South East, the proportion allocated to affordable housing should be increased to at least 50%.

11. A community centre suitable for local resident activities such as public meetings, polling stations, mum and toddler groups, pre-school, youth clubs, scouts, guides, etc should be provided along with ample parking. High Copse pavilion on the Shinfield Meadows development is an example of this type of building - it has a hall which will seat over 100 people.

12. A convenience store is likely to be too small for the size of the development if it is approved and more expensive than a larger supermarket so residents are likely to use their cars to drive elsewhere to shop. A supermarket should be provided.

13. The proposed parking allocation is insufficient. More parking spaces should be provided for the school (in particular), SANG, care home, supermarket etc to reduce the likelihood of people parking on, and clogging up, adjacent roads and pavements.

14. Pavements and footpaths should be wide enough to accommodate comfortably buggies/prams, wheelchairs and mobility scooters.

15. The developers should support the current bus service and enhance it, particularly to assist access by public transport to the supermarket and the GP surgery.