

PLANNING REF : 260720
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Vinewillow House
: Old Wokingham Road, Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG40 3BT
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Colin Wright
DATE SUBMITTED : 22/04/2026

COMMENTS:

I strongly object to this development, the local infrastructure is not keeping up, the traffic is becoming constant and the roads cannot cope, lack of local shops, GPs etc, this will lead to more and more trips from the site.

Pinewood Campus, Nine Mile Ride - 136 Dwellings

I wish to object to this application on the grounds of highway safety, unsustainable transport, misleading trip assumptions, lack of compliant emergency access, and failure to meet NPPF and WBC Core Strategy requirements.

1. The Transport Statement (TS) is based on unrealistic assumptions

The TS relies heavily on national averages for walking and cycling distances, rather than the actual conditions on Nine Mile Ride. This is a 40mph semi rural distributor road with narrow footways, discontinuous cycle provision, and no safe, continuous route to key destinations. The claimed "excellent accessibility" is not supported by real world conditions.

The TS does not provide a safety audit for children walking to Hatch Ride Primary School, despite the route requiring crossing a 40mph road.

2. Public transport provision is inadequate

The TS confirms that the nearest bus stops (490m away) are served by the 125B only twice per day, making them unusable for commuting, school, or daily travel.

The next nearest regular service (194) is 1.5km away, which the TS itself acknowledges is beyond ideal walking distance.

This development therefore fails NPPF 110, which requires development to be located where sustainable transport is available.

3. The TS uses a misleading baseline for trip generation

The TS compares the proposed development to a historic office use that is no longer active. It uses theoretical TRICS office trip rates

rather than real counts, and references a prior approval for 109 flats that was never built.

This creates a false baseline that artificially minimises the perceived impact of 136 new dwellings.

4. Highway safety concerns are understated

The TS claims "no incidents within 300m", but this is a cherry picked radius. The MAVRIC map shows multiple accidents on Nine Mile

Ride just outside this boundary.

Nine Mile Ride is a known congestion corridor with school traffic, commuter flows, and increasing pressure from Buckler's Park and other SDL developments. The TS does not assess cumulative impacts, contrary to NPPF requirements.

5. The development lacks a compliant emergency access
WBC policy requires emergency access for developments over 100 dwellings. The TS dismisses this requirement and proposes widening a footway to 3.7m as an "alternative route". This is not a compliant emergency access, is not designed for emergency vehicles, and has no swept path analysis.

This presents a significant safety and resilience issue.

6. Cycling claims are exaggerated and non compliant with LTN 1/20

The TS claims a "cycle link to Bracknell Forest", but the missing link is outside the applicant's control. The proposed 0.5m offset is the absolute minimum, not compliant with LTN 1/20. No lighting, segregation, or continuous safe route is provided.

This does not constitute a safe or attractive cycling environment.

7. Mitigation measures are vague, unfunded, and non committal
The TS repeatedly uses phrases such as "willing to deliver", "could

PLANNING REF : 260720

PROPERTY ADDRESS : Vinewillow House

: Old Wokingham Road, Wokingham, Berkshire

: RG40 3BT

SUBMITTED BY : Mr Colin Wright

DATE SUBMITTED : 22/04/2026

COMMENTS:

take a range of forms", and "subject to discussions". This indicates that the proposed off site improvements are not secured, not costed, and not guaranteed.

Without secured S106 obligations, these measures cannot be relied upon.

8. The development fails WBC Core Strategy CP6

The proposal fails multiple CP6 criteria:

CP6(a) - Does not provide genuine sustainable transport choice

CP6(b) - Does not minimise travel distance; residents will be car dependent

CP6(c) - Does not deliver secured improvements to infrastructure

CP6(f) - Does not enhance road safety

CP6(g) - Will cause highway problems on an already constrained corridor

9. The development fails NPPF 109, 110 and 116
NPPF 109 - Transport issues have not been properly addressed

NPPF 110 - The site is not in a sustainable location

NPPF 116 - The residual cumulative impacts on the road network are severe

Conclusion

The development is not sustainable, not safe, and not compliant with national or local policy. The Transport Statement is based on unrealistic assumptions, inadequate public transport, misleading trip baselines, and speculative mitigation.

For these reasons, I request that the application be refused

I strongly object to this development, the local infrastructure is not keeping up, the traffic is becoming constant and the roads cannot cope, lack of local shops, GPs etc, this will lead to more and more trips from the site.

Pinewood Campus, Nine Mile Ride - 136 Dwellings

I wish to object to this application on the grounds of highway safety, unsustainable transport, misleading trip assumptions, lack of compliant emergency access, and failure to meet NPPF and WBC Core Strategy requirements.

1. The Transport Statement (TS) is based on unrealistic assumptions

The TS relies heavily on national averages for walking and cycling distances, rather than the actual conditions on Nine Mile Ride. This is a 40mph semi rural distributor road with narrow footways, discontinuous cycle provision, and no safe, continuous route to key destinations. The claimed "excellent accessibility" is not supported by real world conditions.

The TS does not provide a safety audit for children walking to Hatch Ride Primary School, despite the route requiring crossing a 40mph road.

2. Public transport provision is inadequate

The TS confirms that the nearest bus stops (490m away) are served by the 125B only twice per day, making them unusable for commuting, school, or daily travel.

The next nearest regular service (194) is 1.5km away, which the TS itself acknowledges is beyond ideal walking distance.

This development therefore fails NPPF 110, which requires development to be located where sustainable transport is available.

3. The TS uses a misleading baseline for trip generation

The TS compares the proposed development to a historic office use that is no longer active. It uses theoretical TRICS office trip rates

rather than real counts, and references a prior approval for 109

flat s that was never built.

This creates a false baseline that artificially minimises the perceived impact of 136 new dwellings.

4. Highway safety concerns are understated

The TS claims "no incidents within 300m", but this is a cherry picked radius. The MAVRIC map shows multiple accidents on Nine Mile Ride just outside this boundary.

Nine Mile Ride is a known congestion corridor with school traffic, commuter flows, and increasing pressure from Buckler's Park and other SDL developments. The TS does not assess cumulative impacts, contrary to NPPF requirements.

5. The development lacks a compliant emergency access

WBC policy requires emergency access for developments over 100 dwellings. The TS dismisses this requirement and proposes widening a footway to 3.7m as an "alternative route". This is not a compliant emergency access, is not designed for emergency vehicles, and has no swept path analysis.

This presents a significant safety and resilience issue.

6. Cycling claims are exaggerated and non compliant with LTN 1/20

The TS claims a "cycle link to Bracknell Forest", but the missing link is outside the applicant's control. The proposed 0.5m offset is the absolute minimum, not compliant with LTN 1/20. No lighting, segregation, or continuous safe route is provided.

This does not constitute a safe or attractive cycling environment.

7. Mitigation measures are vague, unfunded, and non committal

The TS repeatedly uses phrases such as "willing to deliver", "could take a range of forms", and "subject to discussions". This indicates that the proposed off site improvements are not secured, not costed, and not guaranteed.

Without secured S106 obligations, these measures cannot be relied upon.

8. The development fails WBC Core Strategy CP6

The proposal fails multiple CP6 criteria:

CP6(a) - Does not provide genuine sustainable transport choice

CP6(b) - Does not minimise travel distance; residents will be car dependent

CP6(c) - Does not deliver secured improvements to infrastructure

CP6(f) - Does not enhance road safety

CP6(g) - Will cause highway problems on an already constrained corridor

9. The development fails NPPF 109, 110 and 116

NPPF 109 - Transport issues have not been properly addressed

NPPF 110 - The site is not in a sustainable location

NPPF 116 - The residual cumulative impacts on the road network are severe

Conclusion

The development is not sustainable, not safe, and not compliant with national or local policy. The Transport Statement is based on unrealistic assumptions, inadequate public transport, misleading trip baselines, and speculative mitigation.

For these reasons, I request that the application be refused

.