

PLANNING REF : 252498
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 52 Colemansmoor Road
: Woodley, Berkshire
: RG5 4DN
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Rodger Sharp
DATE SUBMITTED : 12/01/2026

COMMENTS:

I am in opposition to the above for the following reasons.

Lack of road capacity, and the onward impact to local areas such as Woodley, Earley, Winnersh. Additional traffic that this development will lead to will cause misery to locals going about their normal business. The roads are already busy all the time. The creation of the relief road from Lower Earley Way, Hatch Farm and out to Bracknell has alleviated a lot of the pressures. Assuming most properties will involve owning 1 vehicle, and most will be more than that you are looking at 4,000 (and I know this mentions 2,800 homes, my opinion is that the applications are being broken down into smaller size applications to take our minds away from what is really going on). So I will stick with 4,000 dwellings because that is the overall aim for developing this area, that equals minimum 4,000 vehicles on the surrounding roads. That bridge that is talked about is going to bring so much traffic onto Lower Earley Way, it will congest the roads all around.

I have heard there is an idea about building a road to Hatch Farm Way which will go through a country park. That country park was an agreed natural space to provide flood protection for the houses build opposite and to help to go some way to providing some green space, and something for nature. I don't know why it would be permitted to change the designation of this land.

Pollution will inevitably increase as a result of the extra cars on the road. Doesn't really matter if they are EV's as we know pollution comes from tyre dust and brake dust.

Increased costs to the Local Council to repair roads. We already experience poor road maintenance, pot holes everywhere, with poor, quick fix repairs that don't last. So that'll really help the state of our roads to see 4,000 additional vehicles on the road.

Flood Risks. The Loddon is a river that floods all the way along it's path. Traditional flood plains are being removed which places more pressure on remaining areas. Keeping these areas free to flood not only helps the existing residents who's properties will flood in time if built on, but it will also help to hold this land for the natural, ecological benefits this land gives. It means that we have a bio-diverse ecology here which ought to be protected.

Nature, Environment. In my view what developers leave behind and claim as natural, ecological spaces are a joke. They are merely scruffy, poorly thought out open spaces with ugly fencing, or unnatural pathways, it's all phoney and doesn't come close to

replicating what was there before. This area will be a crucial habitat to many diverse species, bats, newts, mammals. The riverside is so important to water voles who are in decline, kingfishers, plus all the plant life and insect life that is supported. Turning this space into a park on the edge of such a massive development will bring in a much bigger footfall than what exists now, and will not be conducive to promoting and sustaining such a special natural space. Better that this land is maintained to continue to provide food, maybe with an emphasis on supporting local residents, reducing food miles by having food that is locally available. What about something that is about the existing community, community based growing projects, programs that can help those who have poor mental health, recovering from illness. It is a stunning drive coming down Mole Road to Arborfield, although most mornings there is bumper to bumper traffic mid way down to Winnersh.

Urban Sprawl, loss of the green belt. There will be no space to define urban areas, there are other options, which I know developers don't want to use because it means more effort and more cost, but there is no need to increase the population of this area, we have taken on a lot of development already. There is no proof that population will increase, in fact the birth rate is coming down, so this political mantra of build, build, build is unnecessary. Focus on brownfields, focus on property that is left empty. I know it won't reach the numbers proposed here, but should we be placing so many homes into this already overcrowded and nature starved area?

Challenges to water supply and sewage management. Issues with water pressure, hosepipe bans in the summer, where is all the water coming from to support another 4,000 homes? Alright 2,800 but as I say, I don't buy that. Our water industry is under strain, not sure many people have much trust in their capability especially as Thames Water has so many financial challenges right now.

This will be a disaster for people already living here and for nature.