
Project Title:	Pearces Farm, Wokingham
Client	Nicholas King Homes
Document Ref:	A218-R041
Date:	17/12/2025
Author:	T. Moloney/ J Overend

RESPONSE TO WBC HIGHWAY COMMENTS

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Application Background

- 1.1.1 This Technical Note has been prepared by Abley Letchford on behalf of Nicholas King Homes (NKH) in response to the transport comments of Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) Highway Authority in response to planning application no. 242279.
- 1.1.2 The application relates to an outline proposal for the delivery of up to 180 dwellings and associated infrastructure within the wider and recently examined South Wokingham Strategic Development Location Extension (SDLE) allocation.
- 1.1.3 The Highways Authority's comments were issued in their document dated 12th February 2025 (Appendix A).
- 1.1.4 This note has been prepared in conjunction with Masterplan refinements from ongoing consultations through regular PPA sessions and has been purposely held back awaiting the updated Modelling outputs that were initially requested by WBC. The updated Modelling outputs have now been reviewed and are responded to (alongside the original Modelling data that supported the planning application) in the separate and recently issued Abley Letchford report, dated 5th December 2025.
- 1.1.5 Consequently, this note focuses more on the design and connectivity-related comments that were received from WBC and therefore sits alongside the separate Modelling response.

2.0 Summary of Responses

2.1 Parking Provision

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 6 - 12)

- 2.1.1 Issue Identified: WBC requires assurance that car parking across the site will comply with borough standards, based on the housing mix and layout. Submission of a parking calculator based on the master plan and a housing mix breakdown. Confirmation of parking space dimensions and management proposals.

Response:

- 2.1.2 Yes, concerning the parking provision, it can be confirmed that:
 - All parking spaces will conform to WBC dimensions:
Standard: 5m x 2.5m



Parallel: 6m x 2.5m

- Driveways: minimum 3.1m wide
- Garages (if proposed): 6m x 3m minimum
- A Car Parking Management Plan will be provided at the Reserved Matters stage.

2.1.3 Based on other similarly sized developments within WBC, it is estimated that the development would require a total of c.355 allocated parking spaces as well as c.36 unallocated / visitor parking spaces.

2.1.4 As recognised in the highway response, the layout is at the outline stage and therefore a detailed accommodation schedule is not yet available for consideration, but will be at the appropriate stage of planning.

2.2 Cycle Parking

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 13 - 16)

2.2.1 Issue Identified: WBC has requested confirmation that cycle storage will meet borough standards in terms of dimensions and accessibility.

Response:

2.2.2 Yes, confirmation that provision will be made in accordance with WBC design standards is confirmed, including:

- Cycle storage for houses will be provided via sheds with direct rear access or compliant garages (7m x 3m internal).
- Flats will include secure, overlooked communal stores with 2m x 0.9m spaces.
- Visitor parking will be accommodated via 'Sheffield' stands for each flat block.

Electric Vehicle Charging

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 17)

2.2.1 Issue Identified: The provision of EV charging points is welcome but needs to comply with current regulations.

Response:

2.2.2 yes, the charging infrastructure will comply with Approved Document S and WBC adopted parking standards.

2.3 Access and Safeguarded Links

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 18-24)

2.3.1 Issue Identified: Clarification is needed on all proposed access points, including future connections and safeguarded routes.

Response:

2.3.2 Appendix B contains the following drawings showing the additional information requested.

- A218 – 14 P5 - Primary site access (6.5m carriageway + pedestrian/cycle provision)
- A218 – 019 P6 – Signalised Junction with Heathlands Link (not relied upon)
- A218 – 029 P5 – Byway Crossing
- A218 – 038 P2 – NK Pedestrian / Cycle Access onto Byway 30

2.3.3 As mentioned by WBC, an emergency access is not required, because of the permeable routes associated with the site including the link to the wider SDLE allocation to the south-east (Priors



Farm), which will be secured by way of a Grampian condition. The corresponding Abley Letchford note (A218 - R048) for Priors Farm (Lightwood) contains additional drawings showing access arrangements for Priors and how they interact with the NKH site.

- 2.3.4 The proposed access design information is deemed comprehensive for an Outline determination.

2.4 Easthampstead Road Closure

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 25-30)

- 2.4.1 Issue Identified: Highways seeks clarity on the proposed vehicular closure, turning heads, and whether these form part of the related planning application.

Response:

- 2.4.2 The proposed Easthampstead Road Point Closure forms part of the proposed development for the Priors Farm site (Planning Ref: 241933). Comprehensive design information regarding the proposed closure has been prepared and submitted as part of the highways response for that development and is illustrated on drawing A218-034 P4 (Appendix B)

2.5 Trip Rates and Strategic Modelling

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 32-36)

- 2.5.1 Issue Identified: The modelling was completed with an outdated model (WSTM4); WBC now requires re-modelling using WSTM5.

Response:

- 2.5.2 As referred to in Section 1, a separate Abley Letchford report (A218 – R050) has been issued to WBC, which provides a detailed review of WSTM5 results in link and node format. The conclusions are that WSTM4 provided a more robust assessment.

2.6 Junction Modelling and Geometries

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 31-41)

- 2.6.1 Issue Identified: Modelling outputs and geometries were not submitted, making it impossible to validate proposed junction impacts.

Response:

- 2.6.2 Abley Letchford are awaiting junction coding outputs from WSTM5 via WSP /WBC, so that junctions can be re-run with the updated model parameters. **ACTION WBC**

2.7 Visibility Splays

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 42-44)

- 2.7.1 Issue Identified: There is ambiguity around current and future speed limits near the access, and a tree may impact visibility.

Response:

- 2.7.2 The visibility splays shown on the submitted drawing A218-014 P3 were provided in accordance with the approved SDL signalisation scheme, which was subject to a 40mph design speed.
- 2.7.3 The proposed access arrangement is now shown on the updated drawing A218-014 P5. It should be noted that it is also proposed to reduce the speed limit of Easthampstead Road to



30mph as part of the road closure scheme, which will see the existing highway become a quieter rural lane.

2.8 Swept Paths

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 47-51)

2.8.1 Issue Identified: Swept path analysis for key vehicles (bus, refuse) is incomplete.

Response:

2.8.2 Swept path analysis of the proposed accesses has been undertaken and is presented on drawings in Appendix B:

- A218-042 P2 – SPA Bus
- A218-046 P2 – SPA WBC Refuse Vehicle
- A218-019 P6 – Signalised Arrangement onto Heathlands Link
- A218-029 P6 – Byway Crossing Arrangement

2.9 Active Travel Routes

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 50-55)

2.9.1 Issue Identified: There is no comprehensive plan showing how pedestrian and cycle movements are facilitated internally and externally.

Response:

2.9.2 Abley Letchford drawing A218-054 P1 (see Appendix C) has been prepared to address this comment. It shows the access strategy for the proposed development, while the details of each access point are shown on the drawings listed in Sections 2.3 and 2.8 above (Appendix B).

2.9.3 As this is an outline application, details regarding internal accessibility are yet to be fully determined, although the proposed layout will be developed in accordance with WBC street design guidance through reserved matters and potential consistency with SDL design codes etc.

2.10 Site Roads and Adoption

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 56-61)

2.10.1 Issue Identified: WBC requires clarity on whether the roads are intended for adoption and the associated design standards.

Response:

2.10.2 Adoption intentions will be confirmed at the detailed design stage. Regardless of the final scheme, the roads provided will be constructed to an adoptable standard. Roads will meet highway standards and be addressed via either S38 agreement or private management through S106 obligations.

2.11 Bus Strategy

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 62-65)

2.11.1 Issue Identified: No reference was made to the approved South Wokingham SDL Bus Strategy. Information Required: Updated strategy aligning with existing SDL plans.



Response:

- 2.11.2 At this stage, the proposed access arrangements have been designed to accommodate bus movement, whilst the primary street through the development and adjacent site to the west will be designed in accordance with WBC design requirements for a bus route.
- 2.11.3 The planning submission made reference to the principle of bus routes either within the SDLE or accessible to SDL proposals along the SWDR. A joint bus strategy was always envisaged and can be developed in line with the South Wokingham SDL Bus Strategy to guarantee service integration and delivery, as discussed at the November PPA meeting.

2.12 Road Safety Audit

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 67)

- 2.12.1 Issue Identified: A Stage 1 RSA and the Designer's response are missing. Information Required: Complete RSA documentation.

Response:

- 2.12.2 Stage 1 Road Safety Audits have been commissioned and are included in **Appendix D** along with their respective Designers' Responses.
- 2.12.3 The Audit revealed no significant safety issues, and where appropriate, the recommendations made have been incorporated into the proposed designs.

2.13 Servicing

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 68)

- 2.13.1 Issue Identified: Compliance with refuse collection distances needs to be demonstrated. Information Required: Confirmation that all properties meet MfS carrying distances.

Response:

- 2.13.2 The site layout is not presented in detail at this outline stage; therefore, details regarding refuse collection and fire vehicle attendance have not been fully assessed.
- 2.13.3 However, when this level of detail is progressed on the basis of an outline consent, then the detailed design for refuse collection can be undertaken in accordance with WBC refuse collection design requirements, whilst fire tender access will be in accordance with Part B of the building regulations.

2.14 Lighting Strategy

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 69)

- 2.14.1 Issue Identified: No lighting strategy was submitted with the outline application. Information Required: Outline lighting principles and proposed approach.

Response:

- 2.14.2 A Lighting Strategy will be submitted at the appropriate RM stage.

2.15 Framework Travel Plan

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 70-71)

- 2.15.1 Issue Identified: No Travel Plan was submitted.



Response:

- 2.15.2 As set out, the development would contribute £612 per dwelling to the My Journey initiative. Based on the development of 850 dwellings, this equates to a total contribution of £110,160.

2.16 Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 72)

- 2.16.1 Issue Identified: CEMP is required to manage construction impacts and was not provided.

Response:

- 2.16.2 A Framework CEMP will be submitted, covering working hours, traffic management, construction vehicle routing, dust/noise controls, and site access arrangements.

2.17 Section 106 Contributions

(WBC Paragraph Ref: 73-74)

- 2.17.1 Issue Identified: WBC has confirmed a standard travel contribution, with the potential for others based on further assessment.

Response:

- 2.17.2 We confirm agreement to the £612 per dwelling travel plan contribution.
- 2.17.3 We remain open to discussion of further contributions pending final modelling and assessment.

3.0 Summary and Conclusion

- 3.1.1 This technical note addresses each of the helpful points raised by WBC Highway Authority regarding the proposed development on land at Priors Farm.
- 3.1.2 The response principally considers access arrangements and details regarding active travel as well as demonstrating compliance with relevant transport and highway standards at this outline stage. Supporting drawings and audits have been appended to clarify the proposed arrangements and confirm alignment with WBC's requirements.



APPENDICES



Appendix A

WBC Highway Comments



Appendix B

Revised Drawings



Appendix C

Active Travel Context Plan



Appendix D

Road Safety Audit Reports