PLANNING REF : 250415
PROPERTY ADDRESS : The Lodge
: Aphelion Way, Shinfield, Berks
: RG2 9FR
SUBMITTED BY : Doctor Paul Kennedy
DATE SUBMITTED : 24/03/2025

COMMENTS:
I wish to objection most strongly against this propose planning application.

In reality it is asking for a blank cheque to do whatever they want with the land, as long as it's not offices and can do it 24/7. However, their own company press release announced it was going to be a distribution hub. Nobody ever is or should be given a blank cheque for planning. Any planning should come with severe limitations on use, they are asking for the change, the default position should be no change and only change where it is in the interest ion this affected by it.

This will result in massive disruption and impact the quality of lives of the people who live in the surrounding area.

They are only interested in taking but giving nothing in return.

They traffic predictions are ludicrous and will impact everyone in the area, but they refuse to pay for the work that it will require.

Their parking is obviously insufficient.

They seem to want to force a local charity out of business (the
TO JUNCTION 11 OF THE M4, WHICH WAS DESIGNED TO MEET 2012 TRAFFIC VOLUMES, BEFORE THE SOUTH OF M4 SDL DELIVERED 3900+ ADDITIONAL HOUSES, AND IS REGULARLY CHOKED WITH TAILBACKS IN ALL DIRECTIONS AT PEAK TIMES?

-As above, there will be a net reduction in trips associated with the site in peak hours compared to what the site previously and still could generate as an office development; therefore, no mitigation will be required for this junction. All major developments in the area which will have had an impact on the M4 J1 will have considered whether any improvements are required, and National Highways would have insisted on these being provided if considered necessary. The difficulty with major motorway interchanges is that there is little scope to make improvements without multi-million-pound projects which would not pass the planning obligation tests for the majority of planning applications.

Again this is a misrepresentation of the facts of the flow of traffic, see below, this is the classic we want to use it but not pay for it. Private profit with socialised costs. (see 21 and 22 below)

12) AT WHAT STAGE IS THE PROPOSAL? HAS A PLANNING APPLICATION BEEN

SUBMITTED ALREADY?

At this stage (15th January 2025) we are seeking the views and feedback from the community, once the consultation period has finished, we will then take the feedback onboard and finalise our proposals before submitting our Planning Application in early Spring to Wokingham Borough Council.

-The entire "public consultation" was a poorly published online meting. The views of the local community have not be taken, has not been taken independently and this is all trying to be done on the quite.
The speed of this raises concerns about the interests of the council and its members.

13) YOUR BOUNDARY INCLUDES SOME WOODLAND/TREES, HAS A SURVEY BEEN COMPLETED IF THESE ARE TO BE REMOVED?

Yes we have done a complete survey on all the trees within the site area. Our approach is to retain as many of the quality trees identified as possible. Our Planning Application will be accompanied by a detailed Aborcultural Impact Assessment which provides the details of the surveys we have undertaken and what we are proposing to remove. Our Landscape proposals will provide details of planting in lieu of any losses of trees.

-All old trees must be maintained, not surveyed and "accidentally" cut down with a slap on the wrist and a small fine. Planning permission should be depend on the survival of all relevant tress identified in the survey. If any of them die, planning person should be removed forever and the site returned and the developers cost to the natural
woodland.

14) ARE THERE ANY PLANS TO TRY AND REDUCE THE IMPACT OF NEW TRAFFIC FROM WORKERS COMMUTING TO WORK?

We have used the trip rates that the former office site generated and compared it to what is proposed. If the site was re-occupied for office use it would generate a higher number of trips compared to the proposed development for Industrial/employment use, which will see a reduction of the number of trips, particularly at peak times, on the site. Varying shift patterns with also contribute to reducing trips during the peak rush hour periods. Full details will be supplied in the Transport Assessment that will accompany the Planning
Application.

-This ignores the fact that the shifts will be changing at the very time of peak use, one workforce will be leaving another arriving, this will not reduce the traffic at peak times or as a whole and again
ignores the use of heavy and light good vehicles associated with the suggested use.(see 22 and 23)

15) THE OLD SHIRE HALL BUILDING ITSELF IS FULL OF ASBESTOS, WHAT WILL YOU DO TO PROTECT THE SURROUNDING AREA/RESIDENTS FROM DEBRIS WHEN DEMOLISHING THE SITE?

We are aware there is some asbestos, but to give everyone some assurance, our contractors will have to comply with all the legislation and safety requirements of the Health and Safety Executive. Before any demolition works start an Asbestos Survey will need to be undertaken to identify where the asbestos is and how much of it is onsite. The removal of any asbestos will be managed and removed in full compliance with the Health and Safety Executive.

-This is not a pro argument for the case, this is the law. The best thing for asbestos is to leave it in situ, there would be no problem without demolishing the building. This is an argument for developing the building rather then demolishing it.

16) HOW DOES HEIGHT OF UNIT 1 COMPARE TO EXISTING BUILDINGS?

Unit 1 has a maximum haunch height of 12m but at its ridge its 16.5m (middle of the building at the top of the roof). The existing building at its highest point is 29m, so our building will be substantially lower than the existing building on the site.

-The present building was build as a landmark statement piece, cheap warehouses have neither the architectural value nor consistence of multiple cheaply produced and gaudily decorated warehouses.
If this is a genuine concern then the highest unit, unit 1, should be moved down the hill and all the colouring of the brislings should be designed to camouflage them with the woodland.

17) WHAT GUARANTEES CAN YOU GIVE THAT THE YOUNG TREES WILL BE CARED FOR ONCE THEY ARE PLANTED RATHER THAN LEFT TO DIE IN EXTREME HEAT SUMMERS AND/OR NOT CUT BACK AFTER THE SITE IS COMPLETE?

All trees that are being proposed are in line with best practice in terms of how they are planted to ensure their best survival. However, Woking Borough Council would expect that if any new trees that are planted die within 5 years they have to be replaced.

-So 5 years? After that it doesn't matter? Any new planting should be ,maintained for the life of the development, not conveniently allowed to die after the council turns it back. This is no guarantee at all.

18) I LIKE THE IDEA OF CHANGING THE FENCING ALONG THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY. WILL IT BE AN OPEN FENCING TO ALLOW WILDLIFE EASIER ACCESS?

Yes we are proposing a typical chunky post and rail timber fence - we want to encourage and provide easy access for hedgehogs and other

wildlife.

-Will it be maintained? Surely the best fencing would be no fencing. What is there to stop subsequently new fencing being put up later? The present fencing needs to be removed due to the present legality of it. This is not some generous point to "help hedgehogs and other life" but what must be done to keep in line with the present rules on the
matter.

This representation of something the developer has to do as something it is choosing to do is misrepresentation and questions the entire honesty of this application

19) DO YOU THINK THERE IS SUFFICIENT PARKING? I ALWAYS THINK THIS IS
UNDERESTIMATED.

For a development such as this when we are applying for different uses, it is always a bit of a balancing act as there are no particular occupiers in mind, at this stage. The amount of parking currently proposed is in accordance with Wokingham Borough Councils parking standards and we have discussed the level of parking provision with the Highway Officer who is comfortable with the proposed provision at this stage. The 226 proposed parking spaces will be allocated to the units and there is an additional overflow car park to the north of the site, should any occupiers require additional parking spaces. Based on previous and similar size developments we have delivered and the parking standards, we are comfortable that this is an appropriate level of parking.

-Again, there is lack off definition of what the units are to used for despite the claims on the company website.
If 560 people are working join the site 24/7 with no bus services then a minimum of that number of spaces would be required would be double this as there will be an overlap between shift changes and visitors. What will happen if so few parking spaces are made available is the
parking will spill over onto Shinfield park, an area already with a parking problem. If so few places are available this would need policing and a traffic order to stop nonresidents parking. Or the development could actually provide the correct number of spaces.

20) ARE THE PONDS TO THE SOUTH WEST MAN MADE OR NATURAL? IF MAN MADE, WILL THESE ALSO BE INSPECTED AND BROUGHT UP TO A GOOD STANDARD? WILL IT BE LOOKED INTO (OR HAS IT BEEN) AS TO WHERE THE WATER WILL RUN TO IF THE PONDS OVERFLOW IN HEAVY RAIN?

There are a couple of ponds to the south west of the existing building that we understand have been there for quite a long time and were created as part of the original development. There is also existing drainage that runs through the woodland to the south and we will not be touching any of that and they will continue to drain as existing. As part of our development we will be bringing forward a site wide Drainage Strategy that will ensure the existing ponds do not overflow with any excess water that the new development could create. We have had some Ecology Surveys undertaken and the

intention is for minimal intervention so as to protect the existing ecology. We are however looking to make some enhancements directly to the north of the ponds to create some nice amenity spaces for employees and visitors using the site.

-This is an area of special scientific interest there is no reason and it should be a condition of the planning permission, that noting occurs to these ponds.

21) HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL WORK AT THE SITE?

This will depend on the businesses that move into the site as different levels of industrial users will have different levels of employees. At the upper end we have estimated about 560 employees. However, it is important to note that it is unlikely that all the employees will be working on the site at the same time given the nature of the uses, as there are likely to be shift patterns throughout a 24 hour period.

-Again, there is a fundamental failure the clarify exactly what the businesses are and how many people are going to work there, This means that any panning permission is in effect a blank cheque. The 24/7 working is incompatible with it's location
Even if it was to be working 24/7 the shifts would overlap, they must, so at changeover of the shifts there will be 560 people there and the requites parking.

22) IS THERE A PLAN FOR A PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ON THE SHINFIELD ROAD TO SERVE THE SOUTHBOUND BUS STOP?

This is not something we have looked into in any detail at this stage, but it could be considered if required.

-Since the site seems to suggest it would be working 24/7, any bus service would have to reflect this. Since no bus service runs 24/7 then public transport is not an option for the workers leaving only private transport.

23) WHAT EXACTLY IS ENVISAGED FOR THE USE OF THE UNITS? IF INDUSTRIAL THERE WILL BE VANS AND LORRIES DELIVERING INTO/FROM THE SITE?

At this stage we do not have any confirmed end users who could occupy the units in the future. Therefore, it is really important that we secure flexibility for a wide range of uses across the full extent of employment uses which cover pure industrial, manufacturing assembly and R&D. The employm ent use we would not be applying for is offices (excluding that which would be ancillary to another employment use).

-Again, the failure to define what the businesses are going to do and the request for a blank cheque approach to planning permission. The plans show space 16 articulated lorries on unit 1, 8 for unit 2, and 8 for unit 5, this totals 32 articulated lorries with an average turnaround time of 4 hours, working 24/7 this results in upto 192 articulated lorries per day, if the products are being moved into vans then the vans would need to be 10 times this number, plus the

560 cars. This puts the total transport there to be over 2000 vehicles per day, 75% are light to heavy goods vehicles.
Since the entrance they show using only allows left turns from the B3270, at least half of these vehicles would need to look around the blank boy roundabout or the m4 j11 round about. The ball boy especially was never signed with this number go HGVs going round and they would have difficult not occluding the traffic light boxes even when there is no congestion, which there is.
The conclusion is that a new junction would have to be made, the present Shinfield park junction will not cope with that flow and another junction 100 years away will further add to the chaos
Using the site for warehousing just does not work and would require am massive investment with rebuilding the two junctions at huge expense. There there is the noise if this flux of vehicles along with it
pollution both noise, and particulate, 24 hours a day.

This site is suited for office building and not distribution or warehousing.

24) HOW DOES A RIDGE HEIGHT OF 16M COMPARE TO THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD?

A typical home is about 8m to the ridge, and the nearest unit to the residential area to the north is Unit 5 which is 10m to the haunch. However, the distance between the northern elevation of Unit 5 and the nearest residential property is 41m and there are also level changes and existing and proposed landscaping which will mitigate views.

-For some reason this is a repeat of thew two questions above, they however miss out a key difference from the B3270, the M4 and across the Loddon valley none of the residential buildings are visible. Shire hall is very visible from all three locations. Any mitigation should remove the impact no reduce it- please see comments above.

25) HOW LONG DO YOU ENVISAGE THE SITE DEVELOPMENT WILL TAKE IF APPROVED?

If our planning application is approved by Wokingham Borough Council we envisage the development of the site will take approximately 18 months to complete.

-Again, please see comments around the impact of redevelopment on pollution of all kinds.

26) SHINFIELD PLAYERS THEATRE (A CHARITY) BORDERS YOUR SITE AND USED TO BE ALLOWED TO USE THE EXISTING NORTHERN CAR PARK ON SHOW NIGHTS. WOULD THIS STILL BE POSSIBLE OR WORTH A CONVERSATION?

We have had some discussions around the use of the car park. However, at this point in time due to some internal works being carried out, the removal of the temporary office building and due to Health and Safety, it has not been possible for anyone to access

the site.
However, we are keen to help facilitate conservations and will encourage future occupiers to engage and be as accommodating as possible.

-So, the developer is not willing to share their parking, why is this? They must know all the car parking spaces will be used more then 24 hours a day and are insufficient. They expect to overflow into Shinfield park unimpeded yet are unwilling to help a local charity. This clearly reveals the greed of the developer, to only take, never to give.
This is a promise that means Shinfield players will die, the question, no doubt at this point the developer will announce they have bought the site for unit 6.

27) WHAT IS THE ANTICIPATED VOLUME OF PERSONNEL AND HGV TRAFFIC IN/OUT OF THE DEVELOPMENT?

It is anticipated that in the morning peak rush hour, based on our current proposal, there will be approximately 130 two way vehicle movements of which 5 would be lorries. Typically throughout the day there will be about 10/12 two way lorry movements per hour (6 in/6out at the worst case) throughout the day. The size of the units do not lend themselves for a large parcel distributer e.g. Amazon, that
generate a large amount of lorry movements and therefore it is more likely to be manufacturing that do not have lots of lorries coming in and out throughout the day and is more likely to be 2 or 3 a day.

-This in completely incongruous with the plans as drawn up, the number go HGV parking spaces etc.- please see below. How does 2-3 HGVs a day need 32 parking spaces?

28) WHAT LIMITATIONS IF ANY, WILL APPLY TO THE TYPE OF TENANTS AND SPECIFICALLY THEIR OPERATING HOURS?

We will be applying for 24 hour operation, but the way the scheme has been designed we have tried to keep the yards in areas where they are not close to residential boundaries, and the position of the units also helps to screen potential noise outbreaks. Whilst some of the units might operate 24 hours a day, that does not mean that lorries will be coming in and out 24 hours a day and will certainly be less frequent at night. We will be submitting a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan as part of the Planning Application, which will
outline how deliveries will be managed in the yards. There will also be a Noise Assessment which will identify whether any additional mitigation may be required in order to protect the amenity of the surrounding residential areas. We are very alive to this and will make sure that proper provisions are incorporated within the design to make ensure that the potential for disturbances is minimised and amenity is protected.

-This is totally unacceptable and must be limited by any planning permission. The developers are already running a diesel generator 24/7. The woodland no reverberates to this. This noise, light and pollution can only be mitigated. If any development goes ahead this

must be severely curtailed to 8am to 8pm Monday to Friday 9-5 at weekends. People bought their properties next to office buildings, not next to warehousing and light industrial polluting 24/7.

29) YOU HAVE A LOT ON LANDSCAPE, ECOLOGY AND SUSTAINABILITY THAT IS FOCUSED ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, BUT THERE IS NOTHING ABUT THE PEOPLE OF SHINFIELD PARK. WHY IS THERE NOTHING ABOUT HOW THE SITE INTERACTS WITH THE PEOPLE SUSTAINABLY?

Our landscape elements for the scheme have worked so hard on the green infrastructure network across the site. The green infrastructure along the Public Right of Way (PROW) itself plays an important role in terms of visual amenity and how the edges of the site interacts with the woodland, the residential edges and the frontage of the site which is something users and people living in the surrounding area will
experience on a day to day basis.

-And yet there is no mention of the impact on the lives of the people who live and work in the area, the noise, the traffic and congestion. The pollution of noise air and light.
If the factors listed by the developers were such an important part of the development, why is there no plan to undo the ecological crime which was the original development of shire hall? Why is there no plan to increase the size of the protected woodland, instead we have a plan to maximise the development of the site at the cost to the lives of the local people and local population.

30) IF THE LAND PURCHASED IS BEYOND THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AREA, WHAT GUARANTEES CAN YOU GIVE THAT THE REST OF THE PURCHASED LAND (E.G. THE WOODLAND) WILL NOT BE BUILT ON AT A LATER DATE?

When we purchased the site it includes an area to the south that is currently dense woodland, which is priority woodland habitat and is heavily protected by planning policy. There is no intention to build on this woodland and any application proposing the loss of woodland would be unlikely to gain planning approval as the ecological impact would be severe.

-There is no intention because it would not be allowed, this comment is an attempt to "greenwash" this project. It is not an option.

31) GIVEN THAT THERE IS PARKING PROVISION FOR 341 VEHICLES (CARS + MOTORBIKES + CYCLES) - WHAT MODES OF TRANSPORT ARE ENVISAGED FOR THE OTHER 219 (40%) OF FORECASTED EMPLOYEES?

The maximum number of employees is based on a certain element of a 24 hour shift pattern on some of the units, so not all of the estimated 560 employees will be working on site at the same time. It is
anticipated that some people will either cycle, walk, use the bus or car share. As part of the Planning Application we will submit a Travel Plan which will outline how the use of substantial transport modes will be encouraged and will be supported by the provision of the facilities on the site including cycle parking and shower facilities.