

PLANNING REF : 250517
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Basingstoke Road
:
: RG7 1PH
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Jonathan Beavon
DATE SUBMITTED : 02/03/2026

COMMENTS:

I'm writing to formally express my strong objection to the hybrid planning application 250517.

Having reviewed both the original 2025 proposal and the revised submissions from February 2026, it's clear the development has become significantly less sustainable yet still poses an unacceptable risk to public safety and local infrastructure.

I urge the Planning Authority to refuse the application on the following grounds:

1. Severe Public Safety Risk: Site located within AWE Burghfield DEPZ (Detailed Emergency Planning Zone)

The developer's own 2026 revision acknowledges this danger by proposing a Detailed Site Emergency Plan (DSEP) that requires the addition of a site-wide siren system, fixed air monitors, and 24/7 onsite response coordinators. The necessity of such extreme measures proves the site is fundamentally unsuitable for high-density residential use, a primary school, and an 80-bed care home. Placing vulnerable elderly residents and children in a zone where they must rely on a private management company to execute radiation emergency protocols is an unacceptable risk to life and an undue burden on emergency services and therefore proves the AWE-B site is potentially more hazardous than the original 2025 developer plan suggested.

The developers betray a reckless disregard for public safety in their own "DEPZ Response, Cover Letter" from May 2025, that notes "the AWE representative observed that there was no development-specific plan that could be devised that would cause AWE not to object to this" while also trying to dismiss the AWE expert's objections to their plan as "unconstructive and unjustified".

2. Failure to Provide Essential Infrastructure: Removal of GP Surgery

The original 2025 plan included a 1,000sqm GP Surgery and a 50-bay car park as key community benefits. These were crucial mitigation measures to address the impact of over 400 new dwellings on local health services and traffic congestion.

However, the February 2026 revised submission has entirely removed the GP surgery. The applicant now aims to increase the local population by over 1,000 people while simultaneously eliminating the medical infrastructure needed to support them.

This bait and switch contradicts sustainable development principles

and will leave Spencers Wood with a significant healthcare capacity deficit while also overloading the existing overstretched surgeries in the area.

This development has become infrastructure-negative as it increases the population while removing promised healthcare facilities.

3. Highway Safety and Severe Traffic Impact

The two proposed access points via Basingstoke Road are insufficient for the scale of this mixed-use development.

The traffic generated by 420 homes, a primary school, an 80-bed care home, and "employment land" [renamed from "Commercial / Industrial Land"] will severely congest and endanger the safety of a road that is already a major artery to the M4 motorway for Spencers Wood, Three Mile Cross, Swallowfield, Riseley, and Shinfield.

Furthermore, the developer's removal of the GP surgery eliminates a vital local service, forcing residents to travel elsewhere for healthcare, further increasing traffic.

4. Overdevelopment and Impact on Local Character

The density and scale of this development in Spencers Wood represents a gross overdevelopment of a rural-edge site.

The proposal fails to respect the established scale and form of Spencers Wood and will result in a significant loss of residential amenity for neighbours on Hyde End Lane, Century Drive, and Basingstoke Road through noise, visual intrusion and excessive traffic.

The 2025 proposal was described as a "mixed-use neighbourhood" with a focus on integrating services. With the removal of the community-focused GP surgery, the developer ignores the social objectives of the planning system and effectively reduces the 2026 development proposal to a Local Centre that now increasingly fails to deliver a sustainable, self-sufficient neighbourhood.

5. Biodiversity and Environmental Harm

While the developer now proposes a small 5m buffer and a SANG, the DAS confirms the removal of several category B and C trees and established field boundary hedgerows to improve access and housing density. This urbanisation of greenfield land will damage local habitats and contradicts the Council's commitment to safeguarding the borough's natural environment.

Conclusion

The 2026 revisions have made this application objectively worse:

The new 2026 Site Emergency Plan has become increasingly complex, requiring protective actions, such as sheltering and alerting during a radiation emergency for the community and increases the "burden" on emergency responders and proves the AWE-B site is more hazardous than the original 2025 developer plan suggested.

It also provides less community infrastructure, specifically removing the GP surgery.
This application fails to meet the requirements of the Wokingham Local Plan and the NPPF.

I strongly request that the Planning Committee refuse this application.

Yours sincerely,
J Beavon