

PLANNING REF : 252769  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Arborfield Village Hall  
: Eversley Road, Arborfield  
: RG2 9PQ  
SUBMITTED BY : Arborfield & Newland Parish Council  
DATE SUBMITTED : 15/01/2026

COMMENTS:

Arborfield & Newland Parish Council objects to the Gleeson Land planning application number 252769 on the following grounds.

We

firstly comment on the 16 January 2026 deadline for responses on this planning application. This deadline is wholly premature given that:

1. It is in advance of any determination by the planning inspectors as regards the soundness of the inclusion of the Loddon Garden Village site in the LPU,
2. It is prior to the planned consultation in the spring of 2026 on the Design Code (Masterplanning) for Loddon Garden Village,
3. We are expected to respond to this planning application before having sight of the planning application for the Hatch Farm area of Loddon Garden Village. We therefore are not able to see the full picture.

We therefore urge WBC to extend the deadline for comment on this application and the planning application number 252498 in respect of the University of Reading section of LGV. We will be making further comments on both of these planning applications later in 2026, having had the opportunity to consider when the three conditions above have been met.

In the meantime, we make the following high level objections to this planning application:

The LGV site significantly lacks current infrastructure, such that the overall infrastructure costs in the Financial Viability Assessment considered at the recent Examination in Public (EIP), amount to more than £100,000 for every dwelling on the site. No information has been forthcoming as regards how the various site promoters at LGV will be splitting these infrastructure costs. What happens if one of the promoters encounters financial difficulties? Does the responsibility for the infrastructure expenditure then pass to the other promoters or would we be left with the situation of the infrastructure not being delivered? There should be a clearly set out infrastructure delivery apportionment between the various promoters at LGV with details of whether the financial responsibility is joint and several.

The site promoters of LGV are relying on assurances from Thames Waters as regards the delivery of the necessary upgrade of the Arborfield Sewage Treatment Works. Without such an upgrade of sewage capacity the housing at LGV will be adding effluence to a system that is already over capacity. There should be a strict planning condition included with any agreement on the planning application that no houses should be sold in advance of the upgrade of the Arborfield Sewage Treatment Works.

The delivery of the M4 bridge to link the LGV site to Lower Earley Way is deemed critical by the traffic modelling. However, as highlighted by A&NPC at the recent EIP, policy SS13 (which relates to LGV) in the Local Plan Update does not specifically reference the M4 bridge. The delivery of the M4 bridge should be specifically referenced in policy SS13. In addition, there should be a strict planning condition included with any approval that the M4 bridge should be delivered before the sale of any housing above a

set level of houses.

All previous Strategic

Development Locations (SDL's) created by Wokingham BC have incurred a significant charge under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

regime. However, the assumption in the plans for LGV is that a nil rate of CIL will apply to this development. Such a nil rate of CIL is contrary to the current WBC policy and would require consultation and examination if it were to be adopted. The infrastructure delivery for LGV does include an amount of £3m for what is described as "parish infrastructure requirements" but this is a de minimus amount compared to the amount of CIL that would be payable under the existing CIL policy. The planning application should be rejected until such time as there has been a proper consultation on the revisions to the WBC CIL charging structure. Thames Water has confirmed in the documents associated with the planning application that there is only sufficient capacity in the clean water network to serve the first 50 houses on the site. Despite this significant constraint, there is no reference to this issue in the EIA Non-Technical summary. In addition, the planned point of connection for the clean water supply is a significant distance from the current water main in Arborfield Cross. The new main therefore has to run from Arborfield Cross down Sindlesham Road/Mole Road before entering the site (as per the Thames Water report). This will almost certainly require the closure of this busy local road for a period of time, particularly as the planning application envisages significant roadworks on this stretch of road to change the current traffic calming on Sindlesham Road as well as to create the entrance to the site on Mole Road. The planning application should therefore be rejected until this water capacity

issue has been successfully resolved and far greater detail is provided as to how clean water can be delivered to the site in conjunction with the significant road works involved on Sindlesham and Mole Roads

The proposal to widen Mole Road in order to create an access point to the site is a recipe for traffic chaos, both during construction and also on-going. The Mole Road has become a major traffic route, particularly at peak times, but the planning application has no detail as to how the proposed changes to Mole Road can be undertaken whilst keeping the road open. Instead, the planning application simply contains a one page drawing of poor quality to set out the scheme. Not only will the Mole Road require widening, but there also plans for a Pegasus crossing and changes to the Sindlesham Road traffic calming (outside Locket Farm), all planned for the same time! Much greater detail should be included in the planning application to demonstrate clearly the feasibility of what is being proposed.

Once completed the new site access on Mole Road will be very close to a new pedestrian/equestrian crossing. This proposed crossing will be very close to the sharp turn on Mole Road as it approaches Ellis Hill, from the Sindlesham direction. What technical work has been done to check the safety of this new road layout? Such work should be included in the planning application.

Given that the planned access onto Mole Road is one of the most challenging from a safety and congestion perspective there should be a strict planning condition applied that no more than 100 homes can be occupied on the Gleasons site before access has been provided to the main spine road at LGV. Such a requirement would reduce the impact of the Gleeson development on the Mole Road traffic.

The non-technical summary

included with the planning application includes the statement "that the site benefits from strong transport links" (page 5). This is utter nonsense, with the site being wholly dependent on car transport. For example:

- Winnersh railway station is 3.4km away (45-minute walk) and has no car parking.
- There will be no direct public footpath to Arborfield Cross (via Sindlesham Road). Instead safe walking to Arborfield Cross and the amenities referenced in the Design and Access statement, requires a lengthy detour down Church Lane and the Reading Road of approximately 30 minutes or a 28-minute walk (source Transport Assessment page 40) through the unlit Coombes Woodland.
- Para 3.18 of the non-technical summary references "Multiple bus routes operate within the vicinity of the Site". There is a single bus route from Arborfield Cross, but as per the point above this requires a lengthy walk to access from the site.

We note that whilst the main site entrances are from Mole Road and from the main LGV spine road, in addition Emergency Vehicle Access is planned from Church Lane. The details on the Emergency Vehicle Access are already out of date given the closure of Church Lane to through traffic, and therefore updated documents should be provided. More importantly, why is separate Emergency Vehicle Access required? Does this reflect the likely traffic congestion on Mole Road or some other inadequacy as regards the plans for the site? Finally, this

application is co-dependent upon the University of Reading planning application (252498), in that much of the infrastructure for the Gleeson's application will be provided by the University of Reading application. Therefore, the Gleeson planning application should not be determined before any approval of the University application.