

PLANNING REF : 252498
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Carters Hill House
: Julkes Lane, Arborfield, Reading, Berkshire
: RG2 9JJ
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Kevin Batson
DATE SUBMITTED : 15/01/2026

COMMENTS:

My objections are many fold :

1. The transport infrastructure will cope with the increase in traffic. Much has been made of transport within the development area but not of where it will go when leaving the site. Mole road and surrounding areas are already becoming clogged since the Arborfield Green developments have taken place.

2. There is no public transport within a reasonable distance. It does not, as claimed in the application, have "strong transport links". The nearest train station is 2 miles away and has no parking.

3. Loss of amenity. There is an extensive series of paths and byways in the area which are heavily used by walkers, cyclists, and horse riders (along with other leisure pursuits). Nobody walks or cycles within a housing estate for leisure or exercise. The proposed SANG has only been proposed because it is unsuitable for building due to frequent flooding. This same issue also makes it unusable for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. What provisions have been made for paths have not included the replacement of those bridleways / byways used by horse riders.

4. The sewage facilities in the area will not cope with the increased demand. It already regularly has to allow sewage into the local Barkham Brook and down into the river Loddon. This cannot be described as "sustainable".

5. The heritage assessment in the application is incorrect concerning Carters Hill House. Carters Hill House is the highest point in the area & is clearly visible over a wide area. Views from and to the house are extensive. The heritage report implies the cessation of an agricultural role for Carters Hill House somehow lessens its heritage significance. Again this is nonsense. The house was a domestic

property well before it was Grade II listed in 1967 - it has not been in agricultural use for decades. It was also cited as one of the reasons for the refusal of a prior planning application for a Wind Farm (application number F/2010/2266, date 2011) at Hall farm (also from Reading University) by WBC. WBC's own comments were "In terms of landscape views from Carters Hill House and views of Carters Hill

House within the landscape, the development would cause a dominant or complete change to the composition of the view, and the appreciation of landscape character, contrasting in terms of form, scale and mass, height, colour and/or texture. Views of the scheme are unlikely to be screened to any extent."

6. Loss of wildlife. The area supports a huge variety and volume of wildlife. While measures may be able to be taken to maintain the diversity the population levels will be negatively affected.

7. The land is valuable farming land. Rated at least medium to good quality. In a climate where we are challenged to provide sustainable local food production, to allow building on such a site is unacceptable. Best and Most Valued agricultural land (BMV land) is probably part of the site. However, no one has done a survey and it

is not known how much BMV land they might be building on. At the minimum a BMV survey should be required.

8. There is a proposed proposed nil rate of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the site, which would require a change in WBC policy. Such a policy change requires consultation. How will the demands of the wider community be met without this money?

In a recent survey the on why residents liked living in the Arborfield area 97% of respondents stated it was because of the semi rural

feeling to the area. If approved, this planning application will irredeemably change this. It also conflicts with the Arborfield & Barkham Neighborhood Plan, approved by WBC. It does not respect the retention of the open green spaces and, specifically, does not protect the valued natural and heritage asset of Carters Hill. The creation of the proposed "gard en village" will in effect join Carters Hill

into a suburban area of Reading, spanning from Sindlesham through to Arborfield and Shinfield. Such urbanisation is contrary to one of the main threads of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and does not respect the individual character of the separate settlements and, moreover, is not what the residents in these communities want. These are rural communities and the people who live there have chosen to live in a rural environment.