

Planning application 250415
Shinfield Park Whitley Wood Lane Shinfield Wokingham RG2 9FW

I wish to object most strongly against this proposed 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 of 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.

Their 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 Shinfield players) robbing the local community of the work they do.

They have not engaged properly with the public, one video conference which was poorly publicized is not engagement.

The decision to demolish Shire Hall appears to have been rubber stamped, suspiciously quick and with no engagement or questions which raises the question of conflicts of interest.

Before any decision is made call upon all those individuals and the council to formally confirm that they nor their friends and family have any conflict of interest in this development going ahead

I have included the questions from the 44 points from the developer's website, (capitalized) along with their own responses (lower case) and have commented on them in hyphenated to show how incongruous this application is.

1) WHY ARE YOU REDEVELOPING THIS OFFICE BUILDING?

Shinfield Park, formerly known as Shire Hall, is a vacant office building and the wider site is underutilised, formerly being used for car parking. Over the past few years, the demand for large office spaces outside town centres, like Shinfield Park, has decreased as more businesses look for smaller and more central office locations instead. With this in mind, we are proposing to redevelop the site to provide modern, high quality and sustainable industrial/employment buildings. These facilities will bring the site back into active economic use, help to address the local demand for industrial/employment floorspace and provide new employment opportunities for local people, both during construction and when operational.

-This is entirely true, however people are increasingly working from homes, so their homes are also their place of work.

Every time another housing estate is given planning permission by Wokingham council on a green field site we are told of the desperate need and government targets for house building. Yet when a brown field site becomes available, suddenly there is no need for housing only for warehouses (or whatever the developer decides to do with the site).

If this planning permission is given it opens every green field property development open to challenge in the court.

2) WILL THE EXISTING PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY BE RETAINED?

The existing Public Right of Way that runs from Railton Close through the connecting to Greenwich Road will be retained and will be accessible throughout the construction period.

-As would be expected of any public right of way, the developer does not have the right to remove the right of way, the clue is in the name. For some reason the developer is making this out as some kind of positive when this is their legal duty.

3) HOW TALL WILL THE NEW BUILDINGS BE, AND WILL THEY BE VISIBLE FROM NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AREAS?

The tallest building will have a maximum height of 12m (16.57m to ridge). This is significantly less than the current office building on the site. Our landscape strategy includes substantial boundary planting that will provide screening for the new buildings and will minimise any potential visual impact on neighbouring residential areas.

-Like most political answers it's not what is said but what is not said.

Clearly the roofs will be visible from the existing residential areas.

The present building, despite its now unpopular brutalist architecture is a land marking building. The same cannot be said of a bunch of warehouses. Unless limited by the planning permission the decoration of the buildings will clash far stronger than the present colouring of the building, producing a less sympathetic integration. Indeed there will be financial advantages for any company using the area to make the colouring stand out.

Any shielding should be absolute, independent of the seasons, but in keeping with the make-up of the remaining woodland.

Any building that is unable to achieve this through shielding will need planning limitations as to the acceptable colours. The buildings should not act as a billboard for drivers on the M4 for reasons of road safety.

Any change in use should improve the views, no worsen them or hide them behind inappropriate plantings.

4) WILL THE SITE BE OPERATIONAL 24/7? WHAT WILL THE IMPACT OF THIS BE ON TRAFFIC?

Yes, the site will be operational 24/7. While offices tend to have a high volume of traffic that peaks during the morning and evening rush hours, industrial/employment facilities tend to have lower volumes of traffic that are spread out throughout the day and night.

-This question very quietly combines two very important questions and ignores the impact of both of them.

The present office site runs roughly Monday to Friday 9-5. The change to a 24-hour working with the associated noise, light and particulate pollution is unacceptable especially to those who bought their houses around the site. This is a massive change in its use. As outlined below (see 39 below) the light pollution will switch on and off 24/7, the engines will run 24/7 and the beeping of reversing vehicles will be audible 24/7. This not only damages and devalues property on the edge of the development, it will damage the sensitive environment the woods represent (an area of special scientific interest.)

The developer has already demonstrated their complete contempt for the people living near the site, running a diesel generator 24/7. The woodland now reverberates to the noise of the most polluting form of energy available both in noise and emissions.

This planning permission is not just for light industrial/ warehousing but as the developer states “for future unknown use”. This is a bank cheque to ruin people’s homes and ruin an area of special scientific interest. This is about development and money over people’s lives and their right to exist in their chosen environment without a big corporation being allowed to change it without any restraint.

I remind the council they are the residents democratically elected representatives not advocates for the developer (or at least they should be).

5) WILL BUS SERVICE TO THE SITE BE MAINTAINED?

Previously, there was a limited bus service to the site, provided by the 603 Park and Ride route. However, following the previous occupier vacating the site, the bus operator decided to amend this route, so the 603-bus route no longer serves the site.

-So almost all staff will be arriving by private transport, please see the comments below about parking and traffic impact.(please see 22 and 23 below)

6) ARE YOU GOING TO BE KEEPING ALL OF THE TREES ON THE SITE?

A Tree Survey has been undertaken so that we know the location and quality of each tree on the site. We will be retaining as many trees as possible. A detailed landscape and planting strategy will be developed to include new trees and native shrubs, wildflowers and meadow planting.

-Any new tree planting should be to correct the ecological crime that was the cutting down of the woodland for shire hall, not as some add on.

Despite the claim above, everyone is aware of the “accidental” cutting down of trees because lying the fine is worth it. Any planning permission should be dependent on not a single protected tree being cut down. Any protected tree being cut down should result in forfeiting of the site and removal of any and all planning permission rather than a fine and a fake apology.

Too often developers are allowed to cut down important trees with a minimal fine, followed by plan to optimise this new space for their gain.

7) IF PLANNING PERMISSION IS GRANTED, WHEN WILL CONSTRUCTION START ON SITE AND HOW WILL THE CONSTRUCTION PROCESS BE MANAGED? HOW LONG WILL CONSTRUCTION TAKE?

If planning permission is granted in late summer/late autumn 2025, we would expect construction to start towards the end of 2025. Based on our experience with similar schemes, we expect that construction could take around 18-24 months. These dates are indicative only and subject to change as the design and planning process progresses.

A framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) would form part of any future planning application and would be a condition to planning permission. This would require the development to comply with agreed standards and methodologies for construction logistics, access for construction vehicles, dust mitigation measures, pollution control, disturbance minimisation and any other construction matter deemed relevant for the site. The final CEMP would be the result of extensive discussions with Wokingham Borough Council. Any appointed contractors would be required to provide updates to local residents on the nature of works to be conducted and the dates for those works. A site manager would be appointed to act as the primary point of contact for construction-related enquiries.

-How will construction take place without serious noise, and traffic problems, even the what has been done already has resulted in a generator running 24/7 and HGVs illegally turning right on and off the B3270

8) WHAT SUSTAINABILITY FEATURES ARE YOU PLANNING TO INCLUDE FOR THE NEW BUILDINGS?

The scheme would be designed to achieve sustainability and energy efficiency certifications including BREEAM 'Excellent' and an EPC 'A' rating (the highest energy efficiency rating for buildings in the UK). The buildings could include water and energy efficient features such as solar panels and air source heat pumps to reduce the energy demand for future occupiers. We are also actively exploring the use of modern and sustainable construction materials that could include bio-based and recycled materials.

-In any development, especially one of this sensitivity, these should be planning requirement, not A rating, not planning permission, not "could" not "designed to"

9) WHY LOGISTICS HUBS AND NOT AFFORDABLE HOUSING? THERE ARE ALREADY EMPTY HUB BUILDINGS, OR DEVELOPMENT SITES FOR THE SAME, WITH FAR BETTER TRANSPORT CONNECTIONS.

The Site is an established employment site and within the adopted Wokingham Local Plan there is a general presumption against the loss of employment land to non-employment uses. We are looking to bring forward a scheme in line with local planning policy, which retains the site in meaningful employment use and offers a range of quality, modern employment buildings aimed at appealing to a wide range of end users across all employment uses (excluding offices other than ancillary provision) including manufacturing, assembly and R&D.

-Every planning permission for housing, the excuse for it having to be green field is the lack of brown field sites, now there is a brown field site it's been turning into a distribution hub or industrial in a sensitive location.

As outlined above If planning person for this project was to go ahead, it would open every green field application subject to the option of judicial review.

If the office is empty, then there is not a need for employment at the site. The plans show warehousing, the company press release was proud to boast it has been bought as a strategic location for a distribution hub. Yet this suggests it could be anything incasing 254/7 manufacturing with all the noise, air and water pollution assayed with it. The developer must define what the site is too be used for and any planning must be clear what it is used for and the planning permission limiting it strictly adhered to.

10) IF THIS DEVELOPMENT GOES AHEAD, WHAT IMPROVEMENTS WILL BE MADE TO THE ACCIDENT BLACKSPOT OF WHITLEY WOOD LANE AND THE B3270, AND ALSO THE BLACK BOY ROUNDABOUT, WITH ITS RESTRICTED EXITS TO THE NORTH AND EAST?

The proposed development will generate fewer peak hour trips than would have been generated by the previous occupier and could be generated by another occupier using the existing buildings for office use. The nature of the proposed units is such that it will attract a wide range of occupiers across all employment uses apart from office use, many of whom will operate longer hours than a typical office use or 24/7 meaning that there will be a number of different shift patterns across the day, none of which start or finish during peak periods. As a result of this, the number of trips on the surrounding highway will be lower during peak periods compared to the previous or potential future office use of the site. On this basis, there is no requirement to make improvements to any surrounding junctions. This approach to the trip generation for the existing and proposed uses on the site has been agreed with WBC highways as part of the pre-application process. This is also reflected in the reduction in car parking provision from over 1,000 spaces currently to in the region of 250 spaces for the proposed development (final layout yet to be finalised).

-This is a blatant falsehood, even very basic modelling shows this is not the case, the lack off the ability to turn right out of the site means many of the HGVs will have to do even more journeys past this site. Any development of this site mandates the development of this junction as well. (see 7,11,23) below.

11) IF THIS DEVELOPMENT GOES AHEAD, WHAT IMPROVEMENTS WILL BE MADE 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 meeting. The views of the local community have not been 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 Arboricultural 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 trees 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 will 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 than 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 of definition of what the units are to be used for despite the claims on the company website.

If 560 people are working on 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 nothing 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 to clarify exactly what the businesses are and how many people are going to work there, This means that any planning permission is in effect a blank cheque.

The 24/7 working is incompatible with its 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 requires 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 employment 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 for 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 up to 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 box roundabout or the M4 J11 roundabout. The blank box especially was never signed with this number for HGVs going round and they would have difficulty 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 a massive investment with rebuilding the two junctions at huge expense.

There is the noise if this flux of vehicles along with air 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 the 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 or 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 than 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 distributor 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 is completely incongruous with the plans as drawn up, the number of 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 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 ABOUT 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.

-As outlined elsewhere this is a blatant misrepresentation of the facts, very few people will be coming by motorbike or cycle 24/7/365. There is no public transport. Shifts have to overlap. This site is on a hill, very few people will want to cycle up the hill even with a shower, certainly not 40%. This ignores visitors, light good vehicles etc. Any travel plan should include legally binding g maximum number of HGV, light good vehicles and cars coming onto the site.

32) IS IT PROPOSED TO APPLY ANY SURFACING TO THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY OR LEAVE IT AS EARTH?

The current Public Right of Way (PROW) on the site to the north is made ground and our aim is to widen it via changes to the boundary treatment but retain it as a made ground footpath.

-The short answer is nothing which will cost us any money. This is fine the rest off the footpaths are the same.

33) WILL EXISTING FOUL WATER DRAINAGE COPE WITH INCREASE? THERE HAVE BEEN PROBLEMS IN THE PAST.

There will be a Drainage Strategy submitted with the Planning Application that sets out how the site will be drained including foul drainage. We are not expecting a significant increase in foul drainage relative to the site's former use. If there have been problems in the past, then we will look into this, as it is in our interests to make sure the foul drainage is sufficient and is going to work.

-Again, this is not an option but should be mandated, no building should be allowed if there are problems with foul water drainage and nay and all costs to rectify this should be at the developers expense.

It should be so much of an interest that any planning permission but dependant on this being resolved. This should also apply to rainwater drainage, epically in view off the huge paved/built on area.

34) WHAT ARE THE CONSIDERATIONS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY USE ON THE SITE?

We are looking to propose solar panels on the roofs of all the units and the potential for air source heat pumps. We are also looking at trying to reduce energy use through the design of the units, including in terms of insulation.

These should not be options, they should be mandated, all roofs should be covered in. Solar panels, all heating through heat pumps only.

35) WILL THERE BE SECURITY MEASURES AGAINST VANDALISM ESPECIALLY OF LANDSCAPES?

We are already considering security on the site. Once the site is operational there will be Managing Agents and an Estate Management Plan, which will be assessed and reviewed on a regular basis. It is in our interests, and that of our future tenants to ensure there is as little or no vandalism and anti-social behaviour on the site. The design of the buildings also gives lots of opportunities for passive surveillance, which should be a deterrent to vandalism and any anti-social behaviour.

-This question suggests the main target off vandalism would somehow be the landscapes whereas this is a rare target of vandalism, the buildings will be the main sites. Clearly it is their responsibility to provide security, as no point is this somehow a favour they are doing.

For passive surveillance I assume they mean cheap CCTV rather than any actual security. So there will be a record of it rather than preventing it.

36) YOU MENTIONED NO FIXED BUS STOP ON SITE, DOES THAT ALSO MEAN NO P&R FOR THE FOOTBALL STADIUM?

We did discuss this with Reading Buses and they have decided to stop this route and as far as we understand there are no plans to bring this stop back.

-Again, the developers who want permission to change the use, offer nothing in exchange and aren't even willing to support parking at the local football club.

37) TO CLARIFY THE EXIT FROM THE SITE, ARE ALL VEHICLES INTENDED TO TURN LEFT AND IF THEY WANT TO GET TO JUNCTION 11, THEY MUST USE THE TRAFFIC LIGHTS AND/OR THE BLACK BOY ROUNDABOUT?

The access is staying the same so any vehicles coming from the M4 J11 can continue to turn left into the site. All other movements are via the signalised junction.

-Please see the comments above re number of vehicles, traffic impact and building

38) YOUR PRESENTATION MENTIONS NEW ROOF HEIGHTS, HOWEVER DO YOU PROPOSE THE GROUND UPON WHICH BUILDINGS 1&5 ARE TO BE BUILT, TO BE HIGHER OR LOWER THAN THE EXISTING GROUND LEVELS OF THESE BUILDINGS?

The floor level to unit 1 will be lower than the existing ground floor level of the building by approximately 3.4m. For context, this is about 0.5m above the upper basement level. The existing car park where unit 5 is located is on quite a steep slope so level differences will vary. A majority of the unit will be higher than existing levels with the north end of the building lower than existing levels.

-Please see comments above about levels and building appearance.

39) WHAT WILL BE THE EXTERNAL LIGHTING IMPACT (FROM BUILDINGS, EXTERNAL LIGHTING, LOADING BAYS OR CAR PARK LIGHTING) ON NEARBY RESIDENTIAL AREAS?

As part of the planning application we will be submitting a proposed Lighting Strategy for the site which will look to provide sufficient lighting to ensure safe operation, but in a way which respects the site's sensitive surroundings, including in relation to ecology as well as residential amenity. Lighting will automatically dim to lower levels enough to cover health and safety services when there is no movement in the area. If there is movement on the roads/area by cars/pedestrians etc the applicable fixtures will automatically ramp up. No lighting will spill outside the boundary of the site.

-So, for clarification if the application unrestricted going off takes place the local residents and people driving along the M4 will be exposed to a nighttime light show of flashing lights. Any private residence doing this 24/7/365 would have nuisance complaints. The size of the buildings and narrowness of trees means that this will always escape if the lighting enables 24/7 working. Flashing lights are worse than constant lights, this is not about reducing the impact, this is about reducing the electricity.

The acceptance of the sensitive location and the requirement for safe lighting are in conflict and show the location is totally unsuited for 24/7 working and no office use.

40) WILL THE NEW LANDSCAPING TO THE NORTH OF THE SITE (MARKED 07 ON YOUR PLAN) BE FLAT GROUND OR WILL IT BE BANKED-UP AS PART OF THE 'ENHANCED LANDSCAPING BUFFER AND SCREENING' THAT YOU MENTION?

The landscaped area to the very north will maintain existing levels. The buffer and screening will be created through planting.

-This area of planting is nowhere near thick enough to buffer the noise, particulate and light pollution from the proposed site. If the developer is interested in the development being even close to being acceptable then the screening and limitations of use should be enough to block all three forms of pollution.

41) NOWHERE IN YOUR PRESENTATION DOES IT MENTION THE BUNKER, SO WHAT ARE YOUR PLANS FOR THIS AS PART OF THE SITE REDEVELOPMENT?

The bunker, which has previously been stripped out prior to Wrenbridge purchasing the site, will be removed as part of the proposed demolition of the building.

-This seems a strange decision; this kind of bunker forms the ideal location for data centers etc and does so without any impact to the surrounding population. There is a far greater demand for data centers than warehouses and this site represents a unique opportunity for use of the site under ground without disturbing anybody in sharp contrast to the submitted plan

42) YOUR PROPOSAL SHOWS NEW PLANTINGS BETWEEN THE WOODLAND CAR PARK AND THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE SITE - WILL THESE BE SAPLINGS OR MATURE PLANTINGS?

Planting to the north of the site is proposed as significant tree planting to create a buffer between the residential edge and the industrially active centre of the site. Structural planting will be proposed to this area at semi-mature/extra heavy standard.

-The building of shire hall was an ecological crime and involved clearing an area of woodland of special scientific interest. In line with the national planning policy all existing trees should be protected and there should be an area presently not planted which is encouraged with planting to rewild. This should be part of the ancient wood land and in keeping with what is known now with the mycelium network continuous with the existing woodland. This should be in addition to the present woodland which forms part of the site. Planting of trees around the site to break up the site should not be included in this total, this is not rewinding, this is artificial planting. Much as artificial planting has a role it is not rewilding.

43) WILL THERE BE LEGAL RESTRICTION IN THE LEASE ON THE TYPE OF NATURE OF THE BUSINESS THEY WILL BE ALLOWED TO CONDUCT ON THE SITE, AND THE TYPE OF PRODUCTS AND SERVICES STORED/CARRIED OUT?

Any future occupiers will be obliged to operate in accordance with the planning permission which seeks a range of uses. At this stage the end users for the units are currently unknown.

-If the uses are unknown how can planning permission be requested? By its nature this application is for a change of use and that use should be defined and limited by the planning permission. It is clearly unacceptable to have a planning permission for any absolutely any usage. This would include options from plastic recycling plants (with their strange ability to combust), weapons production, nuclear use, micro electricity generating with the associated noise and pollution. Any planning permission granted should have no impact on this surrounding the unit or any change compensated, and direct specific permission sought and granted.

The planning should be limited and in the event of breaking the planning terms the site be forced to close.

This statement shows the owner wants to right to use the site not just for warehousing but potentially light or heavy industrial. The warehouse plans being a Trojan horse for development the developer knows they would never get permission for.

44) WILL THERE BE A RESTRICTION PROHIBITING THE STORAGE OF DANGEROUS CHEMICALS, RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS OR OTHER SUBSTANCES THAT COULD POTENTIALLY IMPACT HEALTH OF NEARBY RESIDENTS?

The safe storage, handling and disposal of hazardous waste is controlled and managed under specific legislation which places a duty of care on those involved to adhere to strict regulations. As such we would not expect any planning permission to impose additional controls in this respect.

-This site not only is in close proximity to housing, uphill of more housing it also overlooks the M4. The site is entirely inappropriate for the storage of any hazardous or radioactive chemicals, including lithium-ion batteries. Any fire will result in mass contamination of multiple housing, a woodland of special scientific interest and the M4.

Any plan to store any of the above materials should involve a decision from the highway's agency concerning the risk to the M4, Natural England from the point of the woodland and the consent of the local population.

There have been previous accidents where fires have led to road traffic accidents, the developer is suggesting being allowed to add nuclear and chemical confirmation and potential poisoning of the local population and the M4 to this. No one plans to have a fire, but on a long enough timeline all events happen.

Dr Paul Kennedy BSc MB BS MRCS FCEM RCPATHME
Aphelion Way