

PLANNING REF : 260378
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Maidensfield
: Winnersh, Berkshire
: RG41 5TJ
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs C Jones
DATE SUBMITTED : 23/03/2026

COMMENTS:

I wish to object to the following details on this application:

- House number 7 is built right next to Maidensfield - it is not fitting in with the boundaries of the rest of the site being sideways with its garden to the side. It looks very out of place and just

squeezed in for the sake of it.

- The site overall uses tandem parking - most of which is shared - this is such inefficient and lazy design to just fit in more housing density. This leads to on street parking. House number 9 doesn't even have parking outside of its frontage. Has an actual designer done this plan or some kind of AI? It is very odd looking. Likewise 8,9 and 36&37 look strangely placed.

- There are no apartments in this area of Winnersh - this design does not complement the local area and looks out of place. In the appeal the inspector said 'Significantly, the layout shows two and half and three storey buildings, which Mr Williams' own townscape analysis indicates are almost entirely absent from the wider area. As a result, the scheme as outlined in the indicative layout would be larger, denser, taller and more compact than its surroundings. Such an approach could jar with Maidensfield, disrupt the legibility of the local street hierarchy and harm the settlement pattern of the area. 61. However, the indicative layout is just that. The scheme need not come forward in the way currently suggested. Indeed, Mr Williams confirmed that the provision of two and half and three storey buildings as shown in the indicative layout was a choice rather than being required to fit the scheme in. As a result, the proposal could (and should in my view) ultimately come forward with no building exceeding two storeys in height. In this respect, the scheme would respond better to the existing townscape by not being taller than it, which would otherwise appear odd on the settlement edge.' So why has the applicant ignored this?

- Why is there road leading to a second site - which goes over land that Taylor Wimpey do not have access to? This belongs to Wokingham council.

- Taylor Wimpey have started moving materials onto the field.

However the appeal document says:

'No development shall take place, until a Construction Method Statement, including a CEMP (Construction Environmental Management Plan), has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement (including CEMP) shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement (including CEMP) shall provide for but not be limited to the following : a) construction of suitable works access; b) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; c) loading and unloading of plant and materials; d) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; e) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate; f) wheel washing facilities; g) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate> 28 Appeal Decision

APP/X0360/W/23/3331651 h) a scheme for recycling/ disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works; i) hours of construction; j) hours of delivery; k) mitigation and avoidance measures for ecology and biodiversity; and l) the use of any mineral material extracted during construction.'

- The issue of this development needing a second access has not been covered. The appeal document says:
'In summary, there is a clear need to improve the permeability of the appeal scheme through a second entrance. This would enhance access to services and facilities and achieve the necessary urban design quality. There is a prospect that such an access can be provided within three years. With a second access the proposal would be as permeable as it can be when accounting for surrounding physical constraints. As a result, the proposal would be functional, accessible, safe and adaptable and therefore a conflict with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the CS in respect of this main issue would not occur.'

At the moment the site plans show a reading leading to no where? It seems to show cars would randomly off outside Oaktree school on a road that doesn't exist.

- The noise policy mentions about the Phase 1 of housing not needing the required noise mitigation measures that some buildings would need -because the Phase 2 houses would help to block the noise. But the noise assessment company seem unaware that Phase 2 is not certain to go ahead.
- Nine plots have been identified to need mechanical cooling due to the high noise levels. This seems to be missed off the plans.