

PLANNING REF : 253071
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 7 Burns Close
: Woodley, Berkshire
: RG5 3RP
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Linda Bishop
DATE SUBMITTED : 13/01/2026

COMMENTS:

I'm writing to formally register my objection to the proposed development. While I live in Woodley, I'm a frequent visitor to 22 Canberra Lake Way and spend a significant amount of time in the property. I'm familiar with the location and the specific promises made regarding its layout.

My objections are based on the following material considerations:

1. Breach of Planning Conditions and Loss of Privacy

I was present when my family were discussing the purchase of number 22 and I recall clearly seeing the original plans at the point of purchase. The landscaped green buffer zone was a fundamental part of the consent, designed specifically to protect the privacy and outlook of number 22. They purchased this house as their forever home.

Having spent so much time in the house, I'm acutely aware of how significant that buffer is from a privacy and screening perspective. To remove it now is a breach of the trust placed in the planning system. Under WBC Policy CP3, development must not be detrimental to the amenity of adjoining land. Without this buffer, the rear of number 22 will be completely overlooked by dense housing, resulting in an intrusive and overbearing outlook that is totally unacceptable.

2. Infrastructure Deficit and Car Dependency (Policy CP4 & CP6)

As a retiree, I'm completely dependent on my car to visit my family in Charvil. There's no credible or practical public transport link between my home in Woodley and Canberra Lake Way. I'm therefore forced to use my car for every visit. I recently had an operation on my foot, which prevented me from driving for 6 weeks. Without a car I was unable to travel to Charvil, without lifts from family, I therefore know firsthand about the limitations of public transport to/ from Charvil when taxis aren't an option due to being on a pension.

This first-hand experience makes me seriously question the suitability of this site for socially rented housing. Siting a high number of vulnerable residents in an area with zero GP facilities, limited retail, and poor transport links creates a "forced car ownership"

model. This is contrary to the 2026 NPPF "Golden Rule" of infrastructure-led development and WBC's Climate Emergency goals. It's unfair to place residents who may not have access to a vehicle in a location that is so demonstrably car-dependent.

3. Highway and Pedestrian Safety

As a local driver, I've serious concerns about road safety on Park Lane. The omission of the previously promised pedestrian crossing is a major failure. I regularly see high volumes of pedestrians, including children, struggling to cross this busy road. Adding more traffic without this essential safety measure is a risk the Council should not take.

Proposed Potential Solutions

I'm requesting that the committee considers the following amendments to bring the scheme into alignment with local policy:

Reinstatement of the CLW Buffer: This must be restored to its original specification.

Pedestrian Crossing Reinstated: I request a condition preventing any occupation of the new homes until the Park Lane pedestrian crossing is fully operational.

I'm hopeful that the planning committee will take these concerns based on years of visiting this specific site into account and refuse the application in its current form.