

5 June 2026

T: 01883 346464

Andrew Chugg  
Wokingham Borough Council

*By email: [andrew.chugg@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.chugg@wokingham.gov.uk)*

**Your Ref: 260226**

**Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline Planning Consent 223455 (as approved under APP/X0360/W/24/3350170) for a residential development of up to 230 dwellings, open space, internal accesses and parking, drainage measures, landscaping, demolition of all existing structures, and all other associated works. Details of vehicular access for the development to the A4.**

Dear Andrew,

We write to formally object to the above planning application (WBC ref: 260226) on highways and technical grounds. Our concerns are set out in detail below.

## **1. Technical Appraisal**

It is a well-established principle of planning law and policy that development must provide safe and suitable access for all users and must not prejudice the operation or safety of the wider highway network. The proposed roundabout design demonstrably fails in this regard.

As previously raised through discussions with WBC Highways, including meetings held on 28th August 2025 and 19th March 2026, the currently proposed roundabout design is not appropriately sized or configured to accommodate a potential future fourth arm and associated traffic generation from approximately 230 additional dwellings.

The proposed design fails to reasonably consider future network requirements. Any attempt to retrofit a fourth arm into the existing layout would introduce significant highway safety implications and is highly likely to result in operational and functionality deficiencies to a Primary A Road, Local Authority Principal Road and Primary Diversionary Route for the M4. Fundamentally, the proposals as submitted are a clear and unprecedented departure from recognised design standards.

It is our clear understanding, based on the aforementioned discussions with WBC Highways, that WBC's position is (and has been) that such an arrangement would be unacceptable, and that a comprehensive redesign and upsizing of the junction would be required to enable a connection from the Applicant's site to the north of Bath Road.

## **2. Lack of supporting technical detail**

The submitted application lacks sufficient information to enable a robust assessment of its impact on the Croudace Homes Section 278 (S278) works, both within existing adopted highways land and land within Croudace Homes ownership.

The required, but missing, information includes but is not limited to:

- An updated Reserved Matters Transport Assessment / Statement
- Vehicle tracking drawings (including HGV/refuse/service/car)
- Levels plans
- Proposed highway drainage strategy
- Adoption plan

- Utilities / service layout plans

Without this information, it is not possible to properly understand or evaluate the interface with, or consequences for, the our technically approved and soon to be implemented S278 works. It also raises the question of whether the application should have been validated in the first instance.

### **3. References to amendments on land outside of the Applicant's control**

The application documentation references potential amendments to road markings and signage within land under Croudace Homes' ownership and the agreed scope of our technically approved S278 works. Despite references to potential amendments to the works within our S278 scope and works boundary, the red line boundary of the application does not extend to encompass where these amendments would be required.

It must be noted that no approach, consultation, or correspondence has been received from the Applicant regarding these proposals, and consequently, no agreement has been provided to facilitate such amendments. Furthermore, given the fundamental highways design concerns outlined above, we would not be in a position to support or consent to such changes in any event.

### **4. Unauthorised use of Croudace Homes' technical information**

From our review of the application as submitted, it appears that elements of the current submission have relied upon drawings and technical material originating from Croudace Homes' technically approved S278 application, including work undertaken by our third-party consultants. We wish to make it clear that no permission has been granted for the use or reproduction of this information and there has been no engagement or agreement authorising its inclusion within this application.

This raises serious concerns regarding breach of copyright, data use, transparency, and professional conduct, and we therefore request full clarification on how these materials were obtained and confirmation of why they have been used without consent.

We are also considering whether a Freedom of Information (FOI) request may be necessary to understand how such information has been shared or circulated.

## **Conclusion**

In summary, the application:

- Fails to meet required highways design standards.
- Lacks critical technical information necessary for proper assessment.
- Includes unauthorised references and proposed works within land outside of the Applicant's control.

On this basis, we strongly object to the application in its current form and request that it is refused or, at minimum, significantly revised to address the issues outlined above.

We reserve the right to provide further representations as additional information becomes available.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Norris MEng (Hons) CEng MICE  
Managing Director

For and on behalf of  
**Croudace Homes Limited**