

PLANNING REF : 252896
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Old Wokingham Road
: Wokingham
: RG40 3BX
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs T Gibbs
DATE SUBMITTED : 04/03/2026

COMMENTS:

My primary concern for this proposal is site access and traffic safety - especially during it's development and thereafter depending on expected volumes and visitors trying to exit onto the main highway. "Access to the site will be achieved via an improved existing field access taken from Easthampstead Road. Appropriate vehicular parking will be provided within the curtilage of the site."

Existing field access has not been in use for many years now. Only recently (within the last 12 months) the old agricultural gateway has been cleared of established trees and shrubs - evidently before the tree survey was completed.

The Transport Statement does not take into account any proposed SANG parking opposite and closure of Easthampstead Road as a route from Wokingham for the Planning application 241933. This means the working assumption for this proposal that Easthampstead Road provides a direct route towards Wokingham from the south is no longer accurate. There is also a makeshift layby used by vehicles close to the proposed entrance. This is used by vehicles on a regular occasion, although not an appropriate place to stop. It is also a common place for fly tipping. Both situations would impact line of sight and would need to be addressed.

The junction between Easthampstead Road and Old Wokingham Road (OWR) remains dangerous and evidently out of scope of this development proposal (and the surrounding active planning applications). Unless something changes, adding more and more vehicles to this junction will lead to someone being killed.

Traffic safety around this junction is paramount. Documentation cites that "The review identified that a total of five collisions have

occurred within the latest available five-year period. Three of the incidents occurred at the Easthampstead Road/Old Wokingham Road junction". As a resident I can inform the planning committee that already this year (by end of Feb 2026), property in the immediate vicinity has been damaged (again) by vehicles not traversing the junction appropriately and numerous RTCs have happened (knock for knock, so not all are reported). Traffic safety statistics here do not truly reflect reality. We are fortunate if we have just 5 RTCs in a couple of months! 3,000+ citizens have signed a petition in the last 12 months raising concern over the safety at this junction and still nothing has been done by either WBC or BFC (as the junction straddles both jurisdictions).

Traffic coming along OWR from Pinewood miss the junction on a regular occasion and attempt to turn around in residences opposite before the blind bend reversing into oncoming traffic). Traffic coming from Jennetts Park on OWR are speeding around the blind bend not adhering to the advisory 30mph limit or taking into account queuing traffic due to traffic congestion to Pinewood. That is before you consider traffic wishing to enter and exit Easthampstead Road from OWR - which will increase with the addition of this site and it's proposed entrance. What considerations are really being given to ongoing safety of this

junction?

Note: Additional planning applications for additional houses in close proximity on both sides need to be considered and strongly challenged from a safety perspective if no improvements are being made. There are no public transport options to & from this site currently, and no safe passage for cyclists or pedestrians. There are no

footpaths around the perimeter of the site, meaning from a safety perspective you put your life in your hands to try and traverse both Old Wokingham Road and Easthampstead Road from any public transport options further away. Basically it is safe to assume that all visitors will be by car, so adding to the traffic flow in the immediate area. The letter from Reverend Father Daniel McAvoy - The local Parish Priest and Co-ordinating Pastor for the South Berkshire area;

APPENDIX 1 states that "the intention for a propose chapel will be as a multi-purpose centre to support long term rough sleepers and unemployed individuals" - this does not align with the proposed use where documentation refers to "It was accepted that in such natural burial plots, where the only facilities will be the burial plots themselves . Committals will not be a frequent occurrence, with most people visiting loved ones at varying frequencies In addition, it should be noted that there will be no permanent full-time employees on site. Instead, ancillary staff, such as gardeners and cleaners, will uphold the maintenance of the site when appropriate." Is the building going to be a pavilion/chapel/community centre or are the individuals referred to being employed as the gardeners and cleaners?

Site location maps across the document also do not tally. Some show the proposed site to be up to the boundary of the junction and some a distance away from the junction. Continuity across the proposal would be helpful.

Environmentally, I request that tree preservations be considered especially those mature specimens surrounding the area. As paddocks, this field is also currently a green highway and retention as such should be considered for local wildlife population eg deer. I am fully supportive of all new tree planting, ponds and wildflower meadow for the area to offset the ever decreasing air quality.