

Application: 250407

Submitted: Lorna MacDonald and Mohamed El Tawil

Address: Waingels Road, Charvil RG10 0UA

Comments:

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to object to the application for Permission in Principle for residential development at Land to the Rear of Oak Tree, Waingels Road, Charvil. While I understand the need for housing, I believe this application is fundamentally flawed, fails to address significant concerns, and ultimately, the area is not suitable for development. I believe this application should be rejected based on the following grounds.

Firstly, the application site is designated as countryside, and Policy CP11 of the Wokingham Core Strategy has a restrictive approach to development in such areas, aiming to "protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain the quality of the environment." The Waingels Road provides the only green space between the developments of Charvil and Woodley. While the applicant argues that the site is well-contained and the development wouldn't harm the area's identity, the principle of allowing residential development in the countryside in this location is unacceptable. The agent (Woolf Bond Planning Ltd) relies heavily on the Council's housing land supply deficit to justify the proposal, but this does not override the fundamental importance of protecting the countryside from inappropriate development.

Secondly, the application is premature due to a lack of sufficient detail and inconsistencies within the planning application. This application is for Permission in Principle, which limits consideration to location, land use, and amount of development. Crucial details, such as design, highways, drainage, ecology, dwelling mix, and affordable housing, are deferred to the Technical Details Consent stage. It is impossible to properly assess the acceptability of the development without these details². Furthermore, there are several inconsistencies within the application, such as the proposal for 9 dwellings on a plot of 0.99 hectares, while the document quotes "circa 10 dwellings per hectare across the whole site." This misrepresentation should invalidate the current application and require re-evaluation.

Thirdly, the application fails to adequately address road safety concerns and access for emergency vehicles. The illustrative plan shows access on a bend in the road, with blind spots and reduced visibility, posing a high risk of collision for vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians⁴. There is no analysis of these risks within the planning statement, and the proposed site does not provide safe or suitable access to all users. Additionally, the

access road may be too narrow for emergency services and other large facilities vehicles to access safely.

Fourthly, the application has unrealistic sustainable transport expectations. The site is not within easy walking distance of a range of services and facilities, and the reliance on private car use will be high, which is contrary to sustainable transport objectives. The planning document also inaccurately states that there is good pedestrian access to nearby settlements, which is not true.

Fifthly, the proposed development is out of keeping with the character of the area. This area is characterized by large plots, making this high-density development out of character with the surroundings. To be in character with the area, the site would only be suitable for a maximum of 3 dwellings.

Sixthly, the application fails to adequately address service infrastructure and pollution risks. The application does not address waste management for this development, and the soakaways/drainage system for the septic tanks have a high chance of contaminating the nearby lake. The proposal also fails to consider the ecological impact of the development and how this land acts as a protected habitat for wildlife.

Lastly, the development will have a detrimental impact on the amenity and privacy of neighboring properties, especially the Nikunj dwelling. The high level of overlooking should be considered a detriment to residential amenities.

For the reasons outlined above, I believe this application for Permission in Principle request should be rejected. The proposal is contrary to planning policies, premature in its lack of detail, unsustainable in its location, detrimental to the character of the area, and fails to adequately address the impact on neighboring amenities.