

PLANNING REF : 262274
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 73
: Anderson Ave, Reading
: RG6 1HD
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Miranda Aston
DATE SUBMITTED : 04/10/2026

COMMENTS:

I wish to formally log my strongest objection to the proposed 72MW data centre development at Thames Valley Park. While the applicant frames this as a simple commercial reuse of an existing office campus, a facility of this industrial scale introduces severe, unprecedented threats to the immediate natural environment that cannot be mitigated by standard business park standards.

I urge the committee to refuse this application based on the following critical planning grounds:

1. Ecological Jeopardy to the Adjacent Wetland and Nature Reserve

- **Misleading Site Context:** The applicant relies heavily on the fact that this is an established business park. However, this specific parcel sits directly adjacent to the River Thames, local wetlands, and sensitive nature reserves. It functions seamlessly as part of a delicate riverine ecosystem, serving as a vital corridor for diverse wildlife, birds, and aquatic species.
- **Irreversible Habitat Degradation:** Transitioning from passive office buildings to a high-intensity, 24/7 industrial data facility will fundamentally fragment and disrupt this ecosystem, rendering the area hostile to local fauna.

2. Destructive Impact of Heat Pollution on Local Biodiversity

- **The "Radiator" Effect:** A 72MW facility continuously rejects massive quantities of ambient heat via rooftop air-chillers. Despite claims of a closed-loop system, this immense heat must be expelled directly into the local atmosphere.
- **Microclimate Alteration:** This constant thermal plume will artificially raise the local microclimate temperature. For an area directly bordering a wetland, even minor increases in water and air surface temperatures will cause catastrophic shifts in delicate aquatic biology, encouraging toxic algal blooms and driving out native wildlife.
- **Lack of Actionable Heat Reuse:** On local forums such as Facebook, there is a strong consensus that the lack of an immediate, legally-binding heat reuse infrastructure makes the release of massive waste heat an unacceptable ecological hazard. Speculative "assessments" to reuse heat in the future are entirely inadequate to prevent immediate harm.

3. Continuous Acoustic Disturbance (Noise Pollution)

- **Uninterrupted Low-Frequency Hum:** Data centres require non-stop mechanical ventilation, cooling fans, and primary/backup power generation systems. The resulting constant industrial noise is completely different from the daytime-only, fluctuating noise of an office building.
- **Impact on Wildlife Communication:** This relentless low-frequency

hum will directly interfere with the breeding, nesting, and communication patterns of the diverse bird and mammal populations in the adjacent nature reserves. Acoustic barriers will do little to prevent the ecological displacement caused by 24/7 mechanical noise.

4. Flawed Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Claims

- Artificial Enhancements vs. Real Loss: The applicant's promise of a "10% Biodiversity Net Gain" through superficial landscaping and tree planting is entirely contradicted by the operational reality of the site. Planting trees next to a massive, loud, heat-emitting industrial plant will not attract displaced wildlife or sustain a complex ecosystem. The net result will be a severe ecological loss.

5. Unsustainable Local Power & Fossil Fuel Reliance

- Gas-Backed Fuel Cells: The proposal to run this data centre using on-site gas-powered fuel cells due to local grid shortages is heavily regressive. Introducing a major fossil-fuel burning source directly next to a natural environment contradicts local climate emergency declarations, presenting severe risks to local air quality and carbon reduction targets.

Conclusion:

The proposed development represents a massive industrial escalation that is entirely incompatible with its unique geographic location adjacent to the River Thames and local wetlands. The severe, cumulative impacts of heat and noise pollution on our local ecosystem cannot be mitigated. I strongly urge Wokingham Borough Council to reject this application and protect the unique natural heritage of Thames Valley Park.