

PLANNING REF : 253071
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 10 Canberra Lake Way
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG10 9DH
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Steven Short
DATE SUBMITTED : 26/05/2026

COMMENTS:

Planning Reference: 253071

Location: Land off Park Lane, Charvil

I wish to formally object to this planning application, specifically in relation to the proposed footpath.

1. Increased Traffic and Access Issues

The proposed footpath would link a non-adopted area to an adopted highway, providing convenient access to visitor parking spaces within CLW for the new development, which has limited visitor parking provision.

This is likely to increase both pedestrian and vehicular traffic through CLW and the managed estate.

It is also unclear whether residents of the Bellway development using CLW facilities will contribute towards the ongoing management and maintenance costs of the CLW cul-de-sac.

2. Lack of Justification

There is no clear justification or purpose for the footpath. The route runs parallel to Park Lane, approximately 200 metres away, where an existing path already serves this function.

It is unclear how the proposed footpath would be maintained or funded. Consideration should be given to improving and maintaining the existing Park Lane path instead, particularly given its importance for school access and its proximity.

3. Topography and Compliance Concerns

The ground levels are uneven with varying widths. There is an approximate 1 metre level difference between No. 10 and No. 11, with the land falling towards the Bellway development, and a total fall of approximately 5 metres indicated by the topographical study.

There is insufficient information within the submission to demonstrate compliance with Building Regulations Part M, including minimum widths, gradients for accessibility, and drainage.

The proposed design may result in gradients exceeding acceptable standards (greater than 1:40), narrow access points, and an increased risk of non-compliance with Building Regulations and CDM requirements, raising safety concerns.

4. Privacy, Security and Structural Impact

The proposed footpath would negatively impact the privacy, security, and safety of No. 10 and potentially undermine No. 11's garage

ings. There is insufficient detail to demonstrate that level changes can be managed without impacting neighbouring properties.

A section of the plans shows no boundary treatment, with direct access into the rear garden of No. 10. The submission does not address how privacy and security will be protected.

There is also a lack of information regarding drainage design, maintenance responsibility, and prevention of flooding to adjacent properties.

5. Lighting Impact

The footpath would require lighting. Police recommendations (dated 12 November 2024) require compliance with BS5489-1:2020.

Such lighting would introduce light pollution into neighbouring

properties, particularly affecting habitable rooms at No. 10, negatively impacting residential amenity and wellbeing.

6. Lack of Boundary Treatment and Security Measures

The planning submission does not adequately address Police recommendations regarding defensible space, boundary treatments, or measures to separate public and private areas. There is no clear strategy for incorporating vegetation or stand-off distances to improve safety and security.

7. Increased Crime Risk

The Police report states that the proposed footpath would create a "leaky" cul-de-sac and increase the risk of crime. The report recommends that the footpath should be avoided, supported by evidence and case studies.

This raises significant concerns regarding personal safety and potential increases in insurance costs for residents.

8. Impact on Child Safety

CLW currently provides a safe environment for children due to its cul-de-sac layout and traffic calming characteristics.

The introduction of a footpath would compromise this safety, increasing risks and concerns for residents.

9. Lack of Transparency

It is understood from the applicant's covering letter that the footpath was requested by Wokingham Borough Council on 16 April 2026.

The removal of the footpath in earlier proposals was a positive change. Clarification is requested as to why it has been reintroduced, what benefits it provides, and how these outweigh the concerns raised above.

Conclusion

I am not opposed to the development in principle; however, I strongly object to the inclusion of the footpath. There is no clear benefit, while the potential negative impacts on safety, security, privacy, and residential amenity are significant.

I request that these objections are fully considered and that a clear and transparent justification is provided should the proposal be supported.