

PLANNING REF : 252782
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 11 The Hawthorns
: Charvil, Berks
: RG10 9TS
SUBMITTED BY : Mark Dixon
DATE SUBMITTED : 23/11/2025

COMMENTS:

Dear sirs, I wish to object strongly to this revised application on numerous grounds

Firstly how would anyone in their right mind approve an Oil storage facility adjacent to (within yards) of a nature reserve and 3 streams of the river Loddon, and the adjacent flood plain/fields.

The consequences of a spill and discharge into any of these would be catastrophic on the environment/river and wildlife.

1) Whilst the plans note that bunding of the tanks and installation of a separator will be installed, we are talking about an inventory of 837,000liters of fuel.

In reading the mitigation measure a major spillage/incident could lead to the total site being flooded with oil, this is acknowledged by the companies consultant in the report, a 800 litre oil containment sump/interceptor will be absolutely useless

2) One other aspect that has not been mentioned is the fire protection systems, or lack of a few extinguishers is no use, this size of installation should require an automated foam system, Note:-water sprinklers would only compound the run off and pollution aspects

Question has the FIRE Service's been asked to comment on what is required and how they would go about fighting a fire on this site ? If not then the planning authorities should ask for this review asap along with consideration of what happens to the firewater

Any fire in the facility would also significantly be compounded by the tyre storage facility in the warehouses next door, leading to a much enhanced fire and pollution risk from the combination

3) No mention of a fail safe earth bonding system is mentioned in the application, these are routinely utilised when filling oil/fuel tankers to prevent static build up and the risk of sparks/ignition, has this been identified ?

4) Venting of tankers when filling releases vapour containing oil mist, whilst carbon filters are noted these are not very efficient, need routine changing and in themselves once saturated produce an enhanced fire risk

5) Traffic management plans are the usual , joke, With all tankers to exit and enter via the Old Bath road from Charvil direction, increasing the traffic of heavy vehicles along this stretch 6 days a week significantly, already there are times when deliveries to the adjacent Tyre warehouse lead to 2 large artic container trucks being parked on the pavement and in front of the proposed fuel depot , these present a significant traffic/accident risk for cars/cycles/buses and pedestrians using this section of Old Bath road, In fact personally I have seen a blue Light Ambulance have to

wait 6 mins whilst the drivers of the Arctics attempt to reverse into the warehouse frontage!!

It goes on to state that Tankers will drive to the A329m Junction at Sutton Seeds to pick up the M4 !!, No they wont they will go to the Wee Waif roundabout and turn right along the A4 to head east to The 404, compounding the traffic situation on the A4 where Wokingham have granted significant New housing around the Wargrave roundabout, The A4 being used by numerous School children , More traffic more significant risk

The traffic survey states that its quite feasible for the fuel oil trucks to turn right into the facility off the Old Bath Road, whilst they are waiting for the GAP, other vehicles are rounding the S Bends and come across standing traffic, this already occurs (tyre Warehouse) and is a significant accident risk

Parking for Staff/drivers cars is proposed, if its anything like the Tyre warehouse then this is chaotic, with cars parked on footpaths many times, the proposal being that Fuel oil drivers will park their cars, move their Tanker, before getting out an moving their car to the Tanker spot is farcical and will not happen, leading to more congestion in this area and risk of accidents

All in all this is a ridiculous proposal, and needs to be rejected unanimously by the planning team and councillors, there are far to many risks associated with this proposal on so many fronts, it should not be entertained