

PLANNING REF : 252498  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 27 Harrow Way  
: Sindlesham, Berks  
: RG41 5GJ  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr steven john Everton  
DATE SUBMITTED : 16/01/2026

COMMENTS:

Mr S J Everton  
27 Harrow Way, RG41 5GJ  
Application 252498

General

I have separately commented on application 252769 and some of those aspects are similar and hence repeated here.

However, I am frustrated and disappointed, and I feel prevented in this larger application from finding the information I need to be able to make a comment or objection. This is a significant issue, and you should give consideration to.

Remember please that the detailed plans have never been provided to us in the Local Plan processes to date, so we have never been able to examine them in detail. Nor have we been given specific presentations on the detailed proposals. This is unacceptable for local workers having to trawl electronically through 81 pages of document most of which are so poorly titled and so voluminous that non-professional local residents have no chance whatsoever of finding actual information in relation to their concerns. The search

function on the portal is POOR. One may type "Transport" say and then get load of poorly titled documents; they might open the document

which appears to be THE "transport report" (who knows?) and it is just "Chapter 17" with no contents list - how on earth is an interested party supposed to find the important information.

I highly recommend you consider the way that information has been provided in relation to this application. Firstly the information should be easy to navigate to what one needs, and secondly the details of the proposals in this application should be presented in public to locals, not just hidden in this maelstrom of digital storage.

I object to the proposed application on the basis of traffic implications of the construction works in particular, and how the developer has considered this.

The Local Plan hearings in 2025 at Wokingham Council offices explicitly made the point several times : that the traffic numbers used by the Developers /WBC were "robust" and "appropriate for the local plan stage". They were questions repeatedly on the relevance of the traffic numbers used, and they repeatedly and defensively just repeated that they were "robust". They refused or could not

when asked, provide any indication of levels of certainty and sensitivity and error in the numbers used. The statement was made on more than one occasion occasion by the developer, the KC and WBC that it would be the Planning Application stage that more robust traffic numbers and modelling should be considered. That time is now. Accordingly, as Planning Authority WBC must rigorously challenge the numbers, the assumptions and the outcome of the Traffic Assessments of this and the other 2 applications to come, and in conjunction.

2) As a result of the extremely poorly structured and titked provision of substantial comp,ex information, it is therefore unclear how this applicant has considered the closure of Mill Lane to traffic during the periods that it is intended to construct the roundabouts on Mill Lane and the road to Hatch Farm. The adjacent applicant has mentioned this closure in 11.2.3(4) and (5) in particular. They then go on to say that 11.3.26 "... there is immaterial change in delay at the Nirvana Spa roundabout..." !? This conclusion was very worrying as to whether they have undertaken any validation whatsoever on their conclusions. Every year we have a full scale demonstration of the impact of closure of Mill Lane, when it floods for about a week once or twice a year. When this happens, the traffic in both AM and PM queues stationary all the way back towards Arborfield circa 2.6km+, and sometimes even to the Arborfield X roundabout! Yet this situation is not at all mentioned in their transport assessment. Why have these foreseeable and significant queues from the development proposals mentioned in this assessment report NOT been considered.

This is a huge impact on the area here; it is understandable for a week each year when we flood, but NOT acceptable for EVERY day for several years.

Regarding this application 252498, i am unable to do a search in the Planning Portal for e.g. "Mill Lane" unless it is in the title of the document.

Accordingly i am unable to find the applicant's consideration of the Nirvana Spa roundabout /Mill Lane implications. This is unacceptable.

3) I reference my comments on the Local Plan which i submitted in relation to that last year:

Question 7B Mill Lane roundabouts

Mill Lane currently works. It is a critical local travel route. The Hatch Farm / Longdon Road new traffic lights cause daily traffic queuing back to and past Sindlesham and Nirvana Spa. Mill Lane is therefore a huge benefit by being available to take traffic away from that queue.

That is unless the Loddon floods or there are roadworks on Mill Lane when it is closed. At this point it causes traffic queues all the way back to Arborfield, exacerbated by the mini roundabout at Sindlesham which prioritises traffic approaching from Bearwood. Mill Lane is locally vital therefore.

Two roundabouts are proposed in the local plan on Mill Lane, before and after the M4 underpass. The ultimate closure of Mill Lane is debatable, however if the big M4 bridge is constructed it is noted that some traffic will use that route, and if the link road to Hatch Farm Way is made early. However it is the temporary closure of Mill

Lane that appears to have no provisions made in the Plan to address the significant impact on local traffic.

The lower north roundabout needs to be constructed in/above or very close to the part of the Loddon which floods several times every year. It requires significant engineering works in an area of very limited space and would benefit from the new proposed link road to the recent Hatch Farm Way being constructed first to gain access without limiting traffic on Mill Lane, because of its importance for local road

traffic. It clearly will need to address loss of flood area and it is not easy to understand how this will be achieved in such a tight area. No provision has been presented to demonstrate how this construction without significant traffic impact could be achieved, and therefore this does not demonstrate a sound and viable method of delivery.

The higher south roundabout on Mill Lane would be constructed on the steepest part of Mill Lane, such that substantial cut and fill permanent earthworks would be required and which would need greater land take than would be immediately apparent and drainage. Such a roundabout would be constructed offline (I.e. to the west of the existing Mill Lane) such that the long periods of construction and e.g. utilities diversion and placement would not impact traffic until a point when it was ready to be tied into the road network. That would require the roundabout to be situated further west than is currently shown on the plan. This would be a sound approach, however we

understand from representatives that the developer would wish to build houses in the location of the offline roundabout. This does not demonstrate a sound approach to construction and its impact on local traffic.

Provisions are required to make the construction of these roundabouts OFFLINE such that traffic flow can be maintained.

#### Question 7C Mole Road as construction access route

We understand from statements from the Exhibition staff, that it is expected that Mole Road will be required as construction access route.

We are astonished by this; it is narrow, winding undulating, unlit. We feel it is not a sound consideration as to how large construction vehicles may access the construction areas safely using such a route be without adding to existing impacted traffic, queues and accidents.

These points apply also to the other 2 applications for LCGV because

it is the cumulative impacts which are really important, and therefore the traffic impacts need to be considered combined, not just on their own.

S J Everton  
January 2026