

PLANNING REF : 252498
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Leander House
: Reading Road, Arborfield
: RG2 9HP
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Ruth Anderson
DATE SUBMITTED : 16/01/2026

COMMENTS:

I object strongly to the proposed development of Lodden Valley Garden Village for 2800 houses and associated amenities (application number 252498) and my comments here are in addition to my comments lodged against application number 252769. Comments are limited as the plans lack sufficient detail and specifics.

As there are existing planning applications, where either planning has been granted and are yet to be built or are waiting a decision for well over 2000 homes in the immediate vicinity of this proposed development. I presume in all the impact assessments the effect of these homes and the inhabitants has been taken into consideration in the feasibility surveys undertaken for this development ?

My reasons for objecting against development of this site are:-

1. WATER/SEWAGE Arborfield Sewage Treatment Works is in urgent need of upgrading as is currently failing and at capacity. This situation is acknowledged by Thames Water but given their dire financial situation is a solution to this problem coming anytime soon? During periods of heavy rainfall road tankers are required to take away the excess sewage causing noise and light disruption to local residents. Discharges of raw sewage into the local waterways are frequent and pose a great risk to health and the environment.

Water supply is also under great pressure in the area. Thames Water are currently undertaking mains water pipe replacement in the area but whether these upgrades are sufficient to supply a development of this size is questionable. We were without water for two days last week and this is quite a frequent occurrence (so much so that we keep emergency water at all times at home). Guarantees of supply from Thames Water should be gained in full before planning is even considered.

2. ACCESS One of the major entrances for the development is onto Observer Way. Given the general direction of travel that most vehicles currently take I'd expect a huge increase in traffic along Reading Road towards Arborfield Cross (ie turning left out of the development) which goes against the traffic calming measure that have been introduced in an attempt to reduce through traffic in the village centre.

3. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT This is a semi rural area. Whilst there is a regular bus service to the West and North of the site the majority of movement to and from this development will be by car. The road network in this area is at capacity already. I believe the improvements proposed by the developers are not sufficient to take the volume of

traffic that will come from a development of this size.

4. SANG The developers are making a big focus point about the SANG incorporation in these plans and the extensive area that it will be. What they are failing to mention is that for a fair proportion of the year most of the land earmarked is completely inaccessible due to flooding (A similar situation exists at Langley Mead across the road!). With development of the other surrounding areas, even with special measures to harness rainfall, concreting over such a large area is only going to exacerbate flooding in this area and most likely surrounds too.

5. BIODIVERSITY I am puzzled how promises can be made to cause a net gain in biodiversity with development of this scale. This area is home to a huge number of wild animals whose natural habitats and freedom to roam will be completely destroyed. I would also question the reliability of some of the site surveys undertaken seeing as during the time they were done, extensive hedge cutting was undertaken disturbing/destroying the traps which would have lead to inaccurate results.

6. ESSENTIAL SERVICES Medical providers in this area are at capacity. There is no medical provision in Arborfield at all (despite what is written). No new development should be allowed until provision is secured and a promise of a timeline for development of the facilities is committed to. Supermarkets and other facilities should be built at the start along with the first homes .not an afterthought like they have been in Arborfield Green.

7. LOSS OF AGRICULTURAL LAND This is valuable agricultural land still farmed daily. We should not be allowing development of this scale without exhausting all possibilities of local brownfield sites .

8. FLOOD RISK As an owner of a property which is situated on the border of this site which has never historically flooded I can only hope that the experts projections are true and accurate.

9. HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE The ruins of the old St. Bartholomew's should be respected and the serenity of the site preserved.

Much has been made about keeping this site accessible to all. The point that seems to be missed is that Hall Farm is currently accessible to all and is used by hundreds of people on a daily basis for recreational use. The beauty of this site should not be destroyed for future generations. I urge the planners to make the right decision, not the easy one, and reject this application.