

PLANNING REF : 253071

PROPERTY ADDRESS:

22 Canberra Lake Way

Charvil

RG10 9DH

SUBMITTED BY : Ms Sarah Beere

Objection to Reserved Matters Application 253071

I'm writing to object to this Reserved Matters application as currently submitted, and make some suggestions that - if implemented - would allow me to support a future iteration of the plan.

I do not object to the development of 75 properties on this site in principle, but I cannot support this Reserved Matters proposal as it stands. The plans represent a significant departure from the sustainable vision previously presented in the outline plan, and fail to comply with Wokingham Borough Council ('WBC') and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2026 requirements, and do not align with existing residential developments on the boundary of my road - Canberra Lake Way ('CLW').

I'm focusing my objections strictly on matters that directly impact 22CLW, CLW as a whole, and Park Lane. Consequently, I have opted to refrain from commenting on broader community concerns or general planning grievances that fall outside these specific parameters. However, I strongly urge Bellway Homes to consult directly with all key stakeholders before any further plans are submitted, so that this major development in the village of Charvil enhances the community.

Canberra Lake Way: A Case Study in Design Excellence

CLW exemplifies what a new development can contribute to a village through thoughtful planning, high-quality design, adequate parking to meet residents' and visitors' needs, and the inclusion of a central green with associated landscaping - which together foster a safe, community-centric environment. It serves as a benchmark for high-quality planning in the WBC area.

The current proposal lacks any sensitivity to the context of the existing residential design, and fails to respect the very standards WBC should be using as a case study for excellence.

Breach of Landscape Buffer (Policy CP3, CC03 & Prior Approval)

The removal of the 10m landscape buffer between CLW and the new development is a critical failure to safeguard our privacy and amenity. The buffer is shown with the extent of the red line in the only landscaping plan for the CLW development.

Without this buffer, 22CLW will be overlooked by multiple housing units, listed as plots 26 - 28 and 36, which will be excessively intrusive and overbearing, leading to a breach of privacy for children who use the back garden. Before any new application can be considered, the original requirement for a 10m deep green landscape buffer surrounding 22CLW and neighbouring properties must be enforced and subsequently upheld by Bellway Homes. This removal violates WBC Policy CP3 (which ensures developments do not harm the amenity of adjoining land) and MDD Policy CC03, and fails the NPPF 2026 mandate for "nature-inclusive" development.



The reinstatement of the CLW vegetative buffer is a critical component for achieving the 10% BNG on-site, which the proposal currently fails to achieve and is imperative given the greenfield nature of the site.

The Flank Boundary and Overbearing Impact on 22CLW (Policy CP3)

The removal of the landscape buffer and subsequent Bellway plan results in an unobscured "flank boundary" between 22CLW and a proposed Bellway property (plot 36), creating significant negative planning features. The depth of gardens in CLW are limited to the minimum WBC design guidelines, and without the buffer, the new building will have an unmitigated overbearing impact on our property. This violates WBC Policy CP3 and the Borough Design Guide, which protect against "dominance" and "tunnelling" effects. This situation creates an overshadowing of our private living space and garden, increases noise pollution and light-spill into private living space. Instead of a green transition, we are faced with a stark, hard-border "wall" of development that fails to respect the established building lines and soft landscaping of CLW.

While the proposed house type may be acceptable, its current siting and massing in such close proximity to the boundary is strongly objected to. To mitigate this impact, we request that the dwelling be reorientated to give a 'garden to garden' boundary and set back behind the landscape buffer to ensure compliance with local policies.

Density, Character, and Privacy (Policy CP5, CP6 and 2026 Climate Emergency)

The abrupt transition from the low-density homes of CLW to high-density terraced units is detrimental to existing residents and inconsistent with other housing estates in Charvil.

The proposal's density is inconsistent with the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan (Draft) and contradicts WBC Policy CP6 and 2026 Climate Emergency goals by forcing car dependency due to infrequent public transport.

Furthermore, the current clustering of social housing, most notably on the CLW boundary, violates WBC's "tenure-blind" policy, with a high proportion in one block. Units must be redistributed evenly throughout the development to ensure social inclusion as per Policy CP5.

Site Layout and Efficient Use of Land

While the need for 75 residential properties, to meet WBC housing targets is acknowledged, I object to the current urbanised site layout adjacent to existing low-density homes. Sufficient land exists to accommodate the density while fully adhering to the 10m buffer requirement and protecting the amenity of neighbouring properties, specifically those in CLW and The Hawthorns. The current proposal unnecessarily concentrates high-density development against established residential borders. Reorienting these elements toward the commercial interfaces (Homestead industrial estate and Sonning Golf Course) would provide a sensitive transition in scale and density relative to existing communities. In the current plan **CLW is the only border on the site without a landscaped or vegetative buffer**. This can easily be resolved. Residential borders should be managed sensitively and Bellway should be encouraged to provide a site-specific solution rather than a 'cookie cutter' approach.

Traffic, Road Safety, and Inadequate Parking (Policy CP6 and CC07)

As a parent who navigates Park Lane daily with young children, I have firsthand experience of the severe limitations of the current infrastructure, which serves as a primary arterial route for accessing essential village facilities.

Safety and Accessibility Concerns

The suitability of Park Lane for increased residential density is fundamentally compromised by several factors:

- **Pedestrian Safety and Pavement Width:** The existing footway is substandard in width, forcing pedestrians into the road, creating an unacceptable collision risk.
- **Environmental Hazards:** Poor drainage causes pedestrians to be soaked by passing vehicles, and low sun elevation in winter impairs visibility.
- **Lack of Alternative Infrastructure:** There is no pavement on the opposite side of the road.

The current infrastructure is already at a breaking point and cannot safely accommodate additional traffic. I urgently request an "infrastructure-first" approach, withholding approval until a comprehensive mitigation strategy is secured to widen footways, improve crossings, and address drainage issues.

The construction of 75 residential properties would result in a substantial uplift in vehicular activity via a single access point onto an already constrained road, presenting a clear and foreseeable risk to road safety and existing on-street parking conditions. The development is predominantly composed of larger family homes, with high car ownership levels, an issue insufficiently addressed in the transport information.

Traffic and Transport Strategy

- The transport strategy fails to address the cumulative impact of funnelling all traffic through Park Lane with a single access point. Assertions that the site is "sustainably located" are generic and unsupported by binding, funded measures.

Road Safety

- The removal of the pedestrian crossing is a retrograde step that directly contradicts WBC's Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which prioritizes "Vision Zero" to eliminate road deaths and serious injuries.

Parking

- Although 223 spaces are identified, I believe this figure materially overstates the usable supply because garages are counted as parking spaces despite evidence that they are used for storage. Out of the 25 properties with multi car ownership in CLW, only 2 -3 vehicles (out of +40 vehicles) are stored in their garage. There are 13 visitor bays for parking on CLW for 25 residential households - which means that 17 visitor bays for the new development of 75 houses is wholly inadequate. Displacement parking onto Park Lane and surrounding residential streets, namely CLW and the Hawthorns will be a risk to pedestrians and abuse of private visitor bays on CLW. This outcome would conflict with WBC MDD Policy CC07, which requires parking provision to function effectively.

Summary

In order to be able to support a future iteration of the plan, I ask for:

- The originally proposed 10m CLW landscape buffer to be created as a pre-commencement condition, with discussions to be held on how it is maintained.
- A reorientation of the property on the boundary of 22CLW so that it offers a 'garden to garden' boundary - or set back the proposed property on the boundary of 22CLW to reduce the overbearing impact.
- Redistribute high-density housing to the two commercial boundaries of the site.
- Review the clustering of social housing to reflect a 'pepper pot' approach (in conjunction with the redistribution of high density housing) to limit social housing to cluster of 2 - 3 residential properties.
- Site visits by WBC to be completed during school drop off and pick up to understand the hazardous nature of the current Park Lane layout.

- The review and implementation of traffic calming measures for Park Lane, including a safe pedestrian crossing, before any residential development commences.
- A robust Construction Traffic Management Plan to prohibit construction traffic during school drop off and pick up times.
- A reassessment of parking provision including visitor bay allocation, so that garages are only treated as usable parking spaces where evidence supports it.

Collaborative Solutions and Conclusion

I wish to stress that simple, common-sense solutions exist to address the concerns raised. I would welcome the opportunity to invite WBC and Bellway Homes to work proactively with residents to refine the layout ensuring that the planning process can be approved and progressed as quickly as possible.