

PLANNING REF : 260224
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 8 Winnersh Gate
: Wokingham, Please-Select
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 8 Winnersh Gate
: RG415PL
: Wokingham, Please-Select
: RG415PL
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Robert Norrington
DATE SUBMITTED : 03/03/2026

COMMENTS:

I strongly object to this development on the grounds of design, visual impact, traffic, noise and flood risk.

DESIGN & VISUAL IMPACT

The topography clearly depicted in the side elevations show that the southern / western end of the development is a higher elevation than the northern / eastern end, and therefore it would surely make sense (and would reduce the visual impact of the development) to place the 3-storey flats at the lower (northern / eastern edge) of the development, rather than the southern / western end where they will unnecessarily tower over the entire surrounding area. Changing this would reduce the significant visual impact of these higher buildings.

There is a serious design incongruence in that the single/2 bed accommodation 3-storey flats that have been placed in the south-west corner of the Phase 1 development. This places the highest population density, highest number of vehicles, noise and traffic in this area and jars with the neighbouring properties on Watmore Lane and Winnersh Gate. Architects always go on about sympathetic design that does not jar with existing developments, so why has it not been applied here?

It seems illogical to site the larger houses closer to the motorways (eastern side - which will be very noisy), and the smaller (higher density) properties closer to the existing development in Winnersh. This is surely the wrong way around, even from the Developer's point of view.

The Design and Access Statement refers to "an increased density on the southern part of the site". Why? It doesn't make sense to focus the density here based on the above comments.

TRANSPORT / TRAFFIC:

On Transport movements and noise, my objection is that this design makes a provision for road connection with the future Phase 2 planning Ref 260225 / 260379). I object to this very strongly because of the following points:

- When the original Woodward Close development was approved in the 1990's many years ago, there was a planning condition put in place that required the narrow section of Watmore Lane (next to Wheatfield School) to be closed off permanently to traffic. This was to prevent Watmore Lane and Woodward Close, becoming a "rat-run" for traffic wishing to avoid the congestion at the Winnersh crossroads.
- With Wheatfield School, the SEND school and the Care Home having been built since then, the criticality of this planning condition has been reinforced.

- Therefore, the same logic MUST be applied to this new development and MUST prevent traffic entering via Maidensfield and driving through to Woodward Close, and vice versa. The road networks for the 2 phases must be independent, allowing cycling and pedestrian routes, but not vehicles.

- The IMPACT of not doing this will be unsafe chaos. With the numerous schools, the (already large) queues on Danywern Drive and Robinhood Lane at peak times, it will be natural human behaviour for drivers to seek alternative routes through this new development. This will increase traffic, noise and create a huge safety issue for Maidensfield, Watmore Lane, Danywern Drive, Woodward Close and the new development. The Developer's suggestion that "traffic calming" will fix this is just fantastical.

SUBMITTED BY : Mr Robert Norrington

DATE SUBMITTED : 03/03/2026

COMMENTS:

I strongly object to this development on the grounds of design, visual impact, traffic, noise and flood risk.

DESIGN & VISUAL IMPACT

The topography clearly depicted in the side elevations show that the southern / western end of the development is a higher elevation than the northern / eastern end, and therefore it would surely make sense (and would reduce the visual impact of the development) to place the 3-storey flats at the lower (northern / eastern edge) of the development, rather than the southern / western end where they will unnecessarily tower over the entire surrounding area. Changing this would reduce the significant visual impact of these higher buildings.

There is a serious design incongruence in that the single/2 bed accommodation 3-storey flats that have been placed in the south-west corner of the Phase 1 development. This places the highest population density, highest number of vehicles, noise and traffic in this area and jars with the neighbouring properties on Watmore Lane and Winnersh Gate. Architects always go on about sympathetic design that does not jar with existing developments, so why has it not been applied here?

It seems illogical to site the larger houses closer to the motorways (eastern side - which will be very noisy), and the smaller (higher density) properties closer to the existing development in Winnersh. This is surely the wrong way around, even from the Developer's point of view.

The Design and Access Statement refers to "an increased density on the southern part of the site". Why? It doesn't make sense to focus the density here based on the above comments.

TRANSPORT / TRAFFIC:

On Transport movements and noise, my objection is that this design makes a provision for road connection with the future Phase 2 (Planning Ref 260225 / 260379). I object to this very strongly because of the following points:

- When the original Woodward Close development was approved in the 1990's many years ago, there was a planning condition put in place that required the narrow section of Watmore Lane (next to Wheatfield School) to be closed off permanently to traffic. This

was to prevent Watmore Lane and Woodward Close, becoming a "rat-run" for traffic wishing to avoid the congestion at the Winnersh crossroads.

- With Wheatfield School, the SEND school and the Care Home having been built since then, the criticality of this planning condition has been reinforced.
- Therefore, the same logic MUST be applied to this new development and MUST prevent traffic entering via Maidensfield and driving through to Woodward Close, and vice versa. The road networks for the 2 phases must be independent, allowing cycling and pedestrian routes, but not vehicles.
- The IMPACT of not doing this will be unsafe chaos. With the numerous schools, the (already large) queues on Danywern Drive and Robinhood Lane at peak times, it will be natural human behaviour for drivers to seek alternative routes through this new development. This will increase traffic, noise and create a huge safety issue for Maidensfield, Watmore Lane, Danywern Drive, Woodward Close and the new development. The Developer's suggestion that "traffic calming" will fix this is just fantastical.
- The apparent justification in the Transport Report that states that having a secondary access would reduce the need to use Maidensfield and make it easier for residents to travel towards (e.g.) Wokingham via the secondary access, is a circular argument that simply does not make sense. It only serves as an admission that Maidensfield is not suitable for the volume of traffic that will ensue from the entire development - and it gives no consideration to the very real secondary impact on the "rat-run" users. (that will bring even more traffic through Maidensfield that has not been contemplated in the traffic studies.)
- If the roads cannot cope - then don't built the houses. It's that simple.
- The Planning Committee must address this and impose a Planning Condition upon the developer, as a minimum, to amend their plans and put in place total vehicular segregation of Phases 1 and 2. If this doesn't work from a transport assessment point of view, then the Phase 2 Development (260225 / 260379) should be refused in its entirety.

Generally, the traffic impact of this development will gridlock the eastern half of Winnersh at peak times. Any traffic coming from Twyford / Woodley will be stuck in (even longer) queues. The additional traffic from Phase 1 (let alone Phase 2) will only make this worse.

FLOOD RISK:

The proposed development site is currently a natural soakaway/drain for rainwater to flow into the Emmbrook at the eastern edge of the field.

It is not clear how the rainwater is going to drain from the existing properties and gardens to the west (which already flood in heavy rain) with all of this development and concrete in the way. Whilst I am sure the designers have calculated how to ensure the new buildings are suitably drained, they have given no consideration for the need to maintain the existing natural drainage via the field. With the heavy clay soil in the entire area, this is a serious concern.

- The apparent justification in the Transport Report that states that having a secondary access would reduce the need to use Maidensfield and make it easier for residents to travel towards

(e.g.) Wokingham via the secondary access, is a circular argument that simply does not make sense. It only serves as an admission that Maidensfield is not suitable for the volume of traffic that will ensue from the entire development - and it gives no consideration to the very real secondary impact on the "rat-run" users. (that will bring even more traffic through Maidensfield that has not been contemplated in the traffic studies.)

- If the roads cannot cope - then don't build the houses. It's that simple.
- The Planning Committee must address this and impose a Planning Condition upon the developer, as a minimum, to amend their plans and put in place total vehicular segregation of Phases 1 and 2. If this doesn't work from a transport assessment point of view, then the Phase 2 Development (260225 / 260379) should be refused in its entirety.

Generally, the traffic impact of this development will gridlock the eastern half of Winnersh at peak times. Any traffic coming from Twyford / Woodley will be stuck in (even longer) queues. The additional traffic from Phase 1 (let alone Phase 2) will only make this worse.

FLOOD RISK:

The proposed development site is currently a natural soakaway/drain for rainwater to flow into the Emmbrook at the eastern edge of the field.

It is not clear how the rainwater is going to drain from the existing properties and gardens to the west (which already flood in heavy rain) with all of this development and concrete in the way. Whilst I am sure the designers have calculated how to ensure the new buildings are suitably drained, they have given no consideration for the need to maintain the existing natural drainage via the field. With the heavy clay soil in the entire area, this is a serious concern.