

PLANNING REF : 203544  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : c/o Shute End  
: Wokingham, Berks  
: RG40 1BN  
SUBMITTED BY : Cllr Maria Gee  
DATE SUBMITTED : 13/07/2021

COMMENTS:

As before, I welcome the provision of affordable housing in the development, however the proposal does not address many of the previous reasons for refusal of PA182882 and the existing problems with PA203544, particularly settlement separation (contrary to CP21), insufficient SANG onsite and therefore lack of mitigation for the Thames Basin Special Protection Area for the increase in population (contrary to CP8 and CP21). There are also proposals contrary to CP1, CP6, and CP7. For these reasons, I object strongly to the proposal. I have not been contacted as ward councillor as part of the process of community involvement. As far as I am aware no part of the community has been contacted for their views on this development.

The proposal is not sustainable from a transport perspective (contrary to CP1, CP6). The walking distance to the railway station is more than 2 miles, not 1.5 miles as stated in the DAS. The cycle route along London Road does not reach as far as the access point to the development. The bus routes are, however, satisfactory. However, overall, this development will increase motor vehicle traffic onto an already busy London Road; this will not help the council's declarations in relation to the climate emergency.

The development is outside the areas defined in the WBC core development plan. It is also isolated from all other development and has only one entrance/exit. Access to local facilities such as the school and local shops would therefore mean using London Road or, for pedestrians, using the adjacent SANG (which is not designed for this purpose). The access to the SWDR would therefore be along an already crowded London Road and, when returning to the development from the SWDR, would involve two right turns. There is no provision for cycling infrastructure.

There is access to the London Road only. The speed limit on this stretch of road is 40mph, is not safe for many cars exiting in the rush hour, and not at all suitable for cyclists exiting on to a road with no segregated cycle path. There is no safe access for a right turn onto London Road, unless a new set of traffic lights is installed, adding to the several sets that already exist in that location and adding to stationary, idling traffic, increasing pollution. This is contrary to CP1 and CP3, no safe access.

The distances to local amenities in the DAS appear to be as the crow flies, rather than walking, as far as I can establish, given no suitable current access across the existing SANG. The distance to Montague Floreat from the front of the estate is 1.0km according to google maps, not 500m; the distance to Jennetts Park School is 2.6km, not 1.4km, by the quickest existing routes (google maps). Similarly, Merrydale Nursery, by a safe walking route appears to be 1.1km, not 500m. Tesco on Finchampstead Road can be reached via a number of routes, the shortest one being 3.3km, not 2.6km (or, depending on which page you read, 3.1km) as stated. Burma Hills surgery is at least 2.2km away, not 1.6km. The development will add to the pressure on local medical facilities, already oversubscribed. Access to the closest GP practice is more than 1.5 miles walking or driving. It is unlikely that those who are unwell or infirm will walk that far so this adds more pressure onto the roads. I would like these differences in stated distances investigated independently.

The proposal will have adverse effects on local ecology (contrary to CP7). Many trees with TPOs are being removed. These are mature trees and replacing

them with immature trees will not help our commitment to a climate emergency. Removal of the trees also adversely affects visual amenity. There are bats, slow worms and great crested newts on site, all are protected species. I am baffled by the conclusions that, since there are no roosting bats in the buildings on site, that no further surveys are necessary; common and soprano pipistrelle, noctule, and Leislers bat, all found in the earlier Ethos report, roost in trees.

Proposing that using the Montague Park SANG as part mitigation for building on green space is not acceptable and contrary to CP8 and CP21, because there are already housing allocations against the existing SANG. Cutting down trees and hedgerows to gain access to the existing SANG is simply ridiculous (arboricultural assessment). I cannot find 4.93 (referred to in 2.25 of the LVIA, which is supposed to demonstrate mitigation). The offsite SANG will not mitigate the effect on the The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) as a result of adding new residents in this development.

The application states that the development does not maintain the separation between Wokingham and BracknellBinfield. In fact, the area is a green barrier between the two towns and the development erodes the green space between the communities of BracknellBinfield and Wokingham and is contrary to CP21.

Maria Gee Wescott Borough Councillor