

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Land East of Pincents Lane as a development site and proposal to extend the Tilehurst Settlement Boundary
Date: 28 January 2025 17:56:16
Attachments: [REDACTED]

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. STOP. THINK before you CLICK links or OPEN attachments.

Good evening

Please find attached our objections to the inclusion of Land East of Pincents Lane as a development and the proposal to extend the tilehurst settlement boundary.

Kind regards

Simon and Christine Collard

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Land East of Pincents Lane and Proposal to extend the Tilehurst Settlement Boundary

Please see below our objections regarding this planning application now being considered as part of the Local Development Plan ('LDP').

Firstly this application has been refused several times over many years by WBC for a variety of fundamental, justifiable reasons and yet, apart from a reduction in the number of dwellings, **nothing substantive has changed**, so why is land now being included within this LDP boomeranging back into consideration by WBC yet again?

We have personally been objecting to this development several times over many years, including but not limited to:-

1. Emergency Access as set out in the RBFRS own website clearly states

"Access for emergency vehicles"

It is critical to ensure there's suitable access for emergency services to provide a swift and effective response at all times.

Fire appliances are generally larger than vehicles used by other emergency services. "Poor or inadequate access can result in a delayed response to often life-threatening incidents."

This can have a direct impact on the safety of our residents and the protection of property."

RBFRS quite rightly stated, in one of their objection emails regarding this development, "***It is imperative that operational personnel can access and egress our site with minimal delay and it would appear the proposal to utilise Pincents Lane as the sole vehicle access road to service new properties may compromise this.***"

WBC have previously stated access to the development by emergency vehicles could come from either direction (see (a) and (b) below).

(a) Up from the South past IKEA and just past Pincents Manor into the site, or

(b) Down from the North down from Little Heath Road to an Emergency only locked and gated barrier entering at the current gate of the equestrian field.

A report from the WBC Planning Officer states ***the' Fire service would have access to the whole of Pincents Lane'***

(a) Coming up from the South direction of Pincents Lane

Recently we have re-measured -

A 3m width restriction- kerb to kerb down by IKEA rear goods entrance by Turnham Green business park sign

A 2.8m width restriction - Pincents Manor laurels to the iron fence by the empty leased building opposite. The existing Applicant has already confirmed this empty building is actually leased by them.

WBC Planning stated there would be a 2m pavement on one side of this pinch point, also inferring they could remove the laurels outside of Pincents Manor which is not part of the Land in question as it is part of Pincents Manor Care Home approved application. WBC officers also stated the iron fence outside of the empty office leased building should never have been erected and is a breach of planning so was and still should be a WBC planning enforcement issue.

Removal of the laurels suggested by WBC would result in the grade 2 listed Pincents Manor house being completely open, unprotected and exposed to vandalism, ASB and potentially squatters who could potentially irrevocably destroy the Manor house and its protected contents.

The Applicant stated this pinch point width would be increased to 5.75m comprising 2m footpath and 3.75m road width. This 5.75m width could only be achieved, including a 2m pavement, by removal of the laurels and completely removing the leased office. The Applicants fictitious claim cannot be considered by WBC planning as they don't actually own the leased building!

Having spoken to the leasing agent he confirmed, the Applicant has entered into a five year lease and the actual owner of the office has no intention of demolishing this empty office facility, which would require a separate planning application to demolish it anyhow. On this basis the Applicant proposed access width of 5.75m cannot be achieved this is a fundamental fabrication.

All two-way roads should have a minimum width of 7.3 metres, however from the brickwork of the current Pincents Manor replacement barn the existing road is only 5 metres wide. Also the road is only 4.5 metres wide from the brickwork of the currently un-occupied temporary building to Pincents Manor boundary. So how are the applicants going to comply with the minimum 7.3 metres road width requirement and then install a 2m pavement!

What is also concerning is the serious safety issue rendering, not only the Emergency services access and egress as non-compliant in accordance with the 2010 Building Regulations, but it actually creates a serious risk to the current many users of the Pincents Lane.

Considering all types of current users general walkers i.e. school children, elderly, young mothers with buggies and it also being used extensively for cyclists, runners and horse riders Pincents Lane is so narrow in places, in the case of any emergency there is absolutely no place for these users to safely move aside.

Has anybody from WBC or the Applicant actually performed a 'footfall' usage review of how many different types of users, on a daily basis, actually use Pincents Lane which could be compromised by any emergency incident particularly from the North direction heading towards this proposed development?

A 3.75m road width would create a significant safety hazard to any pedestrians using the 2m footpath, not only when Fire Appliances need to use the south route, but when very large HGV's are delivering material to site during construction phases.

(b) Coming down from the North direction of Pincents Lane

Next to the 'Hounds and Bounds' compound there is a large TPO tree with significant tree limbs stretching across the entire width of the lane which are less than 4mtrs high from the road surface which is lower than the minimum High Reach Fire Appliance 4m Clearance Height required.

30m down from the 'Hounds and Bounds' compound the width from a tree opposite to a solid earth bank outside of a private property dwelling measures a maximum width of barely 3.1m.

Due consideration needs to be taken to the fact this stretch of Pincents Lane is particularly winding and has a number of sharp bends.

The Building Regulation requirement B5 (2000) concerns 'Access and Facilities for the Fire Service'.

Section 17, 'Vehicle Access', includes the following advice on access from the highway:

(i)The total width available for the passage of appliances, i.e., combined width of road and pavement, **must not be less than 3.1m with a straight approach.**

Travelling North down Pincents Lane is certainly nowhere near a **straight approach** and therefore a Pump or High Reach appliance would have significant difficulty, in an emergency, traversing this stretch of Pincents Lane from the North!

(ii)Fire Service Vehicle Access Route Specification for Pump Appliance **Minimum width of road between kerbs: 3.7m.**

Travelling South up Pincents lane **there is only a 3m width restriction- kerb to kerb** by IKEA rear HGV goods entrance by Turnham Green business park sign and the claim of the 5.75m is farcical.

Regulation B5 of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended) imposes a legal requirement to provide reasonable provision to enable fire appliances to gain access to the building. Approved Document B, Table 21 give minimum dimensions and key parameters for access roads.

What are the Minimum Requirements for Fire Service Access?

The minimum requirements as detailed in Approved Document B are as follows:

Pump Appliance

- Minimum width of road between kerbs – 3.7m
- Minimum width of gateways – 3.1m
- Minimum turning circle between kerbs – 16.8m
- Minimum turning circle between walls – 19.2m
- Minimum clearance height – 3.7m

High Reach Appliance

- Minimum width of road between kerbs – 3.7m
- Minimum width of gateways – 3.1m
- Minimum turning circle between kerbs – 26.0m
- Minimum turning circle between walls – 29.0m
- Minimum clearance height – 4.0m

2. Traffic congestion

Previous entire traffic survey data presented to date fails to take into consideration the close proximity (within 1.5 miles radius) new housing developments. Namely Dorking Way and Bourne Close comprising 225 homes, 425 developments in Theale under construction, together with over 100 units in the 2 approved care homes at Pincents Manor and Dorking Way yet to start construction. All of these developments together have started to, and will continue to result in significant increase in traffic flow in and around the A4 junction by Sainsbury's, even before considering inclusion of an un-warranted development on the Land East of Pincents Lane.

Calcot and Tilehurst residents all know, from 'real-life' painful experiences, the many times the A4 junction by Sainsbury's/Pincents Lane and surrounding roads cannot cope with the extra traffic these developments are already creating and could create should any more developments in this area be approved. Incidents on the M4 near junction 12 gridlock the surrounding roads for significant amounts of time regularly already without completion of the ongoing developments and potential new ones!

3. Already approved developments within a 1.5 mile radius

As stated in point 2 above, the local surrounding residents have been/will be subject to, within the last 4 years, approved dwellings totalling 750 units and there has been an abject failure to by WBC to adequately access the impact these new local developments have and, in future will have on traffic infrastructure, medical facilities, and oversubscribed school place availability.

Whilst it is recognised developers provide CIL funds to WBC who in turn flow some of this CIL to the affected Parish Council – evidence reflects, in the case of the Bellway Dorking Way/Bourne Close developments the neighbourhood directly affected and burdened for years during the actual development, sees these CIL funds being spent of areas of the parish not affected or burdened by the new Estates.

4. TPO tree Pruning Approval 23/01519/TPW on the Pincents Lane land

Limited tree pruning was approved by WBC in 2023 on the proposed land. This limited activity was blatantly disregarded and resulted in total ground clearance being performed reducing an area of land to bare soil, not minor tree pruning and yet WBC did nothing to address or admonish the culprits regarding the well-publicised carnage left behind – why?

It is an established fact that removal of trees has a negative affect on flooding issues and the only way flood water will go should this development proceed will be downhill affecting well established businesses and potential properties. The current applications have all required surplus water to be pumped uphill as it is!

Extension of Settlement Boundary

It appears rather curious, and suspicious, the Settlement Boundary proposal to extend this Boundary is aimed solely at including this development. This begs the question why are certain WBC individuals, who have been involved for many years previously and refused, some under duress, the previous applications, now seeing this as a 'golden egg' to change the settlement boundary to have this development included?

It is on the facts above, together with the other matters we have previously raised, as set out on the WBC Planning website, which we find this application flawed, with fiction and conjecture. The access requirements create a fundamental safety issue for current Pincents Lane users, potential new residents of the development, the welfare of the RBFRS/Emergency personnel and potential damage to their appliances.

Any further development will crystallise local residents view this particular area, taking due consideration to the approved housing developments, already completed, to be completed and awaiting commencement totalling circa 650 dwellings and 100 care units within the 1.5mile radius as a WBC dumping ground.

What irrevocable commitment, from any developer, will be the percentage/number of affordable dwellings out of this 138 and what will be the minimum of affordable homes WBC will acquiesce to when the developer claim they can't afford to build the original commitment?

It is common knowledge there are far more appropriate sites within West Berkshire that could make up the new Government requirements but appear to be being protected from development from certain WBC councillors for some reason.

We, along with thousands of WBC residents, who have previously objected to this development on this site, should this LDP somehow be approved, who will be forensically questioning – what **'benefits'**, given to whom, **'outweigh'** the residents' concerns in order for WBC to approve this LDP.

The facts underpinning the objections significantly outweigh any WBC ticking the box exercise on making the revised housing numbers, any sales bluster, fictional fabricated claims of the Applicant and their Agent Marketplace who are represented by a Reading Borough Councillor!

We urge WBC to firmly reject this unwarranted LDP and prevent turning this green area of outstanding natural beauty into another imposition of virtually non-affordable estate in an already over-developed saturated area.

Kind regards

Simon and Christine Collard