From:
To:

Subject: Objection to the LPR Proposed Main Modifications (MM) Nov 2024 re: Land East of Pincents Lane

Date: 30 January 2025 19:19:02

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

Objection to the LPR Proposed Main Modifications (MM) Nov 2024 re: Land East of Pincents Lane (TIL13) and the Proposed extension of the Tilehurst Settlement Boundary (PMC5, Annex E)

To Whom it may concern

With regards to the above referenced article and the recent proposal to include Pincents Lane (Site TIL13, as referred to in the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (MM) - November 2024)), and to the Proposed Changes to Policies Map as amended 16 Dec 24 re PMC12 where these both propose:

- · The inclusion of the Land East of Pincents Lane as a development site
- · The proposal to extend the Tilehurst Settlement Boundary

I want to raise an objection to its inclusion given that this application has been proposed and subsequently refused on multiple occasions over the last few years, on the following basis:

1. Wildlife and Green space

Pincents Hill / Lane is a beautiful well used local green space . I myself use this area almost daily as do my children. We walk out dog here and vist the area to spot the wildlife, including deer, bats badgers, birds and foxes. Plus many many more.

We as a community should be able to enjoy this green space as we do now and not loose it to a concrete jungle. The site is simply not suitable by any means and will be sorely sorely missed by the local community of all ages. I also cannot believe you would destroy the homes of 100 of species of wildlife who call this site home. My daughter and friends walk this route to and from school daily enjoying the views from the field. My sons enjoy running freely spotting the birds and deers particularly and running with our pet dog. We all would be devastated to loose this spot it and living very close by it would completely change the environment we live in and love so much.

2. Access, Traffic and Congestion

When the council and developers assessed the site access, they originally concluded that access to the proposed residential area would run past IKEA down the lower section of Pincents Lane to the interchange with Sainsbury's and then onto the M4.

Previous objections heavily indicated that any exiting traffic heading south, passing by the IKEA site will create an additional congestion problem to that which already exists. Also, should an exit to the north onto City Road or Little Heath Road now be under consideration, the residents from this new development would add to the already congested traffic going down Langley Hill or even down Sulham Hill towards Pangbourne or Theale to get out to the westbound A4.

I have noticed that the Langley Hill exit route from Tilehurst is already severely congested due to the M4 roadworks, and huge housing development built opposite Sainsbury's and Theale. I have doubt this will ease even when those are completed due to the recent housing additions in the area at Stoneham's Farm and Dorking Way.

Another issue that will arise, should the fully opening up of Pincents Lane be considered, would be that people

from Purley, Pangbourne and other areas in West Reading will use it to get to IKEA and to Sainsbury's, creating an entirely new congestion issue.

Surely given the current awful traffic situation, this is now worse than when previously assessed and should be reassessed in any future decisions.

3. Amenities:

At this time, we know that all local Primary (Springfield, Birch Copse, Calcot) and Secondary (Theale Green, Little Heath and Denefield) Schools are full.

In addition to this all of the local GP surgeries are full and are not accepting new patients, and some have even made their catchment area smaller to try and resolve the problem leaving even less spaces.

How will these new residents be served if there are no spaces for education and medical services anywhere?

A past application said the developers would build a Doctors Surgery, but the NHS confirmed during that process that they wouldn't be able to take it on and to staff it. Add to this that there are now limited pharmacy provisions in and around Theale and Tilehurst, this makes matters worse as people will have to travel, mostly by car, to locations where they can get their medications.

These new residents will effectively have no services available to them, which makes the proposal completely impractical, and would add excessive stress to a system that is unable to cope now, let alone further down the line.

3. Change in Tilehurst Settlement Boundary Proposals (PMC5: Annex E)

This change is a clear attempt to bring the proposed Pincents Lane development into a position where the council can simply justify putting housing there without further consultation.

I have noted that this also includes the Calcot Recreation Ground, therefore have to assume that at some point in the future, even this space could be considered for housing, otherwise why include them in the settlement boundary changes? These areas are heavily used green spaces which we should be able to enjoy instead we are fighting to keep them.

I can see from the TIL13 plans that a recreational space is to be included adjacent to the Pincents Lane site, which is somewhat commendable, but this can be seen as a potential move for building on the existing recreation ground.

This is completely outrageous and is simply ear marking potential new sites for development without formal consultation further down the line.

we cannot continue to destroy habitats for wildlife or remove outdoor spaces where people can go to relax walk their pets or simply get fresh air in a beautiful spot for a while for their mental health.

This site simply cannot be considered for development or we will increase pollution from traffic, ruin the local environment for wildlife, increase the risk of flooding, or simply drive residents to seek mental health services at doctors surgeries that are already full and cannot take them in.

Thank you for your consideration.

Abby Chenery