**From:** [redacted]
**To:**
**Cc:**
**Subject:** 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)
**Date:** 28 January 2025 13:38:37



Dear Sirs,

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. 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 explorations solidly 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.

Over the last few weeks, I have noted that the Langley Hill exit route from Tilehurst has already become severely congested due to the M4 roadworks, and I doubt it will ease even when those are completed due to the recent housing additions in the area (i.e. Stoneham's Farm, Dorking Way).

Another unintended consequence, 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 and very difficult problem.

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

**2. 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, all of the local Doctors surgeries are full and are not accepting new patients, and some have even shrunk their catchment area to try and resolve the problem themselves.

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 blatant 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?

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.

The systematic elimination of local green spaces has to be halted, we cannot continue to destroy habitats for wildlife or remove outdoor spaces where people can go to relax or simply get away from their troubles for a while for their mental health.

There has to be a line drawn somewhere 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 time and consideration.

Yours sincerely
Graham Muncer

[redacted]