


From: 
To: 
Subject: Pincents Lane objection
Date: 30 January 2025 12:02:11

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)

Good morning Olivia,

Please see below comments against the proposed Pincents Lane inclusion and development.

I want to raise an objection to the inclusion and proposed development on Pincents Hill in Tilehurst. Please see the points below:

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.

As a parent, I find it hard to access amenities for children due to things being fully booked and sold out, often having to travel out of the area to access things or wait on long waiting lists for baby classes or toddler groups. The addition of this development would only make the demands on these services worse.

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

This change is a blatant attempt to bring the proposed Pincent 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 Pincent 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.

Hannah Maulini

