

PLANNING REF : 260577
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Nine Mike Ride
: Wokingham, Berks
: RG40 3NL
SUBMITTED BY : Mr M Pope
DATE SUBMITTED : 28/04/2026

COMMENTS:

Objection to Planning Application 260577

I'm writing to object to this retrospective application for two Gypsy and Traveller pitches. Having reviewed the details, I don't believe this is a suitable or acceptable location for this type of development, and it conflicts with both local and national planning policies.

1. Conflict with planning policy The site is outside any defined settlement boundary and is classed as countryside in both the current and emerging local plans. It hasn't been identified as a suitable

location for development in the Wokingham Local Plan or the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

Planning decisions should follow the development plan unless there's a strong reason not to. In this case, there doesn't appear to be any justification for making an exception.

2. Unsustainable location The site is in a remote area with very limited access to everyday services. Shops, schools, healthcare, and other facilities are not within a reasonable walking distance, and public transport options are minimal.

This means future residents would be heavily reliant on private vehicles, which goes against the aim of placing development in sustainable locations.

3. Unsafe access and road conditions The access to the site is not suitable and raises serious safety concerns. Range Road is a narrow, single-track rural road with no pavements or proper passing places. It isn't designed for regular residential use, particularly with caravans or larger vehicles.

The junction with Nine Mile Ride (B3430) is especially dangerous, with poor visibility and fast-moving traffic. There have been accidents here in the past, and traffic levels have increased. The alternative access via Sandhurst Road is also constrained. Overall, the proposal would create an unacceptable risk to highway safety.

4. Lack of basic infrastructure There's no clear information showing how the site will be properly served by water, electricity, or sewerage. There's also no adequate drainage plan. The area already experiences surface water issues, and additional hardstanding is likely to make this worse.

These are fundamental concerns that call into question whether the site is suitable for residential use at all.

5. Lack of ecological information The application doesn't include enough ecological detail. There are no proper surveys, no clear baseline assessment, and no explanation of how biodiversity requirements would be met.

The surrounding area, including woodland, is likely to support a range of species. Increased activity and lighting could disturb wildlife, especially at night. Without proper information, the impact cannot be properly assessed.

6. Impact on trees There are protected trees on and around the site

that make an important contribution to the character of the area. There are concerns that works already carried out may have damaged them, and future works (such as installing services) could affect their roots.

These impacts have not been properly addressed.

7. Harm to the countryside and local character This site forms part of an important green gap with a strong rural character, including woodland and historic routes like Range Road. Introducing hardstanding, residential use, traffic, and lighting would urbanise the site and harm the character of the area.

This conflicts with policies aimed at protecting the countryside and ensuring development respects its surroundings.

8. Retrospective nature of the development This application seeks to approve and increase development that has already taken place without permission at considerable detriment to the surrounding countryside and its residents.

Approving it risks encouraging similar unauthorised development. 9.

Risk of further development If approved, this could create pressure for more similar developments along Range Road and in other rural locations. Gradual, piecemeal development like this can erode the countryside over time.

10. Overall balance There is a recognised need to provide sites for Gypsy and Traveller communities. However, that need does not override the requirement for development to be safe, suitable, and sustainable.

In this case, the harms particularly around policy conflict, safety, and environmental impact clearly outweigh any potential benefits.

Conclusion For all these reasons, this is the wrong development in the wrong place. It would cause harm to the area and does not meet key planning requirements.

I respectfully ask that the application is refused.