

GROUNDNS FOR OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 260577, Field South of Valois, Range Road RG40 3NR

This planning application is riddled with inaccuracies, mistakes, opaque references and a quantity of documents of questionable relevance. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I would suggest that this in itself is grounds for refusing the application, however, should Wokingham Borough Council disagree, please consider the following.

The Application – not objectively ‘retrospective’

The Application is time stamped as 18:15 on 6th March 2026. The works referred to began at 17:30 that same evening. At 18:15 the applicant was still in the process of widening Range Road (the “Lane”) with a digger, felling trees and pouring hardcore onto the Lane; **he had not yet accessed the Site**. At some point during the night of 6th March a small touring caravan arrived. It was not inhabited and not used as a dwelling as the works continued through the night. The caravans now in situ arrived over the course of the following days. The works referred to in the Application were therefore not retrospective at the time the Application was made. See attached image (figure 1)



Figure 1: This was taken at 10.56 am on 7th March 2026. There was not yet a static caravan and the works were still ongoing – the development was not complete.

The attempt to put in the Application as 'retrospective' is cynical and shows contempt for planning laws. It is a deliberate attempt to avoid the requirements of planning such as biodiversity net gain as set out in the Town and Country Planning Act. As such, it should be refused.

Applicant Details: No first name has been submitted. Therefore, the details of the application are incomplete. Also, it is not possible to verify whether it is the landowner who is residing on the Site and whether they have another residence elsewhere.

Address: This is given as 'Caravan Site'. This only officially becomes a caravan site if the application is granted, before that, the address should read 'Field'. My understanding is that they have no Caravan Site Licence and it is therefore not a 'caravan site'.

Description of the Proposal:

- This makes no mention of the separate toilet and shower block which has been built.
- This states incorrectly that the work and change of use have been completed.
- There is one static and one touring caravan on site, not two, as per the Application.
- In terms of inconsistency, the applicant's Arboricultural Impact Statement refers to "a Gypsy/Traveller pitch". Which is it – one or two and why is this not clear?
- Additionally, very little had been completed at the time the Application was submitted.
- There is no lawful connection to services.

Existing Use: This states 'Gypsy/traveller site'. This is the use *post* the unlawful development. **The use of the site before 6th March 2026 and at the time of the Application was pasture.**

Materials: External materials were used in fencing the Site.

Pedestrian and Vehicle Access, Roads and Rights of Way:

- The only access to the Site before 6th March 2026 was through Valois Farm, the owners of which for decades had a grazing agreement for the field on which the Site is situated. Access was made and hard standing poured that night. Trees falling under TPOs were damaged and removed in order to form an access to the Site.
- There was no pedestrian access from the Site to the Lane prior to the 6th March 2026, other than through Valois.

Vehicle Parking: This is incorrect. There was no parking on the Site prior to the 6th March 2026, but there is now parking for many cars with there generally being at least one car and two or three vans parked there at any one time.

The Site plan referenced in the Arboricultural Impact Statement also shows a parking area. The Application is inconsistent.

Trees and Hedges: There are in fact trees and hedges on the Site. They are at the edges and are according to the DEFRA Magic Map, classed as Priority Habitat of Deciduous Woodland.

Assessment of Flood Risk:

- The proposal will increase flood risk elsewhere, contrary to the statement in the Application. A large proportion of the land is now covered by hardcore/building rubble, meaning that the land has less ability to absorb rainwater. This will therefore run off into the Lane which has no drainage, with water running down to the bottom where it floods into the Sandhurst Road. This problem will now be exacerbated. See image attached (figure 2)
- This flooding causes danger to road users of the Sandhurst Road.
- The Application says that surface water will be disposed of by a sustainable drainage system. There is no detail of this in the accompanying documents, nor is it yet in place. There is no proper soakaway. **The development is not complete and poses a flood risk to the Lane and to the Sandhurst Road.**

Commented [kc1]: Highlight the danger to vehicles of the additional flooding?



Figure 2: the Lane after a short rain shower on 14th April.

- **There is an unregulated cesspit, which in itself is a risk to environmental health, particularly given the high water table in the area.**

Biodiversity and Geological Conservation:

- The Site is within the 5km Thames Basin Heath SPA Mitigation Zone. This is not acknowledged in the Application.
- Silverstock Bog, a designated Local Wildlife Site is located at the bottom of the Lane in close proximity of the Site. It is also where some surface water flows to (the rest pouring onto the main road).
- The areas edging the Site, including areas wilfully damaged by the applicant, are classified Priority Habitat of Deciduous Woodland in the DEFRA Magic Map.
- The Site prior to development formed part of a truly dark woodland environment, home to many nocturnal animals including **deer, owls, bats and moths**. The Site is floodlit all night, every night (see attached image Figure 3). While any residential development would be detrimental to the animal inhabitants in the area, the applicant has shown themselves to be unconcerned with the effect on the biodiversity of the whole area to a staggering degree. Lost deer have been found on the Nine Mile Ride as a direct consequence of the development of the Site. Bats and moths are known to be adversely affected by nighttime illumination. However, should the Site be vacated by its human inhabitants, it could regenerate and biodiversity and habitat be restored.



Figure 3: the Site at night.

Biodiversity net gain:

- The Application states that the Biodiversity Gain Condition does not apply because this is a retrospective planning application.

- **This is not however a retrospective planning application: the application was submitted before the works on the site were commenced and before caravans were onsite.** See above.
- The attempted timing of the application is a deliberate and cynical attempt to avoid planning laws.
- As this application is not retrospective, Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) does in fact apply and Biodiversity net gain has not been met.
- Additionally, there is reference to “BNG metric” but no legislation is referenced and this therefore should be inadmissible as it is impossible to know what they mean.

Foul Sewage:

- Why is it unknown how foul sewage will be disposed of? Why is this not in the plan?
- Why is it unknown how the applicant will connect to the existing drainage system?
- There is no foul water drainage to the Site; the Lane is not connected to the mains drainage system. There is a high water table in the area which means foul water will either quickly be absorbed into ground water or run off the hard standing into the Lane and down into Silverstock Bog. Silverstock Bog is an important area for wildlife.
- The applicant has dug an unregulated cess pit. This is already endangering the ground water.
- **The cess pit is in the vicinity of the water pipe (belonging to a neighbour) from which the applicant has abstracted fresh water.** Due to this abstraction, the integrity of the pipe has been lost, endangering the supply and safety of the water for other households.
- **This creates environmental problems.**

Waste Storage and Collection: Why has this not been planned for? What are they currently doing with their waste? No bins have been put out for collection since the applicant’s arrival.

Residential /Dwelling Units: The applicant has stated that the proposal includes a gain in residential units. Here it seems that **the applicant is not treating the Application as retrospective;** there were no caravans before the development or before the Application.

Residential/Dwelling Units – Existing: Here however the applicant says that units are existing: the units are only existing in breach of planning law. **There were no buildings on the Site before 7th March 2026.**

Totals: The Totals for both proposed and existing residential units is stated as 2. These are the same units; there was nothing there before 7th March 2026.

Additionally, there is only one pitch on the Site; one static caravan and one touring caravan.

All Types of Development: Non-Residential Floorspace: This states that the proposal does not involve the loss, gain or change of use of non-residential floorspace. This is incorrect:

- A large area of hard standing tarmac was laid on 6th March 2026 on what had previously been pasture;
- A toilet and shower block have been erected and is not included in the Application;
- There were no buildings/dwellings on the Site prior to the development on 7th March 2026; and
- The previous use had been pasture. The erection of hard standing, dwellings, shower/toilet block is a change of use.

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 4. Liability for CIL – This has been answered as ‘No’ but this is incorrect; there were no dwellings on the Site before 7th March 2026. The CIL is dated 5th March and predates the Application.
- The Application does therefore include the creation of new dwellings.
- Sections 6 of the CIL should therefore have been completed.

Trees Arboricultural Impact Statement

This is written by the agent, whose credentials are not cited. One assumes that he is not in fact an arboreal expert.

- Trees were removed, contrary to the statement. Many were removed or damaged in the Lane in gaining access to the Site. These were priority habitat according to the DEFRA magic map.
- The statement claims that Tab 1 shows there were no trees; it only shows no trees in the centre. There were trees at the edges, which were removed to form an entrance and to enable fencing.
- The statement claims that “the possibility of compaction of the soil around the Oak Trees [subject to TPOs] due to vehicular movement is minimal. The main area of roots of the trees are unaffected by the development”.
- **The agent is not a tree expert; where is the expert opinion? My understanding is that tree roots cover the entire area under canopy and would those be impacted. This document is worthless.**

Screening Assessment Form (Version 10.3)

Site Description:

- This states that the Site was previously developed and was a garden.
- This is untrue.
- **This field was formerly pasture** and undeveloped with the inhabitants since the 1980s having been, Velvet the pony, Brownie the horse, Erik her foal and Stanley the donkey, followed by Christmas the donkey and the two white ponies. Please see images attached – Figures 4,5 and 6.



Figure 4: photograph taken in the 1980s.



Figure 5: Ponies on the field in 2025



Figure 6. Photograph taken in approximately 2018

Site History, Land and Building Use:

- This states that the proposed land use is Domestic and Agricultural. There is no other mention of proposed agricultural land use elsewhere. What agriculture is proposed?
- It further states that the past land use was Domestic. This is untrue – it has always been pasture or woodland.
- Use of existing buildings onsite: There were none before this unlawful settlement of caravans.
- “Have any fuels/chemicals been stored onsite”: This has been answered as No but the caravan has a gas cylinder attached.
- Details of groundwater or surface water abstractions: water is being unlawfully abstracted from a water pipe crossing the Site.

Waste Disposal Activities:

- This states there is evidence of demolition activity on the Site and that “there was evidence of previous development on the land. The land is heavily disturbed”.
- This is untrue
- **There was no disturbance or development of the land prior to the applicant’s unlawful development of it.** Please see Figure 4 above.

Design and Access Statement

- (4) - This states that the site has historically been a garden. This is untrue as shown above and by figures 4,5 and 6; it was pasture and historically there was a grazing agreement on it between the previous owner and the owner of Valois Farm.
- (6) – states that the Proposal is compliant with the Wokingham Local Plan; it is not.
- (9) – this is incorrect. The site is in the SPA, a priority woodland habitat by the DEFRA Magic Map and in the amber zone on the Nature Space map. Additionally, the Lane is a key green gap (Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan) between the historic rides of Sandhurst Road and Nine Mile Ride.
- (10 &11) – the site will be detrimental to the character of the area.
- (13) – Irrelevant. While doubtlessly many people disagree with and would like to challenge certain laws and regulations, while they are extant we must abide by them, whatever our personal preferences.
- (16) – this is subjective and untrue. As for four vehicle movements per day, this is also untrue. There tend to be 2 or 3 vans and two cars on the Site every day. An increase in traffic has been noted, in particular vans travelling on the Lane at

excessive speeds. This is the case even though at this time there is only one Pitch with two adults residing there.

- (17) - the access to services is poor and will require an increased intensity of car use.

Community Involvement Statement

1. This states that there is no pitch deliver plan developed by Wokingham Borough Council and that it “allows like most Council’s [sic] the market to decide”.

This is untrue. The Local Plan 2023 – 2040 along with the Topic Paper: Housing: Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, February 2025 (the “Topic Paper”), sets out the needs and plans for the travelling community. Indeed at 2.16(f) of the Topic Paper it sets out to avoid unauthorised encampments and at 2.16(i) seeks to reduce tensions between settler and traveller communities in plan-making and planning decisions. The manner of the applicant’s arrival overnight, with the destruction of parts of the Lane and stress to the environment has very much undermined this aim. Planning should not be granted so as not to encourage similar behaviour elsewhere.

2. States that the applicant purchased the land on the open market so it was assumed that no one had any objection as to what use it was put.
 - The land was not in fact purchased on the open market. It was not being actively marketed at the time of sale; it was a private sale.
 - The statement that it was thought nobody could have any objection is a baseless assumption: the fact that one person has sold a piece of land cannot mean that nobody else will object to its future use.
 - Additionally, the use has been changed and the implementation of that change of use has been disruptive, damaging to the local environment and stressful to the local community.
 - This states that there can be no objection provided that the development meets the requirements of the Local Plan and Planning Policy; it does not in fact meet those requirements. This will be addressed in detail further on.

Planning Statement

- Wokingham Borough Council are well on their way to fulfilling their goal to provide Traveller sites. In any case, paragraph 4.4 of the Topic Paper states that the Council need only show a realistic prospect of providing the requisite pitches within 5 years, but there is no requirement for delivery to be certain or probable.
- The agent for the applicant states that the Proposal would have no significant effect on protected areas. This has already shown itself to be untrue with

significant damage having been done to priority woodland and habitat. The agent's comment regarding 'sabotage' by Natural England is bizarre, [REDACTED]

Block Plan

The plan does not show the toilet and shower block already erected on the Site. Nor does it show the caravans where they are actually situated or their size. It is not to scale. The drainage, soakaway and cesspit are not shown. It is **incorrect and incomplete**. In addition, the area of hardstanding which has been created is far in excess of what would be required for two pitches; once there is a residential user on the Site, it would be easy to increase the number of caravans causing associated problems for the locality.

FURTHER REASONS FOR REFUSAL OF PLANNING CONSENT

The Core Strategy (CS) at paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12 gives the core principals of development on such land, but these are not met: there is no repurposing of buildings, new buildings will be erected and there is no proposal for revitalisation of local services.

Lack of utilities:

- There is no mains water on the Lane; water is brought to each house by private pipe.
- The electricity supply to the Lane is limited by the width of the cable. Also the poles for those cables do not extend to the Site.
- There is no gas and no mains sewerage.
- There are no service strips on the Lane.
- Houses already in situ have water pipes and electricity cables serving them with permission for the installation thereof granted at the time of the initial development to the Lane, the owner of the Lane is now unknown and it is therefore not possible for utility companies to acquire lawful consent to install further utilities.
- The Council have stated that they are unable to adopt the Lane due to its lack of drainage and service strips.
- There is no provision in the Proposal for how connection to services would be managed.
- The applicant has abstracted both electricity and water. Given that there is no provision for connection to services and that doing so lawfully may well be impossible, consent to planning could act as a conduit and encouragement to further breaches of the law.

The Site does not comply with policies CP1 and CP3 and is not acceptable to the character of the area. The Lane itself is comprised of five attractive houses on large and leafy plots, interspersed with areas of woodland, much of which is classified as Priority Woodland by the DEFRA Magic Map. An area of caravans would be totally out of keeping with the attractive nature of the Lane. There are in fact express covenants contained in the titles of the properties on the Lane against the use on the land for a caravan or house on wheels intended as a dwelling.

SUSTAINABILITY AND SCALE

Distance to amenities:

- The amenities of the area including public transport, shops, doctors and schools are **not within usual walking distance and therefore do not support sustainability** contrary to **CP2**.
 - Indeed, the Lane is often extremely muddy and therefore aside from the distance, it is difficult to walk to work or school unless a change of clothes and footwear is taken.
 - The agent for the applicant has compiled a report titled "Access to Services and Amenities". This report gives walking times, which are somewhat optimistic – the report suggests it will take 16 mins to reach the Co op at California Crossroads. Google maps tells me it would be 19 minutes.
 - The report also makes heavy use of bus route 125 – unfortunately this goes only a total of six times per day.
 - Bohunt Secondary School is listed as the nearest secondary school. However due to the scale of development in Arborfield (where it is based) children from this area are no longer accepted. Children from Range Road must now apply to schools in Wokingham itself, which has no safe cycle route. Children from this area travel by car. Incidentally, Bohunt is a 20 minute cycle ride (if the cyclist is making an effort) when taking the recommended and safer 'Greenway' route.
 - There is no cycle storage provision within the Proposal.
 - I have seen a great deal of vehicular activity to and from the site.
 - I feel it is safe to assume that the main mode of transport will be private car.
- Indeed, the increased intensity of traffic has been noted since the unlawful development of the Site. Nobody has been seen walking or cycling to the Site.**

Factor 11 of CP1: there is no provision for alternative transport use, rather the Site Plan has provision for parking spaces and two touring caravans on a large area of permeable hard standing. The hard standing area proposed could accommodate a far larger number of caravans and cars.

Once there is residential user of the Site, having more touring caravans on the Site would **amount to permitted development for which no further planning consent would be required** and so those cars may soon be many cars, with other pollutants increasing also.

The applicant or his agents have been making enquiries to purchase more land on the Lane to either side of the Site. This Site could therefore grow exponentially.

SCALE

- There are five houses on the Lane.
- There is another application (260439) in progress. This is opposite the Site. It is proposing one pitch consisting of a static, a touring caravan and dayroom. The success of this Application would count in its favour.
- There is at least one other plot on the Lane owned by members of the travelling community (other plots may have been purchased).
- It is usual for Gypsy and Traveller plots to be given permission to expand once initial planning permission is granted.
- The proposed size of the hard standing could accommodate many more cars and caravans than contained in the Proposal.
- The addition of more touring caravans would fall within permitted user if the Application were granted and no further planning consent would be necessary.
- The number of caravans would very soon outnumber the houses on the Lane, further changing the character of the area to the detriment of current local inhabitants and increasing the intensity of unsuitable traffic along the Lane.
- **Cumulatively the Proposal is therefore disproportionate to the scale of existing settlement on the Lane.**

17 percent of Traveller and Gypsy pitches in the Borough are in Finchampstead, while Finchampstead only accounts for 10 per cent of the land mass of the Borough. Any further Gypsy and Traveller pitches in Finchampstead would be disproportionate to the scale of existing settlement in Finchampstead.

Conflict of separate settlements

- Much damage was done to the Lane when the Site was unlawfully developed and distress was caused to local residents, with the police and council deeming it unsafe for themselves or residents to approach.
- Topic Paper: Housing: Gypsy and Traveller accommodation expressly seeks to avoid conflict between settled and traveller communities.

- The applicant has firstly abstracted water from a private supply pipe running through the Site and secondly laid cables under the Lane to abstract electricity. The first causes danger of contamination of supply and disruption of supply to the owner of the pipe (who will also be paying for their water usage as it is metered) and the second causes danger to anyone using the Lane and danger of disruption to supply; the Lane is unmade and its depth regularly changes with rainfall.
- The Site is floodlit every night causing distress and confusion in the wildlife including bats and deer (which are now wandering lost onto the Nine Mile Ride), and nuisance to local residents. See Figure 3 above.
- **This is likely to bring the separate settlements into conflict and has caused distress in the settled community.**

ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE

The Site does not meet the criteria of the Core Principles (CP) of the CS as set out in CP1; the Development is not sustainable.

- The Site forms a part of the **Special Protection Area (SPA)**
- The Proposal does not maintain or enhance the environment; trees were cleared on the Site and the Lane itself badly damaged with diggers with the arrival of the development. See attached image.
- No provision for additional planting suggesting no commitment to biodiversity.
- No provision for the minimisation of emission of pollutants or of adverse effects on ground water or adequate drainage. Provisions are included for a **soakaway**, itself a risk to the SPA and there is no existing mains drainage. There is already an unregulated cess pit which is a risk to ground water.
- Provision for a large area of hard standing meaning water (likely to contain oil and other pollutants) from the Site will run off down the Lane and into Silverstock Bog, which in itself supports much varied wildlife, again adversely affecting the SPA.
- There is no provision for Biodiversity as the Application erroneously claims to be retrospective. Rather than providing for additional biodiversity, it is massively injurious to the biodiversity which had previously been present.
- The Application contains a document titled **"Great Crested Newts"** and claims to be more than 500 metres from a pond that would provide a suitable breeding habitat for Great Crested Newts. This is untrue.
- Silverstock Bog is approximately 300 metres from the Site and there is at least one garden pond in between, in which newts have been seen.
- The applicant admits that the Site falls within an amber zone of the Nature Space map. This in itself suggests a need for a recognised ecological survey.

- The applicant claims to have carried out a “fingertip search” of the Site prior to development. This is doubtful. This document is dated 27th March 2026, three weeks after the initial development of the Site. The Application was previously invalid because this document was not included. Had the applicant realised that evidence regarding Newts would have been required (hence the fingertip search), he would also have realised that it needed to be included with his application. Ergo, there was no fingertip search and this document is invalid. In any case a fingertip search is not a recognised method of surveying for newts.
- The applicant has submitted a document taken from the Wokingham Borough Council website entitled “Planning Policies and Constraints Map”; this states that the Site and wider area are part of Finchampstead Forested area and Settled Sands and that the Landscape Quality is High, the Landscape Sensitivity is High and Landscape Capacity is Lowest. This hardly recommends the Site for development.

There is extreme LIGHT POLLUTION emanating from the Site. Please see Figure 3. The Site is floodlit to an extreme degree every night, all night. This is to the detriment of the wildlife, in particular bats and to local residents.

Lawful Enjoyment of Property

I would ask that thought be given to the right to the lawful enjoyment of property of the local residents.

- The abstraction of my neighbour’s water prevents him from drinking his water as he fears that it may be contaminated; the abstraction is in the vicinity of the applicant’s unregulated cess pit.
- The abstraction of electricity has made the lights in my house blink and placed strain on the electricity infrastructure.
- The unregulated cess pit is making residents fearful for the contamination of the ground water crossing their properties.

THE LANE – DANGER TO ROAD USERS AND LOSS OF AMENITY

The Lane is a narrow single track, unmade and unadopted Byway. The width of the Lane makes it impossible to bring a full size static caravan onto the Site without substantially widening the Lane and damaging trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The Lane is only 2.8m at the entrance while a standard static caravan measures between 3 – 3.6m with larger models up to 4.27m. There is a mature oak tree at the top of the Lane with a TPO which curtails the Lane’s width and it was demonstrated when the applicant tried and failed to bring a full sized static caravan onto the Site, that it cannot be done, despite having widened the Lane a few days previously to bring a smaller model in.

Please see attached photographs both of the stuck caravan (Figure 7) and oak tree (Figure 8).



Figure 7



Figure 8

- The applicant has included photographs of the Lane, but I am unsure how he believes they assist his application. There is one curious photograph where by

the 'road closed' sign included in the image, shows the image to have been somehow spliced together, making the entrance seem wider. Figure 7 above shows the width of the Lane and pavement in the context of the vehicles thereon.

- **There are no separate footways** on the Lane which makes it difficult for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to get out of the way of traffic. This has not been a problem in the past as traffic has been minimal, but increased development and the understanding that permission for one pitch may lead to permission for many more, **will increase the intensity of traffic and danger to current users.**
- **No refuge for pedestrians** The damage occasioned to the Lane by the mode of the arrival of the applicant on the Site; the Lane was not wide enough even for their smaller static caravan and they therefore brought in a digger to widen it. In so doing they knocked down trees (part of DEFRA Magic Map Priority Woodland) and heaped the verge high with soil, trees and other debris. Parts of the verge are now totally inaccessible (see Figure 9).



Figure 9 The damaged verge

- **No street lighting** on the Lane and together with the tree coverage, this makes it extremely dark at night; dog walkers and joggers frequently come down the Lane after dark and **increased traffic and lack of refuge will put them in particular danger.**
- **Adjoining footpaths** - Should the application be successful, pedestrian access will be precluded not only to the Lane, but also to adjoining footpaths. The Lane

forms a part of a popular circuit comprising of the Lane, **footpath FINC51** and **Byway FINC42**. Access and amenity of these routes will therefore be lost if the Lane becomes dangerous to non-vehicular traffic.

It is understood that consent for this Application is likely to lead to a substantial increase in intensity of car and van use as well as oversized vehicles such as caravans. This has already begun.

Danger to other car users:

- The Lane is narrow and single track; it was not designed for high use.
- The exit from the Lane onto the Nine Mile Ride is perilous due to heavy traffic and **very restricted sight lines**. My mother's car was clipped by a bus some years ago when exiting the Lane because she had to pull into the road and could not see it coming.
- It is only possible to see the length of a car and a half from the top of the Lane to the right and it is necessary to approach the main road very slowly as it is also difficult to see and be seen by pedestrians due to the upward slope of the Lane.
- Personally, when taking my children to school, I am adamant that we have to leave by 7.40am, otherwise it is impossible to get out of the Lane without risking accident.
- While the sight lines onto the Sandhurst Road are better, it has a speed limit of 50mph and is again busy. In addition, the road and Lane are often flooded at that end and the local amenities are in the other direction.
- The applicant includes a Vehicle Crashes Plan in his documents. This shows two accidents on the Nine Mile Ride at the top of the Lane. At least one of these was in connection with a car exiting the Lane.

Entering the Lane from the road is also hazardous:

- It is not possible to see what is coming up the Lane before manoeuvring on to the Lane, by which stage you are committed.
- If there is a vehicle coming up the Lane, this either results in a long and difficult reverse down the Lane or if the oncoming vehicle cannot reverse (as in caravans and trailers), the car entering the Lane must reverse back out on to the main road, which is not only dangerous but illegal.
- It is necessary to turn into the Lane from the Sandhurst Road with extreme caution when entering from the left – cars behind will often not believe that you mean to turn and seek to overtake. A previous neighbour had an accident of this nature.
- When entering the Lane from the right of the Sandhurst Road, it is necessary to partially cross into the oncoming lane in order to enter the Lane at the right angle and not fall into the ditch on either side of the Lane.

No designated passing places:

- Passing is only possible by pulling into private driveways and there is no passing place of any description between the Site and the Nine Mile Ride.
- An increase in development and traffic will make this common place and be very much to the detriment of current residents and no doubt cause acrimony between road users.
- In addition, **the driveways of the houses** on the Lane were not constructed with high traffic usage in mind. It is impossible to see if anything is coming on the Lane before in part turning onto it from the driveways.

The Proposal therefore rather than improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists or enhancing road safety, would lead to a higher intensity of vehicular use and cause highway problems, lead to traffic related environmental problems and endanger pedestrians and cyclists.

A previous application for planning permission was made for a Traveller site on the Lane in 2006. As I understand it, the main ground for its refusal was the danger posed by the access on to the main roads. This danger has only become worse with the increase in traffic in the locality, consequent to new developments such as in Arborfield.

In conclusion, this Application should be refused as it claims to be retrospective when it is not and therefore has failed to provide key information. In any event, this Application should fail on environmental concerns in what is countryside, sustainability, loss of amenity and the danger it poses to other road users. These factors far outweigh the need for additional Traveller pitches in the Borough and in particular, Finchampstead.

