

PLANNING REF : 251621
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 10 Albert Road
: Wokingham
: RG40 2AL
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Sally Heyworth
DATE SUBMITTED : 02/09/2026

COMMENTS:

Planning Reference: 251621

Property Address: 10, Albert Road, Wokingham, RG402AL

Submitted by: Mrs Sally Heyworth

Date submitted: 02 September 2026

Objection to Management Plans re Planning Application

Number: 251621 These comments are in addition to my previous objections and relate to new documents uploaded by the council of which residents have had NO - notice. Why is that?

The management plans uploaded do not address the fundamental issues created by a Car-less development proposal.

Too Little Car Parking Provision is not addressed by this Framework for Parking Management

The framework only references trying to manage the car parking problem created by the development proposal and does not provide a solution to problem - which is over development of the site with not enough parking provided.

The framework highlights that there is no parking available in the vicinity of this proposed development of 21 residential units other than the paid for train station car park.

All nearby streets are small private roads already at capacity.

Building a 'management framework' to address problems created on these roads is a nonsense.

And there's no parking on site. The proposed development is to be serviced by 2 blue badge spaces and 4 visitor spaces for carers and 'authorised visitors' only. This is clearly not realistic. Will these 'Car free residents' only have car free visitors? No development of 21 residential units would be allowed such a low number of parking spaces.

This framework is inconsistent with Wokingham Borough Council's own Town Centre Masterplan and planning policy. The proposal represents overdevelopment.

The Parking Management Plan just highlights the need for more parking - isn't this obvious?

The framework states "tenancy agreements shall include provisions requiring residents not to park vehicles on Park Road or Albert Road other nearby private roads". Why? Because the planning applicant knows that this development will not be car free and they are not providing sufficient parking spaces.

Why is the applicant planning to off-load the parking problem on to local residents as a consequence of their inability to provide on-site parking. Every other residence in this area provides one or more parking spaces per housing unit on its site - this development should be no different. The non-provision of parking is not in accordance with the Local Design Guide which I have already cited in my objections.

There is nothing in this framework that is enforceable as part of their proposal to 'manage the problem'. The plan - if one is required - has no teeth and does not address the problem. Other commentators have highlighted the weasel words used - 'minimize the problem of development parking issues' just confirms that there will

be parking issues. How about a plan that prevents parking issues in the first place.

I therefore request that the Council enforce the need for adequate parking onsite.