

PLANNING REF : 252498  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 28 Wheatsheaf Close  
: Sindlesham, Wokingham . Berkshire  
: RG415PT  
SUBMITTED BY : Miss Deborah Ashford  
DATE SUBMITTED : 02/01/2026

COMMENTS:

Planning Objection: Proposed Gypsy and Traveller Pitches at the Loddon Development (RG41 5PT)

I am writing to register my objection to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller pitches associated with the Loddon development.

My concerns relate not to the principle of providing Traveller accommodation, but to the way this element of the scheme has been planned, consulted upon, and located.

1. Inadequate Public Consultation

The inclusion of a substantial number of Traveller pitches was not clearly presented during the public consultation process.

- \* This element of the proposal was not shown on publicly available maps for a significant period.

- \* It was not clearly highlighted in consultation materials provided to residents.

- \* Many residents only became aware of this aspect of the scheme well after consultation opportunities had passed.

As a result, local people were denied a genuine opportunity to understand and comment on a significant part of the development.

2. Access Constraints and Highway Concerns

The suggested access via Betty Grove Lane raises serious practical issues:

- \* The lane is narrow, with limited capacity and drainage constraints. \* It is not within the developer's control, limiting the ability to deliver necessary improvements.

- \* There is insufficient evidence that it can safely accommodate the volume and type of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed pitches.

This approach does not reflect good planning practice or highway safety standards.

3. Infrastructure Not Properly Designed

Unlike the main housing areas of the development, the Traveller site:

- \* Does not benefit from a clearly designed access road built to adoptable standards;

- \* Lacks detailed proposals for drainage and pedestrian safety;

- \* Appears to be added as an afterthought rather than integrated into the overall masterplan.

This results in a poorly balanced layout.

4. Location and Community Integration

The pitches are proposed at the edge of the wider development and directly alongside an established residential area.

This positioning:

- \* Separates the site from the rest of the new community;

- \* Limits access to shared facilities and services;

- \* Fails to demonstrate how integration with the wider development would be achieved.

Planning policy encourages inclusive layouts that support co-existence rather than physical separation.

#### 5. Alternative Locations Not Clearly Assessed

The application does not explain:

- \* Which alternative sites were considered;
- \* Why locations with safer access or better infrastructure were discounted;
- \* Whether areas within the main development footprint were evaluated.

Without this information, it is difficult to conclude that the chosen location represents the most suitable option.

#### 6. Insufficient Detail About the Site

Key information remains unclear, including:

- \* Whether the pitches are intended for permanent or transit use; \*
  - How the site will be managed over time;
  - \* What facilities and services will be provided.
- This lack of detail limits the ability of residents to assess the proposal properly.

#### 7. Cumulative Impact and Distribution

There are already several authorised Traveller sites in the surrounding area, including in close proximity to Wheatsheaf Close and Mole Road.

Planning policy requires authorities to consider the combined impact of existing provision and to ensure a fair and balanced distribution of sites.

The application does not provide a clear cumulative assessment or explain how this proposal aligns with wider distribution objectives.

#### Summary

While the need for Traveller accommodation is acknowledged, the current proposal raises concerns regarding:

- \* The adequacy of consultation;
  - \* Highway safety and access;
  - \* Integration and layout;
  - \* Lack of evidence that alternatives were properly considered; \*
- Absence of a cumulative impact assessment.

For these reasons, the proposal should be reconsidered and revised before any decision is made.