

PLANNING REF : 252498  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 18 Harrow Way  
: Sindlesham, Wokingham  
: RG41 5GJ  
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Susan Louise Highmoor  
DATE SUBMITTED : 16/01/2026

COMMENTS:

I am writing to formally object to Planning Application 252498. While the applicant frames this as a "Garden Village," the proposal fails to meet the legal and policy requirements for sustainable development. My objection is based on the following material considerations:

1. Technical Inadequacy of the Drainage Strategy (Ref: R058C)  
The Drainage Strategy (R058C) fails to prove the deliverability and safety of the entire site, particularly the peripheral areas.  
\* Groundwater Emergence: The land designated for the Gypsy and Traveller pitches and the boundary with existing residents is historically "boggy" with a high water table. Document R058C relies on high-level SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) that are optimized for the high-density housing parcels but lack localized borehole evidence for the peripheral zones.  
\* Flood Risk Displacement: Under NPPF Paragraph 167, development must be flood resilient. Placing residential pitches (a "Highly Vulnerable" use in planning terms) on a saturated part of the site is a failure of the Sequential Test.  
\* Request for LLFA Inspection: I request that the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) conduct a site visit during the winter months to verify that the saturation levels do not render this specific corner of the development uninhabitable.
2. Failure of Social Integration (Policy HC4 and the Equality Act)  
The Masterplan demonstrates a clear strategy of Spatial Segregation.  
\* Location Choice: The 20-pitch traveller site has been placed at the furthest possible distance from the new District Centre and high-value housing. The developer has previously admitted that this placement was driven by "commercial reasons" to protect new-build sale values.  
\* Policy Conflict: Using commercial profit as a justification to isolate a community contradicts Wokingham Policy HC4 and the National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (Paragraph 13), which mandates that sites be integrated and inclusive. It also raises significant concerns regarding the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010.
3. Unmitigated Infrastructure Lag (Policy CP4 & INF1)  
The Design and Access Statement (DAS) promises significant facilities, yet offers no mechanism to prevent the "infrastructure lag" seen at Arborfield Green.  
\* Phasing Triggers: Without strict Grampian Conditions, there is no guarantee that the promised GP surgery or District Centre will be delivered.  
\* Lack of Functional Benefit: Because these facilities are located deep within the new development to serve new residents, they offer no "Betterment" to existing residents who will instead suffer from the increased pressure on already over-capacity local dentists and doctors.

#### 4. Harm to Landscape and Settlement Identity (Policy NE5)

The proposal represents the "unjustified coalescence" of Shinfield and Arborfield.

\* Character Change: The transition from semi-rural to a high-density "large village" destroys the River Loddon Valued Landscape.

\* Loss of Rural Buffer: The density and layout do not respect the existing settlement pattern, creating an urban sprawl that permanently erodes the character of the area.

#### Conclusion

The application prioritizes developer profit over sound planning logic. By placing vulnerable residents on unsuitable, boggy land for commercial gain and failing to provide guaranteed infrastructure, this proposal is unsustainable.

In conclusion, while I recognise the national requirement for housing delivery and the pressures this places on local councils, I urge the University of Reading to give greater consideration to the existing residents, who have been their neighbours for decades. I chose to live in Sindlesham 25 years ago for its semi-rural character; seeing

wildlife, such as deer, grazing on these fields, and hearing the sound of owls at night, is a fundamental part of the residential amenity of this area. It is deeply saddening to face the prospect of spending the next 30 years witnessing the systematic loss of this environment. I urge the University to consider that the lasting legacy of this development should not be the displacement of nature and the alienation of its long-standing neighbours, but rather a development that truly respects the landscape it inhabits.