

PLANNING REF : 252498  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 10 Sindlesham  
: Wokingham, Berkshire  
: RG41 5GJ  
SUBMITTED BY : Ms Jenny McCurry  
DATE SUBMITTED : 16/01/2026

COMMENTS:

I wish to add additional comments to support my previous objection to Planning Application 252498.

The proposed development fails to meet the legal and policy requirements for sustainable development. My opinion is based on the following:

1. Technical Inadequacy of the Drainage Strategy (Ref: R058C) The Drainage Strategy fails to prove the adequacy and safety of the development site. In particular the land designated for the Gypsy and Traveller pitches and the boundary with existing residents is historically boggy and is frequently waterlogged. The above referenced document relies on high-level Sustainable Drainage Systems that are optimized for the high-density housing but lack localized borehole evidence for the outer edges of the development. Flood Risk

Displacement: Current rules/practice require developments to be flood resilient. Putting residential pitches (a "Highly Vulnerable" use in planning terms) on a saturated part of the site is a failure of the Sequential Test. Site visits need to be undertaken during the winter months to verify that the saturation levels do not render this specific corner of the development uninhabitable.

2. Complete failure of Social Integration (Policy HC4 and the Equality Act) 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 openly admitted, at a resident's meeting that this placement was driven by "commercial reasons" to protect new-build sale values. To place the Traveller Site in a remote location for pure commercial gain is in contravention of 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. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) promises significant facilities, yet offers no assurances or plans to prevent the infrastructure lag seen at Arborfield Green. There is no guarantee that the promised GP surgery or District Centre will be delivered. If they are delivered the inability of existing GP surgeries to recruit doctors will simply put more pressure on current supply of doctors and will only cause harm to existing residents who will be the ones to suffer from the increased pressure for these scarce resources.

4. Damage to current Landscape and Settlement Identity (Policy NE5) The transition from semi-rural to a high-density "large village"

destroys the River Loddon Valued Landscape. The density and layout do not respect the existing settlement pattern, creating an urban sprawl that permanently erodes the character of the area.

5. Lack of consultation and transparency. Local residents were not properly consulted on the inclusion of 20 Gypsy and Traveller pitches. The pitches were not shown on the published development maps

available on the developer's website. Nor where they were clearly identified during the public consultation period, nor clearly

highlighted in consultation materials distributed to residents. This element of the proposal only became apparent in November, after consultation opportunities had effectively passed. This lack of transparency prevented meaningful public engagement and undermines confidence in the robustness of the planning process. 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.

6. The proposed access via Betty Grove Lane is fundamentally unsuitable. Betty Grove Lane is a narrow single-lane road with limited width, poor drainage, and constrained visibility. The lane is not part of the Loddon development, meaning the developer does not have full control over its upgrade, maintenance, or long-term management.

There is no clear evidence that the lane can safely accommodate the additional vehicle movements associated with 20 pitches. This raises serious questions regarding highway safety, sustainability, and compliance with access standards. Such a site requires a purpose-built access road constructed to adoptable standards, good drainage and surface water management, safe pedestrian access. The same standards applied to the main housing development should apply to these traveller sites. There is no published evidence that alternative and potentially more suitable locations were properly assessed, specifically sites within the main development where access roads and infrastructure could be delivered as part of the scheme. Insufficient information regarding the proposed traveller sites has been provided and there has been no consultation. Without the

information and the ability to raise questions residents are unable to make an informed representations.

7. National and local planning policy requires decision-makers to avoid over-concentration of Traveller sites and to assess the cumulative impact of existing provision.

Here there is no clear cumulative impact assessment of existing Traveller sites in the locality - there are several already. Research needs to be done and evidence produced before it can be determined whether a site in Betty Grove Lane would be policy compliant.