Mr M Heard
Spring Copse,Julkes Lane
RG29JJ
[redacted]

8th January 2026

To: Planning Department
Wokingham Borough Council

Re: Formal Objection to the Loddon Garden Village Proposal
Planning Application Reference: 252498

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to formally object to Planning Application Reference 252498 for the proposed Loddon Garden Village. This objection is made having regard to the adopted Development Plan for Wokingham Borough and relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The proposal fails multiple policy tests and constitutes unsustainable development.

1. Sustainable Development – Policy CP1 and MDD Policy CC01 (NPPF paragraphs 7–11)

Core Strategy Policy **CP1 (Sustainable Development)** requires development to deliver a positive contribution across environmental, social and economic objectives. Managing Development Delivery (MDD) Policy **CC01** reinforces the presumption in favour of sustainable development only where proposals accord with the Development Plan as a whole.

The application fails this policy test. The scale and location of the proposed garden village would generate unsustainable travel patterns, place undue pressure on infrastructure, and cause environmental harm that outweighs the generic benefits of housing delivery. The applicant relies on aspirational future outcomes rather than demonstrating policy-compliant sustainability at the point of decision.

2. Location, Scale and Settlement Hierarchy – Policies CP3 and CP9 (NPPF paragraphs 8 and 11)

Core Strategy Policy **CP9 (Scale and Location of Development)** requires development to be located in sustainable locations with appropriate access to services, facilities, employment and transport. Policy **CP3 (General Principles for Development)** further requires development to respect the character and role of existing settlements.

The proposal represents a development quantum wholly disproportionate to Loddon's role in the settlement hierarchy. It would fundamentally alter the function and character of the area and cannot reasonably be considered a sustainable extension or logical growth of the settlement.

3. Infrastructure Provision and Phasing – Policy CP4 (NPPF paragraphs 8, 11 and 34)

Policy **CP4 (Infrastructure Requirements)** requires that all necessary infrastructure to support development is identified, funded and delivered in a timely manner, without placing unacceptable burdens on existing communities.

The application fails to demonstrate with sufficient certainty that schools, healthcare, highways infrastructure, utilities and community facilities would be delivered in advance of or alongside development. Reliance on later phases, viability reassessments or unconfirmed funding streams does not meet the policy requirement for certainty and deliverability.

4. Transport and Travel Demand – Policy CP6 (NPPF paragraphs 109–112)

Policy **CP6 (Managing Travel Demand)** seeks to reduce reliance on the private car and requires development to be located and designed to maximise sustainable transport choices.

Given the site's location and limited public transport provision, the proposal would result in high levels of car dependency. The Transport Assessment relies on optimistic behavioural assumptions and fails to robustly demonstrate that residual cumulative impacts would not be severe, contrary to both local policy and the NPPF.

5. Landscape Character and Countryside Protection – MDD Policy TB21 (NPPF paragraph 174)

MDD Policy **TB21 (Landscape Character)** requires development to conserve and, where possible, enhance local landscape character, with particular regard to scale, form and visual impact.

The proposal would result in the permanent loss of open countryside and cause significant harm to the rural landscape setting of Loddon and surrounding villages. Proposed landscaping mitigation would not overcome the fundamental policy conflict arising from the scale and extent of development.

6. Biodiversity and Ecology – Policy CP7 and MDD Policy TB23 (NPPF paragraph 187)

Core Strategy Policy **CP7 (Biodiversity)** and MDD Policy **TB23 (Biodiversity and Development)** require development to avoid harm to biodiversity, protect ecological networks, and deliver net gains where possible.

The application fails to demonstrate that existing habitats, wildlife corridors and ecological features would be adequately protected. Claimed biodiversity net gain is dependent on future management and uncertain mitigation, which does not outweigh immediate and irreversible ecological harm.

7. Flood Risk and Drainage – MDD Policies CC09 and CC10 (NPPF paragraphs 170–182)

MDD Policies **CC09 and CC10** require development to demonstrate that it will not increase flood risk on-site or elsewhere and that sustainable drainage systems are effective, adoptable and resilient over the lifetime of the development.

The submitted drainage strategy is high-level and conceptual. It lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate compliance with policy requirements, particularly in relation to long-term maintenance, climate change allowances and downstream impacts.

8. Overall Planning Balance

When assessed against the Development Plan as a whole, the proposal is in clear conflict with multiple adopted policies. The harms identified — relating to sustainability, infrastructure, transport, landscape, ecology and community impact — are significant and enduring. The benefits advanced by the applicant are generic and could be delivered in more appropriate locations.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, Planning Application Reference 252498 fails to comply with the adopted Wokingham Borough Development Plan and relevant national policy. The proposal constitutes unsustainable development and should be refused. Should the Council be minded to approve the application, this objection must be afforded substantial weight and no permission granted unless all policy conflicts are fully resolved through clear, enforceable and front-loaded planning obligations.

I am concerned to ensure that the status of the byways in the area of Carters Hill remains unchanged as a result of this planning application because any downgrading of the byways will adversely affect our enjoyment of our property and will create a **legal nuisance** for us.

Similarly, we have an Easement Agreement in respect of our water supply which crosses the land that is proposed for allotments and our position needs to be protected in respect of the provision of this service.

I reserve the right to add to this submission up to the point when it is determined by WDC

Yours faithfully,

M F Heard