PLANNING REF : 252498
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 11
: Wheatsheaf Close, Wokingham, Berks
: RG41 5PT
SUBMITTED BY : Miss Claire Worsfold
DATE SUBMITTED : 05/01/2026

COMMENTS:
objection from Claire Worsfold
.

Formal Objection to the Proposed Gypsy and Traveller Pitches at the Loddon Development (RG41 5PT)
I wish to formally object to the proposed allocation of 20 Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the Loddon development, on the following planning grounds.

1. Failure of Proper Consultation and Transparency
Local residents were not properly consulted on the inclusion of 20 Gypsy and Traveller pitches, despite indications that this element formed part of the scheme from an early stage.

* The pitches were not shown on the published development maps available on the developer's website.
* They were not clearly identified during the public consultation period, nor clearly highlighted in consultation materials distributed to residents.

* 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.

2. Unsuitable and Unsafe Access Arrangements

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 concerns regarding highway safety, sustainability, and compliance with access standards.

3. Absence of a Properly Designed Access Road
The proposal does not provide:
* A purpose-built access road constructed to adoptable standards; * Adequate drainage and surface-water management;

* Safe and appropriate pedestrian access.
This contrasts with the infrastructure provided for the main housing development and results in an unbalanced and poorly planned layout.

4. Unjustified Isolation and Failure to Promote Integration
The proposed Traveller pitches are located at a significant distance from the main body of the new housing, and immediately adjacent to the established residential area at Wheatsheaf Close.
This siting:

* Physically separates the pitches from the wider development;

* Limits access to shared amenities and infrastructure;
* Does not promote integration or inclusive placemaking, as encouraged by national planning policy.
The application fails to demonstrate why the pitches cannot be located within the main development footprint, where access, infrastructure, and opportunities for integration could be properly designed in from the outset.

5. Failure to Consider Reasonable Alternative 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.

The absence of a transparent site-selection assessment undermines the soundness of the proposal.

6. Lack of Clarity on the Nature and Management of the Site
The proposal does not clearly specify:
* Whether the pitches are permanent or transit;
* How the site will be managed;
* What facilities will be provided;
* How impacts will be mitigated over time.

This lack of detail prevents residents from making informed representations and raises concerns about the adequacy of the planning submission.

7. Cumulative Impact and Over-Concentration
There are multiple existing Gypsy and Traveller sites within the surrounding area, including sites in close proximity to Wheatsheaf Close and Mole Road.
National and local planning policy requires decision-makers to avoid over-concentration of Traveller sites and to assess the cumulative impact of existing provision.
In this case:
* There is no clear cumulative impact assessment of existing Traveller sites in the locality;
* The proposal does not demonstrate how it contributes to balanced and sustainable communities;
* The absence of an evidence-based analysis makes it impossible to conclude that the scale of provision in this area is appropriate.
Until a transparent cumulative impact assessment is provided, the proposal cannot be considered policy-compliant.

Conclusion
For the reasons outlined above including inadequate consultation, unsuitable access arrangements, lack of integration, absence of alternative site analysis, insufficient detail, and failure to assess cumulative impacts the proposed Traveller pitches are unsound in their current form.
At a minimum, the proposal should be:
* Subject to proper consultation;
* Supported by safe, purpose-built access;
* Located in a way that promotes integration within the wider development;
* Accompanied by a transparent assessment of alternatives and cumulative impacts.