

PLANNING REF : 252498
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Wheatsheaf Close
:
: RG415PT
SUBMITTED BY : J McKinnon
DATE SUBMITTED : 05/11/2025

COMMENTS:

I am formally objecting to this planning application. While I agree we need more houses in the Wokingham area and across the country, requesting nearly 4,000 additional homes and 2,800 on local residents in such a short timeframe is a complete disregard to the local residents (who will be most impacted). I also want to raise objections to where the current Gypsy and traveller sites are being proposed within the development and request they are moved to a different area of the development.

I ask that the Council takes the genuine concerns of the people who currently live here into account. Frankly, I propose that the applicant needs to cut this development by 50%. That would be a far more sensible and realistic number that won't completely destroy our essential local services. If not, the council needs to drastically slow down accepting all planning applications and scatter these developments over the next few decades so that our infrastructure has a chance to catch up with what will be a huge increase in demand.

The infrastructure that is going to be crippled by this proposal includes Royal Berkshire Hospital, local roads, local train stations, doctors, and dentists. I need to know how the Council can even consider this application when the following infrastructure problems haven't been solved:

1. Royal Berkshire Hospital (RBH)

RBH is already at capacity, with local MPs requesting Government for funding of a new hospital. Adding 4,000 homes (approximately 9,440 new residents based off 2023 household data) will completely cripple our local NHS and this hospital further.

If the Council isn't aware, it is currently impossible to get a parking spot after 10:00am and nearly impossible to get a non-emergency appointment. How exactly has the applicant proven they will fund the massive changes needed to cope with thousands of new residents without harming the existing local population?

2. Local Roads

Whilst I see that some new roads are being introduced, our local roads will be in a constant state of gridlock. I'm talking specifically

about the roundabout joining Mole Road and Bearwood Road, which is already stationary during rush hour. Has this specific, problematic junction been properly considered? The proposed level of traffic is simply unacceptable and will increase air and noise pollution on local residents.

3. Twyford Station

Twyford station is hugely popular, especially since the Elizabeth Line opened, allowing commuters to get to East London easier and quicker. The station is already at full capacity, and commuters are

forced to park illegally on residential roads because the car park is full. Will this critical transport hub finally get the funding for a larger new car park? I honestly think that money set aside for the gypsy and traveller site could be much better used here it would positively impact thousands of Wokingham residents, not just 20 slots.

And please don't suggest a bus route. The last thing a commuter wants after an hour-and-a-half train journey is to wait for an unreliable bus and pay even more for public transport.

4. Doctors and Dentists

I challenge any local councillor to try and get an NHS dentist appointment right now. Locals are already struggling, as seen regularly on the news.

How can 4,000 new homes help with this already impossibly stretched demand? Our needs, as existing residents, should be met first. With almost half the homes being "affordable" it suggests new residents may not have the means to pay for private dental care, making the NHS dentist crisis even worse.

5. Gypsy and Traveller Site Location

The current proposed location of the Gypsy and Traveller site is unfair due to its disproportionate negative impact on existing residents. The current positioning places the site significantly closer to existing homes (in the Sindlesham direction) while locating it away from the majority of the proposed new housing development. This location is considered inequitable and fails to adequately

consider the established residential amenity of the surrounding area. The site should be relocated further within the boundaries of the new housing development. This would ensure that the impacts are more

fairly distributed across the wider community created by the development, allowing new homeowners to purchase property with full prior knowledge of the site's location, rather than imposing this significant change on long-established residents, whose house prices may fall as a result.

The above is just some of the main points I believe that clearly demonstrate that the application is unsustainable and needs to be rejected or drastically scaled back and reviewed.