

Emy Circuit
Development Management
Wokingham Borough Council
Civic Offices
Shute End
Wokingham
RG40 1BN

Bristol
3rd Floor
Beacon Tower
Colston Street
Bristol BS1 4UX
nexusplanning.co.uk

Our Ref: 40846

30 July 2026

Dear Emy

PARCEL R11 OF PHASE 2B OF THE SOUTH WOKINGHAM STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT LOCATION: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF DETAILS RESERVED BY PLANNING CONDITION 15 (REFERENCE: 253029)

On behalf of my client, Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd ('the Applicant'), I enclose a package of revised information that has been prepared in respect of an application to discharge Condition 15 (Hard and Soft Landscaping) for Parcel R11 of Phase 2b of the South Wokingham Strategic Development Location ('the Site'). The submission has been prepared to address matters raised in consultation responses received in respect of the revised pack that was submitted in May.

Submission

Please see the accompanying 'Consolidated Schedule', which sets out the documents and drawings that are being submitted and describes how they relate to the previous submissions that have been made.

Non-Material Amendment Application

As you are aware a non-material amendment application (Ref: PP-15115813) is being made to secure minor changes to the layout required as a result of comments received during the highway technical approval process. To ensure consistency the drawings and documents included in this submission incorporate the amendments being sought through that application.

Consultation Responses

The table below describes the issues that have been raised and sets out the Applicant's response.

Consultee Comment		Response
1. Green Infrastructure Officer (Dated 01.06.2026)		
1.1	More information is needed with respect to the function and intent of the pond that is centrally located within the development. Please indicate if the pond is intended to serve an attenuation, ecological, or other function. While the	The pond does not serve an attenuation purpose. It provided for aesthetic / landscape reasons and is a requirement of the approved Site-Wide Landscape Design Statement (see page 67 of that document).

London

Birmingham

Bristol

Manchester

Reading

Consultee Comment		Response
	section indicates that water levels are anticipated to fluctuate, it is also not clear if this is supposed to be permanently wet at a certain depth. If the pond is to be permanently wet, but not function as an attenuation pond, how will this be achieved where the only catchment is from the POS that immediately surrounds it?	In terms of keeping the pond permanently wet it will have an impermeable liner and will be filled initially. The surrounding landscape will drain towards it to provide occasional top up an overflow pipe connected to the drainage network will ensure it doesn't flood the surrounding landscape in periods of high rainfall.
1.2	If the pond is intended to serve an attenuation function, why has the pond not been included as part of the engineering drawings.	Please see 1.1.
1.3	If the pond is not intended to serve an attenuation function, the illustrative drawing and section that is provided indicates an overflow pipe to stop topping out. How is this pipe intended to drain? This should still be detailed on the engineering drawings if it is to be piped to a different location.	The connection to the wider drainage system is shown on the approved Surface Water Drainage Strategy drawing (7371-MJA-SW-XX-DR-C-002 PL7). It is included in this submission for reference purposes.
1.4	From a Green Infrastructure perspective, I have a safety concern with the circa 2m pond depth, as this pond will be within the public open space. I appreciate there is what is indicated as 1:5 side gradients to allow for wildlife access. However, I do not understand the need for the drop-off that is shown in the section.	To address this concern the drop-off has been removed and a continuous graded slope is now shown.
1.5	Please provide justification for the 2m depth and the need for a large step down. Ideally this pond would be able to function well from an ecological perspective without such a significant step, as this is a safety concern.	Please see 1.4.
1.6	Please clarify why the central pond within the open space does not have any contours and levels associated with it. Based on the section that has been provided with this pond, it seems that that is engineering that needs to be included as there are shelves, a circa 2m depth, and an overflow pipe to prevent the pond from topping.	The pond is included on the enclosed levels drawings A389-R11-RM-401 and A389-R11-RM-402. A section is provided on drawing A389-R11-RM-153.
1.7	A minor point, but please revise drawings to ensure that there are no small 'pinch points' at the end of planters or areas of turf as they can create areas that are difficult to maintain or where plant material will have a hard time establishing.	The 'Detailed Soft Landscaping Plan – Play Space' and the 'Detailed Hard Landscaping Plan – Play Space' have been amended to remove the 'pinch points'.
1.8	If possible, could an area of raised planters be included to provide a space for those with accessibility needs. This is not something that is specifically addressed or required in the Allotment Design Guide,	Raised planters are to be included in the Allotment / Community Orchard that will be provided on the northern boundary of the development (referred to as 'C1' on the approved Green Infrastructure Provision Plan). It is not

Consultee Comment		Response
	but is something that I believe will make this a more inclusive space.	considered necessary to provide them within the allotments in Parcel R11.
2. Landscape Officer (dated 16.06.2026)		
2.1	The covering letter indicates that ground level changes proposed within all public open spaces including the play area to the north, and allotment area are shown on the revised plans, however I am unable to find any proposed levels within these area – further information is required.	The proposed levels are included on the enclosed drawings A389-R11-RM-401 and A389-R11-RM-402.
2.2	I had requested that all contours on the attenuation basins will need to be labelled so we understand how the berms around the basins relate to the adjacent space, however this is not indicated. Plus, it would be helpful to have all gradients for each of the basin sides slopes, indicated too, also as previously requested.	These contours and gradients are shown on the enclosed Proposed Levels and Contours Sheet 1 and Proposed Levels and Contours Sheet 2 drawings.
2.3	It is still not clear from the information provided what and where the vehicle maintenance access arrangements are in relation to each of the basins. Are these required and if so these will need to be indicated on the drawing as this may have a significant impact on the proposed planting around each of the basins.	Basins R11 A and B will be maintained from the adjacent footpaths. R11C will be maintained from the footpath and the play area to the west. R11B will be maintained from the development road.
2.4	The covering letter indicates that construction details of the proposed footpaths within the POS including no-dig details where the footpaths encroach into the RPA's of trees to be retained are shown on Sheet 3 (I presume on the POS Hard Landscape drawing). This is not shown on this drawing.	This information is shown on Highway Construction Detail Sheet 2.
2.5	Illustrative Pond Sections have been provided; however we had requested construction details of the proposed pond in the southern open space are included. We still have no details as to how the pond will be fed with water or whether any outflow is required.	Pond sections are provided on drawing A389-R11-RM-153.
2.6	I had requested chestnut cleft fencing not chestnut paling which is shown in the boundary treatments document. A detail of chestnut cleft fencing is shown below.	The document has been updated to include the requested chestnut cleft fencing.
2.7	The supporting information refers to the additional drawings provided for the play area, however I am unable to find any heights for bunds as described. I had also requested that additional planting was provided along the boundary of the play area with adjacent access	The bund heights have been added to drawing This submission includes Easement Plans from South East Water. They show the route of the

Consultee Comment		Response
	track, but the covering information indicated this wasn't possible due to an easement. I wasn't aware that an easement was located in this area especially as an existing hedgerow is to be removed along this boundary. There needs to be some planted boundary or fence adjacent to the existing access to Brittons Farm as there could be the occasional vehicle using this route.	main and the 5 metre easement. Planting and / or fencing is not permitted within the easement.
2.8	I am unable to find any details with regard to the rain garden detail in the play area as requested.	Raingarden details are included on drawing A389-RM-R11-512.
2.9	I had requested the hedgerow is continued within the POS between the development edge and Waterloo Road as shown by the purple line in the extract below from Sheet 2, however the covering letter indicates there is an easement in this location, which I was unaware of. Please could this be clarified.	This submission includes Easement Plans from South East Water. They show the route of the main and the 5 metre easement. Planting and / or fencing is not permitted within the easement.
2.10	We will need details of each of the enclosure types to be used across the site so we can see that they look like. I note that some of the boundary treatments within the public open space are shown on the Street Furniture and Boundary Treatment document, but others relating the housing are not provided and still not included.	This information is shown on the Boundary Details Plan.
2.11	I had requested that there will need to be some form of enclosure in association with the proposed hedgerow on the public facing boundaries of apartment block 4. – No additional enclosure is shown.	The Proposed Enclosures Layout has been updated to include 1.2m high hoop top railings in addition to the proposed hedgerow.
2.12	There still isn't shown to be any boundary treatment separating the private amenity space for plot 2343 and the adjacent parking court.	The Proposed Enclosures Layout has been updated to fencing and a gate.
2.13	Lighting columns have been added to the landscape drawing key, but they don't appear on the drawings themselves.	The lighting columns have been added to the drawings.
3. Case Officer (dated 22.06.2026)		
3.1	The revised LEMP (revision B) has been submitted alongside the landscaping details and consultees have reviewed it, although it has not been formally submitted in relation to condition 16 yet. (Once it is in an acceptable form, we will need a paper-trail agreeing for it to be treated as being submitted in relation to both).	Noted. I will contact you separately to agree the appropriate mechanism.

Consultee Comment		Response
3.2	The plan on p19 showing the new species rich native hedgerow planting (section 5.6) indicates additional hedgerow which are not shown on the POS landscape proposals at the northern end of the site, highlighted below in purple. Either this plan needs to be updated, or new hedgerow are included and shown on the planting plans. I had already mentioned a lack of hedgerow adjacent to Waterloo Road in my comments and suggested it follows the development edge, however it could form a continuation of the newly planted roadside hedgerow. (plus image included on message)	The plan has been updated to reflect the landscaping plans, which take account of the easements within which planting is not possible.
3.3	The final two paragraphs under 5.16 indicate the allotments will be transferred to a ManCo which is not consisted with the S106 and needs to be revised.	The reference to a ManCo has been deleted.
4. Case Officer (dated 23.07.2026)		
4.1	When the revised landscaping is submitted, please can you make sure that it addresses the removal of the temporary construction access/preparation for landscaping and reinstatement of the hedge once the use of the construction access has ceased (see the comment on Condition 36 and the extract from the R11 RM report below). You will see from the attached that the temporary access overlaps with the permanent path but does not coincide entirely.	A note has been added to drawing P24-2506_EN_03-02G to confirms that the landscaping will be implemented once use of the construction access has ceased.
4.2	In relation to the hard landscaping (and highway construction details as some of the drawings have been submitted in relation to both) I have raised concerns about the use of brindle blockwork (that it might not sit well with the orange/ref bricks) and suggested grey tones might be better. Currently you are still showing brindle and would like to be reassured on the colour point before approving it.	The brindle blockwork has been approved on Parcel R10 and has been installed in some areas. We understand that you will be shortly visiting the site to view.
5. Case Officer (dated 29.07.2026)		
5.1	Along the secondary street the hedges should be supplemented with railings to form a stronger boundary and differentiate the streets in character terms.	The Proposed Enclosures Layout has been updated to include railings as requested.

We consider that this submission addresses the issues raised in the consultation responses received and trust that it will allow you to discharge the condition. Please feel free to contact me should you require further information or wish to discuss the submission in more detail.

Yours sincerely



Daniel Sharp

Director

M 

E 