

From: Connie Davis <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 June 2026 11:43:54 UTC+01:00
To: "Connie Davis" <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>
Subject: Appendix 1 - Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham
Attachments: Limmerhill Proof.pdf

Private: Information that contains a small amount of sensitive data which is essential to communicate with an individual but doesn't require to be sent via secure methods.

From: Connie Davis
Sent: 13 April 2026 18:30
To: 'Tim Northey' <tim.n@amh.co.uk>
Cc: Marco Mauro <marco.mauro@howespercival.com>
Subject: RE: Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham

Dear Tim,

The present deadline for the Council's Statement of Case and Statement of Common Ground is 24th April. This was extended by a week due to PINS' delay to the LPA in confirming your revised appeal plans were accepted. I had assumed PINS had also notified you of this but that does not appear the case.

Nevertheless, a further slight extension for the SoCG may still well be required in light of your leave. I will make contact with them, and my aim is to have a working draft back with you for your return.

Regarding the s106, I will do what I can to speed this up - I am just waiting on a few matters to be confirmed by consultees and then the Council's solicitor should be able to progress ASAP, although noting we have until relatively close to the hearing to finalise.

Lastly, on the matter of SANG, I have now been advised by the Ecologist that there is no statutory requirement for a list to be kept. However, they have advised that the only other strategic SANG supplier is the University of Reading. The SANG you purchase capacity from will need to be within the correct catchment, and as a pointer, the Ecologist has advised you may wish to look at Langley Mead (extension) or Blagrove Lane. Both of these SANGs are not actually operational at this stage, however. For the Langley Mead extension, please contact the University of Reading. Berkley Strategic are the contact for SANG capacity at Land Adjacent to Blagrove Lane (as the SANG is still with the developer). Your Ecologist may well have other suggestions or can discuss this further.

A very recent appeal scheme in the borough (Limmerhill) for 60 dwellings, could also not use Rooks Nest and had to find alternative provision and approached Berkley Strategic as the supplier. Appendix 1 of the Attached Proof for the appeal shows the letter from the supplier. Whilst the appeal was dismissed, a Grampian condition would have been required for this SANG matter to be resolved, as the SANG is not actually in existence yet. As such, if your scheme is also reliant upon a SANG that is not actually SANG yet, a similar situation may occur in that the SANG has to be provided before your scheme via a Grampian condition.

The Ecologist does recommend, however, that rather than a letter form the provider, a full allocation agreement, if they wish to give the inspector confidence in the security of the SANG mitigation measure.

The Council will not be able to get involved further with this matter as it is a separate negotiation between the providers/ applicants, however it is hoped this helps. Any forthcoming SANG proposal for this appeal will need to be reviewed by the Ecologist and Natural England consulted, to understand if reason for refusal 8 could be overcome in advance of the hearing.

Regarding Rooks Nest, figures are currently being worked out as the matter of capacity is presently becoming an issue for live planning applications. The lack of capacity issue has heightened/ become more apparent since I initially contacted you about this matter. As such, and just to re-confirm, the Council will not be able to provide capacity at Rooks Nest.

However, to confirm, SAMM can be secured separately, and so the per dwelling contribution for this element can be secured.

I hope this helps and I will revert back on the SoCG asap along with the s106.

Best wishes,
Connie

From: Tim Northey <tim.n@amh.co.uk>
Sent: 10 April 2026 18:18
To: Connie Davis <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>
Cc: Marco Mauro <marco.mauro@howespercival.com>
Subject: RE: Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham

Dear Connie,

I have still yet to hear from the LPA on the draft Statement of Common Ground which according to PINS timetable is due to be submitted by Friday 17th April. I am however now off on annual leave until the 20th April so it is not going to be possible to meet this

timescale and would suggest the LPA contact PINS to ask for an extension of time on this matter.

I had also hoped that we would have heard from the Council's ecologist by now with regard to a list of local SANGs so we could start looking into potential alternatives. Notwithstanding this, having more fully considered the Council's position on the Rooks Nest SANG we are concerned that the LPA is seeking to be obstructive on the matter by advising that capacity exists but that it is not willing to accommodate this scheme. The Council as land owner would not be concerned with the policy compliance or otherwise of a proposal, this can only be a concern of the LPA suggesting the position has been determined by this function of the Council. Whilst it is appreciated that the Council is not obliged to offer capacity, at the same time it should treat all applications equally and with the LPA no longer the decision maker with this proposal, such behaviour could be considered unreasonable. I would therefore be grateful if the Council could confirm how much capacity currently remains at the Rooks Nest SANG and the extent of any commitments for consented residential schemes so we can fully understand the position.

It would also be helpful if you could provide us with an update on the Council's progress with reviewing the draft legal agreement as we have had no contact from your legal colleagues.

Kind regards,

Tim

Tim Northey *MRTPI BA Hons*
Planning Director

Number: 07792 330576
Email: tim.n@amh.co.uk

www.amh.co.uk



This e-mail is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and you have received this e-mail in error then any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited and you should contact the sender by e-mail return and then delete all the material from your system. This e-mail does not form part of a legally binding agreement and are always SUBJECT TO CONTRACTS. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise that you carry out your own checks on any attachments to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses. Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.



From: Connie Davis <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 April 2026 12:07
To: Tim Northey <tim.n@amh.co.uk>
Cc: Marco Mauro <marco.mauro@howespercival.com>
Subject: RE: Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham

Hi Tim,

Thanks for your email.

I have contacted the WBC Ecologist about this and will revert back ASAP for you. They are out of the office, returning 7th April, so I hope to hear swiftly upon their return.

Also, I have just spotted that your drainage strategy has not been updated to reflect the updated layout. Could you confirm if this is intended to be updated at this appeal stage and if so, timescales for submission (to LPA and PINS)?

Best wishes,
Connie

Private: Information that contains a small amount of sensitive data which is essential to communicate with an individual but doesn't require to be sent via secure methods.

From: Tim Northey <tim.n@amh.co.uk>
Sent: 02 April 2026 10:36
To: Connie Davis <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>
Cc: Marco Mauro <marco.mauro@howespercival.com>
Subject: RE: Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham

Dear Connie,

Thank you for the email and the Council's position on the Rooks Nest SANG is unhelpful but noted.

I understand from our ecologist that LPAs are required by Natural England to maintain a list of local SANGs and their current capacity. This doesn't appear to be available on your website. Please could you therefore forward a copy of this information so we can explore alternative options.

Kind regards,

Tim

Tim Northey *MRTPI BA Hons*
Planning Director

Number: 07792 330576
Email: tim.n@amh.co.uk

www.amh.co.uk



This e-mail is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and you have received this e-mail in error then any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited and you should contact the sender by e-mail return and then delete all the material from your system. This e-mail does not form part of a legally binding agreement and are always SUBJECT TO CONTRACTS. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise that you carry out your own checks on any attachments to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses. Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.



From: Connie Davis <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 March 2026 17:47
To: Tim Northey <tim.n@amh.co.uk>; Marco.Mauro@howespercival.com
Subject: FW: Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham

Dear Marco and Tim,

Many thanks for sending this through.

I was planning on reaching out to Tim about a couple of matters:

1. **SoCG** - Regarding the Statement of Common Ground, I will get this back to you for comment as soon as possible, however until the Council's position on matters becomes clearer for the appeal (ie. I am waiting on updated consultations to your appeal information), it is hard to confirm what is agreed/ not agreed. This will become clearer as the Council's statement progresses. In

my experience, PINS are generally more relaxed for the submission of the SoCG provided that it is still received in adequate time before the hearing date.

2. **Reason for refusal 8 - mitigation for impact on the Thames Basin Heath SPA (SANG/ SAMM)** - I note in your statement (and can now see in the drafted s106) that the intention is to use SANG capacity at Rooks Nest SANG. I have been in touch with the Head of Environmental Services here at the Council who acts as the portfolio holder for the SANG. Unfortunately, he has confirmed that this scheme cannot be accommodated in Rooks Nest SANG. Capacity at the SANG is short at present, and so consequently SANG capacity is only offered to otherwise compliant schemes at this time. Given the Council has refused permission based on a number of other planning grounds, SANG capacity is not offered to this scheme.

Regardless of any debate on capacity (as I note in your appeal statement you stated that it was considered there is sufficient capacity), the Council, as landowner, is not obliged to offer capacity to any scheme as its use is always at the discretion of the landowner (the Council).

The delegated report it did allude to this potential scenario and said:

The submitted Ecological Appraisal proposed to secure mitigation for likely significant effects on the TBH SPA as per the standard delivery framework of providing SANG and SAMM. It proposes to secure SANG capacity at Rooks Nest Wood via a contribution secured by planning obligation. The site is within the catchment of Rooks Nest Wood SANG. Should the Council not wish to supply SANG capacity from Rooks Nest Wood SANG, another strategic SANG will need to be identified and the applicant will need to show that this meets the standards required for it to be viable SANG for this site.

I wanted to flag this up so you are aware of the situation in advance of the hearing, and to give you a chance between now and then to find alternative capacity at another appropriate SANG. Without this, the Council would be maintaining that this reason for refusal should be upheld.

In light of the drafted s106 being on the basis of using capacity at Rooks Nest SANG, could you advise if you wish to retract this draft for the meantime with the aim of resolving this matter and then updating the draft? Alternatively, I can pass this draft to legal colleagues but I will make them aware that Schedule 5 is not agreeable from the offset for the reasons above.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes,
Connie

Private: Information that contains a small amount of sensitive data which is essential to communicate with an individual but doesn't require to be sent via secure methods.

From: Marco Mauro <Marco.Mauro@howespercival.com>
Sent: 26 March 2026 16:27
To: Connie Davis <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>
Cc: Tim Northey <tim.n@amh.co.uk>
Subject: FW: Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham

You don't often get email from marco.mauro@howespercival.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Connie

I am instructed on behalf of the appellant in relation to the S106 which is necessary in connection with this appeal.

Please find attached draft S106 agreement, which in the most part is based on your template wording and agreements that you have entered into previously so it should look quite familiar. There is some detail that we need you to provide us with as set out in the comments. I have also attached the location plan and affordable housing plan.

Title is attached but currently there is an application to change the title into the names of Melissa Lewis and Mitchel Flaherty and I will let you have details of this as soon as it is available. In the meantime, I look forward to hearing from you in relation to the draft.

Kind regards

Marco Mauro

Partner
Milton Keynes
Howes Percival LLP
Direct Dial: 01908 872216

Mobile: [07974 288678](tel:07974288678)

[Read our latest news here](#)



Cybercrime Alert: Bank Details

Please be aware that there is a significant risk posed by cyber fraud, specifically affecting email accounts and bank account details. PLEASE NOTE that our bank account details WILL NOT change during the course of a transaction, and we will NOT change our bank details via email. Please be careful to check account details with us in person if in any doubt. We will not accept responsibility if you transfer money into an incorrect account.

This communication is sent for and on behalf of Howes Percival LLP.

Howes Percival LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC 322781 and is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. Howes Percival LLP is subject to the SRA Code of Conduct, which may be viewed on the [SRA website](#). The term "Partner" is used to refer to a member of Howes Percival LLP, or an employee or consultant of it (or any subsidiary of it) with equivalent standing and authority. A list of members' names is open for inspection at our registered office: Nene House, 4 Rushmills, Northampton NN4 7YB. Howes Percival LLP's VAT number is 119523573.

DATA PROTECTION

Howes Percival LLP takes its data protection obligations extremely seriously. If you are a client of the firm, please see our privacy notice: [Privacy Notice for Clients](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This communication contains information which is confidential and may also be privileged. It is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s), please note that any distribution, copying, or use of this communication or the information in it, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error please notify us by e-mail or by telephone (+44(0) 1604 230400) and then delete the e-mail and any copies of it.

From: Connie Davis <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>

Sent: 17 March 2026 17:24

To: Tim Northey <tim.n@amh.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham

Hello Tim,

Many thanks and hope you're well too. I have just returned to the office after a 1.5 week period of leave to see the appeal has started, so I am just trying to catch up!

Re. the s106, this can be sent to me and then I will notify legal services and then it will be allocated to a solicitor to deal with. Please note that I will have to provide the LPA's s106 instructions to the legal team too, to ensure that the contents of the s106 are along the right lines for both parties. I will aim to do this ASAP, however I note that at present there is not a set date for when the s106 agreement has to be submitted to PINS, whereas there is for other documents. As such, I will likely have to start on the SoCG and SoC which at present are due 17/04.

Best wishes,
Connie

Private: Information that contains a small amount of sensitive data which is essential to communicate with an individual but doesn't require to be sent via secure methods.

From: Tim Northey <tim.n@amh.co.uk>

Sent: 16 March 2026 16:19

To: Connie Davis <Connie.Davis@wokingham.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning Appeal - Land west of Edney's Hill, Barkham

WARNING!

For the attention of
WBC, Optalis, WHL, BCSolutions and
Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Dear Connie,

I hope you are well, and you will probably be aware that we have now appealed this decision of the Council.

A legal agreement has been drafted to address a number of the reasons for refusal, and I would be grateful if you could advise of the Officer our solicitor should issue the first draft to at the Council for review and comment.

Kind regards,

Tim

Tim Northey *MRTPI BA Hons*
Planning Director

Number: 07792 330576
Email: tim.n@amh.co.uk

www.amh.co.uk



This e-mail is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and you have received this e-mail in error then any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited and you should contact the sender by e-mail return and then delete all the material from your system. This e-mail does not form part of a legally binding agreement and are always SUBJECT TO CONTRACTS. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise that you carry out your own checks on any attachments to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses. Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.



DISCLAIMER You should be aware that all e-mails received and sent by this Council are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party. (The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be privileged and confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee). The views expressed may not be official policy but the personal views of the originator. If you are not the addressees any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.

DISCLAIMER You should be aware that all e-mails received and sent by this Council are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party. (The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be privileged and confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee). The views expressed may not be official policy but the personal views of the originator. If you are not the addressees any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.

DISCLAIMER You should be aware that all e-mails received and sent by this Council are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party. (The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be privileged and confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee). The views expressed may not be official policy but the personal views of the originator. If you are not the addressee any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.