

MEMORANDUM

From:	Tina Cuss Ecology Officer		
Service	WBC Ecology	App No:	252892
Address:	59 Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham, RG40 4ND.		
Proposal:	Application for submission of details to comply with the following condition of planning consent 233133 dated 26/02/2024. Condition 15 relates to external lighting.		
Type of Development:			
Site Visit Made:	No		

Summary Of Recommendations

- ☐ No objection
- ☐ No objection subject to conditions (and reasons) **stated below**
- ☒ **Negotiate the amendments stated below; or**
- ☐ Request further information before determination as **stated below**
- ☒ **Objection due to the reason(s) stated below**

Comments On Proposal

I have reviewed the covering letter of 25 November, On Site Non Adoptable Lighting report (It Does Lighting, ref 208-01-NAD-LO-C, 10 December 2023) and the On Site Non Adoptable Lighting Design (It Does Lighting, Dwg 208-01-NAD-CG-C Rev C, 12 December 2023).

I must object to the current submitted report and lighting plan as unnecessary lighting is proposed and the scheme fails to demonstrate how the areas identified by the ecologist, including the retained boundary hedgerow and ecological buffer zone will remain unlit. I cannot support approval of lighting proposals that include lighting on elevations which impact the retained boundary hedges and or ecological buffers in particular the west elevation of Unit 1, and the north and south elevations of Plot 4. In addition, the lighting scheme has failed to adhere to the EEMP 3.6.1 proposals that the proposed external lighting shall be designed to be minimal and ensure it would not negatively impact birds, or affect the site's ability to support wildlife. *"It will also be designed to reflect the positioning of bat boxes on each dwelling"*. I understand properties are nearing completion and the bat boxes will already have been integrated into the southern elevation of Unit 1, southwestern corner of Unit 4 and Unit 2 and the western elevation of Unit 2.

Unit 1

All lighting must be removed from the western elevation of Unit 1. The western elevation is immediately adjacent to the retained boundary hedge wildlife corridor

identified by the Ecologists as needing to be protected and retained as a dark corridor for wildlife including bats and birds. Isolux contours are predicted at ground level and not the within the hedgerow. Grid 7 does not demonstrate the retained western boundary hedgerow will be unlit, and appears to mainly/only cover the area west of the hedge. There are no doors or paths, or need for access on the western elevation. The light pollution and impacts to the corridor are contrary to the requirements of condition 15. Luminaire 11s and 12C are proposed at 3m high, are unnecessary and would detrimentally impact the bat tube installed on the southwest corner.

To recommend approval, lights 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7C must all be removed from the scheme. While there is no hardstanding or patio in the approved hard landscaping plans, light 3C should be lowered so that it is installed below 3m from the ground and the detail of the light must take account for reflection in the French doors and control with a PIR sensor must be proposed. As lighting access to the front door from the drive when in use is justified as necessary I have no objection to sensitive lighting. Insufficient information is provide in the report for me to assess luminaire 8A and confirm if the colour temperature conforms with GN08/23 and best practice. The revised proposals should demonstrate how 8A and 3C are controlled by a PIRs on a short timer less than of not more than 2 minutes and will not be triggered by animals.



Unit 2 & Unit 3

Due to the height of the doors 9 and 10 and 18 and 19 should not be installed above the doors and must be amended to reduce light spill. I suggest a single light mounted between the doors may be adequate, provided that the reflection from the glass does not increase light pollution on the canopy of tree T32 and garden habitat. Luminaires 11 and 19C are proposed at 3m high, are unnecessary and would detrimentally impact the bat tube installed on the west elevations contrary to the approved EEMP proposals.

Luminaires 11, 12 14, 17, 19, 20 and 21 are not justified and must be removed. The surfaced outside space is limited to the parking and driveway, and there is no need for lighting on either the north and south sides of Units 2 and 3. The light spill from

12, 14, 17 and 21 would have an unnecessary impact on the new hedgerow habitat corridors that will be created between the properties. There is no door into the gable end of either garage. Lights 11 and 19C are not required and would cause pollution and could deter bats from using the bat tubes integrated into the western elevations.



Unit 4

The door on the southern elevation of Unit 4 provides access to the bedroom ensuite. There is no access path and no need to light the southern elevation, including where there is a bat box integrated into the western corner of the building closes to the retained tree and enhanced scrub habitat. To support lighting proposals lights 26, 27, 30, 31, 31 and 33C must be removed. There is no access path on the northern elevation and light spill from the windows provides sufficient light for access. Lights 26 and 27 don't provide a health and safety benefit as there is no access to the driveway and the light spill would cause unnecessary pollute the adjacent new planting. Luminaires 30 and 33 C at 3m would also impact the bat box on the southwest corner.

I am satisfied that lights 25, 28C, and 29 only can be justified, but must be controlled by PIR set to not more than 2 minutes. However 25C should only be installed at 3.5m if the contours plans can demonstrate light spill is limited to the path to the front door only, and new hedges remain unlit where possible. I note the luminaires about the front doors of units 1 to 3 are proposed at only 2.20m.

Four recessed wall lights 34b, 35B, 36B, and 37B proposed at 0.60m high are unnecessary. The approved gate is a "traditional wooden entrance gate" 1.2m in height and I am not aware a wall has been approved. The gate would be adequately lit by car lights in hours of darkness. When open the gates there would obscure the lights on the north side. Grid four does not take account of the height and proximity of the new eastern hedgerow. There is currently inadequate information to demonstrate need, or that the detail and the controls of the lighting on the gate would not cause negative to wildlife in the new ecological corridor or why any luminaire is necessary here. If the engineer can demonstrate it is necessary, a single wall low-level light or louvred 180°/half bollard light controlled by a PIR would be adequate to illuminate access for pedestrians.



Summary

The lighting proposals must be amended to ensure that any external lighting included is justified, and demonstrate clearly that the scheme conforms with the detail of Ecological Enhancement & Mitigation proposals, the requirement of condition 15, and planning policy including CP1, CP3, CP7, TB23 and the NPPF.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)

Date:	04/12/25	Signed:	T Cuss
--------------	----------	----------------	--------

