

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

Planning Portal Ref: PP-14442453
LPA Ref: 252712

26th January 2026

Dear Mr Hindle,

Proposal: Application under Section 73 for the variation of Condition 2 (approved plans list) relating to planning application 223691.

Lee Spring, Latimer Road, Wokingham, RG41 2WA

I write further to the submission of the Section 73 application (reference: 252712), which seeks to vary Condition 2 (approved plans list) of planning permission 223691, and the consultation responses received from the Council's Highways and Landscape Teams in December 2025 as a result.

Upon receipt of the consultation comments received from the Council's Highways and Landscape Teams, we subsequently met to discuss the concerns which had been raised and our client's rationale and proposal to address these where possible.

On this basis, I am pleased to enclose an amended set of plans which seeks to address the consultation responses received. For ease of reference, I have included the schedule of plans submitted with the original application with an amended plans reference column.

Plan	Reference	Amended Plan Reference
Proposed Site Plan	28196- PD200	28196- PD200A
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	28196-PD220	28196- PD220A
Proposed 1 st Floor Plan	28196-PD221	28196- PD221A
Proposed 2 nd Floor Plan	28196-PD222	28196- PD222A
Proposed 3 rd Floor Plan	28196-PD223	28196- PD223A
Proposed Roof Plan	28196-PD224	28196- PD224A
Proposed West and East Elevations	28196-PD310	28196- PD310A
Proposed North and South Elevations	28196-PD311	28196- PD311A
West Elevation Comparison Approved Vs Proposed	28196-PD320	28196- PD320A
East Elevation Comparison Approved Vs Proposed	28196-PD321	28196- PD321A
North and South Elevation Comparison Approved Vs Proposed	28196-PD322	28196- PD322A

Henry Adams LLP Rowan House, Baffins Lane, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1UA
01243 533633 option 2 planning@henryadams.co.uk henryadams.co.uk



Sales ▶ Lettings ▶ Holiday Cottages ▶ Commercial ▶ New Homes ▶ Professional Valuations ▶ Development Land ▶ Fine Art Saleroom ▶ Rural & Farming

3D View (South West)		28196-WD1000A
3D View (North West)		28196-WD1001A
3D View (North East)		28196-WD1002A
3D View (South East)		28196-WD1003A
3D View 1		28196-WD1004
3D View 2		28196-WD1005

I have also summarised the amendments which have been made in response to each of the comments raised following the initial consultation period.

Landscape Comments

1. *It is not clear from the information given if the green roofs and solar panels are still proposed as part of the development. These will still need to be included as part of the design.*

- As discussed, the Energy Strategy and daylight calculations are in the process of being updated to reflect the current proposals. Whilst green roofs and photovoltaic panels were shown indicatively on some of the plans submitted with the original application, these features were not specifically secured by condition nor required by the approved Energy Strategy and therefore do not form part of the formally approved development.
- The updated Energy Strategy will demonstrate that the amended scheme continues to meet the relevant energy and sustainability requirements through alternative measures. In addition, the omission of photovoltaic panels responds to long-term maintenance and management considerations, without resulting in any material harm to the scheme's overall energy performance.
- The removal of these features does not give rise to any material harm to the visual appearance of the development or the wider street scene, nor does it conflict with any specific policy requirement applicable to the site. The proposed change therefore represents a minor refinement to the approved scheme, appropriate to be considered as part of the current Section 73 application.

2. *There is a significant reduction in window size across the whole building which has a detrimental impact on the design of the building.*

- Approved windows 450mm cill & 2400 or 2700 head
- Proposed windows 450/ 600mm cill & 2100 or 2250 head.
- Windows have been reduced in size to mitigate Part O overheating/ solar gain issues
- Reducing head heights of windows allows for curtain track space (2400mm ceiling heights)
- Opening lights have been added to balcony doors to allow natural ventilation without having to open the balcony doors.

3. *The removal of patio doors and patios on the northern elevation of the ground floor severely restricts the overlooking and natural surveillance of the northern public open space and will need to be retained.*

- On the approved drawings flat 2 did not stack with the flats above (creating service stacking issues)
- The layout also meant the living space was wholly north facing.
- There are still habitable rooms overlooking the landscaped area.
- Flat 3 already has a large outside amenity area. Adding a second terrace isn't necessary to assist surveillance – However, a window has been added back in where the dining table is to provide more surveillance.

4. *The replacement of railings with brick piers on one side of the balconies on the eastern elevation for first and second floor layouts will not only have a detrimental effect on the articulation of the building from key views as windows and doors are not visible but will also reduce light into these apartments. This is a fundamental change to the design of the apartment block and is not acceptable.*

- These apartments are northeast facing – As stated above, the lighting assessment has been updated which will confirm that this will not detrimentally impact on natural daylight.
- Furthermore, some of the side openings would need to be screened off to prevent overlooking from the balcony to the neighbouring apartment. The current arrangement presents an amenity concern in terms of overlooking.
- To overcome this, recessed brick panels have been added to the proposed plans which provides some additional articulation to the building.

5. *Is it necessary to have rear gardens accesses to two ground floor flats as this will require two parallel lengths of fencing to the backs of two gardens making the garden space even narrower than originally shown.*

- These were required for means of escape. However, these have subsequently been designed out so these rear access paths have been omitted.

6. *Main entrances to the front of the apartment block now appear to be less well defined. They were originally marked by a change in material which clearly signalled the entrance spaces.*

- The approved plans show canopies beyond the main building line and the internal wall clad in timber.
- The canopy depth has been reduced and the door way recessed – this still provides wayfinding.
- These have also been reduced in depth as there are underground services runs required in this location between the building and the car parking (SUDS) spaces.
- Having timber cladding next to a main entrance is not ideal from a maintenance/ robust perspective (likely to be damaged over time) and the client ERs require all external walls to be made of non-combustible materials.
- As suggested, we have proposed a contrasting brick.

7. The red line appears to have changed along the norther boundary of the site, and it is unclear why this change has been made.

- As discussed, the red line has now been amended to reflect the red line shown on the approved application.

8. The small amount of landscape planting that was proposed within the car park has been reduced even further by the inclusion of an overly large bin store and electricity substation. This will have a detrimental impact on the communal space to the front of the apartment block.

- The advice provided from Building Control is that refuse stores should not be adjacent to the main entrance as it is a fire risk on the main escape route to the building (the entrance has been moved for the same fire strategy reasons that the approved designs did not factor for).
- Therefore, an external refuse store has been provided, located centrally for all users of Block A & B. Block C has its own smaller store. The store size is what is required by the refuse guidance (Please refer to the Refuse Store in Highways comments)
- Likewise, the substation is a technical requirement of the site that has had to be provided for.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that some areas of soft landscaping have been lost, they were minimal areas.
- A reduction in car parking provision would redress this balance and given the scheme is now 100% affordable there is data to suggest car usage is lower in such schemes – We understand you have sought advice from the Highways Team on this.
- The refuse store has been sized on Wokingham's requirements.

Highways Comments

1. The approved layout consists of a total of 34 no. car parking spaces (including 6 no. allocated spaces for accessible units and 3 x 3-bed units), and 2 motorcycle spaces. The remaining car parking spaces are unallocated. While the proposed level of parking provision remains unchanged, the proposed number of allocated parking increases from 6 to 8 (3 no. accessible bays, 4 no. allocated bays and 1 no. bay reserved for maintenance vehicle), which does not align with the previous approval. Revision is required. Meanwhile, additional clearance of 0.5m is generally required for Parking Space 26 being adjacent to an obstruction. Parking Space #27 is considered as a parallel parking provision, which is required to be 6m long.

- The revised site plan shows allocations to be 6no (3 for M4(3) units and 3 for the 3 bed units) and the maintenance vehicle reservation has been omitted.
- Landscaping between space 22 and 23 has been moved next to space 26 to provide the 0.5m additional clearance.
- Space 27 can be accessed from the rear (with plenty of space behind it) so we don't agree this is a parallel parking space.

2. The approved plans include 46 no. secured cycle parking and 8 no. additional visitor cycle spaces. The proposed level of cycle provision remains unchanged. It is, however, noted that the minimum numbers of numbers of cycle parking required for Block A is 29 and Blocks B & C is 15. The proposed cycle

provisions accessible to Blocks B & C are reduced to 12. The applicant shall consider relocating four of the cycle stores adjacent to the motorcycle spaces to the Block B & C. Meanwhile, all proposed cycle stores have to be designed according to LTN 1/20. The proposed arrangement does not fully comply with the minimum dimensions as listed in Table 11-2. Revision is required.

- The revised site plan shows 16 cycle stores to Block C, 24 in Block A & B with additional 6 in landscaped space.
- The individual cycles stores comply with LTN 1/20, the A & B Store complies in terms of space for cycles, it falls short in terms of the aisle between spaces (1.8m min req – we can achieve 1.4m).
- It may be possible to reduce the wall between the entrance corridor and Cycle Store to 100mm block which would make the aisle width 1.6m wide if required.

3. According to Manual for Streets and the council's waste collection guide, the maximum carrying distances for households (30m) and refuse collection operators (10m) from the collection point. Such standards will apply to all plots within the site. The applicant proposes a centralised bin store for Blocks A and B, which would likely exceed the maximum carrying distance for multiple households. Meanwhile, to avoid overspilling of wastes and recyclables to the driveway, the required area of the refuse collection point shall be confirmed with the council's Cleaner & Greener team.

- Blocks A & B Refuse Store is 26.5m from Block A and 21.8m from Block B
- Block C's Refuse Store is under 10m from Units 40-43; 18m from Unit 39 and 30m from Unit 29
- Wokingham BC Waste Management Facilities in New Developments Guidance Notes:
Refuse 80L per flat and use 360ltr bins (unless 1100ltr bins can be used)
Recycling 120L per flat and use 360ltr bins (unless 1100ltr bins can be used)
- Block A & B Store is shown to accommodate:
Refuse $36 \times 80 = 2880$ (8nr 360ltr bins)
Recycling $36 \times 120 = 4320$ (12nr 360ltr bins)
- Block C store (plus units 29 & 39) are shown to accommodate
Refuse $6 \times 80 = 360$ (1nr 360ltr bins)
Recycling $6 \times 120 = 720$ (1nr 360ltr bins)

Following our meeting on Wednesday 14th January 2026, you very kindly obtained feedback from the Council's waste team with regards to providing slighter larger bins (1100Ltr). We have explored this option, however for the larger bins we would require 4 for recycling and 2.5 for waste (in this instance that would equate to 2 larger bins for waste plus 2 additional smaller bins to hit the capacity). However, this would only result in a small gain of internal space, as the aisles would need to be wider to maneuver the larger bins. This would result in the bin store needing to be the same size. On this basis, we have left the bin stores as proposed which does accord with Wokingham's guidance.

In summary, we have updated the site plan, associated floor plans and elevations to reflect all of the above changes. These include:

Site Plan:

- Added window to lounge of flat 3 to add to surveillance of communal garden
- Omitted rear access to rear gardens
- Shown refuse store bins that meet WBC guidance
- Moved planting bed adjacent to the refuse store so there is the min 500mm gap
- Rationalised the cycle storage next to Block C so the cycle stores/ refuse store reads as one linear outbuilding
- Revised the allocated parking so it matches the approved arrangement (maintenance vehicle bay annotation omitted)

Elevations:

- Recessed brick panels/ lintel detail added to smaller windows on northeast and northwest elevations (and on the return elevation on the southwest elevation – Flat 14/ 22)
- Additional recessed brickwork with blank windows (Flats 11/ 20)
- Brick detail added to southwest elevation above entrance to Block B
- Elevation drawings updated to show brick hatch only on proposed drawings (omitted on comparison drawings) and shade hatch added to help show articulation.

As requested, we have also provided some 3d Visual Images of the amended elevations to provide some context on the articulation of the building. I would caveat that these images have been provided to show the articulation of the elevations only and do not incorporate the approved landscape scheme.

I trust that the submission is in order and addresses the concerns raised. However, In the event you seek clarification on any of the above information or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I would be grateful if you would confirm receipt of the amended plans and confirm the re-consultation period.

I look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Yours faithfully,

Kind regards,

Harriet Lobacz MRTPI
Senior Planner
Henry Adams LLP