

Emy Circuit

From: Stefania Petrosino [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 September 2026 15:58
To: Emy Circuit
Cc: Jess Jutton; Ethan Cherrett; aidan.robson
Subject: RE: 153142 South Wokingham parcels R7 & R13 draft conditions

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

Hi Emy

Apologies for the delay. I'm now expecting to receive the drainage information tomorrow. If you're happy, I'll send to Boni directly copying you in etc.

In terms of lighting, our lighting designed has provided the below justification for the proposed lighting strategy. In their opinion, the proposed BL1 columns provide the necessary light spill control. Can you send to Duncan to review please so that we can avoid a condition for lighting.

The Ecology Officer is correct that the BL2 optic provides a greater degree of rear light cut-off. However, in this particular instance, the level of cut-off is considered greater than is necessary for the application. During the design process, the BL2 optic was assessed and found to reduce rearward light distribution to such an extent that it would significantly limit the useful throw of light. This would in turn require a greater number of lighting columns to achieve the required lighting performance.

The BL1 optic provides a more appropriate balance, restricting rear light spill sufficiently while still retaining enough rearward distribution to avoid the need for an unnecessarily high number of additional columns. On this basis, I would recommend retaining the current specification where possible, as the BL1 optic provides the necessary control of spill light without adversely affecting the efficiency of the lighting layout.

Many thanks,

Stefania

Stefania Petrosino
Associate

T 07302 005 887

E s.petrosino@nexusplanning.co.uk



LONDON | BIRMINGHAM | BRISTOL | MANCHESTER | READING

nexusplanning.co.uk

