

Reserved Matters Application Consultation Response Tracker			
Application Address		Parcels R7 and R13 Land at Phase 2b of the South Wokingham SDL	
Application reference		253142	
Date		May-26	



No	Consultee	Date	Comment	Response	Old Plan Reference	Revised Plan Reference
1.1	Affordable Housing	17/02/2026	I would like the Affordable rented homes to be smaller unit types eg 1 bed flats and 2 bedroom flats rather than 2 bed Houses, 3 Bed houses and 4 bed houses. This is driven by affordability given the different rent levels of each tenure and that this gap widens as the unit size increases. We cannot assume that all applicants will be in receipt of full housing benefit. I would suggest the Affordable apartment block that is proposed to offer 24 Social rented homes is reviewed to include Social rent and Affordable rented homes. Overall, given the mix above I would say that the number of 3 bed houses and 4 bedroom houses is quite low. Only 6% of the affordable homes are 4 bedroomed and only 17% of the affordable homes are 3 bed roomed houses. However the pepper potting provided in the application is accepted. Additional comments: Having given it further consideration, a better alternative might be to make the eight ground-floor flats in block 1 affordable rented and the 16 first and second-floor flats, plus the houses social rented. This would result in a good fit with the obligation for 4-12% of the rented accommodation to be affordable rented and, because the ground-floor flats each have their own entrance, this would not give rise to the usual management issues.	It has been agreed that the ground floor flats in Block 1 (no. 8 total) will change from social rented to affordable rented and the three and four-bedroom dwellings will change from affordable rented to social rented. This addresses the concerns regarding the affordability of the larger dwellings.	P1905.R07.R13.04	P1905.R07.R13.04 F
2.1	Archaeology	28/01/2026	I have reviewed the above application and in agreement with the archaeology desk-based assessment submitted with the application, I agree that no further archaeological investigations are required for R7 or R13. The DBA does not mention a second phase of archaeology which has taken place along the eastern boundary of the area, within the distributor road footprint near to Britains Farm - however although this work has been completed it has not yet reported on, therefore this is understandable, and it will not materially change my advice.	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.1	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	There are habitable rooms on the ground-floor/south elevation so the enclosure should be extended to provide defensible space around them and define what is public/private	The hedgerow alignment has been adjusted to create additional amenity space for the apartment block and define the public/private space.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
3.2	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Electronic gates to be added to FOG Plot 4076	It is considered that electronic gates are not suitable for this style and type of development in this location.	N/A	N/A
3.3	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Enclosure between Block 3 and car park to be a wall with defensive planting	Enclosure changed to a brick wall with planting.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.4	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Gap between the fencing for the houses and the boundary with the adjacent landowner (Plots 4079-4105)	Railings have been added with provision for maintenance access.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.5	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Hedge to be extended around front garden of Plot 4105.	Hedge has been extended.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.6	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Pumping station - weldmesh product to be reconsidered for something more park setting appropriate.	Weldmesh to be retained but native species rich hedgerow planting proposed around perimeter of the structure with tree planting where possible.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.7	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Details of the piers and how they integrate with railings	New plan produced to show details of the different boundaries.	N/A	P1905.R07.R13.24
3.8	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Block 1 - Identify where the areas of public space and private space will be. Review curtilage of the apartment building at both entrances.	Fencing shown around perimeter of Block 1 to assist with demonstrating private spaces.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.9	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Review hedge placement for double fronted houses - should go around all defensible spaces	This has been reviewed and updated.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C

3.10	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Main Street Character Area - include a fence along with the hedge in front gardens	Railings added to houses within Main Street Character area alongside a hedge.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.11	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Hedge along the boundary with the SWDR	The hedge along the SWDR and Easthampstead Link Road is proposed under the SWDR approved works. A railing is added around the front of Block 1 to define public and private space as per the design code.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.12	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Rural character area boundary with SWDR - review fence option	Railings added to on corner & vista plots	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.13	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Rural edge character area - Plot 3014 - hedge to front garden	Hedgerow has been added.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
3.14	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Fence along the western boundary.	Timber knee rail added to western boundary.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
3.15	Case Officer - Enclosures Comments	02/03/2026	Plot 3051 - extend hedge to side of house.	Hedgerow has been added.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
4.1	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	What amenity space does the FoG, plot 4076 have? If none at ground-level, could a balcony be added?	It isn't possible to add a balcony to the FOG due to its relationship to the road at the front and the car park to the rear. It is the only dwelling without external amenity space - occupiers will be aware of this when buying the house and will have access to the SANG and wider open space.	N/A	N/A
4.2	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Plot 4100 lacks an active secondary frontage.	Low height pier and wall been added to the side of this plot.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
4.3	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	H482 lower sill height of skylights and first floor layout / windows	Changes to housetypes are not proposed.	N/A	N/A
4.4	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Where house-types AL32, AL24 & L358 occur on corners, additional windows have been added in the flank elevations, which is welcome. However, this needs to be taken further to provide a secondary frontage (eg addition of a bay or other, larger windows). Alternatively, those house-types identified with a green symbol provide successful corner units.	L358 have been changed to L361 which are corner turning units. It is considered that sufficient additional elevation enhancements has been made to AL32 and AL24 housetypes.	P1905.R07.R13.01	P1905.R07.R13.01 H
4.5	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	L358 & L467 would benefit from a steeper roof pitch, particularly as they occur in the more traditional character areas.	Changes to housetypes are not proposed.	N/A	N/A
4.6	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	While House type H486 is generally successful as a house-type for a corner plot, the small (bathroom) windows in the centre of the entrance elevation detract from its appearance. A stronger feature is required, perhaps an addition of a central dormer and additional brick detailing around the first-floor bathroom window to give it more impact.	Changes to housetypes are not proposed.	N/A	N/A
4.7	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Would it be possible to swap the first-floor bathroom and study in type H482 to avoid the smaller, obscure glazed window in the front elevation? Also, could the rear windows be enlarged (to improve the appearance and natural light).	Changes to housetypes are not proposed.	N/A	N/A
4.8	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Pull back the parking for plots 4020 & 4021 to reduce prominence on bend	Due to the angle of Plot 4021 the parking cannot go back any further.	N/A	N/A
4.9	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Garden depths are one of the factors that is supposed to help differentiate the different character areas, with those in the Main Street CA having a smaller set-back and more regular building line compared to the rural edge or neighbourhood residential. Plots 4020-4016 & 4030-4032 have quite deep frontages, compared to many others, including the rural edge which is actually facing onto the same street. If these plots were pulled forward, it would fit better with the character area and increase private amenity space.	Plots have been brought forward to reduce the front garden sizes.	P1905.R07.R13.01	P1905.R07.R13.01 F
4.10	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	What is the reason for putting the bollard in this location (in front of plot 3003)? Would it be better near the junction?	Access is required for emergency access with the bollard preventing the road becoming a cut-through.	N/A	N/A
4.11	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	The layout for plot 4001/the sales area must show the final layout, with the interim arrangements shown on a separate drawing or inset. Implementation of the final layout/landscaping before occupation of say the 200 th dwelling can then be conditioned. Presumably, it will need a similar bollard arrangement to the opposite side of the road (point 10).	Additional plan produced for sales area.	N/A	P1905.R07.R13.23

4.12	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Plots 3022 & 3023 are shown to be in the rural edge character area but are identical to house type L255 in the neighbourhood residential CA. Consider changing door furniture/brick and possibly fenestration.	Elevations now proposed in brick only.	P1905.R07.R13.02	P1905.R07.R13.02 F
4.13	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Around the periphery of the housing area, visitor parking encroaches on open space. Consider the use of grasscrete or a similar product to reduce the visual impact when the spaces are not occupied.	Using grasscrete is unlikely to be successful given the constant use expected of the visitor spaces therefore not achieving the natural look that grasscrete would create.	N/A	N/A
4.14	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	I am still not convinced a substation parking space is needed for occasional visits. There is visitor parking in the vicinity and the road is wide enough for other vehicles to pass a parked van. If it must be retained, a detail should be provided, showing how it is going to be integrated into the open space and reserved for its intended purpose, rather than being used as visitor parking.	The parking space is confirmed to be needed but the material will be shown as grasscrete as it will be infrequently used.	P1914.R10.00	P1905.R07.R13.00 F
4.15	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Four houses on the western edge (plots 3045, 3048, 3027 & 3028) incorporate tile hanging which is not a feature of the neighbourhood residential character area. 3028 is on the cusp of the Rural edge, so could be regarded as a transition, but the others should be revised.	All identified plots changed to render and brick front elevation.	N/A	N/A
4.16	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	The relationship between plots 3010 & 3011 needs to be reviewed. Plot 3010 projects some distance forward of plot 3011, resulting in an overbearing impact and blocking morning sun from the kitchen/living room and patio area. If plot were oved forward by 1-2 metres this impact could be reduced without compromising the size of its rear garden too much.	The alternative option is to move plot 3011 parking to the front of the property which causes access issues for the uses of these spaces as they will be on a junction. It would also result in a longer run of parking on this prominent location.	N/A	N/A
4.17	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Many of the houses have landing and, in some cases, secondary bedroom windows in the flank elevations. This provides natural light to the circulation space and, in many locations would not result in undue overlooking. However, there are some instances where there would be direct views towards the rear of neighbouring properties, which would result in overlooking of habitable rooms and private gardens. In these cases, I propose to condition obscure glazing in relevant elevations (unless you would like to consider an alternative such as a skylight over the stairs). The list may not be comprehensive but examples are plots 4085, 4094, 4099, 4105, the kitchen windows in the southern flank of block 2 adjacent to the boundary with plot 3051 (high level windows may work here?), plot 3066, 4039, 4038, 4033, 4028, 4029, 4022, 4023, 4006, 4002, 3004, 3007, 3010, 3012, 3013, 3023, 3025 & 3028.	Identified plots will have obscure glazing - with a note added to the elevation plans.	P1905.L255.102 P1905.AL24.102 P1905.AL32.102 P1905.H283.102 P1905.L465.102 P1905.L356.102 P1905.L454.102 P1905.L467.102	P1905.L255.102 A P1905.AL24.102 A P1905.AL32.102 A P1905.H283.102 A P1905.L465.102 A P1905.L356.102 A P1905.L454.102 A P1905.L467.102 A
4.18	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	The corner of Easthampstead Road and the Heathlands link is identified by the Design Code as the location for a key building and the type L437 proposed on plot 3019 does not fulfil that function. The west elevation is very much a flank rather than a secondary frontage and there is nothing to make it stand out. Further consideration needs to be given to this.	Ground floor bay window added to side elevation.	P1905.L473A.102 L473	P1905.L473A.102 L473A
4.19	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	There is only very limited articulation to break up the mass of the western elevation of Block 2. If space permits (taking into consideration the amenity of occupants) at least one of the gables should be brought forward to create a more significant variation in the plane of the elevation. Other options to consider are replacing one of the gables with a parapet (to reduce the symmetry) and introducing more brickwork detailing to reduce the unbroken expanse of brickwork.	Block 2 elevations have been amended in line with changes to Block 1 to align with a coherent streetscene. Prominent gables which project forward of the main elevations are proposed along with alternative brick detailing in line with the changes to the dwellings in the Main Character area.	P1905.BLK2.106	P1905.BLK2.306 A
4.20	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	While the design of Block 1 (north elevation) has improved considerably since pre-app, the mass of the building, in particular the almost 40 metre long, unbroken ridge line, remains a concern. (NB we will need a full set of elevations; we only have one side and one internal at the moment).	Changes to Block 1 follow discussion with case officer. Changes include an additional central gable to help break up the mass and run of the roof line, changes to the orientaiton of the central apartments to allow the balconies and larger windows to front the SWDR, inclusion of brick detailing to match dwellings in the Main Character area.	P1905.BLK1.105	P1905.BLK1.305 B
4.21	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Suggest bringing the gables forward to create vertical variation, more/taller windows lighting communal stairwells, additional dormers (can the layout of the second-floor flats be configured so a more elongated bathroom extends along the outside wall - with a dormer - and the cupboard is between the bathroom and hall?) and nerhans additional brickwork detailing (soldier courses?)	Vertical brick detailing has been added to the central row of windows indicating the location of the main access into the building.	P1905.BLK1.105 P1905.BLK1.106	P1905.BLK1.305 B P1905.BLK1.306 B
4.22	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Block 1 (south-east & northwest elevations), suggest something to strengthen the centre of the elevation and emphasise the communal entrance eg options might be a more substantial porch, larger windows on the stairwell, a dormer on the stairwell, a more significant brickwork feature.			
4.22	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	I am still concerned about the relationship between the ground-floor kitchens and Block 1 cycle stores, in terms of outlook/lighting but also disturbance.	Cycle stores have moved location to witin the car park areas.	P1905.R07.R13.09	P1905.R07.R13.09 F
4.23	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Use of two-and-a-half storey buildings to form a focal point at the head of T-junctions (plots 3017/3108, 3089/3090, 3056/3057) is supported but it would be helpful to introduce some variation, to help with legibility, eg, omit render in some locations, use flat instead of pitched-roof dormers, change door colour.	Variations considered appropriate at these locations given distances throughout the site.	N/A	N/A
4.24	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	Where white dormers are shown, what materials are proposed (porches and at roof level)?	These are render board.	N/A	N/A

4.25	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	The visitor cycle parking for the flats is welcome but would be better located adjacent to front entrances, rather than the private parking areas.	Visitor cycle stands moved to the front of the building.	P1905.R07.R13.05	P1905.R07.R13.05 F
4.26	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	26/02/2026	The design of the east-west the tertiary street through R13 needs further discussion and the nature of the street along the northern edge has also changed since the street hierarchy was approved , as part of the Design Code, so perhaps needs a more consistent approach.	As agreed in the workshop, visitor parking bays have been reviewed to improve visibility and to assist in slowing vehicle speeds.	P1905.R07.R13.05	P1905.R07.R13.05 F
4.27	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	27/02/2026	I'm looking at boundary treatments/landscaping and it would be helpful to understand the extent of POS adoption, what is to be conveyed to individual householders and what will be transferred to management companies. This could usefully be shown on the same drawing as highway adoption, would that be possible?	Highway adoption plan updated	A389-R7&R13-RM-103 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-103 B
4.28	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	04/03/2026	There look to be a couple of discrepancies in the parking calculator spreadsheets, although they do not materially affect the calculation: plots 4070 & 4074 are 2B/4P so should be three habitable rooms & plot 4099 should be shared rental.	Parking calculator and plan have been updated.	P1905.R07.R13.05	P1905.R07.R13.05 F
4.29	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	04/03/2026	Plot 4076 is a FoG and the garage is its only parking space. From a security perspective it is better for it to have a door but as it is the only parking for this property, it ought to be treated as a garage in the spreadsheet.	Doors on the FOG parking area are considered not suitable nor required in this location.	N/A	N/A
4.30	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	04/03/2026	The cycle stores for blocks 2 and 3 don't meet the level of provision that the Design Code commits to for two-bedroom flats	The cycle stores are designed in accordance with WBC's adopted parking standards for apartment blocks where as the design code refers to only 2 bed accommodation while not been distingused with flats & houses accommodation.	N/A	N/A
4.31	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	04/03/2026	The Sheffield Stands for visitors would be better located to the front of the flats, rather than in the private parking courts	Visitor spaces moved to the front of the building.	P1905.R07.R13.05	P1905.R07.R13.05 F
4.32	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	05/03/2026	The parking layout drawing shows the parking for plots 4010 and 4100 as a car port, is that correct?	The spaces for 4010 and 4100 are carports and updated on the layout and parking plans.	P1905.R07.R13.05 P1905.R07.R13.01-A	P1905.R07.R13.05 F P1905.R07.R13.01 H
4.33	Case Officer - General Layout and Design	05/03/2026	According to the parking layout the carport between 4010 & 4011 belongs to 4011 and 4010's is behind, so I think that may be an error on the parking plan too? If I'm right, can they be corrected when the plans are updated please, along with the garage under the FoG.	Parking plan updated	P1905.R07.R13.05	P1905.R07.R13.05 F
5.1	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	Overall, the LLFA considers that the proposed surface water drainage strategy is broadly acceptable in principle and is aligned with the approved outline Flood Risk Assessment and the wider Phase 2b drainage strategy. In particular: · Parcel R13 is proposed to discharge surface water at a restricted rate of 14 l/s to the SWDR swale via an attenuation basin. · Parcel R7 is proposed to discharge surface water unattenuated to the same swale, relying on downstream attenuation provided within the approved SANG basin. · Surface water drainage has been designed to the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change standard, in accordance with current national guidance.	Noted	N/A	N/A
5.2	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	B. Detailed LLFA Matters Requiring Clarification or Control by Condition 1. Surface Water Drainage – Greenfield Runoff and Discharge Rates The applicant has adopted a greenfield runoff baseline derived from the outline FRA and proposes a restricted discharge of 14 l/s for Parcel R13. Further clarification is required to demonstrate that discharge rates are appropriately controlled across all critical storm durations and catchments. In particular, the LLFA requires confirmation that: - The selected discharge rates are no greater than the equivalent greenfield runoff rates for the contributing impermeable areas. - The hydraulic modelling confirms that the 14 l/s discharge control for Parcel R13 has been tested against all critical durations for the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event. - No uncontrolled exceedance or overspill occurs from the attenuation basin other than via the designed outfall.	As noted in the drainage strategy report, the impermeable area of plot R13 is 4.51ha (this figure includes 10% urban creep allowance for future development). Discharge is limited to 14l/s in accordance with the FRA. If greenfield (QBar) rate of 4.4l/s was applied to the impermeable area, the discharge rate would be 19.84l/s. Therefore, the proposed discharge rate is no greater than the existing greenfield rate. Model results were included in the drainage strategy report and show that maximum outflow from the basin into the SWDR swale (node S-R13-HW4) is 14.0l/s for all critical durations in the 1 in 100 + cc event No flooding is noted in any of the nodes close to the basin. Max water level in basin (node S-R13-HW1 is 1.271m and in node S-R13-HW2 is 1.14m and S-R13-HW3 is 1.267m. The basin depth is 1.7m demonstrating there is a minimum of 400mm freeboard. Therefore there will not be any uncontrolled overspill from the basin.	N/A	N/A

5.3	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	2. Attenuation Basin Design – Parcel R13 The proposed lined attenuation basin is acceptable in principle; however, further technical detail is required to confirm flood risk resilience. The LLFA notes in particular: - The basin is designed with 1:3 side slopes and 400 mm freeboard above the maximum modelled water level. - The basin is proposed as attenuation-only, despite the site's greenfield nature and description of existing infiltration and overland flow pathways. - Clarification is required to demonstrate that the basin design provides adequate freeboard relative to surrounding land uses and finished floor levels, and that infiltration has been robustly discounted.	Correct, basin designed with 1 in 3 side slopes and 400mm free board. The site investigation data shows very low infiltration rates, high ground water rates and a site generally underlain by cohesive soils. For the existing, greenfield conditions, the infiltration rate is sufficient for surface water not to shed beyond the site boundary, but given the increase in impermeable area, large scale infiltration is not considered suitable, hence it will be attenuated prior to discharge. As noted above, a minimum of 400mm freeboard is provided within the basin. FFLs are set above max water level.	N/A	N/A
5.4	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	3. Parcel R7 Drainage Strategy and Reliance on Off-Site Infrastructure The LLFA notes that Parcel R7 discharges surface water unattenuated to the SWDR swale, with reliance on attenuation within the downstream SANG basin. This approach is acceptable only on the basis that: - The SANG basin and associated SWDR infrastructure are constructed, operational, and have confirmed capacity prior to the occupation of any dwellings within Parcel R7. - The downstream swale and network have been designed to accommodate flows from Parcels R7 and R13, together with any other committed upstream development, without increasing flood risk - The LLFA considers that this dependency requires robust control through planning conditions linked to phasing and occupation.	Timing of SWDR works to be confirmed by WBC.	N/A	N/A
5.5	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	4. On-Plot Drainage Capacity and Standards The Drainage Statement confirms that hydraulic modelling has been undertaken. The LLFA requires confirmation that: - The 1 in 30 year rainfall event is fully contained within the pipe network without surface flooding. - Any surcharge during the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event is safely managed within highways and designated exceedance routes, without risk to buildings. - Where tree-pit bioretention features receive runoff, suitable bypass routes are provided to manage blocked inlets and prevent localised flooding adjacent to dwellings.	Model outputs were provided in drainage strategy. Confirmed, no surface flooding in 1 in 30 year event. Exceedance routing plan provided in drainage strategy. Confirm that 1 in 100 yr + CC is managed within highways. Traditional gullies are also provided along the roads with catchments sized assuming treepits are blocked to reduce risk of localised flooding.	N/A	N/A
5.6	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	5. Exceedance Flow Routing and Safe Access The submitted exceedance strategy is generally acceptable; however, the LLFA requires further clarity to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Specifically: - Exceedance routes must be clearly defined, with flow directions and low points clearly shown. - Exceedance flows must not be directed toward existing properties, site boundaries, or onto Easthampstead Road or the SWDR in a manner that would increase risk. - Safe access and egress must be demonstrated during extreme events, with predicted flood depths on access roads remaining within acceptable limits.	Exceedance flow route plan included in drainage strategy report with flow arrows and low points identified. Exceedance flow generally directed away from the Heathlands Link, site boundaries and existing properties. The model identifies a single point of flooding in the 1 in 100 + 40% climate change event - manhole S-R13-3, with a volume of 7.55m3. This manhole is located directly in front of a rain garden. In the event that flooding does occur, water would firstly flow into the rain garden, before flowing down to the western side of the road. A 25mm upstand kerb is provided along this road which would be the limiting depth of flooding. Flooding would therefore pond over an area of approximately 300m2. Refer to plan A389-R7&13-RM-508.	A389-R7&R13-RM-501 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-501 B
5.7	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	6. Water Quality Treatment The LLFA agrees that the applicant has correctly applied the CIRIA C753 SuDS Manual pollution hazard and mitigation index methodology. However, to fully demonstrate compliance, the LLFA requires clearer evidence that: - The cumulative mitigation provided by the SuDS components meets or exceeds the pollution hazard for TSS, metals, and hydrocarbons. - No runoff from trafficked hardstanding discharges directly to the SWDR swale without at least two levels of water quality treatment.	Drainage Strategy report updated to include evidence	N/A	N/A

5.8	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	7. Foul Drainage (Informative but Not Determinative) While foul drainage is primarily the responsibility of the sewerage undertaker, the LLFA highlights the need to ensure that: - Emergency storage at Pumping Station PS2 meets current Sewerage Sector Guidance standards. - Foul infrastructure does not compromise the function or integrity of SuDS features. 8. Adoption, Maintenance, and Management of SuDS	Pump station will be designed to current standards. Foul infrastructure will not compromise integrity of SUDS features.	N/A	N/A
5.9	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	The proposed adoption strategy is considered appropriate in principle. However, the LLFA requires a consolidated approach to long-term management, ensuring clarity on responsibilities, access, and maintenance procedures to secure the ongoing effectiveness of SuDS features.	Adoption approach will be similar to that for R10 and R11.	N/A	N/A
5.10	Drainage Officer	13/01/2026	9. Construction Phase Drainage The LLFA notes the high-level reference to best practice guidance for construction-phase drainage but considers that a detailed Construction Surface Water Management Plan is necessary to ensure that flood risk and pollution are adequately managed during construction.	Drainage Strategy report updated	N/A	N/A
6.1	Ecology - Nature Space	05/02/2026	The survey data provided in 2017 would be considered to be out of date. Survey data that is more than a few years old normally cannot be relied upon for details on which to base mitigation schemes, as populations and sites may change in nature and extent. If there is more recent survey data available to assess the status of GCN on the site and wider landscape this should be submitted to inform the application.	The Great Crested Newt Survey Report 2022 (May 2026) was submitted to the case officer 08/05/2026.	N/A	Great Crested Newt Survey Report 2022 (May 2026)
7.5	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	The access road between parcels R7 and R13 acts to fragment the two main axis of ecological permeability through this part of the site. There appears to be some form of block paved surfacing for some of the road on this connecting link. It is not clear whether this has measures to aid ecological permeability. Are there kerbs? What is being done to avoid gulley pots as road drainage in this area? At the moment, I think it may be better to have wildlife friendly crossing measures for a longer length of the link road, beyond the pumping station.	See comment 7.2	A389-R7&R13-RM-701	A389-R7&R13-RM-701 B
7.6	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	The location of the proposed playground necessitates the loss of a significant portion of the hedgerow running East-West through the green space. Further to that, the path network further fragments the hedgerow and sets a high maintenance management requirement along at least one edge. Whilst the general expectation for policy CP7 and TB23 would be to seek to avoid loss of hedgerow the halfway house design here may appears to have the disbenefits of wildlife corridor fragmentation through loss and restrictive design of the green space through retention of parts. Whilst the mature tree is of value to retain, would it make more sense to translocate other bits of the hedgerow to create a stronger replacement corridor between the SuDS basin and the watercourse? In particular, it would be good to see linear feature landscaping design that guided towards the mammal tunnels designed into the SWDR road, alongside the watercourse.	There isn't space to include a hedgerow between the basin and swdr ditch - a hedgerow has been proposed to the southern edge of the parks and garden space	Awaiting confirmation of changes made	Awaiting confirmation of changes made
7.7	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	I am concerned that there is no detail of the pedestrian bridge/crossing structure across the SWDR diverted watercourse near the pumping station.	Details of the crossing have been provided.	N/A	A389-R7&R13-RM-111 A
7.8	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	It would be preferable to see a drainage strategy that avoids use of gulley pots or other features that risk trapping animals when they cross the access road between the green space wildlife corridors. At the moment there appear to be a couple of gulley pots proposed. If these cannot be avoided, what mitigation measures will be delivered to reduce the risk of trapping animals.	Mitigation measures will be picked up in the submission of the LEMP at discharge of condition stage	N/A	N/A
7.9	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	It is helpful to have the cross-sections of the R13 basin. As I interpret it, this current design does not provide any permanently wet features within the attenuation basin. I think this is a missed opportunity to provide biodiversity enhancement to the space and make constructive use of the deep basin proposed. The steep slopes of the basin have limited biodiversity benefit (although maybe the south facing bank could be landscape to benefit some invertebrate species, see below).	This was previously included and removed after pre-application discussions due to it not being in the parks and gardens suds matrix	N/A	N/A
7.10	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	The submitted street lighting plan does not show the lighting specification for areas not to be adopted. Further detail is required in order to understand the risk of the lighting in these areas causing further deterioration of wildlife corridors.	Lighting lux plan updated	A389-R7&R13-RM-121 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-121 A
7.11	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	I recommend that the local planning authority seek a change to the colour spectrum proposed for the street lighting from 4000K to 2700K or lower in order to minimise the disruption of lighting in proximity to the green space wildlife corridors. Further, I recommend that the local planning authority seek rearwards baffles on lanterns 1B, 2B, 4B, 5B, 6B, 8B, 9B, 16B, 32B, 35B, 45B, 46B, 48B, and 49B.	As above.	A389-R7&R13-RM-121 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-121 A

7.12	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	I recommend that the local planning authority seek more robust soft landscaping of the area between the R13 attenuation basin and the SWDR diverted watercourse to provide an East-West wildlife corridor across the parcel and provide ecological permeability, expected under TB23.	Changes to the hedgerow planting including translocation of the part of the existing hedgerow in the public open space in R13.	P24-2114_EN_50A	P24-2114_EN_50C
7.13	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	Is there potential for more rain gardens to also support individual street tree planting? There appear to be a number of locations (e.g. South of plots 3050 and 3029, or South of 3013) where there is potential.	Rain gardens have been reviewed and additional locations added around the site.	P24-2114_EN_50A	P24-2114_EN_50C
7.14	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	I recommend that at least part of the attenuation basin is planned to be permanently wet to provide habitat diversity. I recommend that the upper parts of the south facing slope of the attenuation basin in R13 include bee and butterfly bank enhancement measures to make the most of the solar gain that this slope will have. These should not be shaded out by native shrub planting (which might sit more usefully on the top of the bank between the attenuation basin and the watercourse).	Ecological Mitigation Strategy has been updated to include bee and butterfly enhancement measures	N/A	N/A
7.15	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	Looking at Map 1 in the submitted Ecosa Ecological Mitigation Strategy (January 2026), the location and proposals for bat and bird boxes for these two parcels are acceptable.	N/A	N/A	N/A
7.16	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	Section 4.5 of the Ecological Mitigation Strategy covers artificial lighting. It is not clear from what is written how any ecological mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design. Please can further information be supplied to support this section.	Ecological Mitigation Strategy has been updated	N/A	N/A
7.17	Ecology Officer	27/04/2026	Hedgehog highways are proposed in section 4.8 of the Ecological Mitigation Strategy. There does not appear to be any further information showing how these will be delivered. I recommend that the local planning authority seek inclusion of Hedgehog highways within the development to provide ecological permeability, as per local plan policy TB23	Ecological Mitigation Strategy has been updated	N/A	N/A
7.1	Ecology Officer	04/03/2026	Fencing along the edges of the open space, adjacent to the highway, a level strip of between 0.8m and 1m adjacent to the footway allows space for a ride-on-mower and gives a bit of step-off space should the need arise.	The fence alignment has been reviewed to provide at least 0.8 from back of highway before fence begins.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
7.2	Ecology Officer	04/03/2026	The road at the junction between the two parcels seems to be predominately standard 125mm upstand kerb. He requests a bullnose kerb with 25mm upstand or similar, to aid ecological permeability). Alternatively, a speed table at this point, bringing the carriageway up to the same level as the footway, would address the ecological point and assist with some of the points we have been discussing about pedestrian movement and speed control.	The bullnose kerb has been reduced to 25mm upstand.	A389-R7&R13-RM-701	A389-R7&R13-RM-701 B
7.3	Ecology Officer	04/03/2026	With regard to the retained sections of hedgerow in the park, he commented that it doesn't help with ecological permeability as there appears to be a gap in shrub/hedgerow cover where the purple arrows are - which is where the connectivity is needed to get wildlife to the under-road tunnels.	A hedgerow cannot be accommodated between the basin and the SWDR ditch.	N/A	N/A
7.4	Ecology Officer	04/03/2026	If parts of the hedgerow are to be retained, it would make sense to put some of the standard tree planting in the hedgerow rather than just in front of it. If there are retained mature trees within the GI, don't put other standard trees immediately to the south where they will grow and shade the existing tree of value.	Tree locations have been updated.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50B

7.18	Ecology Officer, Case Officer	30/04/2026	Address the concerns about fragmentation of both the hedge and the useable space, as follows: • reroute the path to the south of the tree and create a larger useable area, as discussed previously; • translocate the existing hedge to the southern edge of the park. In BNG terms, it needs to be a minimum of 1.5m high to achieve good condition status. If managed as 1.2m (which would be better in terms of surveillance and safety of both the park and the street) then we could accept that as moderate condition. Improving the distinctiveness by making it a native hedgerow with trees might well offset the lower condition score. A minimum of one metre verge would be needed either side, and an overall width of 4.5-5 metres would be needed to avoid the adjacent path being obstructed by overhanging vegetation. • the hedge should continue around the play area to provide some containment, separation from the basin and shrub continuity, connecting to the wildlife tunnels but there is more flexibility about the species here. Trees could also be incorporated in the hedgerow. • reduce the gradient to provide a gentler slope on the southern edge of the basin, with a corresponding increase on the eastern edge to allow greater separation from the play area and slope;	Path has been rerouted, section of hedge has been translocated to the edge of the open space (set back from the road) and additional hedgerow added as the boundary treatment for this edge to define the space and enhance ecological connectivity."Path has been rerouted, section of hedge has been translocated to the edge of the open space (set back from the road) and additional hedgerow added as the boundary treatment for this edge to define the space and enhance ecological connectivity. Planting has been continued around the play space and species will be chosen to benefit wildlife whilst being suitable for its proximity to play and allowing natural surveillance in and out of the play space. The eastern edge of the basin is terraced steps - as is set out in the LDS, this creates an informal seating area and a suitable transition between the formal play space and incidental kick about space at the base of the basin"	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
9.1	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	Appearance, character, and layout and scale of the Parks and Garden open space typology is not consistent with the approved Landscape Design Statement. The usability of the PAG1 open space is significantly limited and does not meet the basic requirements of the Parks and Gardens open space typology as described in the Landscape Design Statement.	Planting has been continued around the play space and species will be chosen to benefit wildlife whilst being suitable for its proximity to play and allowing natural surveillance in and out of the play space.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
9.2	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	Appearance and layout of SuDS attenuation basin within the Parks and Gardens is not consistent with the approved Landscape Design Statement. Side slopes of basin are consistent, do not allow for any variation, and create unsafe or undesirable conditions in certain areas.		P24-2214_EN_50A A389-R7&R13-RM-501 A	P24-2214_EN_50C A389-R7&R13-RM-501 B
9.3	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	Safety concerns with respect to levels and layout of features within the public realm.	The eastern edge of the basin is terraced steps - as is set out in the LDS, this creates an informal seating area and a suitable transition between the formal play space and incidental kick about space at the base of the basin	N/A	N/A
9.4	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	The layout of the play space and the selection of play equipment do not meet the requirements of the WBC Play Space Design Guide and the Landscape Design Statement with respect to creating a play space that is safe, dynamic, and multi-faceted. While some aspects of the play area can be addressed as part of a discharge of condition, more confidence at the Reserved Matters stage is needed to ensure that the space can meet policy requirements.	The LEAP location and arrangement has changed to meet comments raised by officers. The LEAP overlooks the basin which in dry seasons is designed to act as informal useable play space.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.5	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	With respect to NGS6ii, areas of natural/ semi-natural green space along the southern and eastern redline do not appear to accord with the areas of open space shown in the approved Green Infrastructure Provision drawing. The open space provision for NGS6ii will need to be update based on the comments below. Further, the area of NGS6ii along the western redline boundary does not align with the Landscape Design Statement with respect to landscape and appearance.	Area removed from GI provision - play space updated to reflect the new design.	P24-2114_EN_52	P24-2114_EN_52A
9.6	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	While the amount of natural/ semi-natural green space shown in the proposed drawings (.515 ha) is in excess of the amount required as shown in the green infrastructure provision (.28 ha), the amount in the highlighted area below should not be counted toward this typology. As stated in the Landscape Design Statement, the landscape and appearance of the natural/ semi-natural greenspace should be naturalistic in character with areas of planting and grassland with minimal management to encourage habitats to establish and thrive. While the section to the southwest of the primary road access point could possibly be considered natural semi-natural greenspace (also as this section is also defined as a rural edge character area), the narrow widths, lack of opportunities for ecological connectivity and linkage, and the likely need for a higher level of maintenance do not align with this open space typology. For example, based on the coloured landscape master plan, this area consists primarily of flowering lawn. This is inconsistent with the Landscape Design Statement landscape and planting strategy for the natural/ semi-natural greenspace typology which calls for more naturalistic plantings that are lower maintenance.	Area removed from GI provision - play space updated to reflect the new design.	P24-2114_EN_52	P24-2114_EN_52A

9.7	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	The section to the northeast of the primary access road is inconsistent with the Landscape Design Statement landscape and planting strategy for the natural/ semi-natural greenspace typology as it again consists mostly of flowering lawn and also contains an ornamental hedge. Both will require more maintenance than would be expected within the natural/ semi-natural open space typology. This section is also within the CA1 Main Street character area which is more formal and contemporary in character.	Area removed from GI provision - play space updated to reflect the new design.	P24-2114_EN_52	P24-2114_EN_52A
9.8	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	The section of NGS6ii along the western redline boundary in the proposed drawings is not consistent with what is shown in the approved Landscape Design Statement. Specifically, the proposed drawings show significant areas of 'Flowering Lawn' between the road and the north/ south footpath. Flowering lawn will require a greater frequency of maintenance than should be anticipated within the natural/ semi-natural greenspace and may minimise its function as a route for wildlife. Natural/ semi-natural greenspace should have naturalistic plantings that require lower levels of maintenance. It is understood that the area between the road and the footpath will be a transition space, but this edge should still require less maintenance than what will be needed for flowering lawn. Similarly, bulb plantings were not identified in the approved Landscape Design Statement and may require more maintenance within this open space typology.	Grassland type has changed. Bulbs have remained to provide seasonal visual interest on the residential edge. A mown edge to the highway has been retained to provide a cue for care. LEMP will pick up the management requirements for bulbs and grassland.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.9	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	If swales along the western redline boundary are proposed, these areas should be planted to a specification that is appropriate for use within the natural/ semi-natural greenspace, such as wildflower meadow for wetland or similar.	They are sown with a meadow mix suitable for the soil condition.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.10	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	From a Green Infrastructure perspective, aspects of PAG1 do not comply with the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Strategy, the WBC Borough Design Guide, or parts of the approved Landscape Design Statement. As such, these items will need to be addressed to become compliant. In other areas, more information is needed before it can be determined if the open space complies with the Landscape Design Statement.	Design of this area has been reviewed in line with comments and discussions. Section of hedgerow has been removed to create area of mown amenity grassland.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.11	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	While there is a significant amount of open space within the PAG1 area, the usability of this space is limited as Parks and Gardens and does not meet the basic requirements of this typology as covered in the Landscape Design Statement and, more generally, in the Open Space, Sports, and Recreation Strategy and WBC Design Guide. This is based on the following: - As stated in the Landscape Design Statement, the Parks and Gardens open space typology should be designed as a focal, usable green space for residents and the wider community. It should provide areas of hard landscaping for community events, gathering and socialising, and areas of open mown amenity grass for informal recreation. - It is acknowledged that the proposal allows for informal recreation such as walking. An informal path is shown on the southern side of the open space. However, this path will ultimately be a well-used east/ west connection. Within the Parks and Open Space typology, it would generally be expected to see additional footpaths creating a loop or otherwise accessing a greater extent of the park, increasing the functionality and usability of the space. - While there is a proposed footpath on the western side of the open space, this footpath is not appealing and provides limited recreational value. As designed, the footpath appears to be relatively narrow (less than 2m), follows the edge of the attenuation basin with 1:3 basin side slopes immediately adjacent, and will run mostly next to the pumping station.	Design of this area has been reviewed in line with comments and discussions. See 9.13 for full response.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.12	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	There is a lack of useable, mown open space for informal recreation activities. Generally, it would be expected to see larger areas of flat open grass to be used for sitting or an informal kick-about space.	The basin is designed to be used as informal recreational space for kick around activities in the dry seasons. Changes to the proposed paths to the south of the basin to increase the amount of informal space outside of the basin.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A

9.13	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	While the basin is identified in the Design Compliance Statement as being accessible for recreation, slackened side slopes (at least one) of 1:5 max to promote accessibility, as covered in the Landscape Design Statement, is not achieved. It would also be beneficial to have some areas of amenity turf for informal recreation available outside of the basin for use when the basin is wet.	The basin and the play space have been designed so they are integrated into each other. The levels (seen on the landscape sections) create a level of separation whilst also providing additional areas of play. The basin will only be wet in seasonal weather and therefore through drier summer months the base of the basin will be mown and can be used as an informal kick about/recreation area or community gathering space. The terraced steps on the eastern edge create a transition zone between the two spaces and allow for passive surveillance between the spaces. R11 has larger areas of hard standing as in 300m away so to create variety in the community spaces it was decided to not have the hard surfacing here as the base of the basin and two areas of terraced steps create alternative gathering spaces.	N/A	N/A
9.14	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	Other areas within the proposal that have been identified as amenity lawn or flowering lawn are not conducive to informal recreation as they are longer narrow strips separating the basin from the SWDR, shown on steps, or on 1:3 and 1:2 basin side slopes.	The basin has grassed steps on the eastern edge as well as timber steps to allow secondary access into and out of the basin. It has been planted with shrub and tree planting as well as the retained existing trees to create the visual amenity. We've chosen a wetland tolerant grassland mix for the basin with the base maintained as mown grass to allow informal recreation as this mix is more likely to tolerate the fluctuation between wet and dry whilst also creating space for the informal recreation.	N/A	N/A
9.15	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	There is a safety concern with the location of the steps in the public realm within PAG1. Please provide more information with respect to the levels strategy for the steps that access the open space across from plot 4040. How will pedestrians safely use these steps considering pedestrians will be stepping onto the road? How will railings, and landings be integrated into the landscape at this point?	Levels information has been updated in the Engineering Layout. Site sections are provided through the open space.	N/A	A389-R7&R13-RM-401 B
9.16	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	From the drawings that have been provided, it appears that there will be a minimum of a circa 1.2m to 1.4m levels change from the carriageway to the feature paving area. Please provide information on how this levels change will be addressed in the landscape. If retaining walls are proposed, please provide information on the anticipated height, materiality. If walls are not proposed, can levels changes be accomplished with maximum 1:3 gradients?	Levels information has been updated in the Engineering Layout. Site sections are provided through the open space.	N/A	A389-R7&R13-RM-401 B
9.17	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	Please provide information on how levels will be addressed in this area as there appears to be a 1.2 to 1.4m change in levels. How will this be addressed on the back of the visitor parking down to the proposed seating area?	Levels information has been updated in the Engineering Layout. Site sections are provided through the open space.	N/A	A389-R7&R13-RM-401 B
9.18	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	Please provide more information on the relationship of the basin edge steps, basin levels, proposed boulders, cycle parking, play area entry, and feature paving plaza in this area? This area seems extremely tight given the hard landscape features and levels constraints. If this wider area is intended to serve as a space for socialising and gathering it must be able to function as such without extreme levels changes and awkward spaces.	Levels information has been updated in the Engineering Layout. Site sections are provided through the open space.	N/A	A389-R7&R13-RM-401 B
9.19	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	While it is understood that the basin within the PAG1 open space will be dry for most of the year (except after rain events), the basin does not promote multi-functionality beyond serving an attenuation function. Its visual amenity and character are limited and there are safety concerns regarding the design. Multi-functionality, visual amenity, and a smooth, seamless integration into the surrounding landscape are key basin design components for this typology that are not achieved. This is based on the following: - Basin cross sections from drawing A389-R7&R13-RM-530 show consistent, uniform 1:3 (or steeper) side slopes across the basin. No gradients of less than 1:3 can be found on the drawings that have been provided. - Basin cross sections indicate that some slide slopes adjacent to the SWDR are 1:2. Some of these steep slopes are shown with tree plantings. It will be difficult to establish trees in such a condition. - Steep steps create an unsafe environment at the edge of the proposed play space.	Site sections through the basin and open space have been updated.	P24-2114_EN_53	P24-2114_EN_53

9.20	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	From a Green Infrastructure perspective, aspects of P3 do not comply with the approved Landscape Design Statement or the WBC Play Space Design Guide Technical Note. Areas shown as contributing toward the P3 play provision do not relate to play or landscape features that are considered to create a quality play space environment as outlined in the Landscape Design Statement and the WBC Play Space Design Guide. As such, the amount of area that has been shown as contributing toward the required .12ha of play space is questioned. The area to the north of the play space, adjacent to the SWDR functions more as a linear transition space. There is a safety concern that children may easily access the SWDR. Reconsider or provide justification on how the area to the north of the play area, adjacent to the SWDR, positively contributes to the overall play experience. An area of open flowering lawn adjacent to a play space would, for example, generally be expected to function as an area for informal recreation such as 'chase' type games, imaginative play, a kick-about space, or area for relaxing.	The northern edge is a banked slope and therefore has play value for social/imaginative and physical play outside of formal equipment and provides some separation to the SWDR ditch. As above, the basin is designed to be used as multi-functional during the year. The area to the south of the basin has changed to move the path to allow a greater area of grassed area for kick-around or relaxing space.	N/A	N/A
9.21	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	With respect to the proposed play space, grass steps are not an intervention identified for use in the Parks and Gardens typology and may not be appropriate for use in the proposed location as they are currently designed. While no detailed information has been provided, the terraced steps appear to be narrow (run) and steep (rise), creating an unsafe condition immediately adjacent to the play space. If the intent of the terraced steps is to provide access into the basin, it should be noted that access to basins should be accomplished through a variation in gradients between 1:3 and 1: 5 with at least one side of the basin being 1:5. Currently, no basin edges are 1:5.	Page 42 of LDS Matrix has that parks and gardens basins will have retaining features e.g. grass steps.	N/A	N/A
9.22	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	It is unclear how the area of formal paving on the south side of the play area is meant to benefit the play space. While the is benefit to providing areas within the play space for seating, socialising, and gathering it is difficult to see how this space integrates with the wider play area. An area of formal paving that is separated from the play space, as shown in the proposed drawings, would seem better designed into the Parks and Gardens typology.	Play Space Design updated to comments.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.23	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	The layout and selection of the equipment within the play space does not meet the requirements and guidance of the Landscape Design Statement and the WBC Play Space Design Guide with respect to creating a play spaces that are safe, dynamic, and multi-faceted. - While the selection of equipment does incorporate pieces that were highlighted in the Landscape Design Statement and includes some of the play typologies that are listed in the Play Space Design Guide, the equipment as a whole does not work together to create an engaging play experience. Rather, equipment seems randomly placed within the space with no coherent design-led approach. Consistent with the WBC Play Space Design Guide, the layout of play space in its entirety needs to be a design-led approach that imaginatively responds to the context and character of the location and creates a safe, dynamic, and engaging place to play.	Play Space Design updated to comments.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.24	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	The location of PA3 Central Parkland LEAP sits within the Parks and Gardens typology which is the most formal of the open space typologies. Within this open space typology street furniture and hard landscaping finishes are similarly contemporary with a high level of finish. The play space is also located adjacent to the CA1 Main Street Character Area which is is defined by a formal contemporary edge. Given the location with the Parks and Gardens open space typology and being adjacent to the CA1 Main Street Character, the selection of play equipment should match the formal aesthetic. The proposed play equipment is predominately wood which has a more natrua/ rural feel. Consistent with the direction of the Landscape Design Statement, a more balanced mixture of timber and steel equipment should be specified.	Play Space Design updated to comments.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.25	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	Consistent with the Play Space Design Guide, the PA3 play space should thoughtfully and strategically design in more opportunities for risk through equipment selection, location, and integrating with the surrounding landscape.	Play Space Design updated to comments.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.26	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	More information is needed on the proposed play space surfacing options. Please confirm if play surfacing is to be wet pour, rubber mulch, or a combination or if other surfacing is proposed.	Wetpour has been used for main play spaces.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A

9.27	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	With respect to the surfacing of the footpath in PAG1, I do not believe that a hoggin footpath complies with approved Landscape Design Statement. This is more appropriately used in the Natural/ semi-natural typology as it has an informal character. The Parks and Gardens open space typology should have a formal outdoor character. The footpath along the southern portion of the PAG1 open space will be used to access the play space, gathering spaces, informal recreation areas, and serve as a link between the eastern side of R13 and the western side of R7. As such, heavy use should be expected and have a more durable, high-quality finish. Please change the surfacing for the east/ west footpath within the PAG1 to a bound material such as Flexipave.	East west route has been updated to flexi-pave.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.28	Green Infrastructure	05/02/2026	Following guidance from Active Travel England and the Department for Transport: Inclusive Mobility, the following should be accommodated in the layout and design of bench seating: -Seating should be located where natural shade is provided. Please review seating locations and ensure bench seating near tree planting. -Seats should be set back from the main route by at least 600mm to allow the free passage of through traffic. -Provide a surfaced resting place of at least 900mm wide and at least as deep as the bench area next to the proposed bench so that a wheelchair/ motorized mobility devices have space adjacent.	Bench locations within the POS reviewed.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
9.29	Green Infrastructure	26/02/2026	Notes from meeting: request for seating within public realm outside of parks and gardens e.g. along travel corridors, near the SWDR	Bench locations within the POS reviewed.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
9.30	Green Infrastructure	26/02/2026	Notes from meeting: request to move the footpath within PAG1 south of the tree to create a larger area of amenity space. Request to add secondary paths within park to improve experience.	Hedgerow has been removed to create more space.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.31	Green Infrastructure	26/02/2026	Notes from meeting: request for buffer zone north of play space between SWDR, create transition and to slow movement between areas.	Planting has been added along the edge of the play space.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.32	Green Infrastructure	26/02/2026	Notes from meeting: requested clarity on levels at the terraced steps, raised concerns over 1 in 2 slopes	See Engineering drawing	A389-R7&R13-RM-401 A P24-2114_EN_53	A389-R7&R13-RM-401 B P24-2114_EN_53
9.33	Green Infrastructure	26/02/2026	Notes from meeting: request for buffer zone between play space and basin edge, add formal steps in and out of basin	Planting has been added along the edge of the play space and the form of the basin adjusted to help with transition of edge. New planting between the play space and basin, the eastern edge is terraced grass steps and there are timber steps elsewhere to get out the basin on the souther and western edge (as has been proposed and approved on R10 and R11)	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
9.34	Green Infrastructure	26/02/2026	Notes from meeting: request for buffer zone between play space and basin edge, add formal steps in and out of basin		P24-2114_EN_51	P24-2114_EN_51A
10.1	Highways	19/02/2026	1. Several access widths will need to be improved from 3.8m to 4.5m in order to comply with the guidance in Wokingham Living Streets (2019) which identifies a minimum access width of 4.5m for access to Mews/Parking Courts with more than 10 dwellings. 3.8m will not be wide enough to allow two modern vehicles to pass each other, even at a slow speed. This could result in cars mounting the footway to pass each other, to the detriment of pedestrian safety. [Case Officer comment 26/02: The South Wokingham SPD (which is adopted, unlike Living Streets) and the approved Design Code are also relevant.]	See Highways Consultation_ALP Responses 18.05.2026	P1905.R07.R13.01 A	P1905.R07.R13.01 F
10.2	Highways	19/02/2026	2. A list of the most sold cars in 2025 and their dimensions is provided below. Cars measuring c.1.93m – 2.06m wide will not be able to pass each other on a 3.8m wide access. [Case Officer comment 26/02: These would be useful to discuss, in conjunction with the Designing Out Crime officer's comments.]	See Highways Consultation_ALP Responses 18.05.2027	P1905.R07.R13.01 A	P1905.R07.R13.01 F
10.3	Highways	19/02/2026	Visibility Splays 3. The LHA require the applicant to demonstrate forward visibility for vehicles around the bend shown below, which appears to have been omitted from the assessment of visibility on site.	See Highways Consultation_ALP Responses 18.05.2028	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.4	Highways	19/02/2026	4. The LHA require remeasurement of several visibility splays which appear to be measured using an X distance of 1.8m – 2.0m instead of the minimum X distance of 2.4m specified in Manual for Streets. a) The LHA would welcome demarcation of stop lines on the visibility drawing so it is possible to assess where the X distance can be measured from.	See Highways Consultation_ALP Responses 18.05.2029	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.5	Highways	19/02/2026	5. Other visibility splays shown do not comply with the required Y distance of 25 metres. The Wokingham Living Streets Guidance (2019) requires a design speed of 20mph and Manual for Streets Table 7.1 requires a visibility splay of 2.4m x 25m on a road subject to a 20mph speed limit.	See Highways Consultation_ALP Responses 18.05.2030	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E

10.6	Highways	19/02/2026	6. It is concerning that despite incorrect X and Y distance, there are still several visibility splays which pass through visitor parking bays or driveway parking bays. These bays are likely to pose a greater obstruction once the visibility splays have been correctly measured by the applicant. Some visitor bays will need to be relocated to prevent obstruction of visibility. The Manual for Streets Para 7.8.5 states that: 'Ideally defined parking bays should be provided outside the visibility splay' and this is interpreted to mean that ideally parking bays should be outside the visibility splay where the developer is designing the site from scratch.	See Highways Consultation_ALP Responses 18.05.2031	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.7	Highways	19/02/2026	7. At the junction between Plots 3042 and 3051, an X distance of 1.8m appears to have been used by the consultant.	See Highways Consultation_ALP Responses 18.05.2032	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.8	Highways	19/02/2026	Substandard X Distance between Plot 3042 and Plot 3051	X distance is 2.4m, but stop line to be added for measurement review in update of ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.9	Highways	19/02/2026	Substandard X Distance between Plot 4009 and Plot 4024	X distance is 2.1m, but can be corrected to 2.4m without impact to layout as part of update to ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.10	Highways	19/02/2026	Substandard 1.23m X Distance between Plots 4011 and 4021	X distance is 2.00m, but can be corrected to 2.4m without impact to layout as part of update to ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.11	Highways	19/02/2026	Substandard X Distance between Plot 4077 and 4086	Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002 with the demarcation of stop lines to assist measurement (this is 2.4m.)	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.12	Highways	19/02/2026	1.93m X Distance between 4026 and 4037	X distance is 2.4m, but stop line to be added for measurement review in update of ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.13	Highways	19/02/2026	Substandard Y Distance opposite Plot 3076 and 3077.	Layout plans updated	P1905.R07.R13.01 A	P1905.R07.R13.01 F
10.14	Highways	19/02/2026	Substandard Y Distance opposite Plot 3070 and 3071	Layout plans updated	P1905.R07.R13.01 A	P1905.R07.R13.01 F
10.15	Highways	19/02/2026	8. Several visibility splays appear to cross land which will fall within private ownership or front gardens of properties. The LHA request planning conditions and covenants which restricts planting to a height of 600mm within these visibility splays.	Noted	N/A	N/A
10.16	Highways	19/02/2026	9. Visibility splays have not been shown at several junctions or accesses to several car parks. The LHA require visibility splays to be shown at the following junctions: •The proposed priority junction between plot 3067 and plot 4040; •The vehicle access to the car park for Plots 4043 – 4054; •The vehicle access to the car park for Plots 4055 – 4066; •The vehicle access to the car parking area for Plots 4069 – 4076; and •The crossover access to plot 4105 and the running station opposite.	Visibilities added to drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.17	Highways	19/02/2026	10. Screenshots of the junctions/accesses where visibility splays need to be demonstrated are shown below:	Visibilities added in ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.18	Highways	19/02/2026	Junctions Where a 2.4m x 25m Visibility Splay should be Demonstrated: Priority Junction between Plot 3067 and 4040	Visibilities added in ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.19	Highways	19/02/2026	Junctions Where a 2.4m x 25m Visibility Splay should be Demonstrated: Car Park Access Plots 4043 - 4054	Visibilities added in ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.20	Highways	19/02/2026	Junctions Where a 2.4m x 25m Visibility Splay should be Demonstrated: Car Park Access Plots 4055 - 4066	Visibilities added in ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.21	Highways	19/02/2026	Junctions Where a 2.4m x 25m Visibility Splay should be Demonstrated: Car Park Access Junction, Plots 4069 – 4076.	Visibilities added in ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E.	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-002 rev E
10.22	Highways	19/02/2026	11. Car parking bays appear to have been used as traffic calming features. There should be physical features at each end of the parking bays to ensure speed reduction still occurs when the spaces are empty and to ensure vehicles to not just treat the empty spaces as part of the carriageway. Otherwise, there is an almost straight road c.150m long. [Case Officer comment 26/02: This is one of the most significant issues and needs discussion. It also ties in with the point about footpaths being provided on tertiary streets. I anticipate Catherine will also have thoughts on this.]	The 3 visitor spaces will become 2, with the remaining area used to create additional landscaping within kerbed build-outs on ends of parking spaces.	P1905.R07.R13.01 A	P1905.R07.R13.01 H
10.23	Highways	19/02/2026	12. The site has numerous parking spaces which should be pulled closer to the carriageway. Otherwise, there is the possibility that people will be tempted to park closer to the carriageway. [Case Officer comment 26/02: These need to be looked at on a case by case basis. The council's guidance discourages drives that are longer than needed as it often results in additional cars parking, overhanging and obstructing pavements. However, it also needs to be balanced with other considerations such as the Design Code principles about parking being to the side of houses in some character areas. There are cases, eg plots 3042-3050 where parking (and garages) could be brought forward by c 1 metre, still allowing rear garden access, slightly increasing rear amenity space and without cars projecting significantly forward of the dwelling.]	Where possible parking has been pulled closer to the carriageway	P1905.R07.R13.01 A	P1905.R07.R13.01 H

10.24	Highways	19/02/2026	13. The LHA require several changes to improve the site for pedestrians. The LHA require the following changes to the site footways: a. Tactile paving and dropped kerbs need to be shown at several internal junctions. [Case Officer comment 26/02: I would like to see a more detailed drawing of a sample junction to understand the design better, with particular reference to prioritisation of pedestrians (and related where stop lines, if any, are located). Eg what is the treatment of the striped bands shown on the planning layout. There are locations eg between plots 3024 & 3029 where the path does not continue across the junction.]	These are shown in ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-007 rev C. Also see ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-RM-701 rev B.	A389-R7&R13-RM-701 rev A A389-R7&R13-PL-007 rev B	A389-R7&R13-RM-701 rev B A389-R7&R13-PL-007 rev C
10.25	Highways	19/02/2026	b. Numerous 5.0m wide streets should have a 2.0m wide footway alongside, as per the requirements of Wokingham Living Streets. For example, a 2.0m wide footway should be provided between Plots 3024 and 3026 and the pedestrian path to the west. [Case Officer comment 26/02: To be considered in conjunction with the street hierarchy established by the Design Code.]	Page 24 of the approved South Wokingham Phase 2b Design Guide (February 2025) states a carriageway width of 'At least 4.8m', reducing to '4.1m where less than 10 dwellings are served'. Where some shared streets are 5.0m wide this is primarily to accommodate the large manoeuvring requirements of a WBC refuse vehicle or on longer shared streets, to allow a car and refuse vehicle to pass.	A389-R7&R13-PL-003	A389-R7&R13-PL-003 rev E
10.26	Highways	19/02/2026	c. A pedestrian path joins the carriageway in the middle of a priority junction between Plots 3050 and 3026. A formal crossing point should be provided to the footway with dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided. Ped visibility of vehicles should be demonstrated with a 25m Y distance.	The connecting path to the R13 perimeter informal footpath has been move south of the junction where it joins the shared surface to the north of a private drive serving parking for 3 houses. A crossing is subsequently not required.	N/A	N/A
10.27	Highways	19/02/2026	d. The plans do not consistently show a crossing outside Plot 3042. Some plans show the path crossing in the middle of a priority junction which is not considered acceptable.	All drawings now consistently show the crossing to the south of the junction as illustrated in ALP Drawing	A389-R7&R13-RM-701 A389-R7&R13-PL-007	A389-R7&R13-RM-701 rev B A389-R7&R13-PL-007 rev C
10.28	Highways	19/02/2026	Crossing Detail Appears Inconsistent with other drawings	Plans updated	P24-2114_EN_50	P24-2114_EN_50
10.29	Highways	19/02/2026	Crossing Detail Appears Inconsistent with other drawings	Plans updated	P24-2114_EN_50	P24-2114_EN_50
10.30	Highways	19/02/2026	Crossing between Plots 3026 and 3050. Relocate north or south away from junction.	Footpaths have been amended along the western boundary	P1905.R07.R13.01 A	P1905.R07.R13.01 F
10.31	Highways	19/02/2026	14. Swept paths should be submitted which demonstrate a modern large car can ingress/egress the visitor parking spaces and the end parking space in each of the car parking courts on the site. It appears some rows of parking bays would benefit from additional manoeuvring space at the end of the row.	See drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-005 rev D.	A389-R7&R13-PL-005 rev A	A389-R7&R13-PL-005 rev E
10.32	Highways	19/02/2026	15. The number of car parking spaces proposed appears compliant with the requirements of the WBC Parking Calculator and is deemed acceptable by the Local Highways Authority.	Noted	N/A	N/A
10.33	Highways	19/02/2026	16. The Planning Statement highlights that 5% of affordable dwellings (4 dwellings) will be designed to meet M4(2) standards (accessible and adaptable). [Case officer 26/02: Note this is 5% of all dwellings but see my query about the number of houses.]	Noted	N/A	N/A
10.34	Highways	19/02/2026	17. The TS confirms that the site will provide a total of 210 electric vehicle charging points on site. This will comprise 172 single and 19 double Electric Vehicle Charging Points. The LHA are satisfied with this number of EV Charging Points comply with the requirement for 1 active charging point per dwelling as required by Part S of the Building Regulations.	Noted	N/A	N/A
10.35	Highways	19/02/2026	18. Further details of the charger specification and power supply would need to be secured by planning condition, if planning permission is granted.	This level of information has not been requested for Parcel R10 - regardless it is covered by Building Regulation requirements.	N/A	N/A
10.36	Highways	19/02/2026	19. The LHA require confirmation of the undercroft heights and confirmation that delivery vans will be able to pass through the undercrofts provided on site.	The FOG has an undercroft height of 2.1 m, which can accommodate cars, 4x4s and SUVs. In lieu of specific WBC guidance on the height clearance of undercrofts, this accords with the recommended garage door size as set out in the Wokingham Borough Council Parking Standards Study Report, Consultation Document (October 2011). Delivery vans would not use the undercroft, but would instead stop briefly on-street, as will be the case for the other areas of the site. These stops are short in duration, low in frequency, dispersed throughout the day and can be accommodated without affecting traffic flow.	N/A	N/A
10.37	Highways	19/02/2026	20. Swept path analysis for the pumping station is required which demonstrates the largest required vehicle can ingress/egress the pumping station.	See ALP Drawing A389-R7&R13-PL-006 rev D.	A389-R7&R13-PL-006 A	A389-R7&R13-PL-006 rev D

11.1	Landscape	09/03/2026	There has been some discussion regarding the layout of the Parks and Garden space between the development edge of R13 and the attenuation basin. I have no objections to the possible removal of the existing hedgerow and realignment of the proposed path to allow for a more usable open space to be created in this area. Any change will still need to allow for the retention of tree T84.	Hedgerow removed - tree T84 retained.	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
11.2	Landscape	09/03/2026	There needs to be better visual and physical separation between the northern edge of the development in R13 including visitor parking bays and the Parks and Garden typology, and this should preferably be provided through planting. Of particular concern are the visitor bays opposite plots 4041 & 4042 which are in close proximity to pedestrian footway crossing through this space but will be at a slightly higher level than the POS. We do not want to see concrete haunching for the kerbs dominating this landscaped edge.	The northern open space area has been redesigned to address other comments resulting in changes to the levels from the road/visitor spaces down to the open space	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
11.3	Landscape	09/03/2026	The Engineering Layout drawing indicates an embankment sloping down from the development edge into this POS and this probably follows the standard 1:3 gradient. Where there are two visitor spaces opposite plots 3067 – 3070, the amendments could be slackened further so that the whole of the space between the back of the parking bays and the paved area has a more gradual slope rather than these slopes ending as shown by the red dashed line to reflect the built development edge. See purple arrows below showing how the slope could be extended.	This area has been reviewed and design amended, further levels and sections have been provided to show how this area will work	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
11.4	Landscape	09/03/2026	The GI Officer has already commented on the interface between the development edge opposite plot 4040 and the play area. This is an important area to get right due to its strategic location into the play space – see red oval below. It is not entirely clear how the 1m drop in ground levels will be treated or how this also becomes an attractive entrance into the POS and play area. Further details will need to be provided on the hard and soft landscape treatment of this area including additional sections and how this space and ground levels relates to the two visitor parking spaces on either side.	This area has been reviewed and design amended, further levels and sections have been provided to show how this area will work	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
11.5	Landscape	09/03/2026	Not only is there a fall in ground level in relation to the point made above, but there is also a further gradual drop in ground level of an additional metre across the play space to the top of the attenuation basin. Could the level changes be used to create positive features such as low retaining walls which act seating, for example, and which could also create a low barrier to enclose the space.	This area has been reviewed and design amended, further levels and sections have been provided to show how this area will work	P24-2114_51	P24-2114_51A
11.6	Landscape	09/03/2026	It is not clear what the physical or visual transition is between the edge of the play area and the edge of the attenuation basin leading into the stepped edge and boulder area where the steps finish. Although this area is shown on the Landscape Sections it is important that a clear design intention is required between these two different functions.	Planting has been added along the edge of the play space and the form of the basin adjusted to help with transition of edge.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.7	Landscape	09/03/2026	Based on the information provided on the R13 Basin Cross Sections drawing it appears it will be difficult to implement tree planting along the top of the berm between the basin and SWDR ditch due to the proposed construction of the basin using a liner with 300mm of topsoil above. The information provided with the application will need to ensure there are localised areas along this edge which have a greater depth of soil as has been provided on other parcels, which will then allow for some tree planting along this edge in accordance with the Landscape Masterplan.	As with previous phases there will be localised areas of additional topsoil and subsoil above the liner to allow tree planting.	N/A	N/A
11.8	Landscape	09/03/2026	At the western end of the POS where the footpath through the POS meets the road, there needs to be clear pedestrian prioritisation across this road either by a narrowing a small section of the road or the use of a raised table so pedestrians can cross at the same level, or a combination of both.	The are no proposed raised tables through the layout and it is not considered necessary to have one in this location as it is on a section of road that will experience very low traffic. This point has been acknowledged by WBC highways in pre and post submission meetings. Like all informal crossings throughout the site, this location will include drop kerbs and tactile paving, with a change of carriageway surfacing between the drop kerbs to highlight the crossing point. This is shown in the Abley Letchford Drawing A389-R7&R13-RM-701 B Materials Plan.	N/A	A389-R7&R13-RM-701 B
11.9	Landscape	09/03/2026	We will need to see a number of landscape cross-sections along this boundary to understand the relationship of the edge of the development including visitor parking bays with the proposed swales, footpath and proposed woodland planting.	Cross section drawings have been prepared through the open space and	N/A	TBC
11.10	Landscape	09/03/2026	I don't consider the proposal to use a timber post and rail fence along this edge is an appropriate solution for this space and suggest this is replaced with a timber knee rail as indicated in the Site Wide Landscape Design Statement.	Fencing has changed	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.11	Landscape	09/03/2026	It would be good to see feature trees located in this space at the end of the each of the two roads that visually terminate along this edge.	Lighting columns have been moved to accommodate trees.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.12	Landscape	09/03/2026	Two properties on plots 3019 & 3028 directly adjoin this POS and suggest the overlooking side elevations are provided with some private amenity space by the provision of a medium height hedge in the locations shown below in pink.	Noted has been changed.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C

11.13	Landscape	09/03/2026	South-Eastern and Eastern development Edge with Link Road The Link Road includes a number of street trees within the verge; however the development edge will also need to include a comprehensive landscape treatment which will need to include trees to reduce the visual dominance of the development edge of parcel R13. Currently there are no trees proposed in this green space only one at each end of this boundary with the Link Road and this is not acceptable.	Additional trees have been added.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.14	Landscape	09/03/2026	We will need to understand how the proposed fencing and landscaping work together along this frontage to reflect the different character areas.	Fencing/hedgerow shown on plan.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.15	Landscape	09/03/2026	The two additional parking bays for the sales office by plot 4001 should not be shown on the Presentation Layout or Landscape Masterplan as they are only temporary. We need to see proposed planting in this space as per the final layout and to address the two points listed above.	Layout plans to be updated to reflect the final layout. Separate plan to be produced for the sales area	P1905.R07.R13.01 A	P1905.R07.R13.01 F
11.16	Landscape	09/03/2026	Landscape Masterplan / Layout – Other Landscape Issues A number of street trees including those that were previously shown in the public realm in earlier layout iterations, have been significantly reduced. It is important that the layout allows for as many trees to be included within the public realm as possible. Where the rooting volume may be limited in some locations this can be addressed by the incorporation of underground soil cells as part of the tree pit specification.	Additional street trees have been included where possible.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.17	Landscape	09/03/2026	I understand that the location of the lighting columns may restrict the location of some of the trees, however I would like to suggest the possibility of moving lighting columns to the other side of the road to allow tree planting within the verges / rain gardens.	Additional street trees have been included where possible.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.18	Landscape	09/03/2026	Suggestions for additional locations for tree planting are listed below some of which may require additional rooting volume to be provided or a slight amendment to the lighting scheme. Choice of tree species will also be important depending on location: In the rain garden between the parking for plots 3013 & 3014. In the rain garden between the two visitor spaces to the south of rear gardens on plots 3029 & 3050. In the rain garden to the front of plot 3030 In the rain garden to the front of plot 3035. In the rain garden to the front of plot 3036. In the rain garden traffic calming to the north of the rear garden of plot 3041. At either end of the two (reduced from three) visitor parking bays acting as traffic calming adjacent to the northern POS. In the rain gardens to the entrances of both parking courts for apartment block 1 and in rain gardens between parking bays. To the south of side rear garden boundary for plot 4032. In rain garden between parking bays for plots 4034 & 4035. To the west of sub-station parking. In the rain garden traffic calming to the north of the rear garden of plot 4005. In the rain garden to the front of plot 4004. In the rain garden to the front of plot 3006. In the rain garden to the front of plot 3001. Within the front garden of plot 4040 adjacent to the parking for plot 4039. In rain garden between parking bays for plots 4095 & 4096. In rain garden between parking bays for plots 4082 & 4083. To the south-west of apartment block 3.	Additional street trees and rain gardens have been included where possible.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.19	Landscape	09/03/2026	The arrangement of the parking courts for apartment Block 1 is dominated by significant areas of hardstanding required for manoeuvring vehicles and would like to see this reduced if possible. This arrangement has pushed the parking spaces and footways into what would normally be provided for semi-private amenity space for the ground floor flats, therefore there is no space for any buffer planting between the parking bays / footpath and the balconies or other ground floor windows to prevent car headlights shining into these rooms. We will need to see parking bays moved further from the ground floor flats to allow for some buffer planting. If there is limited space an instant hedge could be used which comes pre-grown. It is not clear how far the front garden of plot 4105 extends beyond the parking bays. This area will need to be better defined by planting to the north of the parking. Could the parking for this property be turned at right angles and therefore located to the front of the property rather than extending into an area of incidental open space where the lines of ownership could be blurred in the future.	Landscaping has been updated around updated layout, additional rain garden planting has been added and hedge/trees reviewed to create buffers.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.20	Landscape	09/03/2026	We will require a plan showing the areas that will be managed by a management company, these will need to include all rain gardens.	Hedgerow has been updated.	P24-2214_EN_50A	P24-2214_EN_50C
11.21	Landscape	09/03/2026		Adoption plan updated to show highways land.	A389-R7&R13-RM-103 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-103 B

11.22	Landscape	09/03/2026	Levels and Drainage The Engineering Layout provides details of the proposed levels across the site for the built elements including the new footpaths; however, we will also need to understand what the proposed ground level changes will be in the adjacent POS. I request that this information is also included on this drawing.	Levels added to Engineering Layout drawing	A389-R7&R13-RM-401 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-401 B
11.23	Landscape	09/03/2026	The rain gardens will need to connect into the wider surface water drainage system and shown on the Drainage Strategy drawing.	Drainage Strategy drawing updated to show connections from rain gardens	A389-R7&R13-RM-501 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-501 B
11.24	Landscape	09/03/2026	It is not clear why the Drainage Strategy does not include permeable paving for the parking courts and individual driveways. This should be considered further.	Permeable paving added to parking courts for apartment buildings and the parking areas in R7. On plot materials are subject to conditions.	A389-R7&R13-RM-501 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-501 B
11.25	Landscape	09/03/2026	Arboricultural Issues I have reviewed the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement and associated Tree Protection Plans and have no concerns regarding the information provided. There are very few existing trees within and on the site boundaries and these are shown to be adequately retained and protected.	Noted	N/A	N/A
12.1	TVP	05/02/2026	Apartment Parking Courts It is noted that all the parking courts proposed to serve the apartment buildings are designed in such a way that electronic gates could be provided at the entrances to the parking area. If provided, electronic gates (which could be remote operated via key fob) would limit access to the parking area to residents only. This would not only secure the cars parked within this area, it would secure the vulnerable boundaries of neighbouring dwellings. Without gates, the secure perimeter block is undermined and the car park will be open to access leaving it and neighbouring properties vulnerable to crime and anti social behaviour. The submitted Planning Statement states that the applicant is reluctant to install gates as “it is unlikely that the affordable housing provider will accept the requirement for additional maintenance”. However, there is no evidence that this is the case. In any case, I cannot see how this position can be justified, as the maintenance of access gates would be no different to the general maintenance that would be required for the building (including access controls to the building). A clear assumption is being made without evidence that an affordable housing provider would not take the units based on there being electronic gates to the car park, or why installing the gates would create an onerous maintenance burden. It is maintained that electronic gates should be provided.	Comment above - decision made not to add gates to apartment building courts.	N/A	N/A
12.2	TVP	05/02/2026	Previous iterations of the layout had a more secure boundary to the parking area for Block 3, with a dwelling providing a secure perimeter. With the layout proposed, it will be important that defensive planting is provided on both sides of a robust 1.8m high boundary wall.	Enclosure changed to a brick wall with planting.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
12.3	TVP	05/02/2026	There are a number of awkward relationships between roads and dwellings throughout the proposed development which create areas where vulnerable boundaries area exposed. This provides blank frontages to the public realm (reducing surveillance) and can leave dwellings more vulnerable to burglary. This includes plots 4086, 4077, 4078, 4100, 4093, 4003, 4010, 4037.	All boundary walls which side onto a public street are 1.8m high brick walls with planting in front.	P1905.R07.R13.07	P1905.R07.R13.07 F
12.4	TVP	05/02/2026	If it can be demonstrated that exposed side or rear boundaries cannot be avoided, then the boundary must be as robust as possible (walls instead of fencing) at least 1.8m high, with defensive planting positioned in front to limit access to the wall. The corridors which access ground floor units for blocks 2 and 3 will be accessible to all apartments within the building. This will compromise the security of ground floor units and leave them more vulnerable to ASB and neighbour disputes. It may therefore be more appropriate for these units to have external front doors (in lieu of terraces) which can be more secure and access can be controlled and more defined through defensible space.	The design of Block 2 and 3 is a standard apartment building for the number of units. Security measures will be in place at the front doors to prevent unwanted access.	N/A	N/A
12.5	TVP	05/02/2026	It is noted that the bin and cycle store for block 2 and the bin store for block 3 has two sets of doors. It is not clear why this is necessary and will make the stores more difficult to secure.	The integrated cycle store on Block 2 will have a single leaf louvered door at the rear while the front door will be swapped with a tax window. The rear door on the bin store will be of a single leaf louvered door to justify the individual residents refuse carry distance under building regs.	P1905.CYC.101	P1905.CYC.101 A
12.6	TVP	05/02/2026	A number of double leaf doors are proposed. This can be harder to secure (requiring one leaf to lock into another). Were possible, single leaf doors should be proposed.	All the cycle storage doors will be changed to single leaf louvered door while the bin stores to double leafed where the refuse operators will have the access to take the bins out.	P1905.CYC.101	P1905.CYC.101 A

12.7	TVP	05/02/2026	No information has been provided with regards to the proposed secure access arrangements for the apartment buildings. It is important that these are confirmed as part of the reserved matters to ensure that all residents are afforded a similar level of security. The access and security strategy should cover the following matters: - Access control measures for residents and visitors: Unrestricted access into apartment blocks must not be possible, and access should be controlled by a two-way audio visual system with remote access controls. No trade buttons should be present. - Postage and Deliveries: Postal services must not have unrestricted access to private communal areas, and mail delivery should be provided within a secure access controlled lobby at the entrance to the building (an air-lock entrance arrangement as part of access control strategy), or via secure external letter boxes (certified to TS 009) or delivery 'through the wall' into a secure area (see section 39 of SBD) - Compartmentation: Proposals for compartmentation of the building so that residents only have access to parts of the building that they need to, as offenders have the potential to be both external and internal to the development. Secure lobbies should also be extended to each floor to enable effective compartmentation - Security for ground floor terraces and windows – boundary treatment and defensive planting - Bin and Cycle Store - Window and Door security specification	This isn't a planning matter, but as per normal security design for new apartment buildings, measures will be in place at all entrances to prevent unwanted access. Call systems will be used for postage and deliveries.	N/A	N/A
12.8	TVP	05/02/2026	The proposed lighting for parking courts and private drives is not clear. Lighting throughout the development should meet the general standards of BS5489-1:2020. Bollard lighting is not an appropriate lighting method, and should be avoided. Not only can they be damaged by reversing vehicles, more critically they do not provide sufficient light at the right height to aid facial recognition and reduce the fear of crime. It also does not deter crime and antisocial behaviour.	Updated Lighting Lux Plan in line with site-wide lighting strategy	A389-R7&R13-RM-121 A	A389-R7&R13-RM-121 A
12.9	TVP	05/02/2026	During the construction phase of this development, there is an elevated risk of crime, in particular theft offences. Construction sites across the Thames Valley Police area have been targeted for theft of tools and materials, and in the case of residential development, we have also seen multiple targeted incidents of thefts of boilers from multiple dwellings at the same time, shortly after installation. As such, it is imperative that site security is considered equally as important as site safety. I ask that the Construction Management Plan for this development specifically considers site security, and I recommend the applicants consult the guidance provided by Secured by Design, to make sure all opportunities are taken to prevent crime from the outset. The guidance can be found here: https://www.securedbydesign.com/images/CONSTRUCTION_SITE_SECURITY_GUIDE_A4_8pp.pdf As a general point, and for any future specification for the development, I would recommend the applicant consults the guidance provided by Secured by Design Residential Guide 2025.	Construction details to be set out in CEMP (conditioned)	N/A	N/A
13.1	Waste Services	23/02/2026	For all communal properties built after June 2026 we'll be instructing bin stores to have container space for: General waste - 160-litres per property Dry and mixed Recycling - 240-litres per property A 240l red food bin Space for an additional 240l litre bin for glass From June 2026 sites will be able to plan for using 1100-litre bins for recycling.	The floorplans for the apartments have been updated in accordance with the latest refuse storage guide for WBC	N/A	N/A