

Parcels R7 and R13 Land at Phase 2b of the South Wokingham SDL
LPA Reference: 253142
Aug-26

Consultee	Date	Consultee Comment	Applicant Response 19 May 2026	LPA Response June 2026	Applicant Response August 2026
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.	This is not an adequate justification for ignoring the Designing Out Crime Officer's sound advice. Unless a good reason for not providing gates can be put forward, gates will be conditioned, as for R11.	Gates have been added to the drive through Block 3. Please refer to the revised drawings for HT L256.
		Enclosure between Block 3 and car park to be a wall with defensive planting	Enclosure changed to a brick wall with planting.	A wall and defensive parking have been added on the eastern boundary of the parking court for block 3 (on the enclosures plan, the materials plan needs updating to match) but only a post-and-rail fence on the southern boundary, which will not form a sufficiently secure parking court. I can see there may be an argument for visual permeability here but boundary also needs to be secure. Consideration could be given to something like a wall with railings to balance these considerations.	The southern and eastern boundaries of the Block 3 parking court have been amended to a 1.8m brick screen wall. Please refer to P1905.R07.R13.07-H Proposed Enclosures Layout.
		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.	This doesn't address the reason for why the gap is there. Unless there is a good reason not to, it would be better to incorporate it in the adjoining gardens rather than create a narrow strip requiring separate maintenance	The gap between the dwelling boundaries and the adjacent land (revised plot numbers 4072-4098) is Management Company land for maintenance only. Site levels prevent landscaping in this location.
		Hedge to be extended around front garden of Plot 4105.	Hedge has been extended.	Now plot 4098. This is shown on the landscape masterplan but the enclosures layout has not been updated.	The enclosures plan (P1905.R07.R13.07-H Proposed Enclosures Layout) has been revised to reflect this change to the hedge on plot 4098 (previously plot 4105).
		Details of the piers and how they integrate with railings	New plan produced to show details of the different boundaries.	I can't see that this drawing has been submitted?	P1905.R07.R13.24 Proposed Enclosures Details Submitted in August pack.
		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.	I had suggested as a more general point that it would be helpful to identify land to be adopted as POS and land to be transferred to a ManCo, to help understand the function of different spaces. The adoption plan still only shows highway, so it remains unclear what is the curtilage of the flats and what is public. The realignment of the railing on the NW side of the flats is a backward step as the defensible space has been reduce and this change should be reversed. Also the response doesn't really address my question about the triangle of land to the east of the block which appears to be public but serve no useful purpose/could be useable amenity space for the flats?	The highways adoption plan A389-R7&R13-RM-103 has been amended to show Management Company land.
		Review hedge placement for double fronted houses - should go around all defensible spaces	This has been reviewed and updated.	The point about defensible space around corner houses seems to have been addressed but the approach to enclosure is still not consistent with the design code: railings and hedges in the main street CA; shrubs in the neighbourhood residential CA (with railings to secondary streets); informal hedges in rural edge CA	All front boundary treatments have been reviewed. Please refer to revised plan P1905.R07.R13.07-H Proposed Enclosures Layout.

		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.	Railings are still only shown on corner plots, which is not consistent with the design code for the main street or neighbourhood residential CAs	Railings have been added to all plots within the Main Street Character area. The streets within the Neighbourhood Residential CA are tertiary streets as described in the approved Design Code-Street Hierarchy Plan. The design code states that hop railings should be applied to secondary streets.
		Rural character area boundary with SWDR - review fence option	Railings added to on corner & vista plots	This response is not consistent with the Design Code and does not address the question of whether the post-and-rail fence along the Heathlands link boundary (rural edge section) is needed. However, from previous responses, it be because the fence is being installed as part of the SWDR landscaping?	The post and rail fence has been removed, and shrub planting added where there is space to accommodate.
		Fence along the western boundary.	Timber knee rail added to western boundary.	I had suggested the fence could be omitted (I suspect it may have initially been added under a misapprehension that this was rural edge). There seems to be some inconsistency whether this has been changed to a knee rail. There does not need to be a fence along this edge unless there is a reason for it to be there eg if the kerb is flush to prevent cars overrunning the adjacent planted area.	This fence has now been removed.
		Plot 4100 lacks an active secondary frontage.	Low height pier and wall been added to the side of this plot.	Now 4093: this is doesn't address the issue of an active frontage, needs to be revised.	Windows have been added to plot 4093 (previously 4100) for active frontage.
		H482 lower sill height of skylights and first floor layout / windows	Changes to house types are not proposed.	This was a question. What is the lower cill height of the skylights above internal floor level?	A note has been added to the H482 drawings to confirm the external cill of rooflights to be no lower than 1.7m from FFL.
		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.	Substitution of the L361 for L358 is welcomed. Of the three L358 that remain, only one is a corner plot (3006). Could this be changed to an L361 too? Given the reduction in the number of L358/increase in the number of L361, the fenestration in the secondary frontages of the AL32 (where they occur on corner plots) is adequate (although it is shame the opportunity to improve the design has not been taken). However, the side of plot 4092 does not currently have additional windows, which should be added, given	Agreed in meeting with planning officer that elevations are sufficient.
		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.	There are 11 of this house type: it is not acceptable as it stands and requires revision Also to address the large gap between the eaves and top of the first-floor windows. Furthermore, it occurs mostly in the main street character area where at least one full height window is required by the Design Code. 31/07: I'm afraid the H486 is still not working. The large gap between the top of the first-floor windows and the cill of the second-floor window, combined with the small central window results in too much of an expanse of brickwork. Something needs to be done to fragment that gap. Ideally deeper windows (probably on all three floors) and extension of the brickwork detailing to eaves height.	The H486 HT drawings have been amended in line with the comments raised by the planning officer.

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.	The lack of a reasoned response to this feedback is disappointing. 23 H482 are proposed, which is a significant proportion of the proposed. Also, although I didn't pick it up in my original comments, this house type occurs in the Main Street Character area, where the Design Code which requires at least one full height window in the front elevation of each dwelling	The H482 drawings have been revised to amend the windows to the front elevations and introduce brick detailing.
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.	Ok but still need to think about treatment. Should we be looking for different treatment or for them for them to appear as a widening of the road (where thee happens to be space to park...so shown identified as a space on the parking layout but not differentiated on the ground?	Visitor spaces on tarmac roads have been amended to block paving.
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.	Noted, however this does seem to be reflected in the elevations or street scenes.	The street scenes have been updated to reflect changes to layout and all materials and elevations have been updated.
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.	To clarify, my suggestion was to reduce the depth of the rear garden of plot 3011 (accepting a slightly substandard garden as a compromise for better lighting and less overbearing relationship), not to relocate the parking. Alternatively, provide a daylight/sunlight assessment to show the relationship would not result in unacceptable levels of lighting at the rear of plot 3011 Bathroom only on second floor but both g/f windows serve the kitchen/bathroom/family room	Plot 3011 has been pulled south, with parking bays relocated in the additional space created north of the dwelling.
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.	Not all of these drawings have been revised and those that have do not include any obvious reference to obscured glazing. Furthermore, obscure glazing will detract from the amenity of occupants, so should only be required where necessary to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties. rather than resubmitting further house-type drawings, I suggest this is dealt with by condition. NB for the last two drawings, I don't seem to have a revision A	A condition to satisfy this comment is acceptable.
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.	This is adequate, although still not really a landmark. Defensible space is now shown to the west but this is not picked up on the ALP drawings	Noted.

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.	Although the gables in the western elevation are more prominent the setback has not been revised and remains quite minimal (0.3 metres) On reflection, the secondary frontage is less successful than the first iterations, which better reflected the design code, having a full height window in the front elevation and secondary front elevation of each dwelling. There is a discrepancy between the floor plans (which show larger windows in bedrooms and living areas) and the elevations. As illustrated on the elevations, the solid-to-void ratio results in a mean appearance and it is questionable whether the rooms will receive adequate natural light (especially as they are single-aspect and north facing)	Block 2 elevations now include deeper windows, additional brick detailing, and wider porches for the main doors.
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). 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 perhaps additional brickwork detailing (soldier courses?)	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 orientation 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.	It is disappointing that the double gable, submitted informally has not been incorporated as it worked well. As with Block 2, there are concerns about the solid: void ratio in the secondary frontages. Where a flat has windows in the primary and secondary frontage, there should be a full height window in both. Also, to help the legibility of the building, it would be beneficial to differentiate the communal entrances from those to individual flats by making them more prominent (eg a larger porch and/or door/entrance design).	The Block 2 drawings have been amended to introduce deeper windows and brick detailing. Addition of a Juliet balcony to the bedroom overlooking the public open space.
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.	Vertical brick detailing has been added to the central row of windows indicating the location of the main access into the building.	This helps but the communal entrances to the upper floor have the same weight as the entrances to the individual g/f flats	Brick detailing updated.
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.	This point still needs to be addressed. The distance is not really the point, although in the case of 3107/08 & 3089/3090 there is only a pair of semis between them! These are local landmarks (presumably why you have located taller buildings here) but if all the landmarks are identical it doesn't help much with legibility. Also I seem to be lacking elevations for 3056/57 (although from the streetscene it looks to be brick now)? The plans are for all three pairs of houses and previously it was the same drawing for the elevations too. P1905.L367.102 A L367 Type - Style 4, Front & Side Elevations - Render_A is only for 89/90 & 07/08 and there doesn't seem to be an alternative drawing for 30256/57	Front elevations have been amended so that these semi-detached 2.5 storey units have different elevations.

Case Officer - urban 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	Still only shows highway adoption though?	The highways adoption plan A389-R7&R13-RM-103 has been amended to show Management Company land. This is illustrative and is normally defined at the S38 stage.
	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.	I still need to check this	Noted.
		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.	Now 4069. It was and remains shown as a car port on the parking layout but the floorplans show a garage, which is preferable from a safety/antisocial behaviour perspective. It is not clear why you think doors are unsuitable	Plot 4069 (previously plot 4076) (HT L256) now shows a carport on the floorplan drawing. Doors have been added to drive-through to the parking area. Please refer to revised drawing ref. P1905.L256.101 L256 Type - Style 1, Floor Plans_B.
		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 distinguished with flats & houses accommodation.	The Design Code commits to two spaces for two-bedroom properties (regardless of whether the dwelling is a flat or a house). This was accepted as a positive step because it exceeds the <u>minimum</u> standards.	The cycle provision for Blocks 2 and 3 has been increased to meet the Design Code.
	24/06/2026	The main point I would like to discuss is the flat design. I appreciate revisions were submitted informally previously and the form of the buildings is much improved. However, the fenestration has taken a bit of a backward step, with several frontages/secondary frontages now having almost entirely small windows. In some cases this is contrary to the Design Code and it is certainly to the detriment of the appearance of the buildings. This is well illustrated by a comparison of the first sheet of the street scenes.	N/A refer to column F		Following discussions with the Planning Officer, the elevations for Block 1 have been amended to include longer windows on the principal elevations.
		Boundary treatments would benefit from a comprehensive review to ensure consistency with both the landscaping proposals (there seem to be a few discrepancies where one has been updated but not the other). Eg plots 3019 & 3026, block 3, plot 4105 (now 4098!) but there are other examples.			Enclosures plan updated.
		Also related to boundary treatments, there were previously some points raised about consistency with the Design Code. These have not all been addressed and, in some instances, the proposed revisions diverge from it further than was originally the case. I refer you to the summary on page 68 of the Design Code.			Enclosures plan updated.

Landscape	11/06/2026	The only outstanding issue is that the Enclosures Plan (Rev F) still indicates that the proposed fence along this western edge is post and rail fencing even when the response tracker indicates this has now been shown as a timber knee rail as I had previously requested. The Landscape Masterplan and Illustrative Landscape Sections show the fencing along this boundary as a timber knee rail. This will need to be amended on the Enclosures Layout plan.	N/A refer to column F		This fence has now been removed.
		It is noted that the rain gardens within the road corridors are now shown to be connected into the wider surface water drainage system as shown on the Drainage Strategy drawing. However, all other rain gardens adjacent to on plot parking or within parking courts, which I presume will be maintained by the management company, are not shown as being connected. We will need to understand how these also feed into the wider drainage strategy.			The drainage strategy drawing shows the adoptable network so connections for individual rain gardens within parking courts for example are not explicitly shown. All areas have been incorporated in the hydraulic model.
Ecology - EMS	19/06/2026	The revised Ecosa Ecological Mitigation Strategy (May 2026) now includes Map 2 showing the proposed locations for Hedgehog highways. Unfortunately, the proposed locations are not sufficient to provide a robust network of highways. I recommend that the local planning authority seek further Hedgehog highway holes in the locations marked with pink dots in the image snips below.	N/A refer to column F		The Ecological Mitigation Strategy has been amended to include additional Hedgehog Holes in the locations suggested by the Ecology Officer.
					



Waste Services	25/06/2026	Impression is that the stores for block 1 may be large enough but it is not clear that the stores for blocks 2 and 3 are. He's set out exactly what would be needed for each block (based on the number of dwellings in each block). Can the stores be reviewed in the light of this and something provided that clarifies what is proposed (either colour coded drawings or an explanation of what is illustrated in each store)	N/A refer to column F	The ground floor plan drawings for the Blocks have been amended to add a colour-coded bin store key for clarification.
SDL Flood Risk Officer	29/05/2026	We note that parcel R7 discharges uncontrolled into the swale as an allowance for its discharge has been made within the SANG basin. We need to know what allowance was made in the SANG basin relating to the 1.03ha impermeable area for R7.	N/A refer to column F	SWDR have confirmed an allowance of 0.8ha impermeable area has been included in the wider SWDR model. Refinement of the catchment areas for R7 results in an impermeable area of 0.628ha (this figure includes a 10% uplift for urban creep), therefore we are satisfied there is sufficient capacity downstream for the proposed flows.
		We however note that no output results for the 2 year return period have been provided for both R7 and R13. Please provided the pfd drainage simulation files for auditing.		R7_R13 RM Design Rev B.pfd was submitted to the council on 02/06/2026.
		We note that maintenance will be in accordance with section 6 via agreements with IWNL (S104), Highways authority (S38) and the local authority (commuted sum) Are these agreements in place already?		The S104 and S38 are not in place yet.
		From the drawings, it is unclear what soft landscape treatment is being proposed for the swales on the western portion of the site, in NGS6ii. I cannot find a description in the Key for the swales. If the treatment is the same as the 'attenuation basin', does the swale really need a liner? Or if the intent is for a rain garden treatment? Is this the appropriate treatment?		The key has been updated for clarity.
		The consultee response that was provided indicates that the swales will be meadow mix suitable for the soil conditions. Is this the same mix that will be used in the adjacent flowering lawn areas?		The key has been updated for clarity.

Green Infrastructure	16/06/2026	Please confirm if there are discrepancies between the Abley Letchford engineering sections (A389-R7&R13-RM-531 B Swale Cross Section) the landscape master plan (P24-2114_EN_50C R13 Landscape Masterplan) and the illustrative landscape sections (P24-2114_EN_53A-01 R7 and R13 Illustrative Landscape Sections and P24-2114_EN_53A-02 R7 and R13 Illustrative Landscape Sections). For some swales the engineering drawings show the start of swales at the edge of the footpath. Whereas the landscape master plan and illustrative sections show a level area for a maintenance strip adjacent to the footpath. For some of the swales, it appears on the landscape plans and sections that a mown strip has been provided adjacent to the footpath. However, the detailed sections show no level strip and that the swale will be right at the edge of the footpath which will be a maintenance issue and possibly a safety concern. This should be looked at for all the swales. Like the highways side, there should be a 0.8m to 1.0m level strip adjacent to the footpath before the swale starts.	N/A refer to column F		Swale and footpath have been amended to allow for a minimum of 0.8 level surface adjacent to the top of the swale.
		Please provide a more heavily planted buffer between the play area and the terraced steps. I think this can be dense, low-growing planting appropriate for a play space. I would also like to see a few trees to provide some shade.			The planting buffer has been increased, and multi-stem trees added.
		More information will be required as a further condition discharge to address the following: - Additional soft landscape will be needed for screening of the pump station. - More detail will be needed with respect to the proposed raised timber edging. This may not be the most appropriate material for use in this area. It will be important to understand levels in this area and how the planter integrates into the space.			The key has been updated for clarity.
		I appreciate that the equipment that has been selected addresses the WBC Play Space Design Guide Technical Note in terms of providing a variety of play typologies for the LEAP. I would like to better understand the strategy and method for the overall design to create a multi-faceted, engaging play space. Either prior to or as part of a condition discharge, I would like to further discuss and refine the layout and design of the proposed play space.			The LEAP has been updated in response to discussions with the officer.

	In addition to the conditions listed in the Outline approval 191068, the following conditions should be incorporated within Condition 15 – Landscape, ecology, and green infrastructure: •Minor artefacts to also included detailed information around timber planters around play space •Additional screen planting around the pump station •a detail incorporating guidance from Active Travel England on the layout and design of bench seating;			Additional planting has been added around the pump station, with other details to be provided under a Discharge of Conditions application.
	However more specific details such as the timber raised planters to the edge of the play area will need to be submitted through a future condition's application.			Condition 15 of outline permission 191068 requires full details of both hard and soft landscape works for that phase to be submitted and approved by the LPA.