

DESIGNATED COUNTRYSIDE PROTECTION STATEMENT

FOR

MR & MR SHUBHENDU DAS

ON

**PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION PLANNING
APPLICATION FOR**

TWIN DISABLED PERSONS' ACCOMMODATION

AT

**10 SHEPHERDS AVENUE, EARLEY READING RG6 1AY
BERKSHIRE**

JANUARY 2026



COUNTRY SIDE DESIGN STATEMENT No: DSCS.25.02.01 FOR PROPOSED SIDE EXTENSION AT 10 SHEPHERDS AVENUE, EARLEY, RG6 1AY, BERKSHIRE

This report is supplied in response to Wokingham Borough Council’s comment as follows in response to Householder Planning Application No: 252930 – proposal as above, :- “Due to the location of the site in designated countryside, this type of application requires details about the proposed increase in built volume as a result of the development. Please indicate the original, existing & proposed volumes (in cubic metres) of any buildings impacted by the proposal. We also require a statement justifying the proposal in terms of the planning policy, the site & the design context. Please email this information

The report is triggered by the application by virtue of the site location as aforementioned – at the edge of a registered site of “country side”. A comprehensive definition of “country-side” is not given in the MDD per say or the glossary. However, the relevant countryside / woodland designation details connected with the are as follows:



Name	Woodley-Earley Settled and Farmed Clay
CS Policy	<i>As discussed in report body</i>
MDD Policy	<i>As discussed in report body</i>
Landscape Quality	Moderate
Landscape Sensitivity	Low
Landscape Capacity	Considerable
TPO Reference	TPO-0777-1996
TPO Document	View
Description	Oak, Ash, Sycamore, Field Maple
TPO Type	Woodland
Record Status	Confirmed
Date TPO Served	7/22/96
Date TPO Confirmed	9/27/96
TPO Reference	TPO-0777-1996

The principle policy advice of the Wokingham Borough Council on Designated Countryside for Planning is incorporated in the following publications, especially in the context of this proposal:

1. *Wokingham Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy -, Adopted Jan. 2010.*
2. *Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD). 2014 (valid until 2026)*

Both of these have been examined and the applicable addressing remarks over pertinent policy are tabulated below:

Core Strategy - Chapter 2: Cross Cutting Policies

2.1 The following policies are cross cutting or generic policies, which will apply to most, if not all types of development. They take forward the principles and policies set out in the Core Strategy.

2.2 This section has policies on development limits, character and design, green infrastructure, sustainable design and construction, renewable energy, water and transport.

Policy CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development 1. Planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.	Applicant remarks: Notable and noted
--	--

Policy CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Applicant remarks:
---	---------------------------

<p>2. Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of decision the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:</p> <p>a. Any adverse impacts of planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) taken as a whole; or</p> <p>b. Specific policies in the National Planning Policy Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</p>	<p>Given the physical site layout, its historic background and the sensitively designed detail of the proposal it is considered no adverse impact from its approval shall impart to the character of the existing greenery or arboreal assets of woodland. There is a clear lawn distance of 15+ meters to the nearest mature tree(s). Therefore CC01 -2(a) & (be) are considered accounted for</p>
---	---

<p>Policy CC02: Development Limits</p> <p>1. Development limits for each settlement are defined on the Policies Map.</p> <p>2. Planning permission for proposals at the edge of settlements will only be granted where they can demonstrate that the development, including boundary treatments, is within development limits and respects the transition between the built up area & the open countryside by accounting the adjacent countryside & landscape character.</p> <p>2.9 New development located at the edge of, but within the development limit, should demonstrate how the interrelationship between open countryside and the built form is respected. Careful siting and design of new development at the edge of development limits must allow for an approach which provides a transition between the built area and the open countryside. The aim is for development to recede and soften in relation to adjoining open countryside and avoid hard edges.</p> <p>3. Development proposals within the areas allocated as SDL in the adopted Core Strategy (policies CP18-21) will be permitted that are within the identified development limits unless an acceptable alternative has been agreed through the granting of planning permission accompanied by a deliverable SDL-wide:</p> <p>a. Comprehensive master plan; and</p> <p>b. Infrastructure Delivery Plan which:</p> <p>i. Ensures that the applicant funds and delivers an appropriate share of the SDL infrastructure; and</p> <p>ii. Does not prejudice the comprehensive delivery and implementation of the wider SDL</p>	<p>Applicant remarks:</p> <p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. It is considered this required transition aspect and quasi conservation has been amply demonstrated in whole Application documentation and design details</p> <p>2.9 Please see “previous information” section further in this statement</p> <p>3. Given the physical site layout, its historic background & the sensitively designed detail of the proposal it is considered no adverse impact from its approval shall impart to the character of the existing greenery or arboreal assets of woodland. There is a clear lawn distance of 15+ meters to the nearest mature tree(s). Therefore CC02 -3 is considered accounted for</p>
--	---

<p>Policy CC03: Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping</p> <p>1. Green Routes and Green Route Enhancement Areas are defined on the Policies Map.</p> <p>2. Devel. proposals should demonstrate how they have considered & achieved the following criteria within scheme proposals:</p> <p>a) Provide new or protect and enhance the Borough’s Green Infrastructure networks, including the need to mitigate potential impacts of new development</p> <p>b) Promote accessibility, linkages and permeability between and within existing green corridors including public rights of way such as footpaths, cycleways and bridleways</p> <p>c) Promote the integration of the scheme with any adjoining public open space or countryside</p> <p>d) Protect and retain existing trees, hedges and other landscape features</p> <p>e) Incorporate high quality, ideally, native planting and landscaping as an integral part of the scheme.</p>	<p>Applicant remarks:</p> <p>1. Noted- but not applicable to proposal</p> <p>2 a, b; c;.d & e It is considered this required transition aspect and quasi conservation has been amply demonstrated in whole Application documentation and design details. Please see “previous information” section further in this statement. Although the proposal scale is considered <i>de-minimis</i></p> <p>4. Given the physical site layout, its historic background & the sensitively designed detail of the proposal it is considered no adverse impact from its approval shall impart to the character of the existing greenery or arboreal assets of woodland. There is a clear lawn distance of 15+ meters to the nearest mature tree(s). Therefore CC02 -3 is considered accounted for</p>
---	--

Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD). 2014 Chapter 3: Topic Based Policies:

3.1 Chapter 3 “Topic Based policies”, covers policies that generally only apply to certain types of development. This Chapter should be read in conjunction with other policies in the MDD, including those in the crosscutting chapter.

<p>Green Belt Policy TB01: Development within the Green Belt</p> <p>1. The Green Belt is defined on the Policies Map.</p> <p>2. Within the Green Belt, development for the purposes set out in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF and as set out in point 3 below will only be permitted where they maintain the openness of, & do not conflict with the purposes of including land in, Green Belt.</p> <p>3. The alteration and/or extension of a dwelling and the construction, alteration or extension of buildings ancillary to a dwelling in the Green Belt over and above the size of the original building(s) shall be limited in scale.</p> <p>3.2 The Council established through policy CP12 – Green Belt of the Core Strategy that there were no exceptional circumstances to warrant changes to the Green Belt boundary. The Green Belt is defined on the Policies Map.</p> <p>3.3 Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. The presumption against inappropriate development is key to retaining the openness of the Green Belt. Para. 89 of the NPPF sets out that although the construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt, <i>there are certain exceptions</i>. Paragraph 90 of the NPPF sets out that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt.</p> <p>3.4 With regard to alteration &/or extension of a dwelling &buildings ancillary to a dwelling, proposals will be assessed against the original building(s), as defined by NPPF. Due to the restrictive policies applied to the Green Belt & the need to retain the openness of the countryside, only limited extensions to a dwelling will generally be permitted. ‘Limited’ means a cumulative increase of generally no more than a <i>35% increase</i> in volume over & above the original dwelling.</p> <p>3.5 For the purposes of clarity, any assessment of increase in volume of a dwelling will not include any other buildings on the site. With regard to the construction, alteration or extension of buildings ancillary to a dwelling, changes should <i>not result in disproportionate additions to the original building(s)</i> or cause a detrimental alteration to the scale of the dwelling or to the scale of development on the site.</p>	<p>Applicant remarks:</p> <p>1 Noted- but not applicable to proposal</p> <p>2 Openness is maintained and no conflict is materially arising with green belt or countryside purposes</p> <p>3 The proposal extension is ancillary & subservient to the dwelling. It’s designed as a zero impact as a low rise structure for practical needs the smallest necessary footprint; limited to the MDD realm of volumetric guidelines. This is considered amply demonstrated in the <i>de-minimis</i> Application package</p> <p>3.2 Is noted and only supported as a policy by the Applicant. It is believed the proposal has no conflict, therefore complies.</p> <p>3.3 The proposal extension is ancillary & subservient to the existing dwelling, with a dire need demonstrated through design details and medical evidence. It is also modest is size, shape and footprint. It is on the “edge” of a designated area, almost out there-of. It is therefore considered not inappropriate and comfortably within the realm of “certain exception”</p> <p>3.4 The proposal extension is quite ancillary & subservient to the existing dwelling, with a dire need demonstrated through design details and medical evidence. It is also modest is size, shape & footprint. Compliant Volumetric calculations in context of Para 3.4 are included further in this statement.</p> <p>3.5 The prescribed calculation methodology is complied with for the proposal. Its is also modest is size, shape & footprint. Compliant Volumetric calculations in context of Para 3.4 & 3.5 are included further in this statement. The <i>proposal</i> is not considered disproportionate to the site, dwelling or the other criteria considered here.</p>
--	--

<p>Policy TB02: Development adjoining the Green Belt</p> <p>Planning permission for proposals outside the Green Belt, but conspicuous when viewed from it, will only be granted where it is not detrimental to the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt in terms of scale, form, siting, materials or design.</p> <p>3.6 The visual amenity of the Green Belt should not be adversely affected by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt which, although they would not prejudice the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, might have a detrimental</p> <p>Policy TB02: Development adjoining the Green Belt – contd.</p> <p>3.115 Wildlife corridors are an important part of the network of nature conservation sites & include a range of habitats such as hedgerows, grass verges, waterways, their margins &</p>	<p>Applicant remarks:</p> <p>Although noted- this is not applicable to the proposal – as it is open to view only from the woodland on north-side; see block plan. The wood is itself closed from direct / open public access although the modest scale & layout of the proposal is not considered detrimental</p> <p>3.6 It is believed the required countryside protection has been amply demonstrated in overall Application package & design details. Please also see “previous information” further in this statement. Although the scale is considered <i>de-minimis</i></p> <p>3.115 Given the physical site layout, its historic background & the sensitively designed detail of the proposal it is considered no adverse impact from its approval shall impart to the character of the existing</p>
--	--

<p>floodplains. They are also important in providing a link to the wider countryside from built-up areas. When designing new habitats & biodiversity features, consideration should be given to the use of native species as well as the adaptability to the likely effects of climate change. Policy CC03: Green Infrastructure, Trees & Landscaping</p>	<p>greenery or arboreal assets of woodland. There is a clear lawn distance of 15+ meters to the nearest mature tree(s). Further, protective hedge and soft chicken wire fencing is also retained, Therefore TB02 & CC02 -3 are considered accounted for, including wild life matters.</p>
---	---

Other Overall Contextual Notes

Relevant Definitions: Development Limits Development limits identify the area within which development proposals would be acceptable, subject to complying with other policies contained in the Development Plan. They seek to prevent development from gradually extending into the surrounding countryside

Green Belt: A designation for land around certain towns and built-up areas, which aims to keep the land permanently open or largely undeveloped. The purposes of the green belt are to:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas • prevent neighbouring towns from merging • safeguard the countryside from encroachment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preserve the setting and special character of historic towns • assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land
---	---

In Wokingham Borough, the *Green Belt* comprises land north and east of Twyford, excluding Wargrave, and includes land in the parish of St. Nicholas Hurst east of the ‘The Straight Mile’ and north of Carter’s Hill.

MDD objectives

1.14 The policies in the MDD also help in taking forward the Council’s public health role by promoting health and wellbeing, including through the design of developments and accessibility to green infrastructure, open spaces, services and facilities. – the very little detailed policy guidance is an areas of concern...

Proposal congruent with MDD Para 2.14 2.14 Improving accessibility to existing green corridors must be considered in the layout of proposals. Proposals shall be consistent with the Borough’s Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) that identifies ways to improve access on public rights of way for all, especially those with visual & mobility impairments & to extend the accessibility of the network. No material impact will impart to the protected landscape. None of the protected trees are to be impacted in any way. In reality there is a distinctly defined line with clear fencing between protected woodland and the clear garden grounds for No.10. There is no direct public access through the woodland, rightly, for its protection. The existing sun lounge is to be demolished & the replacement extension will almost align with a side limit albeit moved slightly for the minimum internal space demand. Nevertheless he applicants are themselves very responsible, ethical about and interested in green, ecological and arboreal conservation. Applicant most interest in conservation, and the preservation of the designated countryside areas

The proposal is designed for absolutely the minimum footprint & the demolition of the outer lounge will only generate a net 136 CuM. extension volume, a 25.26% increase. It is essentially a De-minimis scheme for proven, essential family needs. The material country area is demarked by a distinct fencing off of the woodland, besides which the building is shaped as low rise. Although it’s further possible to reduce new volume with a flat roof design it is considered that will be insensitive to the surroundings & building aesthetics. Thus local front, side & rear mansard pitches are proposed.

Health Care provisions & inclusivity: As detailed in this statement the overriding Statutory obligations laid by Inclusivity and Community Facilities Legislation combined with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (*DDA*) *must in practice be balanced with the Country-side protection planning policy with a fine degree discretion between LPA obligations, and established Applicant needs.* Here, it is considered Applicants have demonstrated their material dedication to minimise countryside impact in real terms & spirit with sensitive design & effort to work with the Local Authority over Planning & social needs objectives.

3.21 Core Strategy Policy CP5 and MDD Policy TB05 - alludes to housing mix, density and affordability objectives....to provide a mix of dwellings, including DDA provisions. It is considered the proposal is contributory to these good intents to reflect the demand and the demographic households’ profile.

At the same time the family’s dual person DDA needs are most critical and must necessarily be addressed for the patients’ quality of life, care and access needs within the resource limitations. The Applicants are aware of the counter balancing approach that must be adopted to accord each element between country side policy and the people’s life need(s)

Given the “sensitivity” of the site, especially the woodland which a good 15 – 18 metres from the extension limit it’s designed for the minimum local and overall building footprint. It provides the smallest practical space and access feasible including dealing with and addressing challenging site slope features.

To re-iterate the DDA needs within the proposal are most critical and urgent. However, given the design approach detailed here, it is also that considered no material or perceived harm shall impart to country-side, green-belt or any ecological features or environments interest in the site or planning policies controls in practice, principle or precedence.

The proposal addresses Applicants’ essential health needs; a timely application processing will clearly help towards those. In turn the adopted proposal design approach has been to minimise any country-side impact. It’s considered *an edge of designated CS* area case rather than core countryside.

VOLUMETRIC CALCULATIONS

As stated, LPA requires “Due to the site location in designated countryside, the application requires details of proposed volume increase by the proposal. Please provide original, existing & proposed volumes (in CuM) of buildings so impacted”

Policy TB01 Para 3.4 states “.. only limited extensions to a dwelling will be permitted. ‘Limited’ means a cumulative increase of *generally no more than a 35% volume increase* over & above the original dwelling. Full calculations are shown here under:

10 SHEPHERDS AVENUE DDA EXTENSION VOLUMETRIC CHECK CALCULATION

<i>These calculations are generated by interactive processing with the Digitally produced CAD drawing on a fully intelligent 3D model</i>							
Element	Sub Area	CAD perimeter lin. M	Floor Area Sq.M	Height Lin.M.	Calculated Volume CuM.	Remarks / Totals (CuM)	Percentage changes
Ground Floor	Main block	38.31	65	2.85	185.25		
	Slope lean-to block	38.31	65	0.6	39.00	Ave. to consider	
	Garage drop	14.9	12.72	1.1	13.99	238.24	
First Floor	Main block	33.7	57.5	2.85	163.88		
	Front Lean-to Roof	21	13	1	13.00	176.88	
Roof	Pyramidal Roof	28.82	21.5	2.4	51.60	Eaves Periphery	
	Chimney Stack	8.16	1.34	0.425	0.57	52.17	
S'lge		22.55	28	2.5	70.00	70.00	
Existing Total Volume:					537.29		
Proposal Extension					<i>Maximum limit allowance</i>	188.05	
	Side Accom - blk	28	44.9	2.79	125.3	Ave Height	
	Low mansard Roof		40.94	0.7	28.7		
	Porch Area	21.2	14	3.7	51.8		
	Demolition	22.55	28	2.5	70.0		COMPLIES
Net Volume Added after demolition						135.73	25.26%
						COMPLIES	3.3% ELECTIVE
<i>Volume added w/o demolition consideration</i>						205.73	38.29%
							COMPLIES
Flat roof option added after demolition						107.07	19.93%

Previous Information:

Substantial Material notes about the adjacent woodland have already been made in *Paras 5.1 to 5.7 of the main Design & Planning Support Statement*, included with the original submission. They demonstrate the Applicant’s clear intent to protect the woodland & character of the vicinity / landscape & are repeated verbatim hereunder for convenience and consistency:-

5. Protected Woodland:

5.1. The Applicants procured the property some two years ago with the landscape status quo. The purchase also included a parcel of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), protected woodland, discussed here. The site is a residential plot at the end of a cul-de-sac, backing onto similar properties. To its north is a rising embankment, with protected, dense woodland of Oak and other broad leaved trees primarily. This is shown on the site location & block plans. At approx 60 m. further north, the land falls to a railway cutting beyond.

- 5.2. The proposed extension, at 16 plus metres distance from the nearest trees shall have no impact on any of the protected status, and it is considered, at that separation distance, the extension works shall be outside any root protection zones too. The woodland itself is fenced off against trespass
- 5.3. Although the proposal has no impact on any greenery, apart from a nominal 27 Sqm lawn patch; under the footprint, the wood trees have nevertheless been visually scanned, from ground level. They have all appeared healthy and in good order during the survey. It is therefore considered no further or specialist work is necessary on this aspect, given the separation distances available.
- 5.4. Currently, the protected woodland has no formal or specialist management plan in place. However, it is registered to the property owners & its "enjoyment" is guided by its protected status. It thrives in wildlife, with an excellent ecological regime of rich species diversity. It was purchased by the previous owners from the Railway Authorities & passed to the present owners explained. They are *determined* to care for it as *protected*. The dense tree cover provides a useful sound barrier to the dwelling (and neighbours) from the busy railway. As the trees continue to thrive, a programme for their healthy management will be necessary in time. It is without question, a valued amenity within the local & wider Shepherds Avenue vicinity, an environmental asset for neighbourhood richness. All of that will remain protected from impact.
- 5.5. To reinforce tree protection, guidance in Para. 76 of the old DOE circular 36/78 'Trees & Forestry' has been and will be, followed for absolute assurance during construction phase too. Tree will be protected against any chance of harm from construction activity especially over any the root protection zones. A chicken wire protective fence, in accordance with BS 5837, already exists as shown on Block Plan ensuring no trespass. The clear 16 m spacing clearly helps.
- 5.6. To back-up the protection objective, working drawings / contract conditions shall stipulate specialist consultations for precautions & method statements. Such stipulations would normally include access restrictions on construction plant or operative traffic, with special attention to root protection area (RPA). The complete "tree protection plan" (TPP) will detail location of barriers, protection matting and the like. For wheeled or tracked plant, proprietary protection shall be engineer designed. ""
- 5.7. To fully complete the protection regime contract documents will stipulate factors like: No fires lit on site, no fuels, oils or substances damaging to any tree shall be spilled or poured on site. no storage of any such materials on any soft ground, no work to be carried out within any root protection zone, no embankment changes to occur within the RPA – all to be pre-agreed on site.

Support for Inclusivity and Community Facilities

No specific policy guidance or reference could be found to disabled persons' accommodation or access needs in the MDD The Core Strategy (CS) seeks to ensure that development addresses the needs of *all community sectors* via 'the growth of ethnic / cultural mix within the population. The CS Vision reflects this: "all will have improved access to high quality services such as ...community facilities ...social wellbeing, health & quality of life'.

Criterion D of Policy CP2 sets out to support proposals that address the requirements of: 'The specific identified needs of minority groups (disabled inclusion) in the borough, includingdisabled minority?'

Criteria D (i) and (ii) provide measures that need to be demonstrated for acceptability of the proposals. The policy stated Circumstances for acceptable proposals are:

- (i) The site is located either within or close to development limits of a settlement in policy CP9
- (ii) The proposal is not disproportionate to the scale of the existing

For all the information & reasons explained here-in this report, no mischief is intended, implied or perceived in the proposal application which might materially compromise the relevant countryside characteristics designating the status of this site. It is therefore considered that application for consent should prevail.