

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	251470
Site Address:	1 Halstead Close, Woodley, Wokingham, RG5 4LD
Expiry Date:	15 August 2025
Site Visit Date:	17 July 2025
Proposal: Full application for the proposed subdivision of the site and erection of a first floor side extension to form 1 no. three bedroom dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.	

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP3 – General Principles for Development CP5 – Housing Mix, Density and Affordability CP6 – Managing Travel Demand CP7 – Biodiversity CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals CP17 – Housing Delivery
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB05 – Housing Mix TB07 – Internal Space Standards TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (JMWP)	The JMWP does not apply to the size of the application site or scale of the proposed development.
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU) <u>Those highlighted in yellow are deemed to hold</u>	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy SS10 – Meeting our housing needs CE3 – Environmental standards for residential development C1 – Active and sustainable transport and accessibility C2 – Mitigation of transport impacts and highway safety and design C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging H1 – Housing mix, density and standards H6 – Self-build and custom build H8 – Conversion and sub-division of buildings

<u>moderate weight, all others are deemed to hold limited weight</u>	FD1 – Development and flood risk (from all sources) FD2 – Sustainable drainage NE1 – Biodiversity and geodiversity NE2 – Biodiversity net gain NE4 – Trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows NE5 – Landscape and design DH1 – Place making and quality design DH2 – Safeguarding amenity
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document Woodley Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY		
Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
202520	Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey side extension.	C/A – 20/10/2020
F/2011/2297	Application for the retrospective development including conversion of garage to create additional habitable accommodation with new window, plus replacement porch with pitched roof to front of dwelling (amendment to previous consent F/2011/0181 for the conversion of existing garage to create additional habitable accommodation with new window, plus replacement porch with pitched roof to front of dwelling)	C/A – 20/02/2012
F/2011/0181	Application for erection of rear outbuilding for use as store/gym (Retrospective), plus proposed conversion of garage to create habitable accommodation with new window plus replacement porch with pitched roof to front of dwelling.	C/A – 31/03/2011
CLP/2010/2375	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for the proposed conversion of garage to office/study room with new window to front plus replacement porch to front of dwelling with pitched roof.	Refused – 06/12/2010
CLE/2010/2232	Application for a certificate of lawful existing use for the erection of outbuilding for use as a store room.	Refused – 03/12/2010
05252	Two storey extension	C/A – 30/09/1976
932/71	Terraced house	C/A –

		28/10/1971
--	--	------------

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: Object on the following grounds – the proposed development results in the intensification of a sub-standard access to the detriment of highway safety contrary to the Core Strategy policy CP6 and the NPPF.
WBC CIL: Advice regarding CIL matters

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Woodley Town Council raised no objections.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site is a 1970s end-of-terrace two storey dwelling within the settlement of Woodley. The site sits on a prominent corner plot at the eastern end of a row of 3no. terraced dwellings which face the highway and a row of 3no. terraced dwellings opposite. Beyond the immediate street scene, the site is located to the east of Woodford Park and to the north-east of Woodley Town Centre.

The existing dwelling has been considerably extended over time including a recent single storey side extension which is sited in close proximity to the adjacent footpath and an incidental outbuilding adjacent to the site's southern boundary. The site also benefits from an extended front drive which spans the full width of the frontage. An electricity sub-station is located to the rear of the site.

Proposal:

This application proposes the subdivision of the residential plot of 1 Halstead Close and the erection of a first floor side extension to create 1no. 3 bedroom dwelling with associated parking and amenity space. An additional dropped crossing is also proposed towards the north-eastern corner of the site to create an independent vehicular access for the new dwelling, with off-road parking provision on the existing front drive.

The extension would be sited above the existing single storey side addition with a matching width and total ridge height of approximately 7.4m. The extension would be set down from the main ridgeline and set back from the principal (front) elevation. Following discussions with the applicant, revised plans were submitted which include fenestration changes to the existing incidental outbuilding comprising the removal of 1no. window.

Principle of Development:

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the Local Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, the Development Plan consists of the Core Strategy (CS) 2010 and Managing Development Delivery (MDD) Local Plan 2014. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) must also be considered as it constitutes guidance which the Local Planning Authority must pay regard to, however it does not change the statutory status of the Development Plan as the starting point for decision making. However, the NPPF is a material consideration in any determination and must be read alongside the Development Plan.

Additionally, The Local Plan Update (LPU), the plan which will supersede the adopted Core Strategy and MDD local plans, is at Regulation 22 stage as it has been submitted for examination. As per paragraph 49 of the NPPF:

Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);*
- b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and*
- c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).*

As a whole, the LPU is still given limited weight despite its advance stage of preparation. This is owing to unresolved objections to a great number of the policies contained within it. Those highlighted in yellow in the policy table earlier in this report are those that has received less objection and therefore are deemed to hold moderate weight in the determination of this application at this stage. All the others are deemed to hold limited weight. The policies that hold moderate weight will feed into/ be considered in their relevant sections in this report.

Policy CC02 of the MDD Local Plan sets out the development limits for each settlement as defined on the policies map. The site is located within a major development location and as such the principle of development should be acceptable subject to other material considerations.

Housing Land Supply

To achieve sustainable development, the NPPF (February 2025) at paragraph 78 requires LPAs to identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic

policies are more than 5 years old. The latest published Five-Year Housing Land Supply Statement (at 31st March 2025) shows the Council is currently only able to demonstrate 2.5 years' worth of deliverable sites. Subsequently, policies relating specifically to housing development within the Local Development Plan are currently considered to be out of date. However, this does not mean that they have no weight.

Paragraph 11 states that where policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless:

- i. the application of policies in the Framework that protect assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

Firstly, in considering i), it must be recognised that the proposed development is within settlement limits and not within any protected areas or assets of particular importance (as outlined in footnote 7 of paragraph 11). Therefore, the proposal must be considered under ii) to determine whether there are any adverse impacts generated by the development that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This is referred to as the 'tilted balance', as harms and benefits are not weighed equally, but tilted according to paragraph 11(d)(ii).

An important underlying reason in the context of Wokingham Borough is the historic oversupply of housing against both the requirement set out in the Core Strategy local plan and the scale of local housing need as calculated by the previous standard method which remains a key contributing factor to the current lack of the required deliverable housing land supply, and this must be considered in the planning balance.

Having established the tilted balance is engaged, paragraph 11(d)(ii) requires the proposal to be considered against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination. These key policies, as outlined within footnote 9, will be referred to throughout this response letter where relevant, with the balance required by paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF given in the 'Planning Balance and Conclusion' section.

Development of a Private Residential Garden

The proposed development comprises the subdivision of an existing residential plot to facilitate the creation of two additional dwellings. Paragraph 75 of the NPPF states that LPA should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.

The relevant policy within the Local Development Plan is MDD Local Plan policy TB06 which states that proposals for new residential development that includes land within the curtilage of private residential gardens will only be granted planning permission where there is a positive contribution to the built form and surrounding spaces, integration with the layout of the surrounding area, appropriate hard and soft landscaping, amenity space, building separation and compatibility with the general building height.

This requirement relates to other material considerations. Policy TB06 will be assessed within the 'Design and Character of the Area' section of this response letter.

Sustainability

Policies CP1, CP4, CP6, CP9 and CP11 of the Core Strategy permit development where it is based on sustainable credentials in terms of access to local facilities and services and the promotion of sustainable transport. Expanding on this, paragraph 4.57 in the CS aims to prevent the proliferation of development in areas away from existing development limits as they are not generally well located for facilities and services and would lead to the increase in use of the private car.

In this instance, the site is located within settlement limits within a major development location and is acceptable in terms of the principles stated in the Core Strategy. It also accords with the relevant policies in the MDD Local Plan. The site is circa. 400m from Woodley Town Centre, 2.6km from Earley Railway Station and 260m from the nearest bus stops which serves Woodley and Reading at 15 to 30-minute intervals throughout the day. On this basis, there are no sustainability concerns with the proposal.

Summary of Principle of Development

The principle of residential development within settlement should be acceptable. However, this is subject to whether the proposal complies with MDD Local Plan policy TB06 which outlines the criteria for suitable residential development in private residential gardens and other material considerations which are assessed below.

Design and Character of the Area:

Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy requires developments to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment. Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy states that development must be appropriate in terms of its scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area in which it is located and must be of high quality design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers.

Policy CP5 of the Core Strategy and Policy TB05 of the MDD Local Plan require an appropriate dwelling density and R10 of the Borough Design Guide SPD seeks to ensure that the development achieves an appropriate density in relation to local character.

With regard to well-designed places, paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that

developments should:

- a) function well and add to the overall quality of the area in the long term,
- b) are visually attractive with good architecture, layout and appropriate & effective landscaping,
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities),

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development which is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design as well as any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents.

Siting and Scale:

Halstead Close comprises a mix of housing types. While terraced dwellings are prevalent within this section of the street scene, neighbouring dwellings on the close are more varied in terms of their form and scale including semi-detached bungalows and a more recently constructed pair of semi-detached dwellings located towards the junction of Halstead Close and Headley Road. As such, the proposed creation of an additional dwelling to an existing row of terraces would not be out of character with the area.

In terms of its size and scale, the footprint of the proposed dwelling would be approximately 63.1sqm while the footprint of the existing dwelling would be reduced to approximately 61.1sqm. This is in keeping with the average size of dwellings within the surrounding area. Moreover, the proposal would effectively build on top of the existing built form and would not project beyond the existing flank (side), front or rear elevations.

Given the context of the existing single storey side addition, the proposed extension would be sited in close proximity to the public highway contrary to the guidance contained within the Borough Design Guide SPD. While the proposal would increase the ridge and eaves height of the existing built form, the proposal would remain slightly set in from the site's eastern boundary by approximately 0.4m, and it would not extend across the full depth of the existing dwelling. As such, while a considerable change, the proposal would not appear as an overly dominant addition or adversely impact openness when traversing the street scene.

Design

Section 4.11 of the Borough Design Guide SPD states that two storey side extensions to end-of-terrace properties should seamlessly continue the design and proportions of the terrace or be clearly subservient. Side extensions should also be set back from the building line by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be set at least 1m from the plot boundary.

The proposed first floor side extension would appear as a subservient addition to the existing dwelling due to being set down from the main ridgeline and set back from the principal building line. In this context, it is considered that this is an appropriate design for the proposed dwelling as it would mark the transition from the original

building to the new attached dwelling while sufficiently reducing the overall bulk of the scheme and retaining the style and form of the terraces. Moreover, it would appropriately respond to the proposed dwelling being of a larger width than the existing following the development and would avoid unbalancing the row of terraces.

Although the proposal would be set in from the plot boundary by less than 1m, contrary to the Borough Design Guide SPD, it would not encroach beyond the existing flank (side) elevation and due to its corner plot setting it would not disrupt the rhythm of buildings and the gaps between them along the street frontage. Moreover, the proposed external materials would be in keeping with the existing dwelling, further mitigating the visual impact of the scheme.

Summary

Overall, the proposal would be of an appropriate scale and design which would respect the form of the existing row of terraces while sufficiently minimising the visual impact from introducing an additional dwelling onto the street scene. By restricting the additional built form proposed above the existing side addition the proposal also integrates positively with the layout of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore complies with the NPPF, Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 & CP5 and MDD Local Plan policy TB06 in this respect.

Dwelling Mix:

Policy CP5 of the Core Strategy requires an appropriate mix of dwelling types, tenures and sizes so that the housing needs of the community are met. Policy TB05 of the MDD Local Plan requires an appropriate housing mix which reflects a balance between the underlying character of the area and both the current and projected needs of households. The Berkshire (including South Bucks) Strategic Housing Market Assessment (February 2016) identified future housing need for the Wokingham Borough with 66% of all new dwellings to be 3+ bedrooms.

In this case, the proposal would create an additional 3 bedroom dwelling which is appropriate in an area predominated by suburban family sized dwellings. The proposal is therefore acceptable in this regard.

Housing Amenity:

Internal Amenity

Policy TB07 of the MDD and R17 of the SPD require adequate internal space to ensure the layout and size achieves good internal amenity. In accordance with the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard, a minimum standard of 93m² applies for a 2 storey, 3 bedroom, 5 person occupancy dwelling. Both the proposed and existing dwelling would meet these minimum standards following the development.

A dwelling with more than one bedroom should have a main bedroom, which is to have a minimum area of 11.5sqm while single bedrooms should have a minimum area of 7.5sqm. The proposed and existing dwelling would meet these minimum standards, while the proposed ground floor living space is acceptable and there is

sufficient space to create built-in storage. The proposed fenestration would allow sufficient daylight into all habitable rooms with a reasonable dual outlook and southern aspect.

Therefore, the level of internal amenity proposed is compliant with policy TB07 of the MDD Local Plan policy and would be acceptable.

External Amenity

R16 of the SPD requires a minimum depth of 11m for rear gardens and a 1m setback from the site boundary to allow access thereto. It should receive direct sunlight and be capable of accommodating play, clothes drying and storage.

The existing incidental outbuilding within the rear garden space, as well as the electrical substation located to the rear of the site's boundaries, constrain the external amenity space that can be afforded to both the existing and proposed dwelling following the development. Nonetheless, while the proposal would not meet the recommended minimum depth of 11m, the width of both rear gardens would allow sufficient external amenity space for a three bedroom dwelling. Therefore, this shortfall would not warrant a reason for refusal in this instance.

Following discussions with the applicant, revised plans were submitted which show the removal of a window positioned towards the eastern end of the outbuilding. Following the subdivision of the plot, this window would have directly looked onto the proposed dwelling yet served the existing which would have been an unacceptable loss of privacy for future occupiers. If the application was to be approved, this element of the scheme could be conditioned to ensure that it was implemented prior to the occupation of the new dwelling and ensure this potential harm was removed.

Overall, the proposed internal and external amenity should be sufficient for future occupiers and there are no objections in this respect.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy aims to protect neighbouring amenity and R23 of the Borough Design Guide SPD requires that extensions relate to neighbouring properties.

Due to the scale of the proposed first floor side extension, which would not encroach the flank (side), rear or front elevations of the existing dwelling, and the context of the site as a corner plot there are no concerns in respect of potential impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, overbearing or overlooking.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The NPPF paragraph 116 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Core Strategy policy CP6 concerns issues relating to highway safety and access, stating that planning permission will be granted for schemes that, amongst other requirements, provide appropriate vehicular parking, enhance road safety and do not cause highway problems. Policy C2 of the emerging Local Plan Update, which is deemed to hold limited weight at this stage, states that with regards to highway safety and design, all development proposals must ensure safe and suitable access to the site for all users. This is in line with NPPF paragraph 115.

Policy C5 of the emerging Local Plan Update, which is deemed to hold moderate weight at this stage, states that development proposals should provide and retain vehicle parking (including motorcycles) and cycle parking that caters for the needs of all users that is appropriate to the location and scale of the development. Policy CC07 and Appendix 2 of the MDD Local Plan set out the parking standards for development, noting that these should be regarded as a starting point with each site assessed on its own merits. P3 of the Borough Design Guide SPD notes that parking spaces are to be a minimum of 5m x 2.5m. P3 of the Borough Design Guide SPD notes that parking spaces should be safe and convenient, close to the dwelling and sited to minimise impact upon safety.

Vehicular access to the site's front drive is via a dropped crossing shared with No.2 Halstead Close adjacent. It is acknowledged that over time the front drive has been extended across the site's frontage to create 4no. off-road parking spaces. As the proposal involves the creation of a new dwelling, both the existing and proposed dwelling will require independent access and parking.

Halstead Close is subject to a 30mph speed limit, which requires visibility of 2.4m x 43m to be achieved to the nearside edge of the carriageway in both directions. The site sits on a prominent corner plot adjacent to a bend in the highway. The proposed dropped crossing would be positioned circa. 4.7m from the bend. The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed the proposal and raised significant concerns with the location of the proposed dropped crossing.

While the applicant has not demonstrated visibility splays on the submitted drawings, when taken from the submitted block plan the visibility splay measured to the east is circa. 2.4m x 10.3m which falls significantly short of the required visibility splay nor retain the existing. Therefore, the proposal would impede safe access and have negative impacts on highway safety for future occupiers and other uses of the highway.

It is acknowledged that current occupiers of the existing dwelling may already be using the position of the proposed dropped crossing to informally access the parking space in front of the previous extensions to the main dwelling. Highways Officers views this as encroachment of the public footway, and have concluded that formalising this substandard access, alongside the intensification of its use following the subdivision of the plot, would be unacceptable.

This matter was discussed with the applicant to see whether the scheme could be revised to appropriately address these concerns. However, given the context of the site and its very close proximity to the bend, it does not appear that this objection could be overcome within the constraints of this current scheme.

Notwithstanding the above, the proposed provision of 2no. off-road parking spaces for each dwelling would meet the Council's parking standards. The proposal also indicates the provision of an EV charging point and cycle parking provision in line with policy CC07 which the Highways Officer has deemed as acceptable, subject to further details of the proposed cycle parking provision.

Overall, due to the inappropriate position of the proposed dropped crossing, the proposal would fail to meet satisfactory visibility splays and would not provide a safe or suitable vehicular access for the proposed dwelling creating adverse highway safety impacts for future occupiers and other users of the highway.

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Under this application, it has not been possible to conclude that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Accordingly, the proposal is justified to be refused on highway grounds in line with paragraph 116 of the NPPF. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to paragraphs 115 & 116 of the NPPF, Core Strategy policy CP6, MDD Local Plan policy CC07 and policy C2 of the emerging Local Plan Update.

The above concerns warrant a reason for refusal.

Landscape, Trees and Biodiversity:

There is limited scope for the provision of soft landscaping within the site, in accordance with MDD Local Plan policy CC03 development proposals should incorporate high quality planting and landscaping as an integral part of the scheme. There are no biodiversity issues given the siting of the proposal on land with no significant ecological merit and the proposal not increasing the footprint of the existing dwelling.

Enhancement measures are proposed in the form of planting within the eastern corner of the front drive and further details on this, and other enhancement measures if appropriate, could be secured via condition to secure compliance with NPPF paragraph 187 and MDD Local Plan policy CC03.

Biodiversity Net Gain: Biodiversity Net Gain is mandatory for major and minor planning applications unless the development meets the exception criteria set out in [paragraph 17 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990](#) the [Biodiversity Gain Requirements \(Exemptions\) Regulations 2024](#), and [The Environment Act 2021 \(Commencement No. 8 and Transitional Provisions\) Regulations 2024](#). In the event planning permission is granted, and the exceptions do not apply, paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 grants permission subject to the condition “(the biodiversity gain condition”) and that development may not begin unless:

- a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The proposal would qualify for the de minimis exemption as it does not impact any priority (or any other) onsite habitats.

Planning Balance and Conclusion:

The starting point for decision making is the development plan. However, as set out in the Principle of Development section of this report, paragraph 11d(ii) of the NPPF is engaged and this also requires the proposal to be considered against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. The tilted balance does not however displace the primacy of the development plan.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF sets out that achieving sustainable development means that development should satisfy three overarching objectives in relation to economic, social and environmental benefits.

Economically the proposed development would enable job creation during the construction period although this would be very limited given the scale of the development. The inhabitants of the proposed dwellings would also contribute to the local economy and to the continued viability of local services within the surrounding area including Woodley town centre. However, as the proposal is for one (net) dwelling only the economic role of the development is considered to be limited.

Regarding the **social role** the development would perform, the provision of one family sized dwelling within settlement, while welcomed in principle, would not make a significant contribution to the Council's housing land supply position. This would hold limited weight in the tilted balance.

Regarding its **environmental role**, the development would not result in an adverse environmental impact and there is some scope for biodiversity and soft landscaping enhancements. No adverse harm to the character of the area has been identified, while the proposal would comply with sustainability measures relating to energy efficiency and drainage to a degree through Building Regulations standards. Overall, a limited environmental role would be performed.

Notwithstanding the limited benefits of the scheme identified above, the Council's Highways Officer has objected to the scheme due to the inappropriate and unsafe vehicular access proposed to serve the new dwelling. As discussed within the 'Highway Access and Parking Provision' section of the report, due to the position of the proposed dropped crossing with unsatisfactory visibility splays the proposal would fail to provide a safe or suitable vehicular access for the proposed dwelling resulting in adverse highway safety impacts for future occupiers and other users of the highway.

Under this application, it has not been possible to conclude that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety and as such paragraph 116 of the NPPF indicates that this application is justified to be refused on highway safety grounds. The proposal is also contrary to paragraphs 115 & 116 of the NPPF, Core Strategy policy CP6 and MDD Local Plan policy CC07.

On balance, and when assessing the proposal against the local development plan

and the NPPF as a whole, it is considered that the identified adverse impact on highway safety would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the limited economic, social and environmental benefits of the scheme.

It is not considered that the identified harm could be mitigated through revisions to the scheme as the proposed access has been deemed to be wholly unacceptable and there is very limited (if any) scope to reposition the proposed dropped crossing without materially amending the proposed development.

The application is therefore recommended for **refusal**.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): When planning permission is granted for a development that is CIL liable, the Council will issue a liability notice as soon as practicable after the day on which the planning permission first permits development. Completing the assumption of liability notice is a statutory requirement to be completed for all CIL liable applications.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010): In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that persons with protected characteristics as identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

RECOMMENDATION	
Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date:	14 August 2025
Earliest date for decision:	14 July 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	14 August 2025

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- *Major Development Location – Woodley*
- *Landscape Character Assessment Area – Woodley-Earley Settled and Farmed Clay*
- *Mineral Safeguarding Area (Sharp Sand and Gravel)*
- *Potentially Contaminated Land Consultation Zone*
- *SSSI Impact Risk Zone*