



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 10 March -19 March 2026

Site visit made on 24 March 2026

by Lesley Coffey BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/25/3371069

Land North of Reading Road, Arborfield, RG2 9HN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Dandara Southern Ltd & Elstree Land Ltd against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 243099.
 - The development proposed is Outline application for up to 111 dwellings, with associated works, parking, landscaping and publicly accessible open space, with access from Reading Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for up to 111 dwellings, with associated works, parking, landscaping and publicly accessible open space, with access from Reading Road at Land North of Reading Road, Arborfield, RG2 9HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 243099, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application, subject to this appeal, was originally refused for 10 reasons. Reasons for refusal 8, 9 and 10 related to the failure to secure opportunities for training, apprenticeships and other vocational initiatives, affordable housing, and contributions towards sport and recreational facilities. These matters have been addressed by the submitted planning obligations, and the Council no longer pursues these reasons for refusal. Notwithstanding this, the parties differ as to the wording of the planning obligation in respect of sports and recreation facilities. I address this matter later in the decision.
3. Subsequent to the submission of the planning application the Environment Agency updated its flood maps in respect of flood zones and surface water flooding. Both parties have had an opportunity to address these matters, and I have taken these updates into account in reaching my decision.
4. The Council's Statement of Case added four additional issues. These were
 - Prejudice to the delivery of Loddon Valley Garden Village (LVGV)
 - The adequacy of the access and visibility splays
 - The loss of irreplaceable habitats, in particular ancient and veteran trees on the site, and

- The impact on protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as a consequence of improvements to pedestrian routes between the Site and Arborfield Cross.
5. Prior to the commencement of the Inquiry the Council confirmed that it was now satisfied that the proposed access and visibility splays were acceptable, as well as the impact of the proposed development on protected species and the ability to deliver BNG. In the light of the appellant's highway evidence to the Inquiry the Council also withdrew its objection to the impact of the proposed development on Loddon Valley Garden Village.
 6. I held a Case Management Conference on 16 January 2026 to discuss the management of the Inquiry. The merits of the proposed development were not discussed. The parties submitted Statements of Common Ground in relation to planning, highways, ecology, flood risk and drainage, landscape, arboriculture and affordable housing and housing land supply.
 7. A planning agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides obligations in respect of affordable housing, financial contributions towards allotments, burial grounds, bus services, healthcare, off-site parks and gardens, My Journey and a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) contribution. It also includes an employment skills plan, the specification of estate roads, a travel plan, the provision of public open space, the provision of biodiversity enhancement, the establishment of a management company,
 8. In addition, the appellant submitted a Unilateral Undertaking (UU). This included planning obligations in respect of the delivery of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), a maintenance contribution towards the Green Infrastructure and the off-site sports contribution. These obligations were discussed at the Inquiry and executed copies dated 8 April 2026 were submitted following the close of the Inquiry.
 9. Closing submissions were submitted in writing on 19 March 2026.

Main Issues

10. Based on the most recent position of the parties and the evidence submitted to the Inquiry I consider the main issues to be:
 - Whether the proposed development is in a suitable location having regard to local and national policies in relation to the location of housing and sustainable travel.
 - The effect of the proposed development, including the quantum and scale, on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 - The effect of the proposal on irreplaceable habitats, in particular the adequacy of buffer zones around veteran trees.
 - Whether the proposed development would be safe from flooding and avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere.

- Whether any potential adverse effects on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) would be adequately mitigated.

Reasons

Location of Development

11. The Development Plan includes the Core Strategy (adopted January 2010), Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD) (adopted February 2014) and Arborfield and Barkham Neighbourhood Plan (made April 2020) (ABNP). Policy CP17 aimed to deliver 13,487 dwellings between 2006 and March 2026. This figure was derived from the former South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy and averages about 660 dwellings per annum(dpa). This is significantly less than the 1,316 dpa required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) using the standard method. This equates to 6,909 dwellings over the five-year period from April 2025 to March 2030 when the 5% buffer is included. This represents a significant uplift from the Core Strategy.
12. Policy CP11 restricts development outside of development limits in order to protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain the quality of the environment. The development limits are set by the MDD.
13. The housing requirement within the Core Strategy is time expired and pre-dates the aim of the Framework to significantly boost the supply of housing. It is also significantly lower than that required by the standard method. Notwithstanding this, the settlement boundaries remain part of the adopted development plan and the appellant acknowledges that the appeal site lies outside of the settlement boundaries. For this reason, the proposed development would conflict with Core Strategy Policy CP11.
14. Core Strategy Policy CP1 seeks to deliver sustainable development and includes a number of criteria in respect of environmental factors, including reducing the need to travel, particularly by private car.
15. Policy CP9 requires the scale of development proposals in Wokingham borough to reflect the existing or proposed levels of facilities and services at or in the location, together with their accessibility. It provides for limited development at Arborfield Cross. Paragraph 115 of the Framework states that proposals should ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location.
16. The parties agree that some local services including the nursery school, recreation ground, bus stops, local shop and pub are within an acceptable walking distance from the Appeal Site. The closest primary school is a 16 minute walk from the appeal site, whilst the village hall, farm shop and café are all within a 14 minute walk. The appellant's proposals include enhancements to the walking and cycling route to Arborfield Cross. I conclude that there is a reasonable range of services and facilities within an acceptable walking distance of the appeal site.
17. Bus stops along Reading Road would be less than a 1-minute walk from the centre of the Site. These are currently served by the Leopard 3 service. All the bus services in the direction of Reading call at Shinfield, the Royal Berkshire Hospital, the railway station, and town centre. One bus service an hour also calls at Thames

Valley Science Park. All buses towards Wokingham call at Arborfield Green, Barkham, the railway station and town centre. The parties agree that it complies with the CP6 definition of a 'good' public transport service within the Core Strategy.

18. Three secondary schools would be accessible by bus. Although the timing of the service and the distance from the bus stop would mean that it is not a particularly attractive option for students at St Crispins, it would provide a realistic means of travelling to Bohunt School and the Holt School. The bus service would also provide a reasonable service towards a number of employment locations. These include two industrial estates and would involve journeys of between 11 and 30 minutes. A range of medical facilities are also accessible by bus with journeys of between 4 and 33 minutes. Overall, the bus service would provide a realistic alternative to the private car to many destinations.
19. Church Lane to the west of the appeal site operates as a no-through route for vehicular traffic and functions as a low-traffic environment. Together with Public Footpath ARB01 it provides a direct connection to the south-western area of LVGV, a strategic allocation for up to 2,800 homes, along with schools, community facilities, retail and employment spaces, a large new country park, leisure facilities, green spaces, and new infrastructure such as bridges and access roads. The appeal proposal would provide an active travel route from the Appeal Site to the eastern side of Church Lane enabling a connection to / from Church Lane and the network of recreational footpaths within the locality. In addition, the upgrade of Public Footpath ARB01 to Bridleway status would be secured by a planning condition, together with traffic calming measures for Church Lane.
20. The planning obligations include a contribution towards the maintenance of the bus service whilst the Travel Plan and the My Journey initiative would support behavioural change in respect of sustainable travel. Taken together, the accessibility of a range of services and facilities within a reasonable walking distance, the available bus service, the enhancement to the pedestrian and cycling environment to Reading Road and the measures to enhance the active travel linkages to Church Lane lead me to conclude that although the appeal site lies outside of Arborfield Cross, it would nevertheless benefit from a realistic range of active and sustainable travel opportunities. In this regard it would therefore comply with policies CP1 and CP9 of the Core Strategy as well as the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the MDD.
21. Overall I conclude that although there would be conflict with Policy CP11, the appeal site is a suitable location for development and would reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car and would comply with Policies CP1 and CP9 of the Core Strategy.

Character and appearance/Quantum of development

22. The appeal site comprises privately owned fields, a paddock, and a caravan storage area. The Site boundaries are defined by hedgerows and mature trees to the east, west and south with residential development abutting the northern and part of the southern boundaries. A number of the trees on the site are protected by two Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). A watercourse traverses the western part of the Site and is classified as a Main River by the Environment Agency.

23. There is an existing private pedestrian and vehicular access point to the Appeal Site from Reading Road. This is proposed to be repositioned slightly further east to ensure safe and suitable access for the proposed development.
24. To the north and west of the Appeal Site is the historic core settlement of Arborfield, characterised by a string of residential development along Church Lane extending to the west and north of the appeal site. To the south of the Site, on the opposite side of Reading Road, is existing residential development, including Waldren Avenue and the Cross Lanes Farm complex.
25. The landscape context of the appeal site is varied, but overall, the surrounding area has a semi-rural character. This is more apparent in views from Church Lane, which is characterised by large, detached houses on generous plots, within a sylvan setting with generous boundary vegetation.
26. Walden Avenue to the south of the appeal site is suburban in character. It is adjoined by Cross Lanes Farmhouse and the Cross Lanes Farm complex, which, although set back from the road, nevertheless have a strong presence in the public domain due in part to the prominent driveway. Further to the west lies the linear development of Greensward Lane and the industrial estate.
27. Although the character of Reading Road could be described as semi-rural it is a main road linking Arborfield Cross with Shinfield and is notably more suburban in nature than Church Lane. The speed control measures, bus shelters and signage are all characteristic of this part of Reading Road. There is housing immediately to the east of the appeal site, as well as on the south side of Reading Road and further to the west. Close boarded fencing, mown verges and footways are prevalent. All of these features introduce suburban characteristics to this part of Reading Road.
28. The appeal site is located close to the proposed LVGV. Whilst the application has yet to be determined, the parameter plans indicate that there will be a primary school, secondary school and sports hub adjacent to Church Lane.
29. The appellant submitted a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) with the application. The Council was critical of the LVA's failure to include winter photography and its approach to establishing the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The appellant's landscape evidence included a number of winter images of Reading Road, and the trees were not in leaf at the time of my visit. Therefore, the failure to include winter images does not impair my ability to assess the effects of the proposed development. In terms of ZTV, the additional viewpoints sought by the Council were included in the Landscape Statement of Common Ground. These are all close to the appeal site. Overall, I agree with the appellant that the LVA together with these additional images provides a reasonable representation of the visual envelope of the appeal site.
30. The parties agree that the Appeal site is not a valued landscape for the purposes of the Framework. It is located between two areas identified as valued landscapes, but it does not immediately adjoin these areas and the presence of these valued landscapes does not enhance the character of the appeal site.
31. The appeal site lies within the Arborfield River Terrace Landscape Character Area(LCA). It displays some of the LCA characteristics, including water bodies, pasture, a wooded character derived from the trees and hedgerows and horse

paddocks near settlements. The LVA assesses the landscape value of the site as low, due to its enclosed nature and found that the positive factors associated with the site and its character are limited to the boundary vegetation and topography. I broadly agree with this assessment but consider that the trees within the site also contribute to its character.

32. The existing ditches and watercourse would be retained as would most of the trees and hedgerows other than in the vicinity of the access and those to be removed for arboricultural reasons. The proposed development would also include additional planting, particularly to the site boundaries. Nevertheless, as acknowledged by the appellant, the character of the appeal site would change from pastoral to residential as a consequence of the proposed development. The appellant also accepts that this would give rise to harm to the landscape character. However, the part of the site to the west of the watercourse would separate the built development from the adjacent part of Church Lane. Given the extent of the trees to be retained the proposed development would not alter the character of Church Lane. The change in character would be noticeable from Reading Road, particularly given the proposed access. Nonetheless, in the light of the existing residential development in the vicinity of Reading Road, including Walden Avenue and the houses to the east of the appeal site, this would give rise to moderate harm at most.
33. The Council consider that the density of the proposed development is high by comparison with the surrounding development. I was advised that the density along Church Lane is about 4 dwelling per hectare (dph), the adjoining dwellings on Reading Road are about 10 dph and Walden Avenue about 11dph. In contrast the scheme would be approximately 28 dph. Paragraph 113 of the Framework advises that density should be optimised in locations that are well served by public transport and paragraph 130 is clear that where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. Policy H1 of the LPU similarly requires development proposals to optimise density, make efficient use of land and achieve high quality design. It is not necessary to replicate existing densities in order to avoid harm to the character of the surrounding area.
34. In the case of the appeal proposal, whilst the plots, and in particular the gardens, would be smaller by comparison with other dwellings in the area, the illustrative plans suggest that the proposed dwellings would be similar in height to many of the surrounding dwellings and would also benefit from a similar degree of separation to many of the more modest dwellings within the locality. The evidence submitted to the Inquiry does not indicate that the proposed density would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore find the quantum and scale of development to be acceptable.
35. The Council concede that the site is visually contained and that any visual impacts would be experienced in the immediate locality of the appeal site. It remains concerned about the impact of the proposed access on views from Reading Road and the effects of the changes arising from the s278 works on Reading Road.
36. In order to accommodate the required visibility splays it would be necessary to remove one tree at the access. The other frontage trees and hedgerows would be

retained. It is also proposed to reinforce the hedge along the frontage to further filter views of the development. The proposed dwellings would be visible in the vicinity of the access road and would be particularly noticeable at Year 1. By Year 15 such views would be substantially filtered in the summer but would be more noticeable in winter months. Since most of the other vegetation is retained along this frontage other views would not be significant.

37. In order to improve the sustainability of the appeal site for pedestrians and bus passengers it is proposed to widen the footpath and provide some built out areas at the bus stops, together with street lighting and dropped kerbs. The Council contend that the s278 works would urbanise this part of Reading Road, a designated Green Route, that provides a rural approach to Arborfield Cross, and as such would be contrary to MDD Policy CC03. It suggests that the changes would be particularly noticeable to passengers on the buses stopped adjacent to the appeal site. Policy CC03 is a broad policy aiming to protect and enhance green infrastructure.
38. The overall width of the highway would remain as at present. Altering the balance between the carriageway used by cars and the footpaths used by pedestrians would not have any appreciable impact on the character of this part of Reading Road. The introduction of dropped kerbs and the two proposed bus passenger build outs would similarly have a negligible impact, whilst being beneficial to existing and future residents thereby encouraging sustainable travel.
39. The proposed street lighting would be noticeable by motorists driving along Reading Road and pedestrians walking along it. Evidence to the Inquiry showed that this is not a dark skies area, moreover, there are streetlights opposite the appeal site at Walden Avenue. This part of Reading Road would continue to be a tree lined road into a settlement, with new tree and shrub planting on the appeal site. I therefore conclude that the proposed s278 works would not appreciably alter the character of this part of Reading Road or conflict with Policy CC03.
40. There was much debate at the Inquiry as to whether Arborfield was a village or a dispersed settlement. I have assessed the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area taking account of the readily identifiable attributes. Consequently, this matter does not alter my conclusions above,
41. Overall, I conclude that there would be some harm to the character of the appeal site due to the change from a pastoral landscape to a residential landscape. I however, find the scale and quantum of development to be acceptable. There would be some harm to views from Reading Road, mainly close to the proposed access. Due to the visual containment of the site, such harm would be very localised. The s278 works would have a negligible effect on the character and appearance of Reading Road.
42. I therefore conclude that the proposal would give rise to some harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and I afford such harm moderate weight. For this reason, there would be some conflict with Core Strategy Policy CP1.

Trees

43. The reasons for refusal did not include any potential harm to ancient and veteran trees on the appeal site. This concern was first raised as an issue within the Council's Statement of Case. The illustrative layout has been amended since the determination of the application in order to address this concern. Whilst the Council acknowledges that the potential impact on the trees on the site has been reduced as a consequence of these changes, it remains concerned that the proposed development would nevertheless have an adverse impact on the veteran trees on the site.
44. The parties agree that T4 (Oak), T39 (Lime), T50 (Oak), T56 (Oak) are all veteran trees and are also protected by the TPO. They differ as to whether T72 (oak) is an ancient or veteran tree but agree that for the purposes of the Framework and Natural England's Standing Advice: *Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions* (CD 18.06) ancient and veteran trees are treated in a similar way.
45. The appellant contends that T3 and T87 are mature trees rather than veteran trees. T3 is located within the western part of the appeal site away from the proposed built development and the appellant has taken a precautionary approach such that T3 would benefit from a Natural England (NE) compliant root protect area (RPA).
46. T87 is located off-site, but close to the boundary. The appellant has provided a RPA in accordance with BS5837 and T87 would be located within an area of open space. The tree is located in the area used for caravan storage, and the RPA includes an existing building and hardstanding extending to within 3 metres of the tree. The block-built barn and concrete slab would be removed, and the area would form part of a 13 metres wide landscaped area. This would represent a considerable improvement on the current conditions.
47. T3, T4 and T50 are all situated to the west of the watercourse. The proposed RPAs are all compliant with the NE Standing Advice. In addition, they have been off-set to take account of roots that may be growing under the road. The Council also contend that the RPA for these trees should be further extended to compensate for competition between the roots of adjacent trees. The only proposed development in proximity to these trees would be the s278 work on Reading Road, which I return to below. Neither BS5837 nor NE's Standing Advice indicate that an additional allowance is required to compensate for competition between trees, and the Council confirmed that it had not required such an allowance in other cases.
48. Within the appeal site the appellant has provided a NE compliant buffer zone for T56 which would be located within an area of proposed open space. The tree is located on the boundary, and the Council contend that the RPA within the site should be extended to accommodate that part which falls within the property to the north. This view is based on NE's Standing Advice which states that development proposals, including gardens, should not be approved within buffer zones. This advice relates to the development to be approved rather than existing gardens.

49. The Council referred me to an appeal decision in respect of Rowan Drive, Crowthorne.¹ It was suggested that the decision supported the Council's view that RPAs should be off-set to compensate for RPAs within adjacent gardens. However, reading the quoted paragraph in context it is evident that this was not the finding of the Inspector in that case. Moreover, this position is not supported by the published guidance.
50. The Council also contends that where the buffer zones are in areas identified as public open space, (T39 and T72), recreational use and use by domestic pets could give rise to deterioration due to soil compaction, as well as increasing levels of air and light pollution and noise. It was clarified at the Inquiry that the concerns in relation to light and noise related to biodiversity rather than any direct impact on the tree.
51. T39 is located within the open space to the western part of the site and is protected by the TPO. The Amended Illustrative Masterplan shows the footpath routed to the south and outside the RPA of T39. The Council explained that T39 has collapsed to the north-east with scaffold branches layered and shooting where they touch the earth and as a result T39 is 'walking across the landscape'.
52. The RPA falls entirely within the western part of the site. T39 has fallen and re-growing limbs are to the north and east of the main trunk. A footpath is proposed on the west side of T39, this would be outside of the BS5837 RPA, but within the NE buffer. Access within the buffer zones is permissible under the Standing Advice provided the habitat is not harmed by trampling. In this instance the re-growth is not within the area where the footpath is proposed. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm T39.
53. T72 would provide a focal point for the eastern part of the site. The Council sought a larger buffer than required by NE standing Advice and the appellant extended the RPA from 28m to 30m diameter. The buffer zone is adjoined by an area of open space that would include a play area. The Council suggest that T72 could be at risk from people and pets using the buffer area and adjacent open space. This is an outline application and the detailing of the buffer around T72 would be addressed as part of the reserved matters. The intended for use as a play area and open space lies outside of the buffer. Footpaths within the buffer zone of T72. It is proposed that they would be delivered using a permeable and porous no-dig installation method. As with T39 the NE Standing advice does not preclude such access and the routes and methodology would be determined as part of the reserved matters.
54. There are 3 mature oak trees T127, T129, T130 growing on a raised bank to the southern side of Reading Road. The proposed footpath widening works in this area show some widening of the pavement into the highway. The parties agree that the widening of the footpath should not have a detrimental impact on these trees provided the footpath is widened into the carriageway so as to avoid tree roots. The appellant confirms that these works can be designed to avoid excavation beneath the depth of the existing highway sub-base. This was not disputed by the Council
55. I conclude that subject to suitable conditions the proposed development would not harm the veteran trees on the appeal site and would not lead to the loss of

¹ ID10 Appeal ref: APP/X0360/W/17/3169773

irreplaceable habitats. In this respect the proposal would comply with Core Strategy Policies CP1,CP3,CP7 that seek to protect biodiversity and maintain the quality of the environment, and well as paragraph 193 of the Framework.

Flooding

56. As set out above the site now comes within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The Council's position is that the proposed development should be subject to a sequential test in that the pedestrian link to Church Lane would need to cross an area within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and also due to the risk of groundwater flooding.
57. It is proposed that all built development would be located within Flood Zone 1. The pedestrian link to Church Lane has been realigned so that it now joins Church Lane within Flood Zone 1. As such the only part of the development that falls outside of Flood Zone 1 is where the pedestrian link crosses the main watercourse. This comprises a relatively narrow ditch that separates the eastern and western parts of the site. This would be a non-vehicular internal access route and is envisaged to cross the ditch as a free-span bridge with no footings falling in Flood Zones 2 or 3. For this reason the appellant contends that it does not trigger the sequential test.
58. Whilst this route would not be a main access and the bridge would cross rather than be located within Flood Zones 2 or 3. I acknowledge that it does not clearly fall within the exemptions to the sequential test at paragraph 175 of the Framework, Notwithstanding this, any risk would be minimal, due to the presence of alternative routes, the size of the watercourse and that the proposed bridge would be elevated above Flood Zones 2 and 3. Given that the built development, including the other access routes would all come within Flood Zone 1 the proposed development would comply with the aims of the Framework, namely to steer development to the areas with the lowest risk of flooding.
59. The Council also consider the site to be at risk of flooding from groundwater and therefore contend that the proposed development should be subject to a sequential test for this reason as well. In reaching this view the Council relies on the Winter Groundwater Level Monitoring Results submitted during the appeal. These results form part of the on-going monitoring recommended by the Surface Water Hydraulic Modelling Report.²
60. The Report acknowledged that groundwater inflows are likely to result in challenging conditions for the formation of excavations for foundations and drainage during winter months. It found that the variation of the measured water levels was suggestive of localised pockets of groundwater perched within the more granular soils, rather than being indicative of a single body of laterally consistent and hydraulic continuous groundwater.
61. The Council assessed the groundwater monitoring results on the basis of the criteria within the Sequential and Exception test document produced to inform the LPU. This states that sites where less than 10% of the site is within the highest risk category in the JBA Groundwater map (groundwater is <0.025m below the surface in the 1 in 100 year event) and those where less than 75% of the site is within the second highest risk category in JBA Groundwater map (groundwater is

² CD 1.32

between 0.025m and 0.5m below the surface in the 1 in 100-year event) have been considered low risk.

62. The winter monitoring figures show a single reading for Borehole 1 within the highest risk area, whilst the readings for the other boreholes varied between a single reading within the second highest category and in the case of Borehole 4, all readings within the second highest category. However, as made clear by the appellant at the Inquiry, and as also explained in the Surface Water Hydraulic Modelling Report the purpose of the monitoring was not to assess flood risk, but to inform the method and timing of excavations.
63. The winter monitoring measurements do not provide any compelling evidence that the groundwater encountered does not comprise localised pockets of groundwater perched within the more granular soils as assessed by the original Report. This view is consistent with the JBA Groundwater Emergence Map which indicates a localised area within the site (along the western main river) as having a risk of groundwater emergence between 0.025 to 0.5m below the surface. On this basis the sequential test is not required in relation to groundwater flooding.
64. The Council contend that the allocated sites within the LPU are at lower risk of flooding than the appeal site and therefore sequentially preferable. However, this view relies on the Sequential and Exception Test document dated September 2024, which in turn relies on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) dated May 2023. Therefore, neither the LPU, the Sequential and Exception Test document or the SFRA take account of the updated flood maps. Nor have any of the sites assessed been subject to detailed borehole assessment. Were the appeal site to be assessed on the same basis as the allocated sites within the Sequential and Exception Test document it would come within Flood Zone 1 and would not come within either of the two categories at greatest risk of groundwater flooding.
65. In addition, I note that a significant number of allocated sites are at risk of groundwater flooding based on the existing SFRA. These include, but are not limited to, High Barn Farm that falls entirely within the second highest category for groundwater flooding but is allocated for gypsy and traveller pitches which are identified as a highly vulnerable use in the Framework. In the case of Honeysuckle Lodge, 84 % of the site comes within the highest risk category of groundwater flooding, in addition to an 86% risk of reservoir flooding during a wet day event but is also allocated for gypsy and traveller pitches. Such an approach would seem to be entirely inconsistent with the Council's approach to the appeal site.
66. Consequently, there is no substantive evidence to indicate that there are sequentially preferable sites. Although a sequential test was not submitted in respect of the proposed bridge, it would provide a safe crossing point over land within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and residents of the proposed development would be safe from the risk of flooding. On the basis of the evidence submitted to the Inquiry I find that the appeal site would not be at risk of groundwater flooding. On balance I conclude that a sequential test is not required, however, even if it were, the submitted evidence does not demonstrate that there are sequentially preferable sites.

67. In addition to the flood risk on the appeal site the owner of Lavender Cottage, and adjoining property, was concerned that the proposed development would increase flood risk at her property due to surface water from the proposed development discharging into an existing drainage route which passes through Lavender Cottage.
68. Following discussions between the owner of Lavender Cottage and the appellant, a condition was agreed that restricts the discharge from the development to the downstream ditch and drainage system serving Lavender Cottage to the existing greenfield runoff rate. It was agreed that the condition would be enforceable and address the concerns of the Owner of Lavender Cottage.
69. The Environment Agency (EA) was concerned that the proposed development may introduce a new culvert in order to facilitate access to the site, and that this may increase flood risk elsewhere. This concern was a reason for refusal, but evidence from the appellant confirmed that there was an existing culvert in this location. As the existing culvert would be used there would be no change to the flows through the culvert and thus no adverse impacts to flood risk. The EA was concerned about the condition of the culvert and its ability to accommodate the increased loading and traffic movements associated with the appeal scheme. This matter can be addressed by a suitably worded condition.
70. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would be safe from flooding and would not increase flood risk elsewhere. It would therefore comply with Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP3, and MDD Policy CC09 as well as Section 14 of the Framework.

TBHSPA

71. The Appeal Site is within the 5km Zone of Influence around TBHSPA. Regulation 63(1) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) ("the Habitat Regulations") requires me as the Competent Authority to make an Appropriate Assessment of the implications of any plan or project potentially affecting a site with regard to the site's conservation objectives.
72. The TBHSPA is an internationally important habitat and is designated due to 3 rare species of ground nesting birds - the Dartford Warbler, Nightjar, and Woodlark. The Habitats Regulations require that if likely significant effects on a European site cannot be excluded, permission may only be granted after having ascertained that it would not affect the integrity of the site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
73. The proposed development would increase the population of the local area and in the absence of suitable alternative recreational space, increased recreational pressure may lead to disturbance of SPA designation bird species, and therefore, have potential effects on the features of the SPA.
74. Within Wokingham the established strategy for mitigating recreational impacts on the TBHSPA, as agreed with Natural England, is monitoring payments (the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Contribution (SAMM)) in respect of the together with the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). The parties are agreed that the proposals require 2.13 ha of SANG.

75. The purpose of the SAMM contribution is to implement an identified programme of works to manage and monitor visitors use of the SPA. It includes warden patrols, leaflets, signage and educational material to monitor the effectiveness of the avoidance/mitigation measures. The SAMM would be secured by way of a planning obligation.
76. The appellant proposes a Grampian condition to deliver the SANG and avoid any adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA. The suggested condition would prevent occupation of the development until adequate SANG has been secured and provided.
77. Although the Council owned Rooks Nest SANG and the Rooks Nest extension may together have sufficient capacity to mitigate the effects of the proposed development, the Council is clear that it is required for other allocated development sites and would not be available to the appeal scheme. Whilst the appellant considers this to be an unreasonable position for the Council to take, its position accords with Policy NE3 of the LPU.
78. The Council considers that unless a specific SANG is identified a Grampian condition is not appropriate in the circumstances of this appeal. It contends that there is a risk that the proposed development may be delayed, whilst waiting for SANG to be delivered.
79. The Council relies on the advice from Natural England regarding Grampian Conditions. (ID25) This lists the circumstances where a Grampian condition may not be appropriate. These include where the SANG listed does not currently have planning permission in its own right and where a list of SANG options are included, without a resolute choice. Both of these circumstances are relevant to this appeal.
80. The Council confirm that there is sufficient SANG capacity at the available University of Reading sites to mitigate the proposed development.³ The Ridge SANG is both available and has capacity for the development. The Langley Mead Extension would also have capacity for the proposed development. There is a resolution to approve it, and it is anticipated to be available in the near future. In addition, there is also potential SANG capacity at LVGV, although it has not yet been approved.
81. The appellant submitted Heads of Terms agreed with the University of Reading. These would apply should the University make the SANG provision available for the appeal scheme. I agree with the Council that it does not provide certainty that the SANG would be provided. It does however clearly indicate that there is sufficient SANG capacity in the locality of the appeal site to mitigate the proposed development.
82. Whilst I acknowledge the view of NE, Regulation 70(3) of the Habitats Regulations explicitly considers outline permissions. It provides that outline planning permission must not be granted unless the competent authority is satisfied (whether by reason of the conditions and limitations to which the outline planning permission or otherwise) that no development likely to adversely affect the integrity of a European site could be carried out under the permission, whether before or after objecting to approval of any reserved matters

³ CD16.12

83. The proposed Grampian condition would act to prevent the occupation of the development until the SANG provision is in place. Therefore, the mitigation is sufficiently secured and there would be no risk of the development proceeding unless the SANG provision is secured at the time of the reserved matters. Although the condition does not tie the proposed development to a specific SANG, occupation of the proposed development would be contingent on the delivery of the SANG, thereby mitigating any potential adverse effects on the integrity of the TBHSPA.
84. I conclude that taken together, the SAMM contribution and the SANG would mitigate any additional recreational pressure arising from the appeal scheme. Taking account of the proposed mitigation, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the TBHSPA either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. It would also comply with saved Policy NRM6 of the former South East Plan Regional Strategy and Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy.

Other Matters

85. It is agreed that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply as required by the Framework. The Council's position is that it has a 2.50 years supply, whilst the appellant believes that the housing land supply is 2.30 years.
86. Until the LPU is adopted, housing land supply is measured against the current standard method figure (1,371 dpa). The emerging LPU is being progressed under the transitional arrangements within the Framework and aims to provide 751dpa. Once the LPU is adopted the Council would have a 5-year housing land supply. However, the LPU would meet less than 80% of the local housing need calculated using the standard method. It would therefore be subject to an immediate review. In addition, an announcement from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government on 6 March 2026 directs Wokingham to commence work on its new-style Local Plans by June 2026.⁴ It is therefore likely that further housing sites would be required in addition to those allocated within the LPU.
87. Wokingham has generally delivered housing significantly above all relevant requirements. Housing Delivery Test scores show that the requirement has been exceeded by at least 57% in all years prior to the December 2024 changes. Delivery over the plan period has exceeded the Core Strategy requirement by 2,350 dwellings, representing a 17.8% uplift over the plan-led target. Notwithstanding this, the Council does not currently have a five-year housing land supply, and whilst this will change once the LPU is adopted, the LPU will fail to meet the housing need requirement as calculated by the standard method.
88. The site includes 0.7ha of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land (Grade 3a land). This comprises about 11% of the site and is located within the western portion of the site. The Framework requires planning decisions to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of such land, whilst Policy CP1 aims to avoid the development of BMV land. However, this area of land has not been used for agriculture for many years and is also constrained by the adjacent watercourse and the veteran trees on the site. I therefore agree with the parties that given the size of the BMV land concerned and the other constraints, this matter attracts very limited weight.

⁴ ID 16 Letter dated 15 January 2026

89. The proposed lighting along Reading Road as part of off-site highways works has the potential to negatively impact bat species. However, I agree with the parties that subject to mitigation at the detailed design stage, this is unlikely to significantly affect the local conservation status of the bat species identified. These measures will be secured by condition.

Planning Balance

90. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The most important policies in respect of this appeal are Core Strategy Policies CP11, CP9, and CP1, together with MDD Policy CC02. The proposal conflicts with Policy CP11 and MDD Policy CC02, and to a lesser extent Policies CP9 and CP1. I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan when read as a whole.
91. The Framework provides that where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. The above policies are out-of-date due to the significant shortfall in the 5-year housing land supply and also because the development limits on which they rely are based on the housing requirement within the Core Strategy which is in turn derived from the former South East Plan. Consequently, the housing requirement the Core Strategy aims to meet is significantly lower than that required by the Framework and the standard method.
92. I found above that subject to the implementation of appropriate conditions the proposed development would adequately mitigate any potential adverse effects on the TBHSPA and the veteran trees on the site. I have also concluded that the failure to submit a sequential test in relation to flooding does not provide a strong reason for refusal. Therefore, the tilted balance within paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged.
93. I attribute very significant weight to the provision of market housing. The proposed development would also deliver up to 44 affordable dwellings. Evidence from the Council indicates that there are 1,396 households on the housing needs register, of these 209 are in the most urgent need of housing, with a further 531 households in significant need. Therefore, the delivery of affordable housing attracts additional very significant weight in favour of the proposed development.
94. The proposed development would provide the mandatory 10% BNG and I afford this limited weight in favour of the scheme. The inclusion of a proportion of mobility housing, together with measures to limit carbon emissions and water consumption would also be a benefit of the proposed development which I accord moderate weight.
95. The proposed development would deliver a number of benefits, including the delivery of market and affordable housing and some economic and environmental benefits. These benefits include the creation of jobs during the construction period, and an increase in local expenditure from new residents. There would also be benefits in terms of improvements to the pedestrian and cycling environment, and the provision of a play space within Arborfield. I give these benefits moderate weight.

96. I have found above that the proposed development would conflict with Core Strategy Policy CP1 in so far as it would give rise to some harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area as well as the loss of BMV land. However, such harm would be localised and contained. The proposal would comply with Policy CP1 in so far as it would however avoid increasing the risk of flooding, including the retention of the veteran and other trees on the site, measures to reduce water consumption and limit emissions, and support opportunities for active and sustainable travel. The proposed development would fail to comply with Policy CP11 and MDD Policy CC02 due to its location outside of the development limits, however, these settlement boundaries are out of date. Although there is some conflict with CP9, future occupants would have access to a range of services and facilities using sustainable transport and would not be dependant on the use of the private car. These considerations taken together reduce the weight to be given to the conflict with the development plan and I afford such conflict moderate weight.
97. The proposed development would be safe from flooding and would not increase flood risk elsewhere. It would also safeguard the veteran and other trees on the site as well as mitigate any likely significant effects on the TBHSPA. These matters attract neutral weight.
98. Overall, I conclude that the adverse impacts of allowing the appeal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Planning Obligations

99. The appellant submitted planning obligations in respect of affordable housing, financial contributions towards allotments, burial grounds, bus services, healthcare, off-site parks and gardens, My Journey and a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) contribution. It also includes an employment skill plan or alternatively an employment skill contribution, the specification of estate roads, a travel plan, the provision of public open space, the provision of biodiversity enhancement, and the establishment of a management company,
100. The Community Infrastructure (CIL) Regulations and paragraph 58 of the Framework set a number of tests for planning obligations: they must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, be directly related to the development, and be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
101. The appeal scheme proposes to deliver 40% of homes as affordable housing with a tenure split of 70% Social Rent and 30% Shared Ownership. This approach accords with the policies within the Framework. Evidence on behalf of the Council suggests a minimum affordable housing need for 1.396 dpa. I am satisfied that this obligation meets the relevant tests.
102. A contribution towards the enhancement, management and maintenance of existing allotments within the Parish is necessary to mitigate the direct impact of the additional demand for allotments generated by the development and to ensure compliance with Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP3, CP4, and MDD Local Plan Policy TB08,

103. The proposed development would generate additional population and associated long-term demand for burial space. MDD Local Plan Policy TB08 states that proposals for residential development must demonstrate how they contribute to the delivery of cemeteries/burial grounds. I am satisfied that the contribution sought is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
104. The Council also seek a contribution towards the bus service. At the present time there is a good bus service serving the site. At the Inquiry the Council explained that the service was reliant on a subsidy from the Council and there was no certainty that the subsidy would continue. The contribution sought would maintain the existing level of service. The bus service is necessary to facilitate sustainable travel and make the development acceptable. The contribution sought is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
105. The Integrated Care Board identify a need for additional infrastructure. The nearest GP practice to the appeal site is at capacity and there is a need to reconfigure Swallowfield Medical Practice to provide additional clinical space and to improve the existing GP services to accommodate the population from the proposed development. I am satisfied that the contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable. The contribution has been calculated on the basis of the patient yield from the development and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.
106. My Journey Wokingham is a borough-wide sustainable travel behaviour-change programme. It encourages the behavioural change through delivering, a range of initiatives, including cycle training, active-travel events; travel packs for new residents, and borough-wide travel information and mapping. I agree that the contribution towards My Journey is necessary as part of an overall package of sustainable travel measures. The contribution has been adjusted to take account of measures to be provided by the appellant and it is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.
107. Policy TB08 of the MDD Local Plan sets standards for open space, including parks and gardens. The contribution would be used for the enhancement of an existing park and/or garden to mitigate the impact of the additional population. I am satisfied that this contribution meets the necessary tests.
108. As explained above the SAMM contribution is in addition to the SANG provision and is necessary in order avoid/mitigate any potential harm to the SPA and to monitor the effectiveness of the avoidance/mitigation measures. The contribution is therefore necessary to make the development acceptable and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.
109. MDD Local Plan Policy TB12 requires planning applications for all major development to submit an Employment Skills Plan or pay and Employment Skills Contribution in lieu. This is intended to encourage both the training and use of local labour in the construction phase of major developments. The developer may elect to make an in lieu financial contribution in place of delivering an employment and skills plan. The obligation is necessary to deliver training, apprenticeships and vocational initiatives during the construction phase to encourage training and use of local labour. The contribution sought is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

110. The obligation in respect of estate roads seeks to secure the delivery, construction and long-term management of estate roads. It also seeks to establish those roads to be adopted as public highway. The Council consider this obligation to be necessary to ensure a safe and functional scheme and the long-term management and maintenance of these roads. The safety and functionality of the proposed estate roads would be secured by the reserved matters. Schedule Nine of the Planning Agreement requires the establishment of a management company. The responsibilities of the management company include the maintenance and repair of the private roads and it would be a matter of agreement between the developer and the Highway Authority whether any roads are to be adopted. Should any roads be adopted the construction and specification to the roads would be a matter for the Highway Authority. I therefore do not find Schedule Five of the Planning Agreement to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and I have not taken it into account in reaching my decision.
111. The Travel Plan includes a Travel Plan Bond provided by the Owner to the Council. It would be used by the Council for the implementation of the measures and initiatives of the Travel Plan. The Council explained that these measures could include vouchers towards cycle purchase or rental, car club membership as well as other measures. These measures are necessary to encourage sustainable travel and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
112. Schedule Seven requires the LEAP and the on-site public open space to be provided in accordance with the specified timeframe. This obligation is directly related to the development and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
113. The proposal is subject to a mandatory BNG of 10%. The indicative strategy for BNG delivery is to use both on-site and offsite habitat creation or enhancement to achieve the target of 10% BNG. The obligation requires the submission of the monitoring reports in relation to the BNG pursuant to the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (to be secured via condition) and payment of fees to cover the Council's costs associated with the production of monitoring reports over a 30-year period. I am satisfied that this obligation meets the relevant tests.
114. Schedule Nine requires a management company to be set up. Amongst other matters it would hold the legal interest in the Private Roads and/ or the Green Infrastructure and maintain both. This obligation is directly related to the proposed development and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
115. The appellant also submitted a UU. The first schedule relates to the SANG, in the event that I find that a Grampian condition would not provide sufficient certainty. For the reasons given above, I am satisfied that the Grampian condition would provide certainty in terms of the impact of the proposed development on the TBHSPA. Accordingly, Schedule One of the UU is not required.
116. Schedule Two sets out maintenance and monitoring contributions should the Green Infrastructure be transferred to the Council. The management and maintenance of Green Infrastructure including community facilities like play, leisure, and public open space is necessary in order that it can continue to fulfil its purpose in the long term. Therefore, this obligation satisfies the relevant tests.
117. Schedule Three addresses the provision of the off-site sports contribution and was a matter of difference between the parties. The obligation provides for the payment

of the off-site sports contribution in accordance with either Formula A or Formula B. Formula A calculates the contribution by reference to the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy and playing pitch calculator. Formula B is the payment of a fixed sum per dwelling to be used towards the provision of Sports facilities at Grays Farm.

118. The principle of a contribution is agreed by the parties, but they differ as to whether it should be used towards facilities at Grays Farm (as advocated by the Council) or whether there should be flexibility for it to be used elsewhere, including potentially LVGV.
119. Core Strategy Policy CP1 aims to encourage sustainable travel, and limit travel by private car, whilst Policy HC4 of the LPU requires new sports and recreation facilities to be well related to the communities they serve. Grays Farm is a former fruit farm purchased by the Council to provide a sports hub including playing pitches. Although the parties disagree as to the precise distance of Grays Farm from the appeal site it is about 7 or 8 miles and would take about 20 minutes to reach by car, and over an hour by public transport, and perhaps longer at busy periods
120. The appellant contends that sports facilities are to be provided at LVGV that would be about a 10 minute walk from the appeal site and therefore seek the flexibility to use the sports contribution at this much nearer location. LVGV is subject to an existing planning application and the illustrative masterplan and the illustrative play strategy show the sports facilities located adjacent to Church Lane. This location would be significantly closer to the appeal site. It would also be accessible without the use of a private car benefiting teenagers and others, as well as encouraging sustainable travel.
121. I therefore conclude that the off-site sports contribution should accord with Formula A of Schedule Three of the UU in order to provide the potential for facilities closer to the appeal site, encourage sustainable travel, and also be available to future residents without access to a car.
122. Overall, in terms of the planning obligations, I conclude that Schedule Five of the Planning Agreement, and Schedule One of the UU are not required, whilst Formula A of Schedule Three of the UU should apply.

Conditions

123. Following the close of the Inquiry the Council and the appellant submitted a schedule of suggested conditions which I have reviewed in the light of the Guidance in the Framework and PPG. I have addressed the remaining differences between the parties below. The conditions that I have imposed include some editing for clarity and consistency but are, in substance, the same as those agreed by the parties. Some conditions require matters to be approved before development commences. These are necessary to address impacts that would occur during construction or where design details would need to be resolved at an early stage. The appellant has agreed to the pre-commencement conditions.
124. Condition 1 is a standard time limit condition in relation to the reserved matters. A condition precluding the commencement of the development until the reserved matters are approved is unnecessary. Condition 2 requires development to be in accordance with the plans, in the interests of clarity and certainty. Condition 3

requires details of existing ground levels and finished ground levels.⁵ The Council suggest that the condition should restrict the extent of any change in level, including within the root protection area of the trees. I find this to be unnecessary since it would be considered by the Council at the reserved matters stage. Condition 4 restricts the height of the proposed buildings to 2.5 storeys above finished ground level. Both of these conditions are necessary in order to safeguard the landscape character and visual amenity of the surrounding area. I have given consideration to the Council's view that building heights should be restricted by reference to existing ground levels, however, condition 3 requires the submission of existing and proposed levels and it would be a matter for the Council to determine whether the proposed levels are acceptable.

125. Condition 5 requires the provision of the visibility splays prior to the first occupation of the dwellings and is necessary in the interest of highway safety. Condition 6 requires the provision of the emergency access. Condition 7 requires details of the off-site highway works whilst Condition 8 requires such works to be completed by the time the 40th dwelling is occupied. Both conditions are necessary in the interest of highway safety and sustainable travel.
126. Condition 9 requires details of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and connections from the development to both Reading Road to the south and Church Lane. It also clarifies that the watercourse crossing should be delivered as a clear span bridge. Condition 10 requires an upgrade to Public Right of Way ARBO1 for the use by cyclists. Both conditions are necessary in the interests of sustainability.
127. Condition 11 requires full details of the drainage system. This is necessary to prevent the increased risk of flooding, and to protect water quality. The condition includes restricting the discharge from the development to the downstream ditch and drainage system serving Lavender Cottage to no greater than the greenfield runoff rate and also the need to avoid any deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including veteran, and ancient and notable trees within and adjacent to the site. Condition 12 requires details of the management and maintenance of the SuDS.
128. Condition 13 restricts development within 5 metres of the water main crossing the site and is necessary to avoid adverse impacts on the underground water utility infrastructure.
129. Condition 14 requires the submission of a Construction Environment Management Plan. This is necessary in the interests of highway safety and convenience, and to safeguard the amenities of surrounding occupants and biodiversity ecology. Condition 15 controls the hours of work in order to safeguard the amenities of surrounding occupiers. I have not included the requirement to give written notice to local residents and the Parish Councillors of any works proposed outside of the permitted times since this is unduly onerous and should it be necessary could be addressed at the time should there be any such requests.
130. Conditions 16, 17, 18 and 19 require the provision of a proportion of accessible homes, compliance with the National Space Standards and the principles of Secured By Design and limits on water consumption. These conditions are necessary in order to ensure that the proposed dwelling provide for a range of needs and that the proposed dwellings are of a satisfactory standard and help to avoid water stress.

⁵ Condition 27 on the Draft Conditions 02.04.2026

131. Condition 20 requires a Noise Impact Assessment in respect of any air source heat pumps in order to safeguard future residential amenity. Condition 21 requires details of a reduction in carbon emissions through renewable and/or low carbon sources. However, the wording of the suggested condition was imprecise and may give rise to difficulties with enforcement. The submitted Sustainability Statement details measures that will guide the construction of the development and considers a number of areas including materials, water consumption and energy efficiency. It predicts that the site's forecasted emission rate represents a 68.69% saving over the Building Regulations Part L 2021. I have therefore amended the condition to require the submission of an Energy Strategy based on the principles within the Sustainability Statement.
132. Condition 22 requires an overarching landscape strategy, including the watercourse buffer zone in the interests of visual amenity and to maintain favourable conservation status of the site for protected species and species of principal importance. Condition 23 requires a habitat management and monitoring plan, including details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) to provide for the long-term implementation of the plan. It is necessary in order to ensure that provision is made to allow satisfactory maintenance of the landscaping and delivery of BNG. Condition 24 requires a strategy for ecological permeability and species biodiversity enhancement, as well as a lighting strategy for biodiversity in order to safeguard and enhance biodiversity. Condition 25 requires a lighting strategy for Bats and Veteran Trees in order to avoid detriment to protected species and irreplaceable habitats. I have deleted the reference to irreplaceable habitats since this is addressed elsewhere and should there be any adverse impact on such habitats the Council could decline to discharge the condition.
133. Condition 26 requires an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Hydrological Impact Assessment Report in order to protect any ancient, veteran trees, near veteran, notable and other trees shrubs or hedges growing within or adjacent to the site which are of amenity value to the area. Condition 27 requires the submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement in order to safeguard the protected trees on the site and ensure compliance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to construction. I have amended some of the wording to avoid unnecessary repetition.
134. Conditions 28 requires a programme of archaeological work, including a Written Scheme of Investigation and is necessary so that the potential impacts of the development can be mitigated through a programme of archaeological work. The additional suggested condition in relation to archaeology is not necessary and I have included the requirement for the publication and dissemination of the results in Condition 28.
135. A preliminary ground investigation report was submitted at the time of the application. This concluded that the historical use of the majority of the site is not considered to present a potentially contaminative history, however, it recommended that the position should be reviewed once the design layout of the proposed development has been finalised. Therefore Conditions 29 and 30 are necessary in order to mitigate any potential contamination. Condition 31 is necessary to avoid any adverse effect on health should unexpected contamination be encountered.

136. Condition 32 requires details for the protection of the existing culvert, including a survey and is necessary to ensure the proposed access does not adversely affect the stability of the existing culvert which will compromise its function and may increase flood risk.
137. Condition 33 requires the submission of details of the SANG to be implemented prior to the occupation of the proposed dwellings. For the reasons given above it is not necessary to require a specific named SANG at this time.
138. A separate condition requiring details of parking, including motorcycle parking and cycle parking to be submitted with reserved matters is unnecessary since these details would be in any event come within the reserved matters.
139. A separate condition in relation to highway construction details is not necessary since most of the information sought is required by other conditions and/or the reserved matters. Moreover, there is insufficient justification to require the roads and footways to be constructed to adoptable standards. All built development is outside of the RPAs of the protected trees on the appeal site. Therefore, there is insufficient justification for a condition requiring details of the foundation design. Any concerns would be a matter for Building Control.
140. The Council seeks a condition preventing the occupation of the proposed development until the upgrade works at Arborfield Sewage Treatment Works are implemented. In support of its position, it relies on the response from the EA. The EA is concerned that Thames Water have not provided confirmation that its growth scheme in Asset Management Plan 8 (AMP8), to build capacity up to 2036, is still on track. Thames Water state that the Arborfield STW is currently compliant and is forecast to remain compliant throughout the period of 2025 - 2030. It disagrees that the appeal scheme would contribute to unacceptable levels of water pollution or adversely affect water quality. On the basis of the response from Thames Water, the statutory undertaker for the Arborfield Sewage Treatment Works I do not consider that there is sufficient justification for such a condition.

Conclusion

141. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Lesley Coffey

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Christopher Boyle KC instructed by Woolf Bond

He Called

Clare Brockhurst FLI, BSc (Hons), Dip LA Leyton Place Landscape Planning

Terry Seymour BScEng CEng MICE Infra Engineering Practice Limited

Peter Wilkins BA (Hons) MArborA MEnvSc CEnv Ruskins Tree Consultancy

Brigid Taylor MSc LLB MRTPI PISEP MEnvS Woolf Bond Planning Consultancy

Matt Stevens MIHT Milestone Transport Planning

Sadie Pitman (S106 Only)

Daniel Bradbury

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Jack Parker Instructed by Amanda Pierce

He Called

Christopher Hannington BSc (Hons) MPhil CMLI MRTPI

Joanna Carter LLB(Hons) LLM MA MRTPI

Ian Church BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Alan Lewis C. Eng FIHE CMILT Highway Development Manager Wokingham Borough Council

(round table SANG, planning obligations and conditions)

Duncan Fisher Ecologist

Andy Glencross Head of environmental services

Roundtable Planning Obligations and conditions

Ms Chalcot Affordable Housing

Ray Drabble

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Michael Eccles on behalf of Iris Dicker Lavender Cottage

Richardson Environment Agency

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/25/3371069

- 1) Application for approval of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping (hereinafter called the “Reserved Matters”) shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. Development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than two years from the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans :
 - Location Plan – drawing no. 052403-DAN-LOC01 Rev –
 - Land Use Plan – drawing no 052403-DANMP04-Rev A
 - Proposed Site Access General Arrangement – drawing no. 25103/002 Rev C
- 3) The reserved matters application shall be accompanied by a measured survey of the site and a plan prepared to scale of not less than 1:500, showing details of existing ground levels for the site and proposed finished ground and floor levels (in relation to a fixed datum point) and finished roof levels for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall show the difference in the pre- and post-construction levels across the site colour-coded for 0.2m intervals. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) No building within the development shall exceed a maximum height of 2.5 storeys and in any event no part of any building shall exceed 10.5 metres above finished ground level at its highest point.
- 5) The visibility splays as shown on drawing 25103/002 Rev C shall be provided prior to the first occupation of development hereby approved and thereafter kept free of obstruction above 0.6 metres in height.
- 6) The emergency vehicular access shown on the approved drawing 25103/002 Rev C shall be provided prior to 100th occupation and maintained permanently thereafter, with bollards or other measures as agreed pursuant to Condition 12 to restrict general vehicular access.
- 7) Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans approved pursuant to Condition 2, no development other than demolition, site clearance and preparation works hereby approved shall commence until details of the off-site highway works shown indicatively on the following plans have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - 25103/001/01 Rev D: Enhanced Active Travel Linkages (Sheet 1)
 - 25103/001/02 Rev D: Enhanced Active Travel Linkages (Sheet 2)
 - 25103/003 Rev –: Reading Road Eastbound Build-out (Chicane)
 - 25103/004 Rev –: Reading Road Westbound Build-out (Chicane)
 - 25103/005 Rev A: Church Lane “Quiet Lane” Proposals

The details to be submitted for approval shall include pedestrian and cycle access points onto Reading Road and Church Lane, design, construction specification, drainage, lighting (including avoidance and mitigation measures for protected species, in particular bats), signage, road markings, traffic-calming devices, kerb lines, pedestrian crossing points, bus stop upgrades and associated works.

- 8) The off-site highway works approved under Condition 7 shall be fully completed prior to the occupation of the 40th dwelling, unless an alternative phased programme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 9) As part of the Reserved Matter Application, details of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and connections from the development to both Reading Road to the south and Church Lane to the west of the site together with a programme of implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall also include pedestrian/cycle watercourse crossing, whose location is indicatively shown on drawing Illustrative Masterplan 052403-DAN-MP04 Rev A, which shall be delivered as a clear span bridge. The measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of development hereby approved.
- 10) Prior to, or concurrent with, the submission of Reserved Matter Applications, details of upgrade works to the Public Right of Way ARB01 for the use by cyclists broadly in accordance with drawing 25103/005 Rev A: Church Lane "Quiet Lane" Proposals shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved upgrade works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to 40th occupation of development hereby approved.
- 11) Prior to or concurrently with the submission of the Reserved Matters, full details of the drainage system for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:
 - (a) Full calculations demonstrating the capacity of attenuation features to cater for 1 in 100-year flood event with a 40% allowance for climate change and runoff controlled at 1.67l/s/ha, or preferably better. Notwithstanding the above, the surface water drainage scheme shall demonstrate that discharge from the development to the downstream ditch and drainage system serving Lavender Cottage shall be restricted to no greater than the greenfield runoff rate derived from the area of the site that currently drains to that outfall prior to development. The strategy is required to demonstrate both how on-site storm run-off is being dealt with and how off-site flows entering the site are being managed.
 - (b) Separate drainage systems for any proposed adopted highways and residential dwellings.
 - (c) A demonstration of how surface water runoff is going to be catered for, given that parts of the development site already suffer from surface water flooding.

- (d) A description of how the proposed development will deal with surface water exceedance flows for storm events that exceed the design capacity for attenuation.
- (e) Cross-references to all groundwater monitoring data collected for the site, confirming seasonal high groundwater levels in the area, and demonstration how attenuation features are being designed to accommodate these.
- (f) The location and sizing of all SuDS features, with the base of any SuDS features located at least 0.5m above the seasonal high water table level; alternatively the details shall demonstrate how attenuation features will be designed to ensure that they continue to function optimally.
- (g) Demonstration of how the SuDS basin(s) would be designed to hold standing water to achieve ecological objectives set out in paragraph 5.14 of the Ecological Impact Assessment and Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment SWE-P24-0078 Rev R1.
- (h) Demonstration to show how the proposed drainage strategy and flood risk mitigation strategy would not cause deterioration of irreplaceable habitat (veteran, and ancient and notable trees) within and adjacent to the site.

The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be maintained in the approved form for as long as the development remains on the site.

- 12) No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until a plan for management and maintenance of the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems for the lifetime of the development hereby approved (hereinafter referred to as SuDS Maintenance Plan) has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The SuDS Maintenance Plan shall include:
- The arrangements for adoption by a public authority, a statutory undertaker or a management company and arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime;
 - Full details of the access that is required to reach surface water management component for maintenance purposes; and
 - A plan for safe and sustainable removal and disposal of waste periodically arising from drainage system, detailing the materials to be used and standard of work required, including method statement.

The approved SUDS Maintenance Plan shall be implemented in accordance with approved details prior to first occupation of development hereby approved.

- 13) No construction shall take place within 5m of the water main. Information detailing how the developer intends to divert the asset / align the development, so as to prevent the potential for damage to subsurface potable water infrastructure, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of construction. Any construction must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved information. Unrestricted access must be available at all times for the maintenance and repair of the asset during construction works and for the lifetime of the development.

- 14) No part of the development hereby approved shall commence, including demolition, site clearance and preparation works, until a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved CEMP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The CEMP shall include the following:
- (a) construction of suitable works access;
 - (b) details of haul routes to be used to access the development;
 - (c) parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors (including times, these should be in line with hours of work permitted under Condition 19);
 - (d) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - (e) programme of works, including measures for traffic management and operating hours, and associated communication strategy;
 - (f) details of the appointed site manager or other nominated person, including their name, direct telephone number and email address, who shall act as the primary point of contact for local residents 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for the duration of the construction period;
 - (g) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - (h) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - (i) provision of lighting during construction;
 - (j) protection of trees (including particularly the extended Buffer Zones, Root Protection Areas and Construction Exclusion Zones for ancient, veteran and notable trees), hedgerows and other natural features (in accordance with details to be approved under Condition 33);
 - (k) control measures to prevent the spread of invasive non-native species
 - (l) wheel washing facilities and an area cleaning regime;
 - (m) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction (including street sweeping);
 - (n) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction works;
 - (o) details of pest control measures, if required
 - (p) hours of delivery; and
 - (q) mitigation and avoidance measures for protected species and species of principal importance.

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved CEMP during site preparation, clearance and construction of the development.

- 15) No work relating to the development hereby permitted, including works of ground clearance or preparation prior to commencement of construction operations shall take place other than:
 - (a) between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday; and
 - (b) 08:00-13:00 on Saturday; and
 - (c) at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays except for
 - (d) individual operations which cannot reasonably be undertaken within the construction working hours defined above and have been notified to the Local Planning Authority (including details of the nature extent and timetable for the works) at least two weeks in advance and approved in writing.
- 16) The application for Reserved Matters shall demonstrate how no less than 10% of market dwellings and 95% of affordable housing dwellings will be constructed in line with M4(2) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended) (or any other standard that supersedes it) and how no less than 5% of affordable housing dwellings will be constructed in line with M4(3) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended) (or any other standard that supersedes it).
- 17) The application for Reserved Matters shall demonstrate how each of the dwellings proposed complies with the Nationally Described Space Standard or any other standard that supersedes it.
- 18) The Reserved Matters application for the development shall demonstrate how the development has taken into account principles of Secured by Design Residential (Homes) Guide 2025 (or any other guide that supersedes it).
- 19) Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme achieving a maximum domestic water consumption of 110L per capita per day (including 5L allowance for external water) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the dwelling to which it relates is first occupied and shall remain operational for the lifetime of the development.
- 20) In the event that Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) are proposed as part of a Reserved Matters application for the development hereby approved, the Reserved Matters application shall be accompanied by a detailed Noise Impact Assessment (NIA). The NIA shall:
 - (a) Identify the predicted operational noise levels from all proposed ASHPs, including cumulative impacts where multiple units are proposed;
 - (b) Evaluate the potential impact of this noise on the amenity of future occupants of the proposed dwellings and any existing noise-sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed ASHPs; and

- (c) Detail the specific measures to be incorporated into the design, layout, orientation, and specification of the ASHPs, and/or other mitigation measures (such as enclosures or screening), to ensure that noise from the ASHPs does not give rise to an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity.

The design and layout of the development submitted pursuant to the Reserved Matters application shall be informed by, and incorporate the recommendations of, the NIA. Any ASHPs shall subsequently be installed and maintained in accordance with the details as approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 21) Prior to the commencement of development, a fully detailed scheme of on-site energy generation from renewable, low carbon and/or zero carbon energy sources shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be broadly in accordance with the measures set out in the Section 5 of the JSP Sustainability Statement dated November 2024 and shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and shall remain operational for the lifetime of the development.
- 22) Prior to or concurrent with the Reserved Matters application, an overarching landscape strategy for the site shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape strategy shall contain details of open space typologies proposed, 8m watercourse buffer zone, location of foot/cycleways and possible linkages outside development parcels, sustainable urban drainage solutions (including flood mitigation measures) and proposals for management of buffer zones around veteran trees.
- 23) Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The HMMP shall include the following:
 - (a) Description and evaluation of features including buffer zones and Root Protection Areas of trees identified as T3, T4, T39, T50, T56, T72, T85 and T87 within the Arboricultural Assessment Report and Tree Condition Survey 1024-100809 November 2024, covering all landscaped areas other than domestic gardens;
 - (b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
 - (c) Aims and objectives of management, including delivery of detailed Biodiversity Gain Plan;
 - (d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
 - (e) Prescriptions for management actions;
 - (f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period);
 - (g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan; and
 - (h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The HMMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the HMMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

- 24) Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, a strategy for ecological permeability and species biodiversity enhancements to the site shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist and include measures for bats, birds, hedgehogs, reptiles, amphibians, and invertebrates. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy and shall thereafter be permanently retained as such.
- 25) Prior to or concurrent with Reserved Matters application a Lighting Design Strategy for Biodiversity for the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall:
- (a) Identify those areas/features on and around the site and any s.278 works that are particularly sensitive for bats and where the development may cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along foraging and/or commuting routes; and
 - (b) Show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent bats using their territory or having access to their breeding sites, foraging areas and resting places.
- 26) The Reserved Matters application shall be accompanied by an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Hydrological Impact Assessment Report which shall demonstrate that buffer zones and Root Protection Areas of trees identified as T3, T4, T39, T50, T56, T72, T85 and T87 within the Arboricultural Assessment Report and Tree Condition Survey 1024-100809 November 2024 and Root Protection Areas of other tree(s) shown as being retained would be free from development and that the proposed changes to hydrology of the soils within such buffer zones and Root Protection Areas would not have detrimental impact on these trees.
- 27) An updated Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of any development or other operation (including site clearance and preparatory works) and adhered to throughout the construction period. The AMS shall provide for:
- (a) The retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent the site,

- (b) No development (including any tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) shall commence until the Local Planning Authority has been provided at least 7 working days written notice to inspect the implementation of the measures identified in the AMS.
 - (c) No excavations for services, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires or disposal of liquids shall take place within an area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the AMS.
 - (d) The tree protection fencing and other works which are part of the Approved Scheme shall not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works including external works have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials removed from the site unless the prior written approval of the LPA has first been sought and obtained.
- 28) Prior to commencement of development a programme of archaeological work, including a Written Scheme of Investigation (hereinafter referred to as the WSI), shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The WSI shall include:
- (a) Assessment of significance and research questions;
 - (b) Programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
 - (c) Programme for post investigation assessment;
 - (d) Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
 - (e) Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - (f) Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation; and
 - (g) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the WSI.
 - (h) Provision made for publication and dissemination of the results and archive deposition has been secured and confirmation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The programme of archaeological work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved WSI.

- 29) Notwithstanding the details in the Desk Study and Ground Investigation Report J2429 dated 24 November 2024, an investigation and risk assessment should be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, including landfill gas, The investigation and risk assessment should be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings produced. The written report should submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

prior to commencement of development. The report of the findings should include:

- (a) a survey of the extent, scale, and nature of any contamination.
- (b) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - human health,
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
 - adjoining land,
 - groundwaters and surface waters,
 - ecological systems,
 - archaeological sites and ancient monuments.
- (c) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

30) A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development hereby approved. The scheme should ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

31) If land contamination is found at any time during site clearance, groundwork, and construction the discovery shall be reported as soon as possible to the local planning authority. A full contamination risk assessment shall be carried out and if found to be necessary, a 'remediation method statement' shall be submitted to the local planning authority for written approval.

32) Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, a scheme showing the design of the access road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

(a) Details of a survey undertaken of the existing culvert (associated with the main vehicular access) during a dry period to allow the culvert's condition to be assessed fully to inform the watercourse crossing design;

(b) Details of the proposed measures for the protection of the existing culvert; and

(c) Where necessary, details of the proposed replacement culvert.

No groundworks or plant/machinery access shall take place until the scheme has been fully implemented in accordance with the approved details.

33) No development on the site shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority details of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) strategy which ensure the scheme will produce no likely significant effects upon the Thames Basin Heaths

Special Protection Area. The details shall include details of the SANG's location, layout, and arrangements for its retention and management in perpetuity. None of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied before the works to create the SANG have been completed and the SANG has been made available for public use.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE INQUIRY

ID01 Appellant Opening Statement

ID02 LPA Opening Statement

ID03 Inquiry Statement - Michael Eccles

ID04 Location of SANGs relative to appeal site

ID05 Borehole Locations overlaid

ID06 Groundwater Monitoring Results

ID07 Tree Table of impacts and effects

ID08 Outline Drainage Strategy Layout -FZ overlay IEP_001_022_005 Rev A

ID09 Indicative attenuation Basin Sections and Construction Detail Rev A

ID10 Rear of Rowan Drive Appeal Decision Ref: APP/X0360/W/17/3169773

ID11 Schedule of Highway Plans

ID12 Vision-Led Package & Highway Off-Site Improvement Works Addendum Note dated 9 March 2026

ID13 Schedule of Highway Plans (repeat of ID 11)

ID14 Gladman-Developments-Ltd-v-SSHCLG Judgement [2026] EWHC 51

ID15 Limmerhill Road Appeal Decision Ref: APP/X0360/W/25/3361360

ID16 MCHLG letter to Wokingham Borough Council dated 15 January 2026

ID17 Appeal decision ref: APP/V2255/W/24/3350524 Faversham

ID18 Draft Planning Agreement

ID19 Draft Unilateral Undertaking

ID20 Planning Obligations summary

ID21 SANG Statement of Common Ground

- ID22 Wokingham Local Plan Update Habitat Regulation Assessment (February 2025)
- ID23 SANG Heads of Terms – University of Reading Heads of Terms for SANG dated 16 March 2026
- ID24 Loddon Garden Village Update
- ID25 Thames Basin Heath SPA Advice Note from Natural England August 2025
- ID26 Local Plan Update Response to Inspectors' Matter 5 Anticipated Housing Land Supply
- ID27 Letter from Berkley Home re: Limmerhill Road Appeal SANG provision (See page 52)
- ID28 Limmerhill Road Appeal Natural England Response to use of Blagrove Road SANG
- ID29 Email from Mr Eccles dated 17 March 2026
- ID30 Thames Basin Heath SPA Map
- ID31 Planning Agreement under S106
- ID32 Unilateral Undertaking
- ID33 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant
- ID34 Closing submissions on behalf of the Council
- ID35 Email from Mr Eccles dated 25 March 2026