

MEMORANDUM

From:	Coralie Ramsey Trees and Landscape		
Service	WBC Landscape and Trees	App No:	243132
Address:	201 Reading Road, Wokingham, RG41 1LJ.		
Proposal:	Full application for the proposed erection of 1 no. detached dwelling and detached double garage with associated landscaping and entrance gate, following demolition of the existing dwelling and garage.		
Type of Development:	Minor Dwellings (1-9)		
Site Visit Made:	Yes/No		

Summary Of Recommendations

- ☐ No comment
- ☐ No objection
- ☐ No objection subject to conditions (and reasons) **stated below**
- ☐ Request further information before determination as **stated below**
- ☒ Objection due to the reason(s) **stated below**

Comments On Proposal

The site is on a Green Route and subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 1402/2011, T1 an oak on the front boundary of the site. TPO 1197/2007 has been served on various trees at the rear of the site and on adjacent plots. A green back drop is a feature of the houses along the road at this point.

T1 of 1402/2011 is a veteran tree, number 65555, as recorded on the Woodland Trust Ancient Tree Inventory.

I refer to submissions and information 230026; proposed block plan 290 P7 11.12.24; proposed garage plans 290 P4; D&A; proposed gate elevation 290 P6 12.12.24; planning statement 4271 20.12.24; Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement MDA reference V23 3.2.25.

National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF), Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (Adopted 29 January 2010), CP1 – Sustainable development, CP3 - General Principles for development and Wokingham Borough Managing Development Delivery Document (Local Plan) – Adopted 21 February 2014, Policy CC03: Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping and Policy TB21: Landscape Character, Wokingham Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary

Planning Document June 2012 and BS5837:2012: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations refer.

The front site garage is contrary to Design Guide policy R23. Planning Inspectorate case APP/X0360/D/23/3319260 seems to be relevant in this instance as the proposed garage covers almost half of the front of the plot and is so close to the front boundary fence.

The submission notes that there is a front garden garage next door. I would be pleased to know the planning application number for this building. Regardless, it is smaller and less obtrusive in design and scale and set back behind screening green infrastructure. So, I struggle to find that it sets a precedent for the proposed double garage.

The house is higher at the ridge than its immediate neighbours and as such would appear incongruous in the street scene, on the Green Route, obscuring the green back drop. This would be contrary to R9 of the Design Guide.

The veteran tree (T1 of the arb assessments) has a root protection area (RPA) which has erroneously not been adjusted for the root impermeable surface of the A329, Reading Road. Point 4.6.3 of the BS5837 refers. The roots of this TPO, A rated tree would be in the soft landscaping of the front of the site much more than indicated and so would be subject to more harm from built forms and their construction.

The Government *Guidance: Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions* 14.1.22 states:-

‘For ancient or veteran trees..., the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree’s canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree’s diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area.’ This highly relevant has not been incorporated into the tree submissions.

Another point regarding the supposed RPA for T1 in relation to the proposed new driveway is the use of Cellweb as a ‘no dig’ solution. There will not be ‘no dig’ where the driveway meets the access point of the site. If ‘no dig’ was to be maintained at this point, there would be a minimum 150mm high step. As this is not tenable, Cellweb must be buried for a length which gives an acceptable slope for cars etc. To avoid this unacceptable harm, point 5 of the Cellweb information sheet, states excavations for kerbs etc should be avoided with RPAs. As the whole of the front of the site is covered by RPA and buffer zone, Cellweb is not a plausible solution.

I am also concerned that no mention has been made about harm from the root incursions for the proposed gate.

Overall, the application appears to not comply with the T&L parts of the policies and guidance listed above, I am unable to support it as it stands.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)			
n/a			
Date:	28.1.25	Signed:	C Ramsey

