

Tiara Wijaya

From: Tobias Fox <Toby.Fox@wokingham.gov.uk>

Sent: 10 June 2026 12:00

To: Jones, Dave (Distribution) <Dave.Jones2@sse.com>

Cc: Ecob, Thomas (Distribution) <Thomas.Ecob@sse.com>; Catherine Brimble <Catherine.Brimble@wokingham.gov.uk>; Chris Hannington <Chris.Hannington@wokingham.gov.uk>; Boyd, Ash (Distribution) <ash.boyd@sse.com>; Chloe Ranger <Chloe.Ranger@theclancygroup.co.uk>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: South Wokingham cable installation - TPO consent ref 251817 - TPO-1341-2010

Dear Dave,

Apologies for the delay in responding I have been on annual leave. Thank you for your email and for providing details of the proposed amendment to the approved works specification for T78.

Having reviewed the revised specification, I can confirm that there is no arboricultural objection to the (Option1) proposed works / AMS and the Council would be minded to grant consent for the amended specification.

However, as the original TPO application has already been determined and a decision notice issued, the Council is unable to amend or vary an existing decision notice. Unfortunately, this means that a new TPO application will need to be submitted to cover the revised works specification.

To reassure you, once the new application has been received and validated, I will be able to issue the decision notice immediately, as the proposed works have already been assessed and are considered acceptable. Therefore, the application will not be subject to the usual eight-week determination period.

Please submit the new application with the associated documents you have provided at your earliest convenience and I will arrange for it to be processed as soon as it has been validated.

Kind regards

Toby Fox

Tree Officer

Community, Heritage, Green & Blue Infrastructure

Place & Growth | Wokingham Borough Council | Shute End | Wokingham | Berkshire | RG40 1BN

Email: toby.fox@wokingham.gov.uk

Web: www.wokingham.gov.uk

Private: Information that contains a small amount of sensitive data which is essential to communicate with an individual but doesn't require to be sent via secure methods.

From: Jones, Dave (Distribution) <Dave.Jones2@sse.com>

Sent: 26 May 2026 11:13

To: Tobias Fox <Toby.Fox@wokingham.gov.uk>

Cc: Ecob, Thomas (Distribution) <Thomas.Ecob@sse.com>; Catherine Brimble <Catherine.Brimble@wokingham.gov.uk>; Chris Hannington <Chris.Hannington@wokingham.gov.uk>; Boyd, Ash (Distribution) <ash.boyd@sse.com>; Chloe Ranger <Chloe.Ranger@theclancygroup.co.uk>

Subject: South Wokingham cable installation - TPO consent ref 251817 - TPO-1341-2010

WARNING!

For the attention of
WBC, Optalis, WHL, BCSolutions and
Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Dear Toby,

I am writing in relation to TPO application/consent **251817** and works affecting **TPO-1341-2010** (this tree is referred to as **T78** in the AMS and email below). This relates to a project involving the installation of a new underground electricity cable in South Wokingham by Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks, as previously discussed in correspondence between yourself and Chloe Ranger (Clancy Group), attached.

Since the granting of the above consent, a detailed cable system design assessment has confirmed that the RPA of T78 prevents a compliant cable trench design within the 10m easement and presents risks to cable performance and long-term operation (see enclosed Cable Systems Design report).

As such, two alternative options were assessed to achieve a compliant cable design:

- Option 1: Introduce a localised working corridor within the RPA of T78 (c.11% temporary incursion) while retaining T74 (Category A2 oak).
- Option 2: Remove T74 with only minor additional RPA incursion affecting T78.

An arboricultural assessment has been undertaken (see email below). This confirms that Option 1 is feasible, with the temporary incursion (approximately 68m² of a 578m² RPA) considered tolerable and capable of recovery following reinstatement.

Based on this, Option 1 has been selected for the following reasons:

- It avoids removal of T74, a category A2 tree.
- It represents the least overall arboricultural impact, limiting intervention to a localised RPA adjustment to T78.
- It enables a compliant and buildable cable design, avoiding complex or non-standard construction approaches.
- It supports long-term asset integrity, maintaining appropriate separation between cables and retained root zones.

As the anticipated impact to T78 has changed, a modification to the existing TPO consent is requested from the Council. I would be grateful if you could review the proposed amendments and enclosed details and confirm whether the Council's consents to these proposals.

Please let me know if any further information is required.

Kind regards,

Dave

Dave Jones CEnv MCIEEM
Principal Ecologist / Environmental Advisor
Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks
No 1 Forbury Place
43 Forbury Road
Reading
RG1 3JH

T: 07880 812 586
E: dave.jones2@sse.com

From: Iain Waddell <iain.waddell@adas.co.uk>
Sent: 22 May 2026 10:50
To: Jones, Dave (Distribution) <Dave.Jones2@sse.com>; Ecob, Thomas (Distribution) <Thomas.Ecob@sse.com>
Cc: Doran, Ricky (Distribution) <Ricky.Doran@sse.com>; Boyd, Ash (Distribution) <ash.boyd@sse.com>; Tiara Wijaya <Tiara.Wijaya@adas.co.uk>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: South Wokingham - T74 and T78

Good morning Dave,

Following our phone call this morning I have had a look at the two options proposed in section 8.5 of the document 'Route Feasibility & Cable System Design Review' reference C010-SS-REP-001.

Having looked at the previous arboricultural survey data detailed in the planning approved Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) report (ref ADAS_1052383-18_Clancy_South Wokingham_AMS_December 2025 (Rev C) (Final)) for the scheme, I would consider that Option 1 would be feasible with the below methodology. This way we are avoiding the removal of any trees but still allow for the installation of the cable route within the easement.

Option 1, moves the works area into the Root Protection Area (RPA) of T78 to create a 5m working corridor. This working area will be set 1.5m off the southern side of the easement, with this 1.5m offset the total incursion by the 5m working corridor will be 68 m². With the RPA area for T78 being 578 m² the temporary loss of 68 m² will be a 11% impact on the trees RPA.

Its considered that since the trench for cable installation is a temporary incursion and that the ground is to be reinstated with the same excavated material, T78 will be able to tolerate a temporary loss of 11% of its RPA.

I would recommend that all excavation works are supervised by an arboricultural consultant who can advise of the best pruning techniques for all roots encountered within the trench, this will need to be pruned back to the trench edge as per the methodology described in section 5.6 of the approved AMS. The pruning of the roots within the trench leaving a clean cut surface and with the correctly reinstated top soil will promote the tree to produce new root growth over the next few growing seasons reestablishing the RPA.

Other points to consider is that at the edge of the 5m working corridor there will need to be tree protection fencing installed as per section 5.5 of the AMS and any unexcavated ground within the RPA will be protected using ground protection as described in section 5.6 of the AMS.

I hope the above is of use and if you require any further information or advice please get in touch.
Kind Regards

Iain Waddell *L6 Dip Arb (ABC)*
Associate Director - Arboriculture
Environment
ADAS

Mobile: 07391866564

[Ecology](#) [Arboriculture](#) [Archaeology](#) [Planning](#) [Landscape](#) [Habitat Management](#) [Soils](#)
www.adas.uk

