

MEMORANDUM

From:	Coralie Ramsey Trees and Landscape		
Service	WBC Landscape and Trees	App No:	250197
Address:	102 Redhatch Drive, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 5QR.		
Proposal:	Householder application for the proposed two storey front, side and rear extension, plus the addition of 2 no. roof lights and changes to fenestration.		
Type of Development:	Other Householder		
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 located on road of dwellings of various ages and styles, many of which have been altered over time. This house is semi-detached and set back within its plot. Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 1423/2012, T1 and T2, both oaks, grow in the rear garden. T1 and a goat willow provide backdrop green infrastructure.

I refer to submissions and information 181389; 130129; 212436; 212342; 210664; RFS/2020/085615; photos 19.2.25; proposed plans, elevations & site plan – sheet 2 14.2.25; arboricultural development report 13.2.25 and application form PP-13730649 28.1.25.

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.

As a point of clarification - looking back at the planning application for Collins Drive (eg 181389, detailed planting plan sheet 1 of 3 and 130129, outline hard landscape

designs 200 B)) it appears the roadside boundary fence is not as per that application and not as per the location plan of this current application.

The mass, location and height of the proposed side extension would remove protected green backdrop of high local amenity value from public view as seen from Redhatch Drive. This would be contrary to Design Guide point R23, plus policies such as CP3, CC03 and TB21.

T1 of the TPO (T2 of the arb submission) states circa 10.46% of the RPA will disappear beneath built form and that this is acceptable according to the BS5837. However, for T2, there have been at least the fourth occasions that works have been undertaken in its rooting area, for track and road works and a drain. Point 5.3.2 states the 'cumulative effects of incursions into the RPA e.g. from excavation for utility apparatus are damaging and should be avoided.' T2 has a survey category of B3, i.e. a tree 'in such a condition as to make a significant contribution but may have slight defects or imperfections.' It has a suggested life of 10 to 20 years in which to offer amenity. Apart from a recent crown reduction which has removed many tertiary branches, the tree is in reasonable health. I take from the submission that there is no reason to believe it will not remain so, but only if there is no more incursion into its rooting area.

T2 has been classified as a mature tree. According to the BS5837 point 5.2.4 mature trees need 'particular care' and that '...adequate space should be allowed for their (the trees) long-term physical retention and future maintenance.' Point 5.3.1 states 'The default position should be that structures are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained' unless there is an overriding justification. Given the cumulative effect of repeated road works in the RPA, I suggest any further incursion into the RPA eg by this household extension, would risk the health of the tree and the public amenity it provides.

There is scope for a front extension as the property is behind the building line. And a ground floor side addition that does not go beyond the existing depth of the house.

Overall, the application appears not to comply with the T&L parts of the policies and guidance listed above.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)			
n/a			
Date:	24.2.25	Signed:	C Ramsey