

MEMORANDUM

From:	Coralie Ramsey Trees and Landscape		
Service	WBC Landscape and Trees	App No:	242437
Address:	125 Beech Lane, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 5QD.		
Proposal:	Householder application for the proposed erection of a two storey front,side and rear extension and a single storey rear extension with a balcony and changes to fenestration and installation of game room.		
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 set back within its plot and is located at the end of a spur from Beech Lane. Maiden Lake Site of Urban Landscape Value (SULV) also Maiden Erlegh Nature Reserve abuts the rear boundary, a formally maintained public path runs along this boundary. Public Right of Way (PROW) EARL10 runs close to the southern boundary. The PROW, SULV and Nature Reserve is within a Nature England designated area of Wood, Pasture and Parkland with a site reference of 'Maiden Early'. A horse chestnut located along the PROW adjacent the front south boundary of the site has been recorded on the Woodland Trust Ancient Tree Inventory as a Veteran, number 164233. Most of the houses along the spur have been altered over time, many feature rear boundary out-buildings.

I refer to submissions site and location plan 24/954-04 Aug 24; Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement BS5837:2012 AAAIA125B 14.10.24 (AIA); proposed plans and elevations 24/954-02 Aug 24; proposed games room 24/954-03 Aug 24 and existing plans and elevations 24/954-01 Aug 24.

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, Natural England Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions 14.1.22 refer.

Veteran tree:-

The application includes an AIA which appears to address many of the tree related issues associated with the site. However, veteran tree (T2 of the arb submission) has been reduced to a monolith, but no mention has been made of its veteran status. The Government Guidance (14.1.22) on Veteran trees states –

‘For ancient or veteran trees (including those on the woodland boundary), 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.’ It goes on to state the planning authority should not approve development proposals, including gardens, within a buffer zone. I mention this as a porch (not detailed on the floor plans of the Proposed Plans and Elevations but noted on the TPP) and driveway is proposed in what would be the buffer zone, so the scheme may need adjustment.

Please request that the agent (arb) reviews the Veteran tree legislation, relates it to T2 and comes back with a revised scheme, as necessary. As it stands the application appears to be contrary to policies CC03, CP3, TB21 and NPPF point 186 c.

Outbuilding:-

The outbuilding is located in a different place on the Site and Location Plan versus the Tree Protection Plan (TPP) of the arb submission. The arb submission’s location will better protect the third part trees of the SULV and Nature Reserve. It will delay the requirement to prune the canopies when they grow towards the building in the future and improve maintenance space around it. It would also put the built form further from the SULV and Nature Reserve, reducing its visual impact to the demarcated green space. Therefore, I request that the TPP location is used.

Main house:-

The main side extension is the same ridge height as the existing, contrary to Design Guide point R23, but it is set back and given the appearance of some neighbouring houses, I suggest the scale and mass of the proposed house would not be out of keeping in the street scene.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)			
n/a at this time			
Date:	14.11.24	Signed:	C Ramsey