

PLANNING REF : 251973
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 9 Primrose Lane
: Winnersh, Wokingham
: RG41 5UR
SUBMITTED BY : St Nicholas Hurst Parish
DATE SUBMITTED : 08/09/2025

COMMENTS:

St Nicholas Hurst Parish Council objects to application 251973 on the grounds that there is not sufficient justification for the proposed works as there are no concerns raised over the trees structural integrity and cumulatively the effects will harm the landscape

character, ASC and erode the significant degree of containment and mitigation provided by the peripheral trees and hedgerows (as confirmed by the Inspector at the Appeal for application 211532).

1) Detailed Reasons:

- The application clearly states there is nothing wrong with the trees all of which are protected, i.e., there is no disease, nor do they have any fears that they might break or fall. They also state that the trees do not cause any damage to property or damage to drains or drives.
- No evidence has been provided to justify that any of the proposed works, including crown lifting, is beneficial to the trees; Indeed crown lifting can be harmful as it removes large primary branches which can create large wounds that can lead to decay. Therefore, it must be presumed that the overall purpose of proposed works is only for the benefit of the residential amenity, i.e., to allow more light in their garden, rather than for the benefit of the trees.
- The dwellings were purchased with the knowledge that ALL the trees in the periphery of the development had a TPO (TPO 1790-2021) on them and that the gardens would be affected by these trees.
- In order for the site to be developed they had to remove 6 trees. This proposal is for the removal of yet another tree for no good reason.
- In addition, since completion of development, a further 2 applications for works on the protected trees have been submitted by other parties.
- There is some ambiguity as to whether the trees fall within the curtilage of Walnut House and this should be clarified.

2) Original Application 211532 which was refused and then allowed at Appeal.

Officers Report states that (Page 7) Landscape:

Whilst the submitted documents state only 4 to 5 trees will be removed, the intensity of the proposal would have detrimental effect on the remaining trees and would irreparably damage them. [6 trees were removed].

The Officer also stated (page 15) that "Additionally, existing mature vegetation on all three sides of the site along with the trees and hedges of Church Hill and School Road help in maintaining the green verge that also contributes to the verdant rural character of the area".

3) Appeal reference APP/X0360/W/21/3280255 in respect of Application 211532 Heading 9.

The Inspectors Reports

stated the following:

Paragraph 10. Trees were a 'Main issue' in determining the appeal (The effect of the proposed development on

trees).

Paragraph 28: In my view, the existing hedgerow and trees on the periphery of the site provide a significant degree of containment which considerably screen views of the site from the adjoining roads.

Paragraph 31: In visual terms, I consider that the proposal would cause limited and localised effects on the appearance of the countryside because of the relatively contained nature of the site and its surrounds, and the retention of trees and hedgerows along its peripheral boundaries. In my view, as a consequence of the retention of the majority of the peripheral trees and hedgerow, the visual effects of the proposed development would be very localised and minor adverse.

Paragraph 38: "I do not consider that the proposed scale of the development would cause the proposal to be visually detrimental to the ASC as a consequence of the mitigation provided by the retention of the peripheral trees and hedgerows".

Paragraph 58: I have considered the Council's concern that the proposed development may result in future pressure for tree pruning to mitigate shading and overhang. However, I have no demonstrable evidence to conclusively confirm that this would be the case. In any event, the Council would have a degree of control over such matters as a consequence of statutory protection and/or the requirements of suggested planning condition No.14 which is considered later in this decision.

Paragraph 93: In order to ensure the protection of trees identified for retention on the site, a condition requiring the implementation of tree protection works as required by Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement Report dated 30 April 2021 and drawing

JPP23213-03 is necessary (condition No 5)

4) The application should also be considered alongside previous recent applications:

232684 (Submitted by Westbourne Homes - Developer) which involved Crown

fting to trees along Sawpit Road to give a ground clearance of 5.2 metres over the highway. This was approved as it was necessary to provide statutory clearance over the adjacent highway [Sawpit Road]. HPC robustly objected to this ViewDocument

250714 (Submitted by

Primrose Cottage) re the T1 Oak on Sawpit Road to remove 3 of the lowest branches; reduce remaining overhanging lateral spread and provide a clearance of 2 m from the property leaving a height of 12 metres and lateral spread of 4.5 meters - WBC partially refused the proposed tree works to the T1 Oak and stated the following:

"Whilst the council appreciates that a certain amount of pruning is justified to provide adequate clearance beneath the crown and to adjacent built structures, the proposed removal of three branches appears excessive given that the branches and the tree appear to be in a relatively sound and healthy condition with no outward signs of any significant defects or decay"

To conclude:

The recent applications from the developer and residents of this new development, to gradually remove trees, remove the branches and alter the shape of healthy trees surrounding the development, if taken cumulatively, is significantly harmful to the landscape and verdancy of the surrounding landscape character and Area of Special Character. The crowning and reduction of the trees is gradually eroding the significant degree of containment which considerably screen views of the site from the

adjoining roads.

WBC expressed concern at the outset of the proposal for this development and during the appeal (Appeal Decision Paragraph 58) that the development would harm the ASC and it was important to retain the trees and hedgerows and the BNG was conditional upon increasing the density of the hedgerow; The proposal is doing none of this. The inspector at the appeal confirmed that the retention of the hedgerow was important to mitigate the harm.