

MEMORANDUM

From:	Coralie Ramsey Trees and Landscape		
Service	WBC Landscape and Trees	App No:	250239
Address:	41 Appleby Walk, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG7 1UZ.		
Proposal:	Householder application for proposed erection of an outbuilding to the rear of the dwelling. Followed by the extension of the existing garage.(Part-Retrospective).		
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 on a new housing development. Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 1602/2017, T5, applies to an ash growing on the rear boundary of neighbouring no.43 Appleby Walk.

I refer to submissions and information 231796; 130163; garage extension floor plans PROP 03 12.2.25 and proposed elevations PROP 002 13.2.25.

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.

No information has been submitted regarding the TPO ash which is a mature specimen requiring sensitive management, according to the tree works application 231796. Works in the rooting area of the tree (see Land Split Plan below for rooting area) may have/will cause harm, contrary to the TPO legislation, and this must be

assessed by a suitably qualified person, in accordance with the best practice procedures BS5837:2012.

I am concerned that the new and older structures are located in the 'buffer zone' as defined in planning submission Land Split Plan 40 0-1805-012 REV B of application 130163.



This being the case I question if there should be any built forms in this zone.

As it stands, I suggest the application is contrary to policies such as CP1, CP3, CC03 and TB21.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)

n/a

Date:	29.4.25	Signed:	C Ramsey
--------------	---------	----------------	----------