

MEMORANDUM

From:	Coralie Ramsey Trees and Landscape		
Service	WBC Landscape and Trees	App No:	242471
Address:	16 Pitts Lane, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 1BT.		
Proposal:	Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey front porch and two storey side and rear extension following a single storey rear extension, changes to fenestration and a garage conversion.		
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 rear of the site is part of the Bulmershe Site of Urban Landscape Value (SULV), it backs onto Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 3/1951, A1 on various trees alive in 1951. The south rear boundary is impacted by TPO 1152/2006, G2 on 2 x scots pine and the front south boundary features a beech tree number T7 of TPO 1152/2006. The road features large individual and semi-detached houses, set back from the street, many of which have been altered over time.

I refer to submissions block plan 2429-P104 Sept 24; existing and proposed elevations 2429-P102 Sept 24 and car parking 2429-P105 Sept 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, Policy TB22: Sites of Urban Landscape Value, Wokingham Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document June 2012 and BS5837:2012: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations refer.

The side addition is not subservient, as required in Design Guide policy R23, but then neither are consented applications for no.27 or (not true to the consent, but still in keeping) no.17. Both appear not to unduly harm the street scene of the road, so I have no concerns about the character impact of this proposal.

The rear and side TPO trees are not proximate, so will not be unduly harmed by the built form. The SULV, is screened by mature trees and shrubs and will also not be affected. The side extension requires the removal of a hedge and relandscaping the front lawn. The changes to the green infrastructure could be accommodated by a landscaping condition.

However, the impact upon the TPO beech by the driveway (which will need to be larger, according to Highways) has not been considered. Work in the rooting area would be harmful to that amenity without suitable mitigation. The design and construction of the driveway will need to be informed by a BS5837: 2012, so I request this to allow the application to comply with policies such as CC03, CP3 and TB21.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)			
n/a at this time			
Date:	5.12.24	Signed:	C Ramsey