

MEMORANDUM

From:	Stuart Ryder External Landscape Consultant		
Service	WBC Landscape and Trees	App No:	251124
Address:	Land at Lands End House, Beggars Hill Road, Lands End, Twyford, RG10 0UD.		
Proposal:	Permission in principle application for the proposed erection of 1 no. detached dwelling.		
Type of Development:	Minor Dwellings (1-9) PiP		
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

Thank you for asking us to comment on this 'Permission in principle' application for a single house at Beggars Hill Lane.

Recognising that 'technical details' are to be resolved subject to the granting of the permission in principle there is one technical matter that needs to be defined to allow consideration of effects on trees and possible change of character at the Site. This is the question of root protection areas (RPA's) and whether the proposals will encroach within them. I note on Page 1 of the Agent's letter accompanying the application that a topographic survey has been undertaken to position the trees on site and their extent. I have highlighted the passage in a digital snip for your ease of reference.

The site, the extent of which is shown outlined in red on the site location plan accompanying the application, extends to an area of approximately 0.16 hectares and comprises land (the northern part of the site) that falls within the residential curtilage of Lands End House and (to the south) within part of a Local Plan strategic housing allocation. In addition, the woodland section of the site (the southern part) is subject of a Tree Preservation Order (1611/2017), with that Order also covering trees along the eastern side of this part of Beggars Hill Road. The application as noted, relates to the erection of a single detached dwelling and is supported by an illustrative site plan (P101) prepared (following a topographic survey identifying the location, spread and stem diameter of trees) in order to understand the relationship with – and potential impact on – trees the subject of the noted Order.

However it is an Arboricultural Survey, or more usefully an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) conducted by a competent and experienced arboriculturalist that would determine what effects, if any would occur to the existing tree stock on Site.

The Agent's letter also discusses the matter of a specimen ash tree experiencing ash dieback disease on the western site boundary and how the proposed access position can be formed without impact on any root protection areas. Again a digital extract of the paragraph in question from Page 2 of the letter has been set below for your ease.

Notwithstanding the above and the scope of matters to be considered, the application is accompanied by an illustrative site plan showing how the site could be developed for a single dwelling. This plan, prepared following a full survey of the site identifying the location of trees (subject of the above noted Preservation Order) and including their crown spread and stem diameter, demonstrates that the development could be accommodated outside the root protection area of the existing trees to be retained. The plan does indicate – albeit it is no more than indicative at this point – the removal of the Ash tree located on the frontage of the site as this is suffering *Hymeniscyphus fraxineus* (Ash Dieback) and would be replaced as per legislative requirements. However, the scheme – and the provision of the access way in particular – is not reliant on the removal of this tree and, indeed, all works associated with that access would be outside the root protection area of the tree so, as required, the tree could be retained notwithstanding the status as a 'dying' specimen.

This shows that some consideration of RPA's has been undertaken but it is not stated on any of the submitted material I have seen how the RPA's have been defined.

In reviewing the illustrative plan that accompanies the application I note a series of dashed circular green lines around each of the trees marking the RPA's. The dashed blue line identifies the ash tree experiencing ash dieback. Again an AIA would be able to give a considered response to whether this particular ash would be better left as dying timber (taking into account proximity of public access) and whether its replacement would better the TPO applied to stock on site.

The illustrative plan does not actually show any topographic information and whether ground modelling/retention is required to form the development platform for the house. It is often these formation activities, or the positioning of service runs that will cause damage to tree root systems.

With regards to matter of landscape character the Google Streetscene imagery I have consulted show that other detached dwellings have recently been constructed along Beggars Hill Lane. These have more of an influence character wise on this part of the lane and the Site than the large scale housing development to the south which in summer conditions appears largely screened by the mature tree line that separates this Site from the houses of Fir Tree Way and Hawthorn Crescent.

The positioning of the proposed dwelling set back from the lane corridor is preferable to a location on, or adjacent to the Beggars Hill Lane corridor. It would appear as a larger property set within a larger, well treed plot.

Visually I consider it would not look out of keeping with the other recently constructed individual properties and would be evident in views from the lane but not necessarily look out of keeping, or intrusive in this location.

The presence of the TPO 161/2017 will require ongoing recognition and retention of this tree stock is necessary to aid the retention of the amenity of the lane at this location.

In short the missing information is certainty as to 'the how and the who' has calculated the RPA's on which the illustrative proposals are based and confirmation that ground modelling/retention is not required on site.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)

I have not placed any detailed conditions under this section given the nature of the Permission in Principle application. I however anticipate that the following conditions would be required should be minded to grant approval;

- Hard and soft landscape proposals;
- Tree protection measures;
- Arboricultural management plan to ensure the ongoing care and retention of the TPO trees on Site and others that may not be TPO's but contribute to the character of the Site and area.

Date :	4 th June 2025	Signed :	Stuart Ryder
------------------	---------------------------	--------------------	--------------