M E M O R A N D U M

From:	Brigitte Crafer Landscape Architect		
Service	WBC Landscape and Trees	**App No:**	262521
Address:	Land at and to the rear of 240 Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, Wokingham, RG40 3QD.		
Proposal:	Application for non-material amendment to planning consent 250655 to change the wording of condition 2 to include an amended boundary treatments plan.		
Type of Development:			
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

Addition of Close Board Fence to Western Boundary

Prior to this application, the Boundary Treatments Dwg. No. 230122A L 02 02 Rev. A 12.5.25 and Softworks Plan Drawing No. 230122A L 02 02 Rev. C 12.5.25 showed a native hedge to the western boundary with the existing permeable chainlink style fence retained and was approved in 2025. The inclusion of the native hedge was a requirement to ensure the landscape character of the setting could be retained and enhanced in accordance with Policy TB21 of the Local Plan.

The current application includes a revised Boundary Treatment drawing ref. 230122A L 02 02 which includes 3 revisions within the titleblock;

- Rev. A 12.5.25 for close board fence to eastern boundary.
- Rev. B dated 14.10.26 included the proposed close boarded fence to the western boundary.
- Rev. C dated 15.10.26 shows the removal of the proposed / approved western hedgerow.

I understand from the enclosed letter the applicant is submitting Rev. C under this application which removes the native hedgerow but presumably retains the proposed close board fence.

Public: Information that can be seen and used by everyone inside and outside the Council.

The addition of a close boarded fence in the location proposed with no landscape mitigation would be to increase the sense of urbanisation that this development has already contributed in an area of countryside and woodland.

Whilst I accept that 1.8m close board fence may be the only way to successfully create an instant secure boundary between the development and the existing dwellings along the western boundary, the proposals must be in keeping with and enhance the existing landscape setting.

The existing fence was permeable and showed open woodland views and character. The addition of a native hedge along the boundary is in keeping with the existing landscape character. Even with the addition of a close board fence to the western boundary the hedge to the outside of the fence will mitigate the visual impact of the 1.8m wooden fencing whilst retaining and enhancing the wooded setting.

I object to the removal of the proposed native hedge which can still be planted outside the close board fence and maintained by the management company, whilst still providing an in keeping visual screen to the wider woodland character.

The site boundary is not straight and shows strips of land between the plot boundaries and site boundaries. There is no reason why the approved hedge enhancements cannot succeed and be planted to naturally follow the site boundary line/ or the fence line.

Methodology for erecting fence in RPA (root protection areas of trees).

The report is submitted with the application from SJ Trees.

Every attempt needs to be made to erect the fence outside of the RPA along the western boundary where there are many large trees, and in some cases the location of the fenceline through / very close to the tree stem. Avoiding the stems may be difficult although there is a caveat in the methodology which states flexible post positioning and adjustments around trees.

A drawing of the preliminary positioning of the fence in relation to retained trees should have been submitted with the application and a final ‘as built’ drawing submitted on completion.

I have no objection to the methodology for installing the fence – and due to the length of the boundary to be fenced there will inevitably be a conflict with root protection areas. Providing the excavation of post sites and excavation are overseen by the Arboriculturalist and concrete is placed within an impermeable barrier.

However, if the hedge had been planted last year a temporary fence such as Heras fencing may have sufficed without the need for a fence and the incursion into the RPA to erect the fence.

Public: Information that can be seen and used by everyone inside and outside the Council.

Conclusion

The fence line shown on Drawing No. Boundary Treatments - 230122A L 02 02 Rev. C 15.10.26 is quite organic – but the site boundary line should also be included to understand how the fence line relates to it.

The plots themselves have boundary treatments. It would be much more natural for the western boundary to be composed of native hedge planted either side of a chainlink fence. The native mix could include 3 evergreen species and 3 prickly species providing screening and security. The hedge will take time to grow but would be a much better solution in the long term, but will take a few years to reach 1.8m height. I suggest that by planting the hedge as well as erecting the fence, eventually the hedge will out live the fence by a long way as long as it is properly maintained.

Therefore, I would like the proposed hedge reinstated on the plans and the inclusion of the site boundary in relation to the position of the fence boundary.

I would like to see a preliminary sketch of the location of the fence in relation to the site boundary and the fence line which may provide more scope for placing the fence away from the RPA.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)

CL4 Reinstate native hedge
CL7 Tree Protection – Provide preliminary layout to show location of the fence. Followed by a final layout.

Date:	23.11.26	**Signed:**	BRC

Public: Information that can be seen and used by everyone inside and outside the Council.