

Chairman P. Gallagher 10 Ashton Road Emmbrook, RG41 1HL 0118 989 1176 chairman@emmbrookresidents.org



REPRESENTING EMMBROOK RESIDENTS

25th June 2020

Development Management, Wokingham Borough Council, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1WR

Dear Sirs,

Planning Application No. 201326 Site Location: Land Adjacent To 1 Fernhill Cottages Toutley Road, RG41 1QJ Proposal: To construct two detached three bedroom dwellings

I am writing on behalf of the Emmbrook Residents Association to submit our comments on the above application as detailed below:

Parking

Paragraph 5.12 of the Planning, Design and Access Statement goes through various contortions, assuming some or all of the parking bays are unallocated, in order to obfuscate the situation on whether a visitors parking bay is required. This is all to no avail as two of the bays are in tandem, such that a second parked car would block the first in. This arrangement, which the ERA disapprove of, is only tolerable if the two bays are allocated to one household, which in this case should be Plot 1 as they are adjacent to it. Therefore, to reduce the total requirement to just four bays the two in front of Plot 2 would have to be unallocated, leaving Plot 2 without an allocated bay, which clearly would be an untenable situation.

Paragraph 5.14 states "In any case in reality, a visitor to number 1 is highly unlikely to use the visitor space: they will simply park adjacent to house number 1" and "This is demonstrated in the submitted swept path analysis". The swept path analysis actual shows that the area adjacent to Plot 1 is used for vehicle turning so any vehicle parked here would not only impede other vehicles negotiating the bend, it would also stop the area being used for vehicle turning, resulting in vehicles not being able to both enter and leave the site in forward gear. This could cause issues with road safety as this section of Toutley Road forms the only direct link between the centre of Emmbrook and the North Wokingham Distributor Road (Queens Road).

One issue that the swept path analysis clearly illustrates is how close the vehicles pass the front of the dwellings with the side of a vehicle actually passing under the front porch of the dwelling on Plot I in both forward and reverse gear. This clearly is an unsafe and unacceptable situation.

Trees

A brief resume of the history of the main trees on site is that in 2009 TPO order 1293/2009 gave three trees TPO status, trees T1 and T2 on the western perimeter and T3 within the site. Later that year this status was removed from T3 and it was felled. In 2015 permission was given to remove tree T1 providing a replacement was provided. Consequently, an oak sapling was planted in the north west corner of the site.

According to the Arboricultural Survey and Impact Statement supporting this application the current proposal is to remove this replacement and plant a second replacement elsewhere on site. This action would be required to allow for the construction of the driveway to the two houses. Two positions have been identified for planting the replacement tree, one to the north and one to the south of the TPO tree T2. The one to the north is within the default root protection area of TPO tree T2 and the one to the south is within the adjusted root protection area. This raises the question is it really acceptable to deliberately plant a replacement for a TPO tree in the RPA of an existing TPO tree, where presumably it will be competing for resources and space? There seems little point in planting such a tree in a position where its chances of growing into a Class A example are severely compromised, other than just going through the motions of complying with a requirement.

It is noted that the Arboricultural Survey states the following:

9.32 The frontage to the houses comprises access and parking, as opposed to garden space, and it is considered that the canopy extent of T1 (*TPO tree 2*) is such that there will not be any overbearing effects upon residential amenity. There will still be plenty of space under, within and around the canopy during both summer and winter months to enable light and the feeling of space to be enjoyed to the frontage to the houses and the lounges that front onto the parking areas.

and

9.33 The proposed access and parking area will achieve good natural light levels, as seen on site during the survey, with sun for the majority of the day. In this context, no shading or overbearing issues will occur as a result of proposals and an appropriate and useable access and parking space can be provided.

Clearly, if the replacement tree does, in time, manage to establish itself the above will not be entirely true.

To summarise, as the car parking arrangement not only fails to conform with WBC Design Guide (June 2012) section 6 but is also basically unsafe, and the TPO tree issues have not been satisfactorily addressed, it is submitted that the application in its current form cannot be approved.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Gallagher Chairman

Emmbrook Residents Association