



SUNNINGDALE PARISH COUNCIL

The Pavilion, Broomhall Lane, Sunningdale, SL5 0QS

☎ 01344 874268

Email: info@sunningdaleparish.org.uk

www.sunningdale-pc.org.uk

Clerk: Ruth Davies

Jo Richards
Planning Officer
RBWM
Town Hall
Maidenhead

29 August 2019

Dear Jo

19/02204/FULL | New silt-traps, filtration reed beds, ponds, swales, timber jetty, two bridges and boardwalks. | Broadlands Bagshot Road Ascot SL5 9JN

The Planning Committee considered this application at its meeting on 27th August 2019, and **objects** to this application.

The site comprises of hundreds of trees which are TPO protected under the Broadlands site TPO dated 20 January 2003.

The Parish Council would like to make the following comments about the trees.

1. There are significant numbers of trees that are shown together under group categories in the attachment titled 'Full Tree Work'. For example, Category W001 extends the complete length of the west side of the site. All trees within W001 are categorised by the Z prefix. There are over 80 trees shown just within the group W001 including oak, chestnut, beech, Scots pine and lime. However, none of these trees are individually categorised with their heights, age or tree category listed. They appear under the Schedule Of Trees with the comment '*Re-inspect in September 2019 and undertake felling and tree work as specified on drawing no. 7034-D-TW*' However, inspection of drawing no. 7034-D-TW, a section of which is shown below, states that various works including felling are **already** recommended to many of those trees within W001.

Z309	Beech	Trifurcates at circa. 3.5m, union partially included. Major deadwood. Stem cavities. Reduced vigour. Branch tip dysfunction - not significant. Proposed work - Monitor annually (vigour). Priority 3.
Z321	Sweet Chestnut	Bifurcates at circa. 2.5m, Almost dead, Proposed work - Reduce to 7m monolith. Priority 3.
Z323	Hornbeam	Bifurcates at circa. 5m above ground level. Significant cavity and stem decay at union, Proposed work - reduce crown by 5m, Priority 3.
Z326	Sweet Chestnut	Bark necrosis on tension side, no active decay beneath. Dead upper canopy. Proposed work - reduce to 8m monolith. Priority 3.
Z327	False Acacia	Significant stem cavity and decay from base to circa. 4m. Notable branch failure. Major deadwood. Proposed work - reduce to 7m monolith. Priority 3.
Z328	False Acacia	Significant cavity from ground level to circa. 7m, Hollow, Root heaved and resting in adjacent Sweet Chestnut. Proposed work - Fell. Priority 2.
Z331	Sweet Chestnut	Bark necrosis from ground to 8m, Hollow lower stem, Dead upper canopy, Proposed work - reduce to 8m monolith. Priority 3.
Z341	Corsican Pine	Twin stemmed. Poor taper. Etiolated crown. Proposed work - Reassess suitability for retention following removal of Z343.
Z343	Corsican Pine	Twin stemmed from circa. 2m above ground level, significant bark inclusion. Not considered suitable to reduce and brace. Proposed work - Fell. Priority 2.
Z344	Beech	Large stem cavities north / north eastern aspect, most likely coalescing with large Ganoderma bracket at circa. 5m above ground level on opposite side of stem. Large wound South eastern aspect circa. 8m with old Ganoderma brackets. Fusing stems above. Proposed work - reduce to 8m monolith. Priority 2.
Z353	Sweet Chestnut	Dead upper canopy. Proposed work - reduce to 8m monolith. Priority 3.
Z354	Sweet Chestnut	Almost dead, Proposed work - reduce to 7m monolith, Priority 3.
Z364	Beech	Root heaved and hung up in adjacent tree. Proposed work - Fell. Priority 2.
Z365	Beech	Stem lean. Significant stem cavity with decay. Spalling evident. Proposed work - reduce to 8m monolith. Priority 3.

The Parish Council strongly request that these trees are individually categorised, assessed for height, age, classification etc and further assessed by the Tree Officer before any works are authorised. If a tree reinspection is planned for September 2019 it is surely reasonable to ask why the planning application was not postponed until after this inspection rather than specifying works beforehand?

2. Other groups of trees for example, W003 close to the house have works specified such as Z240 (beech) and Z243 (hornbeam). They are both categorised as '*requiring secondary investigation or fell*'. We are unsure how this description can be applicable to TPO trees as it allows for felling without any further investigation. Again, there is no indication of height, age or condition of the trees.
3. Group G009 situated west of Group W003 comprises of 6 Scots Pine trees, 22 metres high, of which 2 (Z298 and Z301) are shown for '*secondary investigation or fell*.'
4. The above comments are also applicable to the other groups of trees on the site, eg G001, G0055, W002, G015 etc
5. The plan (Drawing no: BRO 6.0.07, REV:C) showing the watercourse linking the two ponds contains the phrase '*Avenue of trees may need to be lifted prior to construction and re-*

planted in the same place'. The Parish Council is unsure how this action might be realistically achieved.

6. The extensive boardwalk itself must be close to the RPA of many trees. However, the plans do not appear to clearly show if its route compromises any of these RPA's
7. The Parish Council have some concerns about some other trees with a T prefix.
 - a. T011, a 27 metre high oak, category U. Action: undertake secondary investigation
 - b. T013, a 24 metre high cedar, category U. Action: undertake secondary investigation
 - c. T014, a 21 metre high western hemlock, category U. Action: fell
 - d. T063, a 13.5 metre high oak, category U. Action: relocate seat if tree to be retained

All the above trees are situated south of and very close the main house except T063 which is situated on its own further south. Given the height and specification of these TPO trees the Parish Council request that the Tree Officer review the findings of the proposed '*secondary investigations*' mentioned above before authorising any tree works.

Given the number of TPO trees on the site and the extensive plans for landscaping the Parish Council strongly request that the Tree Officer visit the site to ascertain the intended plans proposed for all individual trees. We would hope that this might then clarify some of the anomalies stated above.

Also, another concern is that the area is described as 'undeveloped' and as such there is likely to be a variety of existing wildlife which may need to be considered. We recommend that the applicant provides an Ecological Appraisal for this site.

The same comment applies to Archaeological implications for these works.

We ask you to **reject** this application.

Yours sincerely

Michael Burn
Chair Planning Committee