



# SUNNINGDALE PARISH COUNCIL

The Pavilion, Broomhall Lane, Sunningdale, SL5 0QS

☎ 01344 874268

Email: [info@sunningdaleparish.org.uk](mailto:info@sunningdaleparish.org.uk)

[www.sunningdale-pc.org.uk](http://www.sunningdale-pc.org.uk)

Clerk: Ruth Davies

Josey Short  
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  
Town Hall, St Ives Road  
Maidenhead, Berks SL6 1RF

27<sup>th</sup> May 2020

Dear Josey

**20/00691/FULL 21 Greenways Drive Sunningdale Ascot SL5 9QS**

## **Construction of x1 dwelling.**

The earlier application, 19/00022 was refused due to the size and bulk of the proposed building and the impact of that building on TPO trees.

Whilst slight repositioning of the building as well as a change in design are noted, the area is characterised by individual dwellings situated on spacious plots.

This design, mass, and bulk, whilst an improvement on the previous application, are still at variance with the surrounding area and therefore conflict with **NP/DG2 and NP/DG3**.

It is the impact of the dwelling on a number of TPO trees on the site as well as the impact on trees on an adjacent site that also give the Parish Council concern.

1. T3 is a category A, 24-metre-high oak tree which is situated in the neighbouring property, No 20. The canopy of this tree will be within metres of the front of the proposed house. As the tree is directly East of the proposed dwelling it will therefore cast a shadow over almost every front window of the house throughout the morning. There could therefore be considerable pressure to prune this tree as it continues to grow in order to maximise natural light in the habitable rooms of the house. Section 2.4 of the arboricultural report suggests that '*modest pruning*' of this tree must be undertaken. The same report also states, '*pruning back of the canopy*' and the need to '*reduce back overhang by 2 to 3 metres*' (table 1, page 6). Bedroom 5 on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor only receives natural light from 4 small Velux windows (2 facing East and 2 facing West) so this room will be especially affected by shadow from T3 in the morning.
2. T5 (oak, 17 metre height, category C1) and T6 (beech, 17-metre-high, category B) are also very close and to the side elevation of the proposed building. Their location to the South East would indicate that the four windows on the South elevation will be extremely close to the canopy of these trees.
3. T2 is a category B, 23-metre-high oak tree situated in No 20 but with its RPA and canopy directly over the proposed new vehicle access drive for the building. There must be concern about the intended construction method for this drive and the almost inevitable interference with the roots of this oak tree. This driveway is also the only access point for the site so all construction vehicles will be using this route.

4. Section 3.3 of the arboriculturally report mentions hand digging near RPA's and the necessity of using forks and spades in such circumstances indicating that such work is required. It is assumed that this refers to the method envisaged for the drive. This is a construction method that has previously not received favourable support from RBWM and is likely to be very difficult to manage and even harder to enforce.

The trees mentioned above can be seen in the site plan below.



Given all the above, the Parish Council maintains that the proposed design conflicts with policies H11 and NP/ DG1.

However, The Parish Council request the Tree Team comment if they are in agreement that the pruning works proposed to T3 are acceptable; that the driveway (and its construction) will not damage the RPA of T2 and that height of T3, T5 and T6 will not restrict natural daylight to the habitable rooms of the house.

If there is **any doubt**, then the application should be **REFUSED**.

Regards

Yvonne Jacklin and Michael Burn  
Co-Chairs of Planning