

HITCHAM AND TAPLOW

PRESERVATION SOCIETY

NEWS LETTER No. 28

SPRING, 1974

PRESIDENT

Dr. M. A. T. Rogers, Ph.d.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

Mr. G. P. Ashwell, C.C.
Mr. J. Martineau
Mr. A. J. Page, M.P.
Mr. E. J. Perkins

CHAIRMAN

Mr. C. I. Snow,
Riverclose,
Ellington Road,
Taplow, Nr.Maidenhead,
Berkshire.
(Tel: Maidenhead 20912)

SECRETARY

Mrs. H. E. Huddart,
6 Wellbank,
Taplow, Nr.Maidenhead,
Berkshire.
(Tel: Burnham 3426)

TREASURER

Mr. J. M. R. Stewart Fry,
Hitcham Close,
Hitcham Lane,
Taplow,
Maidenhead SL6 OHG.
(Tel: Burnham 2917)

COMMITTEE

Mr. B. Durham
Mrs. A. Hanford
Mr. H. Hancock
Dr. N. W. Hanson (Committee Secretary)
Mr. L. Lee
Mr. R. J. Lewis
Mr. R. Sneyd

PLANNING APPLICATIONSAPPEALS NOTIFIED

Institute Road, Land adjoining garage - application for parking cars.

'Penwortham', Wymers Wood Road - Application for ten houses.

'The Poplars', Old Marsh Lane, Taplow - Residential development.

Norfolk House, Bath Road - After the rejection by the ERDC of a plan to demolish the existing house and build six new ones a further application was made to build three of the same area as the existing ones; this was also rejected but an appeal has been made.

PLANNING ITEMS PREVIOUSLY REPORTED

The following decisions of the ERDC have been notified -

Hitcham Grange, land at - Demolition of existing residential buildings and re-development of site at four dwellings per acre - Rejected. The Committee wrote to the ERDC objecting to this development.

Poyle Farm - Demolition of existing dwellings and erection of 22 residential houses - Rejected.

Poyle Lane, land on North side - Demolition of farm buildings and residential development - Outline application rejected.

Land by 'Buffins' - Residential development with cul-de-sac from Hill Farm Road. Outline application rejected.

Dropmore Road, - Erection of bungalow with garage 108/110 Dropmore Road - Outline application rejected.

Maidenhead Autos, - Erection of illuminated fascia - Conditional consent.

Lent Rise Service Station, - Illuminated sign - Conditional consent.

Allotment fencing, Boundary Road - Contravention of planning control. The ERDC is considering what enforcement action to take.

The Croft, Ellington Road - The ERDC resolved that an Established Use Certificate should not be granted in respect of letting of furnished rooms.

Odds Farm Caravan Site, Wooburn Common - Proposed sewage disposal plant - Conditional permission; also four month extension of site licence condition requiring site work to be completed March 31st 1974.

Taplow House, - Negotiations are now in hand with a private purchaser.

NEW ITEMS

Your Committee has considered more than the average number of applications related to Taplow since the last Newsletter. The only ones calling for any action were -

Maidenhead Autos, - Application for flagpoles opposed on grounds of being out of keeping with the neighbourhood - Subsequently rejected by the ERDC.

Cedar Cottage, Heathfield Road, - Application for extension opposed on grounds of disproportionate size of proposed extension relative to existing cottage. This application was rejected by the ERDC since when a new application has been submitted.

Taplow House, land adjacent - Application for additional house opposed on grounds of increased density on site - Subsequently rejected by the ERDC.

TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

An order has been made to preserve three horse chestnut trees in the garden of White Place, River Road. Members may be interested in the following notes on the topic.

The Preservation of Trees

Taplow is graced by many fine trees, so many indeed that your Committee had difficulty in finding a site where planting could be justified to mark the Tree Planting Year of 1973. For the same reason the protection of existing trees is a matter of great importance, and the decision of the Parish Council to survey the Parish and seek Tree Preservation Orders where necessary is to be welcomed.

There are two sets of legislation concerning trees. The earlier, the Forestry Acts, are primarily concerned with the management of forests in which felling is necessary both to remove dangerous trees and to encourage new growth. Such Acts however have little application in Taplow, which is more concerned with the post-war Planning Acts such as the Town and Country Planning Act of 1962. This recognises the contribution that trees make to amenity, and sets out to prevent the wilful destruction, felling, lopping and topping of trees and woodlands with amenity value without the permission of the Local Planning Authority (until April 1974 the Bucks County Council). Such permission can of course be given if trees become dangerous, as was the case recently in Mill Lane near its junction with Berry Hill. The penalty for the destruction of a tree so protected, or the topping or lopping carried out in such a way as to be likely to destroy it, without such consent is up to £250 or twice the value of the tree - whichever is the greater - and the owner of the land has a duty to plant another tree of appropriate size and species at the same place as soon as he reasonably can. And nowadays quite large trees can be transported and planted.

To enforce such control it is necessary to specify as clearly as possible which trees are protected by reference to a map. For single trees the species must be given and the tree shown on the map by a black circle which is serially numbered. Groups of trees can be shown by a line around their boundary, and though individual trees need not be identified, the number of each species must be shown (e.g. 3 oak, 2 ash, and 3 elm). Avenues and woodlands are identified in the same way.

Scattered trees may occur in parkland or in roadside strips or mixed hedgerows. Where these are too many for individual identification, the area concerned may be specified; though this may reduce considerably the work involved in preparing Tree Preservation Orders, it may lead to the inclusion of trees not worthy of protection and to problems in proceedings against contravention in proving that a specified tree was in the area when the Order was made.

The Local Planning Authority has to satisfy itself that trees suggested for protection have sufficient amenity value to justify it. They must notify the owner of the land, and any person known to be authorised to work on the land, such as by surface mineral extraction, who are entitled to object to the Minister within 28 days. Considerable correspondence and negotiation may be involved.

The penalties of £250 or twice the value of the tree were laid down some time ago and might seem small at current prices. If these were increased to allow for inflation, Tree Preservation Orders, as described above would seem, if properly enforced, to provide a reasonably satisfactory procedure for protecting our trees.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

The report by the Noise Advisory Council's Working Group on the use of Minimum Noise Routes has just been published. No new evidence has emerged to change the policy of MNR's and the report states that the routes should become a permanent feature of the planning system. However the report accepts that there may be situations where noise disturbance is so high as to justify a further examination of this policy.

One of these special situations is the Burnham route and the report considers that the modification which came into effect on October 11th 1973 was justified and recommends that it be made permanent.
