PLANNING REF : 260671
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 28 Sutcliffe Avenue
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG6 7JN
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Krishna Dhamorikar
DATE SUBMITTED : 11/04/2026

COMMENTS:
I am writing to formally provide comments on the proposed development at 30 Sutcliffe Avenue. As the owner and occupier of the adjoining semi detached property at No. 28, I have several material planning concerns regarding the proposal's impact on residential amenity, design balance, and long term sustainability.

1. Overshadowing and Loss of Light (45 Degree Guideline)
While my kitchen is located at the western end of my property, my primary Lounge/Dining Room is positioned on the eastern side, directly adjoining No. 30 via a party wall. This room contains principal rear facing windows that serve as a key source of natural light. The proposed single storey rear extension at No. 30 projects significantly beyond the existing rear building line. When assessed against the Council's 45 degree guideline, the proposal has not been demonstrated to preserve the daylight envelope serving the main rear windows of No. 28. No daylight or sunlight assessment has been submitted to confirm that acceptable light levels would be retained. As a result, the development risks a material loss of natural light and an increased sense of enclosure to my main living accommodation and patio area.

2. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy from Rear Dormer
The application includes a substantial rear loft dormer at the second floor level. Due to its elevated position, this element introduces a materially different relationship from existing ground floor openings. The dormer would create an elevated perception of overlooking across my private rear garden and toward rear facing windows at No. 28. Owing to its height, this impact cannot be effectively mitigated through boundary fencing and would diminish the privacy currently enjoyed by my household.

3. Cumulative Overdevelopment of a Semi Detached Dwelling

The proposal comprises a front extension, rear single storey extension, loft conversion with rear dormer, and a two storey side extension. While individual elements might appear modest in isolation, their combined scale and massing must be assessed cumulatively. Taken together, the works represent an overdevelopment of the original dwelling, resulting in a significantly bulkier form that undermines the established scale of development along this part of Sutcliffe Avenue. This conflicts with the principles within the Wokingham
Borough Design Guide, which seeks to retain proportionality and visual harmony between adjoining homes.

4. Harm to the Character and Balance of the Semi Detached Pair
Although the two storey side extension is located on the opposite side of No. 30, its scale contributes to a disproportionate overall enlargement of the dwelling. The result is a clear imbalance within the semi detached pair, with No. 30 becoming visually dominant. This erodes the coherent architectural relationship between the two properties when viewed from both the street and the rear, to the

detriment of local character.

5. Boundary Integrity and Practical Deliverability
I have recently installed a new boundary fence entirely within my own title and at my own expense. Given the proximity of the proposed rear extension to the boundary, it is important that the development is demonstrably capable of being implemented without encroachment or reliance on third party land. In particular, clarification is sought that: No foundations, footings, eaves, gutters, or other projections would encroach onto or over sail neighboring land; and The proposal does not rely on access to third party land (including No. 28) for construction or future maintenance.
The current design appears to result in a long, blank wall positioned very close to the boundary, raising concerns about future maintenance access and long term sustainability, which are relevant considerations when assessing neighborly design.

6. Impact on Future Development Potential of No. 28 The scale of the proposed rear extension and rear dormer would materially constrain the reasonable future improvement potential of No. 28 by effectively using up the available spatial and daylight envelope to the rear. This prejudicial impact on the ability to pursue future, proportionate development is a recognized material planning consideration.

Conclusion
For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the Planning Officer undertakes a site visit, including assessment from within my property at No. 28. I urge the Council to refuse the application in its current form, as it would result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity, design balance, and the character of the semi detached pair.