

PLANNING REF : 260555
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 51 Paddock Heights
: Twyford, Berkshire
: RG10 0AP
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Rachel Louchart
DATE SUBMITTED : 12/04/2026

COMMENTS:

The proposed extensive restructuring of 53 Paddock Heights raises a few concerns in relation to the property remaining in keeping with the local area. We are surrounded by largely single storey bungalows at the top end of Paddock Heights and with mainly elderly residents. We are 1 exception and bought 51 in 2012 and the footprint of our property was already a chalet bungalow with the second storey when it was bought off plan and erected in 1955. It shares part of the building with number 49 and remains in keeping with the original plans. Whilst we extended our property to accommodate our growing family, the floorplan did not extend significantly in keeping with the local area. This reflected the land registry requirements and deeds that also suggested that single storey buildings within the vicinity were not permitted to extend upwards and with some restrictions to sideways extensions. The proposed extensive plans for 53 do not seem to reflect a single elderly residents dwelling and more of an onward sale opportunity misaligned with the local resident and community requirements. The plans suggest that no extended parking arrangements or removal of hedges would be required and yet the 3 car parking spaces detailed far exceeds the available space currently and where a hedge curves around part of the front of the property. 3 (or even 2) cars will cross over the available boundary into 51. This will presumably require local authority permissions for an extended drop curve and removal of the hedge or otherwise cause congestion with our existing shared drop curve. The existing space at the side of the property and in between the dwelling and the new boundary fencing, put in place by us prior to the new resident moving in, is about 2 to 2.5 metres. By extending sideways into this space, the extended dwelling appears to leave at least 1 metre of space between the wall and the fence panel. I believe this is inaccurate and that the new wall will meet the existing panels. If this is accurate, it would only be extending the side of the property by about 1 metre which does not seem aligned to the proposed plans for additional rooms throughout the property. Overall, it seems like a complete re-build of a single storey bungalow to become an extensive dwelling not in keeping with the adjoining or adjacent properties and that may contravene existing rights of way without accurate details shared in the proposed plans.

COMMENTS:

The proposed extensive restructuring of 53 Paddock Heights raises a few concerns in relation to the property remaining in keeping with the local area. We are surrounded by largely single storey bungalows at the top end of Paddock Heights and with mainly elderly residents. We are 1 exception and bought 51 in 2012 and the footprint of our property was already a chalet bungalow with the second storey when it was bought off plan and erected in 1955. It shares part of the building with number 49 and remains in keeping with the original plans. Whilst we extended our property to accommodate our growing family, the floorplan did not extend significantly in keeping with

the local area. This reflected the land registry requirements and deeds that also suggested that single storey buildings within the vicinity were not permitted to extend upwards and with some restrictions to sideways extensions. The proposed extensive plans for 53 do not seem to reflect a single elderly residents dwelling and more of an onward sale opportunity misaligned with the local resident and community requirements. The plans suggest that no extended parking arrangements or removal of hedges would be required and yet the 3 car parking spaces detailed far exceeds the available space currently and where a hedge curves around part of the front of the property. 3 (or even 2) cars will cross over the available boundary into 51. This will presumably require local authority permissions for an extended drop curve and removal of the hedge or otherwise cause congestion with our existing shared drop curve. The existing space at the side of the property and in between the dwelling and the new boundary fencing, put in place by us prior to the new resident moving in, is about 2 to 2.5 metres. By extending sideways into this space, the extended dwelling appears to leave at least 1 metre of space between the wall and the fence panel. I believe this is inaccurate and that the new wall will meet the existing panels. If this is accurate, it would only be extending the side of the property by about 1 metre which does not seem aligned to the proposed plans for additional rooms throughout the property. Overall, it seems like a complete re-build of a single storey bungalow to become an extensive dwelling not in keeping with the adjoining or adjacent properties and that may contravene existing rights of way without accurate details shared in the proposed plans.