

PLANNING REF : 252344
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 10 Retford Close
: Woodley, Berks
: RG5 4TP
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Colin Thomas
DATE SUBMITTED : 24/10/2025

COMMENTS:

1. We object to the loss of light and overbearing impact upon the enjoyment and value of No 10, the property directly to the south. Using the statutory 45 rule from windows at both floors on the rear elevation of No 10, the two storey extension will block daylight to both floors of No 10. The architects or developers of No 11 need to demonstrate this is not the case.
2. Aside from this rule, we object to the extension at First floor over the existing garage extending any further to the east/rear than the existing rear elevation of the main house.
3. There is a mature oak tree to the north west of No 11, which may be under a tree preservation order, but is at least fifty years old. The architects or developers of No 11 need to demonstrate the view of this Oak from the rear of the First or Ground floor of No 10 is not significantly changed by their proposals.
4. We are concerned regarding noise pollution to the reception room, the rear north bedroom and the often used patio in the northwest of the garden of No 10 from the proposed habitable spaces at the rear of the Ground and First floor extensions to the garage.
5. We strongly object to having a window in the south wall of the Ground floor extension to the rear of the garage, from the proposed utility room. Even though the window is shown as 'fixed shut' and obscured, there is no guarantee this will remain the case in the future. Alternative means to ventilate the utility area should be sought as we would not accept a vent through this south elevation.
6. Number 11 forms part of a small enclave of houses built in the 1970s which has matured nicely and largely remained unchanged over the years. The proposal alters the brickwork facades, which are typical of the road, to render and timber 'style' cladding materials which are alien to the setting. The result is a bulky design which is insensitive to the setting and negatively impacts the amenity of number 10. We particularly strongly object to the use of render on the south elevations. These should be brick, in keeping with all other elevations visible from the rear of No 10.
7. The proposal extends the foot print of No 11 to close proximity to the boundary with No 10. It is not clear what proposal exists for maintaining No 11 adjacent to this boundary between number 10 and 11 and the drawings generally fail to address relationships to their neighbours except in simple outlines. The architects or developers of No 11 need to confirm how maintenance to the gutters and built fabric of No 11 will be achieved without access from number 10. Previously the build boundary was limited to the garage which was a flat roof, readily accessed by the homeowner with storm water discharging to the east/rear. Furthermore, they need to clarify that discharge of storm water from the south side of the main roof will not encroach beyond the site boundary with No 10, where it could have a detrimental effect on the foundations of north elevation wall of No 10.
8. Please note that site boundary on the location plan and floor plans is incorrect. To the west, the site boundary is shown as

presumably along the south east edge of the access drive to No 11 and 12. The position shown of this line is incorrect and currently extends across a good deal of the north west corner of the front garden of No 10. The access drive is actually broadly parallel-sided rather than

widening towards Nos 11 and 12.

Furthermore, the site boundary between the buildings of No 10 and 11 was built some fifty years ago as the face of the south elevation of the existing garage, continuing along this line to the east as the garden fence. There is therefore precedent for its current actual location. All the drawings submitted by the architects or developers of No 11 incorrectly show this boundary as half way between the south elevation of the garage of No 11 and the north elevation of the house at No 10. These need to be corrected. A result of this correction will require consideration by the architects and developers of No 11 of demolition and construction techniques directly against the site boundary. Party wall issues will also require consideration such that the foundations for the new garage and its extension cannot encroach beyond the site boundary, which is the face of the south elevation of the existing garage.