

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 252634

44 Proctors Road

Submitted by: Owner/Occupier, 42 Proctors Road

Date: 22 December 2025

I am registering a formal objection to planning application **252634** relating to **44 Proctors Road**, which directly affects my home at **No. 42 Proctors Road**.

I am not opposed to development, change or contemporary design in principle. However, as the occupier of the only independent neighbouring property directly affected, this proposal would have a **material and harmful impact on my living conditions, outlook, and enjoyment of my home and garden**, and would significantly harm the character and appearance of the street.

1. Harm to Street Scene, Sense of Place and Local Character

(Personal impact supported by Core Strategy Policy CP3 and NPPF)

As a long-term resident of Proctors Road, I value the **consistent scale, spacing and visual balance** that defines the street. The proposal would result in a **substantially enlarged dwelling that is out of character with both the immediate street scene and the wider vicinity**. Its cumulative front, side and rear extensions would create an **incongruous and visually dominant building** that would disrupt the established rhythm of development.

This change would affect me directly. The outlook from my home and garden would be transformed from one defined by balanced neighbouring buildings to one dominated by a **significantly over-scaled structure**, undermining my sense of place and the enjoyment I currently derive from my property.

This is contrary to **Core Strategy Policy CP3**, which requires development to reinforce local character, respect established form and avoid harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

At a national level, the proposal conflicts with **NPPF paragraph 135**, which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and history (135(c)) and to represent good architecture that contributes positively to its surroundings (135(b)). While innovation and change are supported in principle, this proposal does not represent sympathetic or high-quality design in its context.

2. Excessive Scale, Massing and Built Form – Personal Impact

(CP3 and Borough Design Guide – read alongside Section 1)

The harm described above arises directly from the **excessive scale and cumulative massing** of the proposed extensions and how they would be experienced from my property at No. 42.

The proposal includes two-storey extensions to the front, side and rear of the property, together with a large single-storey sunroom with roof lantern. Crucially, the proposed two-storey side extension does **not merely sit above the existing linked garage**, but **extends the original built form forward of the principal elevation and rearwards beyond the original rear wall**.

From my home and garden, this would result in a **much larger and deeper building mass running alongside my boundary**, significantly increasing the sense of dominance and visual intrusion. The extension would not read as subordinate to the original house; instead, it would appear as a **dominant and overbearing addition**, fundamentally altering the proportions of the host dwelling and my experience of the space around my own property.

The cumulative enlargement on all principal elevations would create a building that is **far larger than the original dwelling and any comparable property in Proctors Road**, and this scale would be directly felt in terms of outlook, enclosure and visual presence when viewed from my garden and rear-facing rooms.

This form of development fails to respect the established scale and character of the street and causes direct harm to my residential environment, contrary to **Core Strategy Policy CP3** and the **Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD**, which require extensions to remain subordinate and to respond positively to their context.

3. Disproportionate Scale and Overdevelopment of the Plot

(Personal impact supported by CP3, WBDG SPD and NPPF)

The proposal would result in a **disproportionate level of built development relative to the size and character of the plot**, which would be directly experienced from my property at No. 42.

By extending the dwelling to the front, side and rear, the cumulative footprint and volume would significantly reduce the sense of space around the building. From my home and garden, this would be perceived as an **intensified and**

visually dominant form of development, increasing enclosure and reducing openness along the shared boundary.

This level of development goes beyond what the plot can reasonably accommodate without harm. The scale and extent of the extensions would overwhelm the original dwelling and its setting, resulting in a form of **overdevelopment** that conflicts with **Core Strategy Policy CP3**, which requires development to be appropriate to its site and context and to avoid harm to neighbouring amenity.

The proposal also conflicts with the **Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD**, which seeks to ensure that extensions remain proportionate to both the host dwelling and the plot, and with the **NPPF**, which requires development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area rather than detract from it.

4. Failure to Respect Established Building Lines

(Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD – Paragraph 4.5 R7)

The street is characterised by a **coherent but staggered building line**, which contributes positively to its appearance and sense of space.

The **Wokingham Borough Design Guide**, paragraph **4.5 R7**, requires development to:

“Define the street space with a coherent building line that relates to existing building lines where they form a positive characteristic of the area.”

The application presents misleading comparisons with neighbouring properties. Due to the staggered layout of the street:

- The properties cited do not extend as far forward and rearward in combination
- Where front extensions exist, they do not project to the same depth and are not two-storey
- The sunroom footprint is omitted from the Site Plan and Location & Block Plan, understating the true extent of development

As a result, the proposal would create a **dominant and incongruous projection** that fails to respect the established building line and would be clearly noticeable from my property and the wider street.

5. Plans and Scale – Clarification

I understand that planning law only requires drawings to be to scale, and that scaled drawings can technically be measured using appropriate software. While this means the application may be valid in principle, the **omission of the sunroom from key plans** materially undermines the ability of neighbours and decision-makers to fully understand the proposal and its true impact.

At a minimum, **accurate plans showing the full footprint of all proposed development**, including the sunroom, should be required before the application is determined.

6. Harm to Residential Amenity

(Personal impact supported by CP3 and WBDG SPD)

The proposal would cause significant harm to my residential amenity at No. 42 in the following ways:

a) Overbearing and enclosing impact

I have a **relatively small rear garden**. The introduction of a **long, two-storey flank elevation close to the boundary** would create an oppressive and enclosing sense of development, materially reducing my enjoyment of both my garden and rear-facing rooms. The sun room is of a permanent brick built construct (unlike the glass conservatory at number 48 on the plans), and although single storey, will still sit above the fence line and extend to almost half the depth of my garden.

b) Loss of daylight and sunlight

The height and depth of the two-storey extensions would reduce daylight and sunlight to my side elevation (front and rear), habitable rooms, and garden particularly during key parts of the day.

c) Loss of outlook and visual openness

Rear gardens currently contribute to the area's open and landscaped character. The scale of the proposed rear extension would erode this openness and replace it with a dominant built form experienced directly from my home.

These impacts are contrary to **Core Strategy Policy CP3** and the **Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD**, both of which seek to protect neighbouring amenity and avoid overbearing or oppressive forms of development.

7. Precedent and Cumulative Harm

Allowing extensions of this scale on all elevations would establish an **undesirable precedent** for similar overdevelopment along the street. The cumulative effect of such development would risk eroding the established character of Proctors Road, which the **NPPF recognises as a material consideration**.

8. Concern Regarding Future Intensification

The enlarged building envelope and inclusion of rooflights strongly suggest that the dwelling is being designed to facilitate future roof-space accommodation. While not part of this application, the **potential for further intensification is a legitimate concern**, particularly where the current proposal already exceeds what the plot can reasonably accommodate.

9. Neighbour Representation Context

The applicant owns the adjoining property at No. 46. As a result, **No. 42 is the only independent neighbouring property directly affected**, and the absence of comments from No. 46 should not be interpreted as evidence that the proposal is acceptable.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above — including **harm to street scene and local character, excessive scale and massing, overbearing impact on my home and garden, failure to respect established building lines, and the risk of cumulative harm** — I respectfully request that **planning application 252634** be refused.

At a minimum, the application should not be determined until **accurate plans showing the full extent of all proposed development, including the sunroom, are submitted and properly assessed**.

Yours faithfully,
J L Pearce
Owner/Occupier, 42 Proctors Road