PLANNING REF : 262554
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Parkhill
: Church Lane, Arborfield Berkshire, Berkshire
: RG29JA
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Andrew Braysher
DATE SUBMITTED : 23/11/2026

COMMENTS:
Formal Objection to Retrospective Planning Application Number 262554

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to this retrospective planning application for the retention of a summer house and associated flat-roofed linking structure adjacent to the boundary of my property.

Before setting out my objections to this retrospective application I would highlight a few inaccuracies within the application itself

Drawing number ATC-GS-06 is incorrect the Hedge is on Parkhill property not Apple Tree Cottage property so any measurements should be taken from the centre of the hedge
Distance from the centre of the hedge to the summerhouse is 64 centimeters
Distance from the outer edge of the hedge to the summerhouse is 15 centimeters
The height of the hedge is 2.4 meters

The Summerhouse stands at approximately 4 meters in height and has been constructed only a few centimeters from the established boundary hedge separating our properties. In addition, a flat-roofed linking structure connecting the buildings is also only a few centimeters from the boundary thereby increasing the overall bulk, massing and visual prominence of the development.

To construct the summerhouse two trees were removed whilst doing the original house extension these trees were numbers 12 and 13 as detailed in the Ligna report which was included in the original planning consent number 232075, this we understand goes against the conditions linked to the application.

Of particular concern is the fact that both the summerhouse and the flat roofed linking structure are within 2 meters of the boundary, generally these are limited to a maximum height of 2.5 meters under permitted development provisions. The summer house stands at 4 meters and well exceeds this benchmark by approximately 1.5 meters whilst being positioned only centimeters from the boundary.

Whilst this application seeks retrospective planning permission, the extent to which the development exceeds the normal permitted development threshold demonstrates the excessive scale of the structure in such a sensitive boundary location.

The development has created a highly dominant and overbearing feature along our shared boundary. Rather than appearing as a modest ancillary garden building, the combined effect of the summer house and

connecting structure is that of a substantial and continuous building extending along our boundary line.

The visual impact from my garden is significant and materially greater than would reasonably be expected between neighbouring residential properties.

The scale, height and siting of the development have resulted in a harmful sense of enclosure and have adversely affected the outlook from my property. The structure appears oppressive when viewed from my garden and disrupts the previously open and landscaped character of the boundary.

I am also concerned about the impact upon the established boundary hedge. The structures have been erected only a few centimeters away from the hedge, leaving little or no practical space for proper maint enance. This raises concerns regarding the future health, management and retention of a mature boundary feature that contributes positively to the character, appearance and privacy of both properties. The close proximity of the buildings may ultimately place pressure on the hedge to be cut back or removed, resulting in further harm to neighbouring
amenity.

The National Planning Policy Framework places considerable importance on achieving developments that are sympathetic to their surroundings and provide a good standard of amenity for existing and future
occupiers. In my view, this development fails to meet those objectives. Its excessive height, massing and immediate proximity to the boundary result in material harm to us the neighbouring property

Forthe reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the Council refuses this retrospective application. The development is visually intrusive, overbearing in its relationship with us the neighbouring property, harmful to the character of the boundary and detrimental to the reasonable enjoyment of my property.

Should however you be minded to approve the application, I request that a site visit be undertaken from my property first so that the full impact of the development can be properly assessed fromthe perspective of the affected neighbour.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew Braysher
Parkhill
Church Lane
Arborfield
Berkshire
RG29JA