

PLANNING REF : 260671
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 28 Sutcliffe Av Earley
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG6 7JN
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Krishna Dhamorikar
DATE SUBMITTED : 15/05/2026

COMMENTS:

I am writing to formally provide comments regarding the revised plans submitted for the proposed development at 30 Sutcliffe Avenue. As the owner and occupier of the adjoining property at No. 28, I have reviewed the amended details and wish to maintain my strong objection to the proposal.

1. Deterioration of Design Quality (Revision A): The amended plans (Drawing 261003/03 Rev A) show a change from a pitched roof dormer to a flat roof "box" dormer. This change significantly increases the perceived mass and bulk of the roof extension. This box-like structure is architecturally unsympathetic to the character of the original semi-detached pair.

Furthermore, the recently approved development at 32 Sutcliffe Avenue sets a clear design standard for this street by using high-quality pitched-roof dormers that respect the local character. The revised proposal for No. 30 represents a significant step backward in design quality. I request that the Council holds No. 30 to the same architectural standards already established and approved at No. 32, rather than allowing a dominant box-style overdevelopment.

2. Impact on Natural Light (45-Degree Guideline): My primary Lounge and Dining area is located on the eastern side of my property, sharing a party wall with No. 30. This room relies on its rear-facing windows for natural light. The proposed single-storey rear extension at No. 30 projects deep into the garden and, based on the Proposed Site Plan (261003/04), appears to breach the 45-degree daylight envelope for my primary windows. No daylight or sunlight assessment has been provided to demonstrate that my living accommodation will not suffer a material loss of light.

3. Loss of Privacy and Elevated Overlooking: The substantial rear loft dormer at the second-floor level creates an intrusive and elevated line of sight into my private rear garden and towards my rear windows. Due to the height of the proposed structure, this loss of privacy cannot be mitigated by standard boundary fencing or landscaping.

4. Cumulative Overdevelopment and Character Imbalance: When the front, rear, and two-storey side extensions are assessed cumulatively, the proposal represents a significant overdevelopment of the original dwelling. This creates a bulkier, more dominant form that disrupts the visual harmony of the semi-detached pair. This is contrary to the Wokingham Borough Design Guide, which emphasizes proportionality between adjoining homes.

5. Boundary Integrity and Practical Deliverability: The proposed rear extension results in a long, blank flank wall positioned directly on the property boundary. I recently installed a new boundary fence entirely within my own title at my own expense. I

seek confirmation that no foundations, gutters, or eaves will encroach onto my land. Furthermore, I will not grant access to my property for the construction or future maintenance of this wall. A design that relies on third-party land for its practical deliverability and upkeep is inherently unneighbourly and unsustainable.

6. Impact on Future Development Potential

By "using up" the available spatial and daylight envelope to the rear, the scale of this proposal materially constrains the reasonable future extension potential of No. 28. This prejudicial impact is a relevant material planning consideration.

Conclusion

I respectfully request that the Planning Officer undertakes a site visit, including an assessment from the perspective of No. 28. The current proposal, particularly with the inclusion of an inferior flat-roof dormer, results in unacceptable harm to residential amenity and local character. I urge the Council to refuse the application in its current form.