

PLANNING REF : 261179
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 2
: Elmwood Close, Reading, Berks
: RG5 3AL
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Lisa Lewis
DATE SUBMITTED : 07/06/2026

COMMENTS:

This is the 4th application we have had to deal with regarding the rebuild of the bungalow at 108 Reading Road ; the first Jan 2025 was withdrawn, the second August 2025 was approved by a sole planner named HMM despite our objection and the objection of the Town Council and other neighbours. The third application in Oct 2025 nod 252525

sought variations of the second to provide and I quote from the statement lodged with the application :

- "Enlargement of the rear dormer to improve internal bedroom layout and usability
- Removal of the rear roof terrace, previously approved, to simplify the design and enhance privacy"

Application 252525 went on to state and I quote

"Reduced Impact on Neighbours: The removal of the rear terrace eliminates any potential for overlooking or loss of privacy.

Although the original design included privacy screens, this revision removes the need for mitigation entirely."

We did not object to 252525, as it respected our privacy. It showed 2 windows at the rear.

This fourth application relates to so many planning breaches that they are trying to rectify. We are sure you have seen them all.

The applicant claims this application is a small deviation but to us it is in fact a significant one, it shows doors at the rear of the first floor and seeks to add back the roof terrace despite the applicant having recognised it "overlooked" and affected neighbours privacy. Privacy screens have been proposed, however they do not mitigate the impact of noise and loss of privacy.

We haven't seen any other houses on Reading Road with 2 large balconies. We do not want people looking at us from balconies/roof terraces when we are enjoying the privacy of our home. We said before our ground level is about 4 feet lower than the road level so when in our house or garden this building is quite imposing.

Due to the clear breaches of the planning conditions and continual revisions we are now left with a building which, and I would like to quote the first Woodley town councillors comments at the public meeting, is "an Abomination" the building is overbearing, not in keeping with other properties along Reading Road or Elmwood Close which it now dominates and this further revision greatly affects the privacy of several Elmwood Close and nearby properties.

HMM did not properly consider the Woodley Town Councils comments last time when they said they objected to the application, for the same reasons as before. HMM stated it was a separate application. We therefore find it strange that the applicant is quoting all 3 live applications in his supporting statement.

Loss of amenity and enjoyment of our home (which was there first) should be taken in to account. Roof terraces are an added luxury.

There is plenty of garden area to sit in the sun. Planning rules exist to balance someone's desire to expand their home, against the living standards of their neighbours. We have not been able to enjoy our home since this commenced.