

PLANNING REF : 251846
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Frankforte
: Basingstoke Road, Three Mile Cross
: RG7 1AS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Colin Boorman
DATE SUBMITTED : 31/10/2025

COMMENTS:

Colin Boorman
Frankforte
Basingstoke Road
Three Mile Cross
RG7 1AS
Wokingham Borough Council
Planning Office
Shute End
Wokingham
RG40 1WH
31st October 2025

Reference Planning Application 251846

Dear Sirs

We understand that this Planning Application has now been amended to show a single storey extension to the side and rear.

We feel we must still strongly object to this proposed development even though it is reduced in height. The majority of our initial objections remain unchanged.

We have had a look at these plans and as previously pointed out, the actual measured distance wall to wall between the existing Frankforte and Blackmoor is 5m of which 1m is within our boundary.

On the Wokingham website Site Plan, the distance between the two buildings is 6m. The previous site plan submitted by Blackmoor showed a distance of 6.5m, which was bad enough. On the site plan now submitted, this distance appears to be 7.5m; So Blackmoor now seems to have floated a further 1m south. We feel this is deliberate deception. Whilst we appreciate that you are not concerned with boundary issues, there can be no disputing of the actual distance (5m) between the walls of existing properties.

This is an overdevelopment of the site and what is proposed will still be nearly double the original building. It will also create a Terracing effect with our property and will still be overbearing. It will also alter the street appearance.

The documents submitted with this application are full of inaccuracies in the mathematics and design.

The CIL form 251846-Planning CIL Form-05082025.pdf under question 6 states a total Existing gross internal area of 149m² with 6m² to be demolished and the total gross internal area proposed will be 161.4m². This CIL form has not been updated.

However, according to the plans submitted, the existing gross internal area is actually 115m² with 2m² to be demolished and the total gross internal area proposed is 214m².

From measuring the submitted floor plans, the External dimensions are: existing 136m², to be demolished 3m² and total proposed 241.5m².

The second document 251846-Planning Statements and Reports-31072025(1).pdf.

The Design and Access statement which again has not been amended. The introduction states "to accommodate residents off the property" implying the property becoming an HMO. It will no longer be a family home.

Figure 4 shows a Garage - This garage is no longer there.

Site analysis statement

We would take issue with the whole of this statement.

? It quotes a core strategy of "providing additional family accommodation". This proposal does not provide any additional family accommodation. There is already a large 3 bedroom family home and the proposal is to increase its size by nearly 100%.

? It states "The proposals make strong and clear reference to inherit the street scene" This proposal does not meet that statement. The proposed design and siting are not in keeping with the street scene and is totally at odds with the existing distance between properties. Other extensions have been sympathetically and aesthetically designed to blend in and a reasonable distance and separation is maintained between buildings.

? This proposal looks totally out of sorts, creating a terraced look due to lack of spacing.

? The statement says "The properties configuration ensures that the proposal confirms with the daylight rules".

The overbearing nature of this proposal will greatly impact our right to enjoy light. The proposal will block the light to our property and our property will remain in its shadow.

? The statement says that "similar extensions have been done"; this is untrue. Whilst Basingstoke Road is a very long road, in this part of Basingstoke Road in Three Mile Cross, there are no similar extensions. Any extensions have been in keeping with the neighbouring properties and the spacing between the properties has been maintained.

Design Principles

We can only go on the plans submitted and measuring them by using the scale given:

? 4.1 The plans show an extension of an additional 100m² and not the 68.4m² claimed. The 68.4m², in any case, does not correspond with the CIL statement which claims only 12.4m².

But, the actual increase in internal floor area is from 115m² to 215m², an increase of 100m², which equates to 87% increase in size. The claim of an extension of 68.4m² is totally incorrect.

? 4.2 It is stated "The proposed height of the extension is 3.7m".

No update to this statement has been made and it is unclear on the plans how high this wall is intended to be, but it will be substantially higher than the existing fence.

The proposed extension is an overdevelopment of the site and by nearly doubling the size of the house, and will be overbearing on our property, cause massing, removing the spacing between the properties and overshadowing our house.

The side extension will be overbearing and totally against what we currently enjoy.

6.0 Conclusion

The conclusion attempts to refer again to a core principle of NPPF. There is currently on the site a large family house. We fail to see how nearly doubling its size and creating a larger house has any relevance to the policy of creating a "much-needed family home and is the best use of underdeveloped land". It is not creating a new house; it is just increasing the existing size by double.

The third document 251846-Planning Statements and Reports-31072025.pdf.

This Daylight and Sunlight Assessment is wrong and misleading. The diagram (Figure 1) bears little relationship to the site plan (251846-Planning Plans-31072025(2).pdf) or the plans for the extension. It is difficult to see accurately as no scale has been given, but the distance between the existing Blackmoor and Frankfort on the Site plan is 6.5m (by measuring the plan), but on this Daylight plan it appears to be 6m. However, the actual physical measured distance (wall to wall) is 5m.

The application under No. 251574 was indeed for an 8m rear extension single storey and we had no objections. This application is for a single storey 5m rear extension and a single storey side extension, which will create a terracing effect.

Blackmoor is to the South side of us and therefore any sunlight comes from that direction; this proposal will have a drastic impact on the amount of daylight and sunlight that we will receive.

The current 5m distance between our houses allows sunlight to come to our house. This extension will create a small dark corridor of space between the houses and it will obscure the sunlight to our house.

Instead of the 5m distance between the houses we will end up with a small dark corridor of space which would be unacceptable.

With regard to the internal plans and external elevations - 251846-Planning Plans-17092025(1).pdf and 251846-Planning Plans-17092025(2).pdf

We have the following observations:

The proposed side extension is still 5.1m wide, yet there is only a 5m gap between the two houses of which 1m is within our property.

The side extension proposed will therefore be impossible to build without coming onto our property and taking our land.

In conclusion, this proposal:

- ? Does not provide additional housing despite claims to do so
- ? Is an overdevelopment, over-massing of the plot and overbearing on our home
- ? Is unsightly and not in keeping with the street scene
- ? Will create a Terracing effect and contrary to the current mix of houses
- ? Will cause a breach of our right to light and will stop us enjoying our property
- ? Is littered with inaccuracies, mis-measurements and claims that are contradictory
- ? The Claimed Existing Internal area is 149m²; in reality it is 115m²
- ? The Claimed Internal amount to be demolished is 6m²; in reality it is 2m²
- ? The Total proposed Internal Area is claimed to be 161.4m²; in reality it will be 215m².

We trust this application will be refused.

Yours faithfully
Mr & Mrs C Boorman