

Objection Letter to Planning Ref: 252366

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 2 Northbury Avenue, Ruscombe, Berkshire, RG10 9LG

SUBMITTED BY: Mrs Rachel Craig

DATE SUBMITTED: 12/11/2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the Householder Planning Application Ref: 252366 for reasons outlined below. The overriding summary of this objection is that the application does not comply with the Policies of the Wokingham Core Strategy (Adopted 2010) which, although out of date, remains the primary framework upon which planning applications should be assessed. My reasons for objections are as follows:

1. Character of the Area (Policy CP3 – General Principles of Development)

Policy CP3 suggests that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that:

- *Are of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and the character to the area together with a high quality design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life*

The proposal represents a significant increase in the overall size of the property, with particular reference to the large rear dormer and single storey rear extension. The proposed dormer is a single, cumbersome structure that is inappropriately large for the roofscape and demonstrates a poor design and in contrast with the established pattern of properties along London Road. These properties feature smaller, more sympathetic dormer in their roofscapes that are visually proportionate and subordinate to the main roof, establishing a key characteristic for the area. By contrast, the proposed dormer dominates the roofscape and is visually incongruous. This departure from the prevailing scale and rhythm of London Road results in a development that is out of keeping with the character of the area, characterised by other properties along London Road.

When taken in a wider context, the proposed rear elevation appears boxy and unsympathetic to the existing dwelling and lacks visual refinement. Its form and detailing do not respond positively to the existing character of 100 London Road or that of the wider area, representing poor quality of design and further contributing to a detraction from the standards as set in Policy CP3 and against the suggestion that the '*design ensures minimal disruption to the main property, as well as creating its own character to the rear garden space*'.

2. Amenity of neighbouring properties (Policy CP3 – General Principles of Development)

It is acknowledged that the proposed development will not cause any loss of light on its immediate neighbours, by virtue of being outside of the 45 degree ruling. However, properties along Northbury Avenue sit perpendicular to 100 London Road and are all single storey dwellings. The proposed dormer includes multiple windows that would sit higher than the existing rear windows.

This increase in window height would enable direct overlooking into the gardens and rear facing rooms of the single storey properties along the southern side of Northbury Avenue and would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, contrary to paragraph 4.7 of the Borough Design Guide and overriding policy CP3. Given this increase in height, it is not accepted that *'the flat roof rear extension is proposed to complement the existing roofscapes, with many existing pitched roofs and the first-floor windows'*, given that the dormer would sit at one and a half storey's.

With particular reference to 2 Northbury Avenue, the proposed extension is positioned approximately perpendicular to my property. However, it sits at a less than 90 degree angle to 100 London Road, creating a narrower angle between the proposed rear dormer and the rear elevation of 2 Northbury Avenue. This orientation further exacerbates the overlooking issue, as the line of sight from the 2.5 storey rear dormer is directed more squarely towards the no. 4 rear-facing habitable rooms of this single storey dwelling. This is further exacerbated by the fact that the proposed dormer would sit considerably further south than the rear elevation of 2 Northbury Avenue, allowing greater visibility into these habitable rooms.

This proposal would therefore cause significant overlooking into the rear gardens of properties along the southern side of Northbury Avenue and, more critically, clear visibility into the rear habitable rooms of 2 Northbury Avenue. It therefore fails to accord with the guidance of Paragraph 4.7 of the Borough Design Guide and subsequently Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy.

It is noted that a treebelt runs along the rear boundary of 100 London Road however, these are not protected by any TPO or protective designation and can therefore be felled without any prior permission. They cannot therefore constitute a material consideration when assessing this application and should be excluded from forming part of the assessment.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development does not accord with the Wokingham Core Strategy and should therefore be refused as it is currently proposed. Should any amendment be made to address the aforementioned concern, I would be willing to take an unbiased view on these as and when they are presented and, should the revised designs address these concerns, I would be willing to remove my objection.

With thanks

Rachel Craig