

PLANNING REF : 251671
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 26 Dark Lane
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG10 8JU
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Julia Bishop
DATE SUBMITTED : 09/08/2025

COMMENTS:

In principle, we don't have any issues to the sympathetic development of the above property, however we are concerned and wish to submit the following five objections to the specific plan submitted. They are: - Disproportionately large building
- Not reflecting the current style of the road

- Overshadowing of other properties
- Overlooking windows on to 26 Dark Lane
- Access to the development site

Disproportionately Large Building:

According to the Wargrave council's Parish Design Statement, extensions and development should match the existing buildings in terms of scale and size. However, the planned extension will create a disproportionately large building with different aesthetics to the existing five properties set back on Dark Lane.

This extension will effectively double the original floor area of the No. 28, and increase the frontage to the street by a further two thirds of the existing house structure. This proposed style and scale is out of keeping with the size of the other houses in the row.

Not reflecting style of road:

The six houses set back on Dark Lane were built at the same time in the early 1970's, when Wargrave Manor sold the land for development, with restrictive covenants on the design of the houses. These six houses have been updated over the last 50 years but have maintained a consistent look and feel in accordance with the Parish Design Statement. Adjacent houses have extended into the loft space but this has not been visible from the front, they have also changed the front entrance but in keeping with the overall look of the development. We would suggest that the front loft and first floor middle window are not in keeping with the design of these houses.

Overshadowing:

Currently the properties 26 and 28 Dark Lane are offset from each other, creating an impression of space in the back garden of no. 26. The proposed rear extension at no. 28 comes out into the back garden a further metre from the existing single storey kitchen wall, and goes up 2 storeys. This is an unnecessary increase in the footprint of the house into the back garden, thereby overshadowing no.26 and the properties backing onto no.28.

An apple tree at the back of the garage currently provides some screening between the two houses. The extension further into the back garden would necessitate the removal of this tree, reducing the privacy of the garden at no.26.

We would propose that the backline of the building should not exceed

the existing kitchen wall.

Overlooking Windows:

The proposed south side windows in the first floor of no.28 will overlook the garden of no. 26 and invade our privacy. We strongly object to any windows in this wall at this height. A south facing Velux is also planned in the games room in the roof - this would also overlook our garden, and we object to this as well on the basis of privacy.

We would propose that no new windows are placed in the south side of the property.

Access to the Development Site:

Access to this property is only available across our property. Our deeds (no. 26) show ownership of the horseshoe driveway from the council maintained road (Dark Lane) to the border with no.24. Our neighbour at no. 28 Dark Lane, has right of access across the horseshoe drive to his private drive.

The planned extension will require access for heavy construction vehicles across our part of the horseshoe drive for a minimum of 6 months, possibly 12. We are concerned about damage to our driveway, our grass bank, and to the broadband fibre cable buried at the edge of the driveway since we believe there will significant increase in heavy traffic to the site.

We would like to ask for a Construction Management Plan to supplement the planning application. This should ensure workman's and delivery vehicles, equipment, materials, waste and plant associated with a development of such a scale are contained within the site and do not obstruct or otherwise cause protracted nuisance or damage to our property or impede our and our other neighbours access.

Given the scale of the proposed development (excavations, materials, waste and vehicle movements involved in such a large project), could we suggest that in reality this necessitates an alternate access (not across our property) to the site for the duration of the development.