

PLANNING REF : 251456  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 82 Woodward Close  
: Wokingham, Berkshire  
: RG41 5UU  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Andrew Vasey  
DATE SUBMITTED : 12/10/2025

COMMENTS:

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 251456

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to submit a formal objection to the planning application for a proposed second-storey extension above the garage at 81 Woodward Close, Winnersh, Wokingham, RG41 5UU, which is directly behind our property 82 Woodward Close, Winnersh, Wokingham, RG41 5UU.

I am strongly opposed to this development due to the serious and detrimental impact it would have on our home, particularly in terms of loss of light, overbearing impact, and loss of privacy.

\* Our Home Has the Majority of Windows on the Affected Side

Unlike most properties on the estate, our home is situated on a corner plot, and as a result, the majority of our windows including those serving key living spaces and bedrooms are located on the side of the house that directly faces the neighbouring garage.

\* The proposed extension would:

Cause a significant reduction in natural light to those rooms;

Lead to a darker and more enclosed internal environment;

Create a strong sense of visual intrusion and overbearing bulk, due to its height and close proximity;

Cast shadows across our living areas and garden throughout the day.

These impacts are far more severe than in other parts of the estate, where similar extensions have not affected neighbours in the same way.

\* Other Extensions Are Not Comparable

While I am aware of other second-storey extensions within the estate, those cannot be considered a fair precedent for this application. This is because:

Most of those developments were in standard mid-plot locations with less exposure and greater separation from the majority of the neighbouring windows;

Our living rooms and bedrooms are positioned directly opposite the proposed extension, unlike other cases;

The orientation and position of our property mean that shadowing and

loss of light will be significantly more pronounced in our case.

It is essential that this application be judged on its own merits and in the context of our specific and unusually exposed position, rather than on any previous approvals elsewhere in dissimilar situations.

#### \* Loss of Privacy from Proposed Velux Windows

In addition to the above, the application includes Velux roof windows, two of which would be positioned in such a way that they would provide direct views into nearly every room of our home, with the exception of one.

This raises serious overlooking and privacy concerns, especially given the height and angle of the proposed windows in relation to our property. The proposal would result in an unacceptable intrusion into our private living spaces, particularly into bedrooms and living areas, where a reasonable expectation of privacy should be maintained.

Such loss of privacy is contrary to planning policy and guidance which aims to protect neighbours from overlooking and to maintain residential amenity.

#### \* Planning Policy and Residential Amenity

The proposed extension conflicts with Wokingham Borough Council's planning policies, particularly those protecting against:

Loss of daylight and sunlight;

Overbearing and overdominant built form;

Loss of privacy and overlooking.

I urge the Council to carry out a full daylight/sunlight and privacy assessment, using tools such as the 45-degree rule, and to reject the proposal based on the clear evidence of harm it would cause to our property.

#### Conclusion

This development would cause a substantial and unacceptable impact on our home by:

Severely reducing natural light to our living areas and bedrooms;

Creating an oppressive and overbearing structure in close proximity to our windows;

Introducing direct views into nearly all of our rooms, resulting in a serious loss of privacy.

Given our unique position and the material differences compared to other houses on the estate, I strongly urge the Council to refuse

this planning application in order to protect our residential amenity.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew Vasey