PLANNING REF : 262523
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Gardone
: 51 West Drive, Sonning
: RG4 6GE
SUBMITTED BY : Mr S Kaura
DATE SUBMITTED : 17/11/2026

COMMENTS:
Tuesday, 17 November 2026

Re: Objection to Planning Application 262523 Section 73 Application to Vary Condition 2 of Planning Permission 241427, 49 West Drive, Sonning

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to object to planning application 262523, which seeksto vary Condition 2 of planning permission 241427. I am the owner and occupier of 51 West Drive, the property immediately adjoining the application site. I strongly object to this application.

Whilst planning permission was previously granted for a replacement dwelling on this site, the current application must be assessed on the basis of the amendments now proposed rather than simply on the principle of development established by the earlier consent. The application seeks approval for a number of material changes, including the forward movement of the building by approximately 2 metres, an increase in ridge height of approximately 500mm, alterations to the roof form and additional openings within the elevations. These changes result in a development that is demonstrably larger and more visually dominant than the scheme previously approved.

Planning History and Incremental Intensification:
This application represents the seventh iteration relating to the redevelopment of this site. Whilst each application must be considered on its own merits, the planning history demonstrates a continuing pattern of proposals seeking to incrementally increase the scale, bulk and impact of the development.

The approval of application 241427 established the principle of a replacement dwelling on the site. It did not establish that subsequent increases in scale, height or massing should automatically be regarded as acceptable. The Council should therefore assess the current proposal against the development that was approved and determine whether the proposed amendments would result in additional planning harm.

Increased Scale and Bulk:
The applicant describes the amendments as revisions to the approved scheme. In reality, the proposal materially increases the scale and presence of the building. The front wall and internal gable wall are proposed to move approximately 2 metres forward, whilst the principal roof ridge is increased from 8.74 metres to 9.24 metres.

Taken together, these changes extend the building envelope and create a significantly more imposing structure than that approved under planning permission 241427. The increase in height and forward

projection cannot reasonably be regarded as minor alterations.

Furthermore, whilst the Planning Statement refers to changes in ridge height, the submitted drawings do not clearly provide all of the dimensional information necessary to fully understand the extent of the increase in height, massing and roof form. The Council should ensure that sufficient dimensionalinformation is available to enable a thorough and accurate assessment of the proposal's impacts on neighbouring properties and the street scene.

The applicant's Planning Statement confirms that the proposed dwelling would have a Gross Internal Area of 585.1m . However, the application material does not provide a clear comparison between the approved and proposed floor areas, footprint or building volume. Given the significance of the proposed amendments, the Council should require a comprehensive schedule comparing the approved and proposed floor areas, footprint and building dimensions so that the true extent of the increase can be properly assessed.

Greater Harm to Neighbouring Amenity:
The approved development was already the subject of substantialconcern from neighbouring residents and the Sonning & Sonning Eye Society regarding its scale, dominance and impact on residential amenity.

The increase in height and amended building position will inevitably increase the perceived mass of the dwelling when viewed from neighbouring properties. The proposal would therefore have a greater overbearing impact than the scheme previously approved.

Overshadowing and Loss of Light:
Previous submissions acknowledged concerns regarding daylight and overshadowing. The proposed increase in ridge height and altered building form raise obvious concerns that the impact on neighbouring properties will be greater than that associated with the approved scheme.

Importantly, the application does not appear to be supported by an updated daylight, sunlight or shadow assessment reflecting the revised massing now proposed. Any assessment submitted in support of planning permission 241427 related to the previously approved building form and dimensions. Given the increased ridge height, amended roof form and forward extension of the building line, the Council should require updated and robust evidence demonstrating that the revised scheme will not result in increased overshadowing, loss of daylight or other harm to neighbouring amenity.

The Council should require robust and unequivocal evidence demonstrating that the increased dimensions and revised form will not result in additional loss of daylight, increased overshadowing or a worsening of residential amenity when compared with the approved scheme.

Privacy:
The application introduces additional windows and alterations to the elevations. Previous objections identified concerns regarding overlooking of neighbouring properties and gardens, particularly from side-facingwindows and upper-floor openings.

The Council should carefully assess whether the revised fenestration arrangements create greater opportunities for overlooking and loss of privacy than those previously approved.

Should the Council be minded to approvethe application, it should first satisfy itself that the privacy-related conditions attached to planning permission 241427 remain effective in light of the revised internal layout, amended elevations, altered rooflights and additional openings now proposed.

Character of West Drive:
West Drive is characterised by detached dwellings set within generous plots with a clear sense of openness and separation between buildings. This pattern of development is a defining feature of the street
scene.

By increasing the height of the dwelling, moving elements of the building forward and revising the roof form, the current proposal would create a more dominant and intrusive building within the street scene. The cumulative effect would further erode the spacious acter that distinguishes West Drive.

Conflict with Planning Policy:
The Council has a duty to determine the application in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In my view, the proposal is inconsistentwith the objectives of Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP3, which together provide the strategic framework for securing high-quality and sustainable development within the Borough. The increased scale, height and massing proposed under this application raise concerns regarding design quality, impact upon neighbouring properties and the character of the surrounding area.

The proposed amendments would result in a dwelling that is materially larger, taller and more visually prominent than the development
roved under planning permission 241427. The cumulative effect of the increased ridge height, forward projection, enlarged upper floors, altered roof form and additional openings raises significant concerns regarding residential amenity, including outlook, daylight, privacy and overbearing impact.

The proposal also risks undermining the established character of West Drive, which is defined by detached dwellings set within generous plots and a strong sense of openness and separation. The increased scale and massing of the revised dwelling would erode these

characteristics and is inconsistent with the design principles that seek to protect the quality and character of existing residential areas.

The application does not provide a clear comparison of approved and proposed floor areas, footprint and building volume, nor does it appear to be supported by an updated daylight, sunlight or shadow assessment reflecting the revised massing. In the absence of this information, it has not been demonstrated that theproposal would avoid additional harm to neighbouring amenity.

The proposal should also be assessed against the principles contained within the Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD, which seeks to ensure that development is appropriate to its context and protects nearby properties from adverse impacts. The Council's own planning guidance identifies the Design Guide as a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications.

For these reasons, I consider the proposal to be inconsistent with the objectives of Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP3, contrary to the
principles of the Borough Design Guide SPD and inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives of achieving high-quality design, protecting local character and securing a good standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

Not a Minor Amendment:
Whilst the applicant seeks to present the current proposals as refinements to an approved scheme, the cumulative effect of:
- Moving the building forward by approximately 2 metres;

- Increasing the ridge height by approximately 500mm;
- Altering the roof design;
- Introducing additional windows and doors;
- Revising the external appearance and frontage treatment; and -
Increasing the overall scale and floor area of the development;

results in a building that is materially different from that approved under planning permission 241427.

Repeated applications should not result in the gradual acceptance of development that exceeds what was originally considered acceptable. Approval of planning permission 241427 should not be regarded as justification for the progressive enlargement of the scheme through successive applications.

Alternative Request Should Approval Be Considered:
If, notwithstanding the concerns set out above, the Council is minded to approve the application, I respectfully request that it:
- Reviews and updates any privacy-related conditions attached to permission 241427 to ensure they remain effective in relation to the revised design;
- Imposes conditions fixing approved ridge heights and key building dimensions; and
- Removes permitted development rights for future extensions, roof alterations and additional openings so that any further changes remain subject to planning control.
Given that this is now the seventh planning iteration relating to

the redevelopment of this site, such safeguards would be necessary to prevent further incremental intensification without appropriate planning scrutiny.

Conclusion:
This is now the seventh iteration relating to the redevelopment of this property. Rather than simply refining the approved scheme, the current application seeks consent for a taller, more prominent and materially enlarged building through a combination of increased ridge height,a forward extension of the building line and further changes to the elevations and roof design.

The cumulative effect of these changes would create a development that is more dominant, more intrusive and more harmful to neighbouring amenity and the established character of West Drive than the scheme approved under planning permission 241427.

The applicant has not demonstrated that the revised proposal would cause no greater harm than the development previously approved. On the contrary, the available information indicates an increase in scale, height and visual prominence, whilst important supporting evidence concerning daylight impacts, massing and comparative floor areas has either not been provided or has not been adequately evidenced.

Furthermore,the application does not provide the Council with sufficient information to properly assess the full impact of the proposed changes. In the absence of an updated daylight and sunlight assessment, comprehensive comparisons of approved and proposed floor areas and footprint, and clear dimensional information regarding the revised building height and massing, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would avoid additional harm to neighbouring amenity or local character.

In these circumstances, the Council cannot be satisfied that the proposal accords with the objectives of the Development Plan, the principles of the Borough Design Guide SPD, or the wider objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to good design and the protection of residential amenity.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning application 262523 be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Mr S Kaura
51 West Drive
Sonning