

PLANNING REF : 251567
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 78 Cannock Way
:
: RG6 4EF
SUBMITTED BY : Miss Charlotte Harman
DATE SUBMITTED : 27/08/2025

COMMENTS:

As the owner of Flat 78, directly above Flat 82 and therefore most impacted by this proposal, I strongly object.

The Community Involvement Statement claims that "informal, direct discussions were held" with all residents of the host building, plans were explained in detail and no concerns were raised. This is not

correct. On 24 June my Ring doorbell recorded individuals in my garden, presumably acting on behalf of the applicant, surveying and taking photographs of my property. They made no attempt to contact me to explain their purpose nor had any consent been sought for access to my private property. The only communication I received from the applicant was a letter through my door at 10:08pm on 27 June, which simply stated that they were submitting a planning application. It contained no details of the proposal and there's been no other

attempt to contact me. Had there been any consultation prior to the proposal's submission I would have raised the objections below at that stage. These circumstances also raise concerns about how my property might be accessed and affected during the proposed works.

Items 3.3 and 5.4 of the Design and Access Statement (DAS) state the proposal "does not impact the outlook" from Flat 78 and "avoids any direct overlooking." This is inaccurate. My kitchen's side window directly overlooks the side garden of Flat 82. The proposal would replace this aspect with the extension's flat roof, which will inevitably weather and accumulate debris and standing water over time, resulting in a significant loss of outlook. The extension would also impact the residential amenity of other neighbouring properties. House 72, whose outlook the DAS claims would not be affected (item 5.5), would directly overlook the new structure, as would the side aspect of Flats 64 and 68.

The extension would also be directly visible from my garden / parking area, so I would be faced with its bulk each time I enter or leave my home. The existing single-skin garden boundary wall between Flats 78 and 82 (and between Flat 82 and House 72) is 1460mm high, whilst the extension wall would be 3357mm. Contrary to items 3.3 and 5.5 in the DAS, a wall of this height will significantly block light to my parking / garden area, prevent me from developing it as usable outdoor amenity space, and create an oppressive sense of enclosure.

Drawing K250602/P09 Rev A suggests the garden boundary wall between Flats 78 and 82 lies within Flat 82's boundary and is to be replaced with the extension wall. I request confirmation of the legal ownership of the existing boundary wall, alongside details of the proposed modifications and foundations and how this would affect my garden / parking area during construction.

The same drawing also shows relocation of a waste manhole. I request

the applicant engage an independent survey to confirm if this manhole is shared with Flat 78 and, if so, full details of the proposed relocation and the impact on my property during the works.

The extension would significantly restrict access to both my kitchen's side window and to roofline features such as gutters. This would make routine window cleaning, required under my lease, extremely difficult and also complicate maintenance and repairs to the building's roof and drainage systems. As such maintenance is organised individually by leaseholders, the additional burden would fall disproportionately on me, contravening planning policy which requires development to avoid creating unreasonable constraints on neighbouring properties.

Soundproofing between Flats 78 and 82 is poor and I already experience considerable noise transference. The proposal would inevitably increase this, creating additional disturbance and negatively affecting my living conditions.

I also have significant concerns that the proposal could compromise the structural integrity of my property, as the works will directly affect the shared external wall and other structural elements and services. I understand fear of damage is not usually a material consideration but, with my property located directly above the proposed works, the risk is real and significant in this case.

The cover letter claims "neighbouring properties exhibit comparable extensions." Neighbouring properties are houses so their extensions are not comparable in terms of scale, setting or impact. There are several blocks of identical flats in the immediate area and across Lower Earley and, to my knowledge, none have been extended. This makes the proposal out of character with all comparable properties.

The DAS states a need for additional "living space" but the extension is marked as a bedroom, which does not provide living space in a conventional sense. The inclusion of bi-fold doors, giving the extension its own entrance, is also unusual and raises concerns about the intended use of the space. The existing uniform layout of these flats supports occupation by individuals or couples. An additional room risks larger households occupying Flat 82 which would fundamentally alter the balance of occupancy, increase noise disturbance and be inconsistent with the building's residential character.

Approving this application would set a precedent for other ground-floor flats in comparable blocks to extend, whilst first-floor flats remain constrained by the original design. This would create an unfair disparity between leaseholders and undermine the expectation that all properties within a leasehold block will be managed fairly and equally.