

PLANNING REF : 251339
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 12 Nightingale Road
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG5 3LS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Andrew Sims
DATE SUBMITTED : 25/06/2025

COMMENTS:

Considering that the proposed extension of No.14 is to the south of No.12 and that it protrudes past the rear of No.12, it is difficult to see how this would not block a significant amount of daylight. Also, as the proposed extension is so close to the boundary of No. 12, it would appear that it will significantly overlook the garden of No. 12 (the proposed first floor window would appear to be only ~5 feet from the boundary.) What provisions are there to prevent the side obscure window, which appears to be a bedroom window, from being changed to a clear glass window in the future?

It would also appear to be impossible to perform maintenance, or construction, without access to No.12 (access to gutters, the exterior of the side window and the drainpipe). If a future owner of No.12 decided to extend to the boundary, then access could be lost.

As the proposed extension is larger than 30 square metres, does not the 1 metre boundary rule apply? Also, as the proposed extension will be within 3 metres of the building of No.12, is a party wall agreement required? From the plans, it appears that the closest point between the proposed extension and the building of No.12 is less than 1 metre, and 1.555m (as per the plans) at the farthest point.

The proposed extension is so close to the boundary that there is a risk of the roof eaves/guttering, and possibly a drainpipe, overhanging the boundary of No.12. The submitted plans appear to indicate that this is the case as the boundary line on the plans clips the edge of the proposed extension (Drawing PP-146-RG-03, Proposed Roof Layout). The existing garage has no roof eaves or guttering.

Also, the front and rear elevations in Drawing PP-146-RG-01 appear to show the extended roof above the garage very close to the building of No.12 and overhanging the side path.

The plans do not show any downpipes from the guttering so it is unclear how rainfall from the roof will drain away.

The current plans do not appear to reflect reality; for example, the current path between the building of No. 12 and the boundary does not converge as the plans indicate. The distance from the boundary to the wall is ~3 feet for the whole length of this path; the plans indicate that the path is 35% to 40% wider at the front than the rear of the house - this is incorrect. The width of the path at the rear of No.12 would appear from the plans to be less than 2 feet which is less than the 3 feet that it is in reality. This would bring into question the accuracy of the boundary line in the plans, which would be a potential issue as the proposed extension is so close to the boundary. Of course, the location of the No.12 building on the plans may be incorrect; however, as Drawing PP-146-RG-03 has a measurement taken to the corner of No.12 it is concerning if the position of No.12 is

incorrect in the proposed plans. Also, scaling from the plans would indicate that the boundary at this point is ~33ins from the corner of No.12, whereas in fact it is 37ins, and the distance from the front corner of No.12 to the existing garage is 49ins where scaling from the plans would indicate that it is only ~41ins. This means that either the position of the boundary or the position of No.12 is wrong on these plans. Either way this is an area of ambiguity, which, taking into account the closeness of the proposed extension, is a concern.

There are no measurements on the existing plan drawing but the boundary does not appear to be correct in relation to No. 14's existing garage, there are no measurements to the boundary on any drawing, which is concerning as there is little margin for error. Nor does this drawing show a garden shed mounted on a concrete base that is located adjacent to the boundary where the rear of the existing garage, and the proposed extension, comes closest to the boundary.

The one thing for certain is that either the position of the boundary or the position of No.12 (or possibly both) is incorrect in the current plans. In addition, the measurement to No. 12 in Drawing

PP-146-RG-03 is questionable. This raises the question that if the boundary is further away from No. 12 is it then closer to No. 14 than the plans show and if it is will the proposed extension fit within the boundary?

While I do not know how these discrepancies will affect the proposed extension, or if there are any other discrepancies, however from past experience I believe that it is in the best interest of all involved parties that they are addressed early in the process.

An unrelated issue is that in the 'Design & Access Statement' the picture labelled 'Rear garden view showing the extent of the patio area and garden' is not of No.14, as the picture shows a house on a junction of two roads, which No.14 is not.