

PLANNING REF : 253097
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 94 Victoria Road
: Wargrave
: RG10 8AE
SUBMITTED BY : Dr Jessica Williams
DATE SUBMITTED : 19/01/2026

COMMENTS:

We are writing to object to the above Planning Application Number 253097, concerning the proposed replacement of the existing rear extension and conservatory with a significantly taller modern extension at 92 Victoria Road in Wargrave. While the footprint is said to remain similar, the increase in height and massing, especially directly on the boundary between our properties, would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity, daylight, and the established character of the terrace. We also have large concerns due to the significant technical inadequacy of several aspects of the submission. Our reasons are as follows:

1. Excessive Height and Overbearing Impact

Although the footprint remains similar, the proposed increase in height represents a major change to the scale and massing of the structure. As neighbouring residents in a row of terraced houses, we rely on a consistent roofline of single storey outbuildings to maintain adequate daylight and avoid an oppressive sense of enclosure. At present, the edges of the existing extension run in line with the top of our shared boundary fence, and because the extension remains at single storey height along the boundary, it does not create an overbearing effect.

The proposed new extension, however, would rise substantially higher than the current one and significantly above the shared boundary fence. This would create an overbearing and intrusive structure immediately adjacent to our garden and rear room. This increased bulk would be visually dominating and detrimental to the sense of openness currently experienced at the rear of our home. As such, it would adversely affect our outlook and the general amenity of our property.

2. Loss of Natural Light

The height increase will inevitably block natural light into the rear of our home and garden, particularly in the afternoon. Although 92's current conservatory rises higher in the middle, its sloping form means that it is hardly visible from our side and its central ridge has very limited impact on the light reaching our property.

By contrast, the proposed design introduces a consistently taller and more solid form across the full width of the extension, including along the shared boundary. This presents a substantial risk of overshadowing, particularly given that their existing extension is already noticeably longer than others within the terrace.

3. Lack of Clarity and Inadequacy of Submitted Information

We have serious concerns regarding the lack of clarity and technical

inadequacy of several aspects of the submission.

First, the proposed drainage arrangements are particularly concerning. The new extension would cover an existing external manhole, yet no information is provided regarding how future access for maintenance or inspection would be achieved. Furthermore, the drainage layout drawing shows foul water discharging into a new soakaway system, which is not an acceptable method of foul drainage disposal.

Second, the application omits essential dimensional information, including the exact distance between proposed new walls and our existing boundary structure, as well as accurate height markers and sections at the boundary.

Third, the design statement states that the proposal will not cause 'significant' detrimental effect. The suggestion that there will nevertheless be some degree of detrimental effect is concerning and unexplained, particularly as the applicant provides no supporting assessment or evidence describing what that detriment may entail or how it has been evaluated.

4. Out of Character With the Terrace and Setting an Undesirable Precedent

Many properties in our terrace have modest single storey rear extensions that align with the character and scale of the original housing. The proposed extension would markedly disrupt this uniformity and appear bulky and incongruous compared to neighbouring properties. Allowing a significantly taller extension risks setting a precedent for similarly disproportionate developments, eroding the architectural coherence of the terrace.

5. Negative Effect on Residential Amenity and Potential Impact on Property Value

The combination of increased height, massing, and overshadowing would have a detrimental effect on our enjoyment of our property, with the new structure dominating the shared boundary. Such visual intrusion and loss of light can reasonably be expected to impact property desirability and value within the terrace.

6. Absence of Party Wall Notice

We would also like to note that no notification or approach has been made to us, or the owners of number 90, under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, despite the proposed works occurring directly on, or immediately adjacent to, our shared boundary. While the Party Wall Act sits outside the planning process, the complete absence of communication reinforces our concerns regarding the lack of detail, clarity, and consideration accompanying this proposal, and raises legitimate doubts about how works affecting the boundary and our property will be managed. We would also like to make the Council aware that the owners of number 90 are an elderly couple.

Conclusion

Given the above concerns, we respectfully request that the Council

refuse the application or require (a) significant amendments to reduce the height and overall bulk of the proposed extension so that it is more in keeping with the scale and character of the existing terrace and does not harm neighbouring amenity, and (b) corrected drainage details, a proper drainage strategy, full measured drawings, and a clear explanation of the detrimental effects expected.

Thank you for considering our objection.