

PLANNING REF : 251649
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Laburnum
: Greensward Lane, Reading, Berkshire
: RG29JN
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Agent of applicant on behalf of 10 Arbor lane
DATE SUBMITTED : 19/07/2025

COMMENTS:

Response to Objection: Planning Ref 251649 - 10 Arbor Lane,
Winnersh, RG41 5JA

To the Case Officer,

We would like to thank Mr Wilson of No. 8 Arbor Lane for taking the time to comment on our planning application. We understand and respect the planning process and fully appreciate that changes within a neighbourhood can raise concerns. That said, we feel it is important to address a number of the points raised, many of which either fall outside the scope of planning policy or have already been carefully considered and addressed within the submitted design.

1. Impact on Light to Skylights and Internal Rooms

The objection references a significant impact on daylight reaching three ground-floor skylights serving a rear kitchen and dining extension at No. 8. While we are sympathetic to the desire for natural light, it is important to clarify that under Wokingham Borough

Council's planning policy and the WBC Design Guide (2021), the presence of rooflights or internal room layouts relying on borrowed light are not protected features in assessing daylight/sunlight impacts.

Our proposed extension has been carefully designed to adhere to the 45-degree rule from neighbouring habitable room windows (not skylights or roof glazing), and complies with all daylight and outlook assessments as typically used by planning officers. The internal configuration and existing limitations of another property's design, including its dependence on specific rooflights, does not constitute grounds to restrict reasonable development in accordance with planning standards.

We would respectfully highlight that the situation described of the objector's own first-floor extension overshadowing their afternoon skylights is the result of their own built form and cannot be used to penalise appropriate neighbouring development.

2. Bathroom Window Concerns

The objection raises concern about a first-floor rear-facing bathroom window being partially enclosed and potentially losing ventilation. While we understand the preference for external airflow and light, this window serves a non-habitable room (a bathroom), and as such is not afforded the same level of consideration as habitable spaces under planning policy.

Furthermore, bathroom ventilation is typically provided through mechanical extraction as per Building Regulations, and is not considered a planning matter. Members of the applicants family also

have asthma and as part of this application will have modern family spaces including adequate ventilation as part of the mechanical design compliant with building regulations. Our design remains set in from the shared boundary to reduce any overbearing impact, in contrast to the objector's own built extensions, which appear to run tight to the boundary and exhibit a more intrusive footprint immediately against the old downstairs dilapidated bathroom window. Again we reiterate careful consideration has been made here unlike previous occupiers / designers for no8. The proposal actually moves the built form away from their property than currently existing with regard to the old downstairs bathroom.

3. Second-Floor Bedroom Impact

We have taken the concerns about the daughter's second-floor bedroom seriously, and we have ensured that the proposed form does not breach the 45-degree sightline from this room. The proposed second-floor element is modest in scale and has been stepped in to minimise bulk and overbearing effects, with significant attention paid to balancing usable internal space with neighbourly design.

4. Design and Character

The objection characterises the proposal as box-like and out of keeping. We would respectfully disagree. The proposed design is contemporary but sympathetic, incorporating appropriate materials and setbacks in line with guidance on scale and massing. The area features a variety of rear additions and alterations of varying shapes, scales, and architectural coherence including multiple extensions at No. 8 itself and we have deliberately proposed a well-proportioned and modest scheme that respects this context.

5. Neighbouring Property (No. 12)

The objection refers to possible impacts on No. 12 Arbor Lane. We note that No. 12 is semi detached, with ample spacing and orientation that does not present any material planning conflicts under normal daylight or amenity tests. Our proposal does not result in overshadowing or overbearing relationships with that property.

6. Internal Design Comments

Finally, we note the suggestion that we install a skylight in our own kitchen to mitigate lighting conditions. While we appreciate the concern, the internal layout and lighting strategy of our property is a private matter and not subject to third-party influence or material planning consideration. We are confident our internal arrangement will provide a high standard of living for our household.

Conclusion

We believe our proposed extension is modest, policy-compliant, and designed with appropriate care to neighbouring amenity. It has been sensitively set in from the boundary, avoids breaches of light guidelines from habitable rooms, and makes far fewer demands on the shared boundary than the objector's own built form.

We trust the planning officer will assess the proposal on the basis of the material planning considerations and established policy

guidelines, and not be unduly influenced by issues that lie outside the scope of the planning system.

Kind regards,
Planning Agent on behalf of Applicant
10 Arbor Lane, RG41 5JA