

Appeal Statement App.no. 260569

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to respectfully reiterate that the proposed extension would not result in any unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy, overbearing impact, or material harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties, contrary to the reasons cited in Wokingham Borough Council's refusal notice.

Impact on No. 16 Tamworth Close

The property at No.16 benefits from a substantial rear garden, measuring in excess of approximately 20 metres in length and around 15 metres in width. This garden is already overlooked by surrounding residential properties, and the proposed extension would not materially alter the existing level of mutual overlooking.

The adjoining property to No.9 Tamworth Close already incorporates an existing rear projection of approximately 4 metres. The proposed extension would remain set behind this established building line and, due to the site's topography, would sit approximately 800 mm below the neighbouring ground level. Consequently, the extension would not appear visually dominant or intrusive when viewed from No. 16 or surrounding properties.

It is also relevant to note that properties such as No. 8 Tamworth Close, which have gardens positioned behind No. 9, already experience similar viewing relationships and no issues have been raised. The proposal would not significantly alter existing site lines or create any additional perception of overlooking beyond what already exists.

Furthermore, existing boundary treatments, including fencing, outbuildings, and a conservatory, already interrupt direct views between the properties. The proposed rear-facing bathroom windows would be fitted with obscure glazing and therefore would not give rise to any overlooking concerns. In addition, the windows serving the extended room would remain in substantially the same position and orientation as the existing windows, merely projecting further outward. This does not materially change the angle of view or increase overlooking compared with the current arrangement.

Impact on No. 18 Tamworth Close

The design of the extension has been carefully developed to minimise any perception of bulk or massing. The proposed sloping roof reduces the apparent scale of the extension and maintains a more open visual aspect than a full-height structure.

The extension is positioned adjacent to the side lawn of No.18 rather than the principal rear garden. This side area already benefits from a detached single-storey garage and a open frontage, which together create an open and spacious setting. The proposed extension would

therefore have a negligible impact on the character or usability of this area.

Importantly, there are no habitable room windows facing the proposed extension from this side elevation, meaning there would be no loss of outlook or privacy. In addition, No. 18 sits approximately 400 mm higher than the finished floor level of No. 9. When considered alongside the separation distance and the proposed sloping roof design, the overall impact on No. 18 is minimal and cannot reasonably be considered overbearing.

Comparison with Approved Developments

It is also appropriate to consider comparable developments approved by Wokingham Borough Council in similar residential settings. There are numerous examples where extensions have been permitted on more constrained plots, with reduced garden depths and closer relationships to neighbouring boundaries, whilst still being considered acceptable in planning terms.

Examples include developments within:

- Tutor Crescent, RG6 1FJ
- RG2 9FU
- RG6 4BU (including the property behind 41 Strand Way, where rear-facing windows overlook neighbouring gardens from a considerably closer distance as site image shown attached)

Annotated Google Earth images and location plans have been included to illustrate these comparable developments alongside the existing and proposed plans and elevations for No. 9 Tamworth Close.

Garden Depth and Planning Context

For context, the rear garden of No.16 measures approximately 6 metres in depth at its shortest point. This demonstrates that the commonly referenced rear garden separation standards are not directly applicable in this instance.

The proposed development extends into the side passage of No.9 rather than projecting significantly into the rear garden. Even following completion of the extension, No. 16 would continue to retain in excess of approximately 10 metres of open garden depth. This represents a generous level of private amenity space and would not result in any unacceptable sense of enclosure or overbearing impact.

Need for the Extension

I would also respectfully ask that appropriate weight is given to the existing internal living conditions at No. 9 Tamworth Close.

The existing family bathroom measures approximately **1.6m by 2.01m**, providing a floor area of only around **3.3m²**. This results in a highly constrained layout, where the bathroom door obstructs the WC and users must stand beside the toilet in order to close the door. The room falls well below the size expected for a functional family

bathroom in a four-bedroom property and significantly limits its usability.

The proposed extension is intended to address these practical deficiencies by creating a bathroom that meets modern expectations for functionality and accessibility while remaining proportionate to the scale of the dwelling.

Conclusion

Having regard to the site's context, existing relationships with neighbouring properties, differences in ground levels, boundary treatments, window design, and the modest nature of the proposal, I respectfully submit that the extension would not result in unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, or overbearing impact. The proposal is proportionate, well designed, and sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area. It would significantly improve the living conditions within No. 9 Tamworth Close without causing material harm to neighbouring amenity.

I therefore respectfully request that the proposal is reconsidered on its planning merits, taking into account the points outlined above. I would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the proposal further should any additional clarification be helpful before a decision is reached on the appeal.

Regards

Paul C Laing