

PLANNING REF : 262026  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 40 Parkway  
: 40 Parkway, Crowthorne, Berkshire  
: RG45 6EW  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Lance Anderson  
DATE SUBMITTED : 07/09/2026

COMMENTS:

Subject: Objection to proposed development - 38 Parkway, Crowthorne, RG45 6EW

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to formally object to the above planning application due to concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on our property, particularly in relation to the height and massing of the proposed garage/extension, loss of daylight and sunlight, overbearing impact, loss of outlook, and the apparent discrepancy between the boundary shown on the submitted drawings and the established physical boundary between the properties.

1. Impact on existing habitable-room windows

Our property has existing windows along the side elevation facing directly towards the proposed development. These include windows serving our living room and a bedroom, both of which are habitable rooms and rely on the existing open aspect to this side for natural daylight and sunlight.

The proposed development would be positioned immediately alongside these windows. The increase in the height and massing of the existing garage/extension is therefore of particular concern to us.

At present, the existing structure is relatively low and sits behind our existing boundary fence. This allows a significant amount of sky, daylight and sunlight to reach our windows.

The proposed increase in height would materially change this relationship.

2. Proposed roof height

The submitted drawings appear to show a proposed roof height of approximately 2.965m.

We understand that the proposed construction also includes a warm-deck roof, which appears likely to increase the overall height of the existing garage/extension by approximately 600-700mm, depending on the existing construction and final build-up.

Based on the dimensions shown on the submitted plans, we anticipate that the proposed finished roof level will be above the existing gutter/eaves level of our bungalow.

This is a significant concern because the proposed roof would be directly outside our living-room and bedroom windows and would create a considerably higher obstruction than currently exists.

We therefore ask the Planning Officer to verify the proposed finished roof level against the actual existing gutter/eaves level of our property, using accurate site levels rather than relying solely on the dimensions shown on the applicant's drawings.

### 3. Loss of daylight and sunlight

The side of our property affected by this development is an important source of natural daylight and sunlight to the affected rooms.

Increasing the roof height by such a significant amount, and ally taking the proposed roof above our gutter line, would inevitably result in a much greater obstruction immediately outside these windows.

Our concern is not simply about losing a private view. It is about the material reduction in daylight, sunlight and open outlook available to habitable rooms within our home.

The existing windows currently have an open aspect towards this side of the property. Raising the roof substantially would introduce a much higher built obstruction into this space and would significantly reduce the amount of sky visible from the windows.

We understand that the Council's guidance considers the impact of development on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties and refers to the 25-degree and 45-degree tests when assessing the effect on neighbouring habitable rooms.

We are particularly concerned about the effect on the existing approximately 25-degree upward line of sight from our window cills and whether the proposed roof would obstruct this.

There is also uncertainty as to whether the proposal would satisfy the relevant 45-degree assessment, given the proposed height and the very close relationship between the new roof and our windows.

We therefore respectfully request that the Council carries out a proper assessment from the actual affected living-room and bedroom windows, rather than simply assessing the development from the applicant's property.

If the relevant daylight tests are not satisfied, we request that the applicant be required to provide an appropriate daylight and sunlight assessment demonstrating that the impact on our habitable rooms is acceptable.

### 4. Overbearing impact and loss of outlook

We are also concerned about the overbearing effect of the proposed development.

The existing lower roof allows our windows to retain an open outlook and access to the sky. The proposed increase in height would replace

this with a substantially higher built form immediately adjacent to our property.

This would create a significantly greater sense of enclosure and dominance when looking out from our living room and bedroom.

Again, our objection is not based simply on losing a private view. It is based on the physical impact of a significantly higher structure being introduced immediately alongside our property, resulting in:

- increased height;
- increased massing;
- reduced open sky visibility;
- reduced daylight;
- reduced sunlight;
- increased sense of enclosure; and
- an overbearing relationship with our existing habitable-room windows.

We ask the Council to assess these impacts carefully.

#### 5. Boundary shown on the submitted drawings

We also have a specific concern regarding the boundary/site line shown on the submitted plans.

The existing physical boundary between our properties is clearly defined by a straight fence line running down the side of our property.

The neighbour's existing garage/extension sits behind this straight fence line on their side of the boundary.

However, on the submitted planning drawing, the line shown appears to be different. It appears to dog-leg out from the established straight fence line, run around the outside of the existing garage/extension and then return to the straight fence line further along.

This does not appear to accurately reflect the existing physical boundary arrangement.

We are concerned that the drawing could give the impression that the land occupied by the existing extension, or the area immediately outside it, forms part of the applicant's site, whereas the established physical boundary is represented by our existing straight fence line.

We are not asking the Planning Authority to determine legal ownership of the land. However, the accurate physical relationship between the proposed development, our property and the established boundary is directly relevant to the planning assessment.

We therefore ask that the applicant clearly identifies:

the existing straight fence line;  
the existing garage/extension in relation to that fence;  
the proposed building footprint;  
the proposed roof position;  
the actual separation distance from our property; and

the relationship between the proposed development and the established boundary.

We would ask the Council to clarify why the submitted drawing shows a dog-leg in the boundary/site line around the existing extension when the existing fence forms a straight line.

This is particularly important when considering the proposed increase in height and massing. If the proposed development is being assessed on the basis of a boundary position that differs from the established physical fence line, this could materially affect the assessment of separation distance and neighbouring amenity.

#### 6. Request for accurate assessment

Given the concerns outlined above, we respectfully request that the Planning Officer verifies the proposal using accurate existing and proposed site levels and the actual position of the established boundary fence.

In particular, we ask the Council to assess:

The proposed finished roof height of approximately 2.965m.  
The additional height resulting from the proposed warm-deck roof construction.  
The relationship between the proposed roof and the existing gutter/eaves level of our bungalow.  
The distance between the proposed roof/wall and our actual boundary.  
The effect on the existing living-room window.  
The effect on the existing bedroom window.

The 25-degree daylight assessment from the affected windows. The relevant 45-degree assessment.  
The resulting loss of daylight and sunlight.  
The increased sense of enclosure and overbearing impact.

We would also ask that the applicant provides sufficiently detailed sections/elevations to clearly demonstrate the existing and proposed levels relative to our property, rather than relying solely on the proposed elevation.

#### 7. Possible reduction in height

We are not opposed in principle to our neighbour making improvements to their property.

Our concern is specifically with the side extension scale, height, proximity and resulting impact of the proposed development on our property.

We believe that a lower roof solution, reduced height or an alternative design could potentially allow the applicant to achieve their objectives while reducing the impact on our existing

living-room and bedroom windows.

We therefore ask the Council to consider whether the proposed development can be amended to reduce its height and massing and preserve a reasonable level of daylight, sunlight and outlook to our habitable rooms.

#### Conclusion

In its current form, we have significant concerns that the proposed development would result in a material loss of daylight and sunlight, an increased sense of enclosure and an overbearing impact on our

living room and bedroom, particularly due to the proposed increase in roof height and the close proximity of the structure to our property.

We are also concerned that the boundary/site line shown on the submitted drawing does not appear to correspond with the established straight-line fence boundary on site, and we request that this discrepancy is clarified before the application is determined.

We respectfully request that the application is refused or substantially amended/reduced in height, unless the applicant can satisfactorily demonstrate through accurate plans, levels and appropriate daylight/sunlight assessment that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property.

Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration.

Yours faithfully,  
Lance