

PLANNING REF : 253113
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 17 Nursery Gardens
: Whistley Green, Berkshire
: RG10 0GN
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Clare Austin
DATE SUBMITTED : 22/03/2026

COMMENTS:

Further Representations - Planning Application Reference 253113
Clear View Cottage, Whistley Green, Hurst, Wokingham, RG10 0DU We
write as neighbouring objectors in response to the letter submitted
by ET Planning on behalf of the applicant, dated 25 February 2026.
We wish to formally draw the Local Planning Authority's attention
to a number of material concerns regarding the content of that
letter, including what we consider to be factual inaccuracies,
internal contradictions and assertions made without adequate
evidential support.

1. INTERNAL CONTRADICTION AND FACTUAL INACCURACY - THE CAR PORT:
STORAGE OR ACCOMMODATION?

We must draw the Local Planning Authority's attention to what
appears to be a significant contradiction within the ET Planning
letter
itself.

On page 1, the letter describes the development as including "a
detached carport with first floor storage." However, on page 8,
under the heading 'Other Planning Considerations', the same letter
accuses objectors of making a factual inaccuracy in claiming the
carport would contain accommodation, asserting that the planning
submission

"explicitly" shows it would not.

This is a direct contradiction within ET Planning's own document. We
wish to draw the Local Planning Authority's attention to the
original planning drawings submitted with this application, which
label the first floor of the car port as 'accommodation' not
storage. We attach the relevant extract from the plans as supporting
evidence.

This discrepancy is not a minor terminological issue. Indeed the
design appears to be more in line with the expectations for
accommodation rather than storage with the permanent staircase,
doorway and architectural design (perhaps glazing?) shown on the
north elevation. The designation of this space as accommodation
rather than storage has significant material implications,
including the level of activity generated, the need for regular
pedestrian access via the
external staircase, and the resulting impact on the amenity of
neighbouring properties. We respectfully ask that the Local Planning
Authority seeks formal clarification from the applicant as to the
intended use of this space before this application is determined.

2. TONE OF THE ET PLANNING RESPONSE

Whilst the letter states at the outset that its purpose is to
provide "constructive comments," we would respectfully suggest that
the

language used throughout does not consistently reflect this aim. The
document variously describes objectors' positions as "plainly
misleading," "perverse," "disingenuous," "disappointing and
illogical," and "nonsensical."

We would invite the Local Planning Authority to consider whether

this tone reflects the kind of balanced, evidence-led professional response that would ordinarily be expected in this context, and to weigh the document accordingly.

As a further specific example, referring to our referenced approximate height of the carport as a factual inaccuracy is misleading and not constructive. A more reasoned and constructive response would have quoted the height of the carport and that of its neighbouring existing building for factual reference and in the spirit of openness. Having reviewed for a second time the 'proposed carport plans and elevations' drawing, using the scale provided on the drawing (0-5m) the elevations do appear to scale close to 6m but we welcome any clarifications the applicant can provide to justify their response.

3. DENSITY COMPARISON - USE OF NURSERY GARDENS AS A BENCHMARK
ET Planning's response places significant weight on a density comparison study (Appendix 1), which examines 15 surrounding properties to argue that the proposed development would not constitute overdevelopment. We wish to raise a specific concern regarding the inclusion of properties within Nursery Gardens in this analysis.

Nursery Gardens is a modern housing estate containing 17 dwellings. Including individual plots from within that estate each of which occupies only a fraction of the overall site as comparators against the single application plot at Clear View Cottage is, in our view, a misleading basis for comparison. A plot within a 17-dwelling estate will, by definition, have a very high density ratio. Using such properties to demonstrate that the proposed development is proportionate in scale conflates two entirely different types of residential land use.

A meaningful density comparison should be made against comparable single residential plots in the surrounding area, not against subdivided estate housing.

We would also further comment that the document itself clearly shows (in the image provided with house sizes) that the proposed property is significantly bigger than any other property in the vicinity. And it appears unclear as to the actual size of the proposed property, with the letter quoting 391m², however the appendix 1 image seems to show 365m² + 119m². Clarity would be appreciated.

4. OVERLOOKING - THE CAR PORT STAIRCASE

ET Planning's letter states that "there would not be any direct overlooking from windows of the proposed dwelling to any neighbouring properties." We do not dispute the position regarding windows of the main dwelling; however, we consider that this statement fails to adequately address the impact of the external staircase providing access to the first floor of the car port.

Any person using that staircase will be elevated progressively above ground level during their ascent. Given the proximity and orientation of the car port relative to our property, we are concerned that the staircase will block light and provide a direct and elevated line of sight into our garden and in particular into the play area regularly used by our children, which is situated alongside our garage to the north west that is not shown in any of the submitted documentation and seems to have been overlooked. This appears to have been designed as an active, regularly used route, not a fixed window, at a height above the border fence to our

property and its impact on our privacy should not be dismissed by reference to window angles and separation distances alone.

We formally request that the Local Planning Authority seeks the following information from the applicant:

- The proposed ridge and eaves height of the car port structure; -
- The maximum height of the external staircase;
- A sightline or privacy assessment demonstrating what views would be available from the staircase toward the curtilage of neighbouring properties

5. IMPACT ON DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT

ET Planning's letter dismisses concerns regarding light levels by stating that any impacts "do not amount to harm." We strongly dispute this conclusion in respect of the carport specifically, and we do not consider it has been adequately evidenced.

No formal daylight or sunlight assessment has been submitted with this application. The car port, by reason of its height, massing, and

proximity to our shared boundary, will have a direct impact on the amount of sunlight reaching our garden at various times of day. The level of sunlight our garden enjoys was a material factor in our decision to purchase our property. The casual assertion that impacts to light levels do not amount to harm unsupported by any technical assessment is not, in our view, sufficient to discharge the Local Planning Authority's obligation to consider residential amenity properly.

We respectfully request that a formal daylight and sunlight assessment be required, carried out in accordance with the BRE guidelines 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight,' before this application is determined.

We trust the Local Planning Authority will give full consideration to the points raised above, and in particular to the contradiction identified in point 1, which we regard as a material matter requiring clarification before any decision is made.

Yours faithfully,

Clare & Phil Austin

17 Nursery Gardens, RG10 0GN