

PROPERTY ADDRESS : Two Hoots
: 51 Reeves Way, Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG41 2PS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Robert Hughes
DATE SUBMITTED : 29/01/2026

COMMENTS:

With reference to: 49 REEVES WAY WOKINGHAM RG41 2PS - Application
Number: 260063

PROPOSED ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION FOLLOWING
DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING CONSERVATORY, PLUS CHANGES TO
FENESTRATION

My property is directly next door to property where the proposed planning application 260063 applies to. I would not have any objection to a ground floor extension if it was in accordance with what I understand to be the guidelines used by Wokingham Borough Council planning department. I consider this proposal to be too large (extending beyond 4000mm from rear of house) and too obtrusive with a large area of brick directly facing our property. I feel there needs to be some negotiation as to the size, (height, width and depth) and the design and construction of the roof (angle). It is for these reasons that I wish to OBJECT to the application, as it stands.

Point 1. THE SIZE OF THE EXTENSION AND ITS APPEARANCE FROM OUR IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT PROPERTY AT 51 REEVES WAY (taking into account: height, width and depth):

Wokingham Borough Council's Borough Design Guide (for any new build or extension) states "The primary consideration is impact upon neighbours".

The proposed extension, which is the subject of part of this application, is of a large area and extends the whole width of the existing house. It will therefore extend close to our boundary fence and will be overbearing in appearance from our adjacent property as we would be looking out on a large plain brick wall from our dining room window. Also the design is one with a single pitch roof with two plain brick walls at either side that would slope up to height just below the existing first floor windows.

The proposed extension is 4365mm in depth from the existing rear wall of 49 Reeves Way and this is in contravention of the Borough's Design Guide which states "Rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main wall where they are close to a side boundary". The distance from the wall of the proposed new extension to the side boundary of the property where the fence-line between 49 Reeves Way and 51 Reeves Way is only 1004mm.

I would therefore request the extension to be no more than the maximum of 4 metres and that it should have a hipped roof design, where there are 3 pitches of roofline as shown on the diagram attached to the hardcopy of this document. (Document will be delivered by hand to the Council's offices, prior to the deadline for comments.)

I am requesting that the design of the roof is sloped in from both sides, as well as the rear facing slope (i.e. 3 sides to the roof pitch), this will reduce the mass effect of the brick wall and help

to mitigate some of my concerns. A hipped roof will result in the new side brick wall being lower in height along its length with a small side pitched roof sloping away from our property. This will be much less bulky and less overbearing in appearance.

This hipped style roof will also match the shapes of the existing side and rear ground floor portions of many nearby buildings namely:

- The rear extension at 16 Crail Close, the property immediately to the rear of 49 Reeves Way and in direct view of this property.
- The porches and side buildings to several other houses in this part of Reeves Way including 43 and 51 Reeves Way.

PLANNING REF : 260063
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Two Hoots
: 51 Reeves Way, Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG41 2PS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Robert Hughes
DATE SUBMITTED : 29/01/2026

COMMENTS:

- The existing single-storey extension to the rear of 47 Reeves Way, making the proposed new extension to 49 Reeves Way more aesthetic to the eye.

To have the least detrimental effect on the light to our property, the following two amendments to the extension should be made:

- i) A shallower pitch of roof which would not block out as much light from the side of our property.
- ii) A request that the extension be set back from the house edge at approximately 500mm as is often done with a rear extension close to a boundary (within approx. 1000mm). This would again reduce the overbearing impact of the extension.

The Council's Residential Design Checklist states "Paragraph 2 - Do they relate well to their context, including both the existing site and neighbouring properties" and "Paragraph 24 - For proposed alterations or extensions to existing dwellings, is the proposal well designed in relation to the original building, to the neighbouring properties and to the character of the local area". I would argue therefore that a hipped roof style would be more in keeping with the neighbouring properties because of the hipped style roof of the existing large rear extension at 16 Crail Close (the property immediately to the rear of 49 Reeves Way) and the hipped style roof of the existing rear extension at 47 Reeves Way and numerous others.

Point 2. PROPOSED NEW SIDE WINDOW OVERLOOKING ONTO OUR PROPERTY

The new proposed window in the side wall of 49 Reeves Way, directly overlooking our property at 51 Reeves Way is very large - it is a double width, standard height window - and we therefore strongly object to the size and positioning of this window. Currently the plans show this new window without any label to say whether it has obscured glass.

We had previously spoken to the new owner of 49 Reeves Way and he had asked whether we would have any objection to a fanlight design window in this wall and we had indicated that we would not. So we

are

surprised by the drawing of a double width and full height window on the planning application plans. We would want this window amended to a fanlight design set as high as possible (and without it compromising the roof structure of the existing lean-to storage area between 49 and 51 Reeves Way). We would naturally want this higher fanlight window to have obscured glass to prevent overlooking onto our property.

I note that Material Considerations for Planning applications include - overlooking, loss of light and overbearing impact. I therefore do not feel it is unreasonable to request the above changes, which would also be in line with the Council's own planning guidelines.

Attachment: Sketch (Sketch ref: SK 20260129-1 Rev 1, 29th Jan 2026) showing proposed house and extension views along with views showing requests for limiting the impact of the extension on neighbouring properties.

These comments together with my sketch (SK 20260129-1 Rev 1, 29th Jan 2026) will be hand delivered to the Wokingham Borough Council office on Friday 30th Jan 2026 for the attention of planning department (application 260063).

With reference to: 49 REEVES WAY WOKINGHAM RG41 2PS - Application Number: 260063

PROPOSED ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING CONSERVATORY, PLUS CHANGES TO FENESTRATION

My property is directly next door to property where the proposed planning application 260063 applies to. I would not have any objection to a ground floor extension if it was in accordance with what I understand to be the guidelines used by Wokingham Borough Council planning department. I consider this proposal to be too large (extending beyond 4000mm from rear of house) and too obtrusive with a large area of brick directly facing our property. I feel there needs to be some negotiation as to the size, (height, width and depth) and the design and construction of the roof (angle). It is for these reasons that I wish to OBJECT to the application, as it stands.

Point 1. THE SIZE OF THE EXTENSION AND ITS APPEARANCE FROM OUR IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT PROPERTY AT 51 REEVES WAY (taking into account: height, width and depth):

Wokingham Borough Council's Borough Design Guide (for any new build or extension) states "The primary consideration is impact upon neighbours".

The proposed extension, which is the subject of part of this application, is of a large area and extends the whole width of the existing house. It will therefore extend close to our boundary fence and will be overbearing in appearance from our adjacent property as we would be looking out on a large plain brick wall from our dining room window. Also the design is one with a single pitch roof with two plain brick walls at either side that would slope up to height just below the existing first floor windows.

The proposed extension is 4365mm in depth from the existing rear wall of 49 Reeves Way and this is in contravention of the Borough's Design Guide which states "Rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main wall where they are close to a side boundary". The distance from the wall of the proposed new extension to the side boundary of the property where the fence-line between 49 Reeves Way and 51 Reeves Way is only 1004mm.

I would therefore request the extension to be no more than the maximum of 4 metres and that it should have a hipped roof design, where there are 3 pitches of roofline as shown on the diagram attached to the hardcopy of this document. (Document will be delivered by hand to the Council's offices, prior to the deadline for comments.)

I am requesting that the design of the roof is sloped in from both sides, as well as the rear facing slope (i.e. 3 sides to the roof pitch), this will reduce the mass effect of the brick wall and help to mitigate some of my concerns. A hipped roof will result in the new side brick wall being lower in height along its length with a small side pitched roof sloping away from our property. This will be much less bulky and less overbearing in appearance.

This hipped style roof will also match the shapes of the existing side and rear ground floor portions of many nearby buildings namely:

- The rear extension at 16 Crail Close, the property immediately to the rear of 49 Reeves Way and in direct view of this property.
- The porches and side buildings to several other houses in this part of Reeves Way including 43 and 51 Reeves Way.
- The existing single-storey extension to the rear of 47 Reeves Way, making the proposed new extension to 49 Reeves Way more aesthetic to the eye.

To have the least detrimental effect on the light to our property, the following two amendments to the extension should be made:

- i) A shallower pitch of roof which would not block out as much light from the side of our property.
- ii) A request that the extension be set back from the house edge at approximately 500mm as is often done with a rear extension close to a boundary (within approx. 1000mm). This would again reduce the overbearing impact of the extension.

The Council's Residential Design Checklist states "Paragraph 2 - Do they relate well to their context, including both the existing site and neighbouring properties" and "Paragraph 24 - For proposed alterations or extensions to existing dwellings, is the proposal well designed in relation to the original building, to the neighbouring properties and to the character of the local area". I would argue therefore that a hipped roof style would be more in keeping with the neighbouring properties because of the hipped style roof of the existing large rear extension at 16 Crail Close (the property immediately to the rear of 49 Reeves Way) and the hipped style roof of the existing rear extension at 47 Reeves Way and numerous others.

Point 2. PROPOSED NEW SIDE WINDOW OVERLOOKING ONTO OUR PROPERTY

The new proposed window in the side wall of 49 Reeves Way, directly overlooking our property at 51 Reeves Way is very large - it is a double width, standard height window - and we therefore strongly object to the size and positioning of this window. Currently the plans show this new window without any label to say whether it has obscured glass.

We had previously spoken to the new owner of 49 Reeves Way and he had asked whether we would have any objection to a fanlight design window in this wall and we had indicated that we would not. So we are surprised by the drawing of a double width and full height window on the planning application plans. We would want this window amended to a fanlight design set as high as possible (and without it compromising the roof structure of the existing lean-to storage area between 49 and 51 Reeves Way). We would naturally want this higher fanlight window to have obscured glass to prevent overlooking onto our property.

I note that Material Considerations for Planning applications include - overlooking, loss of light and overbearing impact. I therefore do not feel it is unreasonable to request the above changes, which would also be in line with the Council's own planning guidelines.

Attachment: Sketch (Sketch ref: SK 20260129-1 Rev 1, 29th Jan 2026) showing proposed house and extension views along with views showing requests for limiting the impact of the extension on neighbouring properties.

These comments together with my sketch (SK 20260129-1 Rev 1, 29th Jan 2026) will be hand delivered to the Wokingham Borough Council office on Friday 30th Jan 2026 for the attention of planning department (application 260063).