

PLANNING REF : 260063
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 47 Reeves Way
: Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG41 2PS
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Pratisha Kaur Verma
DATE SUBMITTED : 29/01/2026

COMMENTS:

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 I REFER TO THE COUNCIL'S RELEVANT TERMS OF
REFERENCE/PLANNING GUIDELINES RELATING TO REAR EXTENSIONS AS
FOLLOWS:

- Planning Material Considerations - overlooking, loss of light and overbearing impact.
- The Borough's Design Guide states "Rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main wall where they are close to a side boundary".
- 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".
- Wokingham Borough Council's Borough Design Guide (for any new build or extension) states "The primary consideration is impact upon neighbours".
- "If any part of the extension is within 2 metres of the boundary the eaves height must not exceed 3 metres."
- Planning Material Considerations - overlooking, loss of light and overbearing impact.

Formal Objection to Planning Application at 49 Reeves Way

Submitted by:

Immediate Neighbour at 47 Reeves Way

1. Impact on Residential Amenity and Visual Intrusion

As the adjoining neighbour to the proposed development at 49 Reeves Way, I wish to formally raise a number of concerns regarding the scale, form, and visual impact of the extension. While I recognise the applicants' desire to increase their living space, I believe the design in its current configuration would have a materially adverse effect on the amenity of our property.

The extension as submitted is of substantial size, and due to its placement directly along our shared boundary, the massing would be excessively dominant when viewed from our conservatory, which serves as a dining room and office and is used throughout the day. The design incorporates a single pitch roof sloping upwards towards the existing first-floor structure, resulting in significant height and two large, uninterrupted brick walls framing the sides of the extension. As a direct neighbour, the outlook from our main rear living space would be of a tall, featureless brick elevation in very close proximity, creating an oppressive and overbearing visual environment.

I respectfully contend that this design approach is not sympathetic to the existing character of the locality or to the pattern of neighbouring extensions. A more appropriate alternative would be the

adoption of a hipped roof, incorporating three roof planes sloping from both sides as well as the rear which would help reduce the perceived bulk and height of the extension. A hipped roof would not only be visually softer but would also be more consistent with neighbouring extensions, including the rear extension at 16 Crail Close (situated behind No. 49) and with the roofline of our own conservatory. This would create a more harmonious and less obtrusive appearance, better aligned with the visual character of the street and surrounding properties.

A shallower roof pitch would further reduce the visual impact when viewed from our property. The extensive height and depth of the proposal, coupled with its very close proximity to our boundary, creates an excessive sense of enclosure that would be mitigated by amendments to both height and width.

2. Boundary Distance and Height Constraints

The proposed extension is positioned approximately 1000mm from the boundary between our properties. Based on this measurement, I believe that the 2 Metre Rule applies, which states that where an extension is built within 2 metres of a boundary, the eaves height should not exceed 3 metres. As currently designed, the eaves and overall massing appear to exceed what could reasonably be considered acceptable in such close proximity to a neighbouring property.

To reduce the overbearing impact and ensure compliance with established planning principles, I believe that a reduction in both the depth (from 4365mm to 4000mm) and the width (from 11785mm to 9785mm) of the extension is both justified and necessary. These changes would substantially lessen the overshadowing effect and the extent to which the extension dominates the shared boundary.

From our own calculations, the proposed extension would obstruct approximately 82% of the side light entering our conservatory and would reduce our outward view by around 3470mm. Such a dramatic loss of natural light would significantly impact the usability and enjoyment of this important living space. To mitigate this, I propose a 2000mm reduction in width, set further away from the boundary,

which is also reflected in the measured drawings included with the hard copy submission.

A photograph taken during the daytime, demonstrating the existing levels of natural light that would be lost as a result of the proposed extension, will be included in the hard copy submission alongside the annotated diagram.

3. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy From the New Side Window

The application also includes a new side facing window at 49 Reeves Way, positioned directly opposite our conservatory. This window is of standard full height dimensions and, in its proposed location, would result in a direct and unacceptable loss of privacy to our property. Given that our conservatory and patio area are used daily, the

placement of a full height side window would create an intrusive level of overlooking, contrary to principles of neighbour amenity and

privacy protection. I therefore formally object to the inclusion of this window and request that it either be:

- removed entirely, or
- replaced with a high level fanlight window fitted with obscured glazing, which would prevent overlooking while still allowing ventilation if required.

This modification is reasonable and proportionate and would

significantly reduce the detrimental impact on our privacy.

4. Summary and Formal Position

For the reasons outlined above relating to visual dominance, loss of light, boundary proximity, non sympathetic design, and loss of privacy I must formally object to the planning proposal in its current form. The amendments I have suggested, including a hipped roof, reductions in width and depth, and alterations to the proposed side window, represent reasonable and practical alternatives that would greatly reduce the detrimental impact on our property while enabling the applicants to improve their home.

Without these modifications, the proposal results in significant harm to residential amenity, contrary to established planning guidance relating to outlook, privacy, overshadowing, scale, and character.

5. Attachments (Submitted with Hard Copy)

- Annotated diagram showing:
 - o Current proposal (top section)
 - o Suggested amendments (lower section), including hipped roof, reduced width, and alternative window design
- Daytime photograph showing existing side light entering our conservatory
- Measurements supporting the suggested width and height reductions