

Planning Apps:

Ref 261172 May 2026 (Retrospective)

Ref 250394 April 2025 (Approved Side & Rear extension)

Submitted by D Wood

Comments:

Background: No 38 Jupiter Way was constructed c1989. The developer erected the rear boundary fence at a set height of 1.8m in line with the Woosehill development.

I write in regard to the above Planning Applications and wish raise an objection.

1)Extension built otherwise in accordance of approved planning:

The application seeks a Sec 73 for amendments made in the construction of the extension which has been constructed otherwise in accordance of the approved plans. It appears that the lounge extension has been built higher than authorised. The recent extensions are more than double the footprint of the original house and built close to the rear boundary at the narrowest point.

The applicant cites privacy as a reason for the application however the building height has been increased which will decrease privacy levels as the house is built on a hill. Triple patio doors have been added to the rear with clear glass - privacy?

2) Fence:

The prescribed height for fencing for rear & side gardens fronting a Highway in housing developments in Woosehill & Wokingham Borough is 1.8m. The original height & design of the fence is still in situ (1.8 m Close board) The height of a fence is measured from the natural land level, in this case the original fence sits on the original land level (viewable from the Highway) The applicant elected to increase the height of the rear fence to an overall height of 2.7m from natural ground level (some 50% over the original height) at the lower end and erected a 1.8m horizontal design fence behind it. An opaque black material has been inserted in-between the panels making it a solid structure. This will increase wind drag on an already excessively high boundary fence possibly causing a safety issue in high winds.

The submitted plans are not detailed. No drawings or photographic evidence has been submitted to reflect the current unlawful fence design, materials or height from natural ground level from both

the interior & exterior of the garden. From a public perspective, the submitted plans are not clear and confusing.

The original rear close board fence is concealed from the garden interior creating the illusion that the fence is only 1.8m high within the boundary. This is because the applicant has artificially raised the land levels up to 90cms at the lower end and placed the new & additional fence on top of the unauthorized raised land. The structure contravenes fencing height regulations.

The expanse of fence is extensive, some 20m+ at the rear with the horizontal fence graduated in line with the uphill gradient of the land. It backs on to a Public Highway (footpath) and open parklands that are well used by pedestrians, cyclists and dog walkers.

The fence has a visually intrusive impact on the open plan nature of the Highway and harmful in character to the surrounding area. The design & materials used are not in keeping with fencing in the area and totally out of alignment with neighbouring fences.

Approving the application will likely result in homeowners raising fence levels far in excess of permitted development, with or without permission and set a precedent.

The applicant has cited 'privacy' as the reason for erecting a 2.7m fence. The applicant has artificially raised the land levels across a substantial area of the garden thereby reducing the original internal fence height to about 1m.

Garden privacy is not an entitlement or legal right.

3) Raising land levels in excess of 30cm

It would appear that a substantial area of the rear garden has been artificially raised in varying levels up to 90cms to create a level platform.

No landscaping documents/plans have been submitted outlining design, materials and construction.

The soil in the area is of heavy clay type prone to expansion & shrinkage with poor drainage. How is the raised land being retained and supported?

The land has been raised above the levels of neighbouring land up to 90cms in parts. Has any attention been paid to drainage of excess water/run off?

The property previously had two paved type patio areas. One to the rear outside the lounge, the second to the side (approx 32sq m) Both areas are now covered by the new extensions.

Has any new hard landscaping been constructed as part of the landscaping project or proposed? If so, no drawings/photos have been submitted. This is relevant to the application in regard to drainage and potential future damage to third party land/property.

No WBC pre application advice was sought by the applicant in respect to either of the planning applications.

Two images are attached:

- 1) Original close board fence 1.8m erected on the known natural land level.
 - 2) The concrete post (set back from the rear fence and boundary fence between No 38 & 40 Jupiter Way) is 2m in height. The new horizontal fence extends the full width of the rear boundary (20m+)
- It towers above the existing & neighbours fence 2.7m H.

There is a 10cm (approx) gap between the close board fence and the new horizontal fence.

The retrospective planning application is contrary to The Town & Country Planning Act 1990. The National Planning Policy Framework and CP3 of WBC Core Planning Strategy in terms of character, design, and having a detrimental impact to the area.



