

PLANNING REF : 260727
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 59
: 59 Arundel Road, Woodley, Reading
: RG5 4JR
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Ying Kit Lau
DATE SUBMITTED : 15/06/2026

COMMENTS:

We are the homeowners of No. 59 Arundel Road. We would like to say at the outset that we are not opposed in principle to our neighbour extending their home, and we understand why they may feel such works are necessary. Our concerns relate specifically to the current proposal, which we believe would have an unacceptable impact on our property and on the local residential amenity. We therefore object to the application on the grounds set out 5 points below.

1. Enclosure and overbearing impact

Our first concern is the sense of enclosure and overbearing impact that the proposed extension would create when viewed from No. 59. This is not a modest infill proposal; it includes a two-storey side and rear extension, together with a single-storey front extension and associated changes to the frontage. The scale of the two-storey element, particularly where the rear portion continues at two-storey height and extends beyond the length of our existing single-storey extension, would introduce a much larger built form than currently exists.

Given that the boundary itself is skewed and the separation is already very limited, a 250mm set-in would still leave the extension extremely close to our garage line in practical terms. In our view, the

combination of two-storey height, limited separation and the rear projection would create a structure that is visually dominant, bulky and oppressive when seen from our property, and would materially reduce the sense of openness beside No. 59. (Drawing 2668/05)

We are also concerned that the extension would project forward and rearward in a way that is not well integrated with the existing pattern of development along Arundel Road. The front projection would appear out of keeping with the prevailing building line, while the

rear extension would create a pronounced two-storey bulk that would be highly visible from No. 59. The two-storey extensions on this part of the street generally align more closely with adjoining houses and do not project in such a dominant way. For these reasons, a more modest approach, or one that better follows the depth and alignment of neighbouring development, would be more sympathetic to the street scene.

2. Loss of daylight and natural light

Our second concern is the effect on daylight and natural light to No. 59. Given the attached garage relationship between Nos. 57 and 59, the extension would be positioned unusually close to our property. We are particularly concerned about the impact on the first-floor bathroom window and the stairwell window at No. 59.

These are not principal

habitable room windows, but they are the only east-facing windows in our property and they bring in valuable morning light, especially in the winter months. We are concerned that the proposed massing would materially reduce this natural light and would leave that side of

the house feeling darker and more enclosed. (Drawing 2668/01)

3. Impact on our garage and roof drainage

We also have concerns about the effect of the proposal on our attached garage structure. As the garages of Nos. 57 and 59 are attached, demolition and rebuilding works on the neighbour's side could affect the adjoining wall and roof of our garage, particularly if the interface is not properly designed and detailed. (Drawing 2668/05) In addition, we are concerned about the proposed roof form and the way rainwater may discharge. Although the rear part of the new roof appears to slope to both sides, the combination of its two-storey height and the skewed boundary line means that it would sit very close to our property in practical terms. We are worried that, in periods of heavy rain, water may be driven towards the side and onto our flat-roofed extension, which could cause long-term damage if the drainage is not carefully resolved. We would ask the Council to ensure that the roof and drainage details are properly designed so that no harmful runoff is directed towards our property. (Drawing 2668/02)

4. Retaining wall and raised platform

We also wish to comment on the part-retrospective retaining wall at the rear. From our perspective, the brick-built outbuilding now sits on a raised platform (936mm), which allows a person standing there to look over the fence and into our garden and towards our home. This has already had a real effect on our privacy. The outbuilding also appears to make full use of the width of the rear garden, which increases its visual presence and makes the relationship with our property feel even more intrusive. The fence between the two gardens is already approximately 5 feet 6 inches high, yet the raised level still allows views across into our property. The existing screening is only partly due to our two trees already there, and this protection is only seasonal, as the trees lose their leaves in winter and the level of overlooking becomes more apparent. (Drawing 2668/07)

We were aware that our neighbour intended to add an outbuilding to the rear garden, but we were not aware that it would be built on such a raised platform. Our concern is simply that the resulting arrangement has already changed the relationship between the two properties in a way that feels intrusive. We raise this not as a procedural complaint, but to explain the real effect that the raised platform and retaining wall have already had on the enjoyment of our property. The Council is respectfully requested to take this existing relationship into account when assessing the current application, particularly in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy and the cumulative impact of further built form and fenestration changes.

5. Upper-floor bathroom windows and future development

Finally, we are concerned about the two bathroom windows proposed at first-floor level. We understand that such windows may seem minor in themselves, but if they face towards our side of the property they could create a long-term relationship that may later become relevant if No. 59 ever seeks to extend in future. (Drawing 2668/03) We are not asking the Council to rule on a hypothetical future application, but we do ask that the current design does not create

avoidable future conflict. If additional daylight is required to serve these rooms, we would respectfully suggest that skylights or another less sensitive design solution may be more appropriate, as this would reduce the risk of future overlooking and avoid unnecessary daylight-related conflict between the two properties.