

PLANNING REF : 262088
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Frankforte
: Basingstoke Road, Three Mile Cross, Berkshire
: RG7 1AS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Colin Boorman
DATE SUBMITTED : 01/10/2026

COMMENTS:

For the Attention of the Case Officer

Planning Department

Wokingham Borough Council

Shute End, Wokingham,

Berkshire, RG40 1BN

OBJECTION LETTER

Planning Application Reference: 262088

Site Address: Blackmoor [or Bluehill], Basingstoke Road, Three Mile Cross

Proposal: Second-storey 5m rear extension and double-storey side extension

Objecting Property: Frankforte, Basingstoke Road, Three Mile Cross

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to register my strongest possible objection to the above-referenced planning application. Having carefully reviewed the submitted plans and statements, I am deeply concerned that this proposal represents a gross over-development of the site that will have a severe, detrimental impact on my property, Frankforte, and significantly harm the character of the local street scene.

This proposal is almost identical in floor plan and features an even higher roof line than the extension originally proposed under Application 251846 (submitted 17th September 2025). That previous application required at least four amendments before it was finally approved, strictly on the condition that it be limited to a single storey with a modest eaves height. As the Planning Officer explicitly noted in the report for Application 251846, "the structure's modest eaves height would substantially mitigate any potential impact on the neighbouring dwelling." By seeking a double-storey extension now, the applicant is attempting to bypass the exact protections the Planning Department deemed necessary just ten months ago.

I object to the development on the following material planning grounds:

1. Significant Inaccuracies and Misleading Documentation

The documentation submitted by the applicant contains severe mathematical and spatial inaccuracies that deliberately obscure the true impact of the development on our property:

- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (Doc: 262088-Planning Statements and Reports-02092026.pdf): The plans incorrectly plot the alignment of the two properties. In reality, the front of Blackmoor sits roximately 3.7m forward of Frankforte. The applicant's plan incorrectly shows Blackmoor 5m forward. Furthermore, the length of Blackmoor is drawn as 12m, yet their own floor plan states it is 14m. Combined, these errors mean the drawings mistakenly shiftBlackmoor forward by 3.3m relative to our home. When plotted accurately, the rear wall of Blackmoor projects significantly further back than shown, proving it will drastically cut off light to our primary living spaces.

- Proposed Site Plan (Doc: 262088-Planning Plans-02092026.pdf): This document claims Blackmoor is now 5.7m closer to the road than our house (again, the actual distance is 3.7m / 16 bricks). It also shows the extension as 5m wide, whereas a maximum width of 3m is all that is physically possible on the plot.

These 2 mis-measurements together with poor (or devious) plotting and drawing totally obscure the effect that this proposal will have on our property. These relative distances have been pointed out many times in the past, yet the applicants seem to persist with presenting false and misleading drawings in order to put their proposal in a better light. The rear wall of Blackmoor is approximately in line with the rear of our house.

- Design and Access Statement (Doc; 262088-Planning Statement and Reports-02092026(3).pdf): Figure 1 utilizes Outdated Satellite Imagery. This drone/satellite image is at least three years out of date. It fails to show the buildings as they currently stand following the recently completed extension works.

2. Overbearing Impact, Massing, and Loss of Daylight/Sunlight

Blackmoor sits directly to the South of Frankforte. Consequently, all direct sunlight to our property comes over their plot.

- Loss of Light: The proposed two-storey height will completely overshadow our home, enveloping our primary living spaces in shadow. This proposal will have a drastic impact on the amount of daylight and sunlight that we will receive. We will not have any natural light.

The current distance between our houses at Ground floor level allows some sunlight to come to our house. This extension will create a small dark corridor of space between the houses and it will obscure the sunlight to our house. Removing natural light and creating a small dark corridor of space is unacceptable.

- Inaccurate Window Data: Section 5.1 of the applicant's Design Principles falsely claims that Frankforte has no side-facing windows. This is entirely incorrect. Our recently approved and constructed plans include three ground-floor windows and a glazed door servicing our kitchen and lounge areas, alongside two first-floor windows on that side. The proposed massing will reduce the current open gap to a dark, narrow corridor, permanently stripping these windows of natural light.

- Height Ambiguities: The application contradicts itself regarding height, citing 5.26m in section 5.2 (which only measures the lowest point, ignoring the fact that the majority of the structure exceeds 8m) and then stating 4.5m in section 5.3.

3. Over-Development and Creation of a Terracing Effect

The construction of a double-storey side extension completely removes the necessary separation distance between the properties. This will result in an artificial "terracing effect" that is entirely uncharacteristic of this section of Basingstoke Road. Local extensions in Three Mile Cross have historically maintained respectful boundary step-backs and modest eaves heights (our own extension was deliberately stepped back and with a 4.5m eaves height to protect our neighbours). The proposed "bolted-on" design fails to respect

the street scene and will result in a visual eyesore.

4. Failure to Meet Core Strategy Policy Objectives

The applicant's Site Analysis Statement relies heavily on the core policy of "providing additional family accommodation." This argument is invalid. The site already accommodates a very large, recently extended 3-bedroom family home. The application does not create a new housing unit to alleviate local housing pressure; it merely over-develops an already maximised plot.

Furthermore, this application must be evaluated cumulatively with Application 251846. The applicant has already expanded the footprint of the site significantly, including building an unauthorised "replacement" detached garage in the rear garden which did not feature on the original plans (the historical garage was located at the side of the house, where the current side extension now stands).

5. Construction Management and Amenity Concerns

Should the council be minded to approve this application despite these severe violations, we request that strict, legally binding Construction Management conditions be imposed. During the construction of the ground-floor extension, work was carried out seven days a week, at all hours, causing severe disruption. We request that:

- Permitted working hours be strictly limited to standard daytime hours (08:00-18:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00-13:00 Saturdays, with no work on Sundays or Bank Holidays).

- A strict parking condition be enforced preventing contractors parking vehicles on the pavements or the local grass verges, preserving pedestrian safety and highway drainage.

For the reasons detailed above most notably the profound loss of daylight, the overbearing massing, the creation of an unwanted terracing effect, and the pervasive inaccuracies throughout the application documents we respectfully urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application.

We request that the Case Officer conducts a physical site visit to verify the true structural alignments and boundary realities, which clearly contradict the applicant's submitted plans.

Thank you for taking our objections into consideration. Please keep us informed of any updates, amendments, or committee meeting dates regarding this application.