

PLANNING REF : 252822
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 25 Sutcliffe Avenue
: Earley, Reading, Berkshire
: RG6 7JW
SUBMITTED BY : Ms Gillian Townsend
DATE SUBMITTED : 17/01/2026

COMMENTS:

16 January 2026

Submitted electronically via the Planning Portal and sent by
Recorded
Delivery

Planning Department
Wokingham Borough Council
Shute End
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1BN

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Planning Application 252822 - 27 Sutcliffe Avenue, Earley,
Reading, Berkshire RG6 7JW

I write to submit formal neighbour representations in relation to the above planning application. I am the owner and occupier of 25 Sutcliffe Avenue, the residential property immediately adjoining the application site.

At the outset, I wish to note that my property was not included on the original neighbour notification list for this application. As a result, I became aware of the proposal at a relatively late stage in the process.

Following this, Rowan from Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Department attended the site on Thursday 15 January 2026 and met with me. During this visit, Rowan viewed the relationship between the two properties, took photographs, and advised that he would now be required to write up a report of his observations. Given the relevance of this site visit to the assessment of neighbouring impact, I would expect that this report will form part of the application record and would wish to see a copy in due course.

While I appreciate that the omission from the original neighbour notification list has since been acknowledged, the late awareness of the proposal has inevitably limited the opportunity to fully assess its implications and, where appropriate, seek independent technical advice. In these circumstances, I trust the Planning Authority will give careful consideration to the need for a fair, transparent and properly informed assessment before reaching any decision.

These representations are made in a constructive and professional manner, with the intention of ensuring that the application is assessed in a thorough, proportionate and technically robust way, consistent with Wokingham Borough Council's established development management approach and with full regard to the protection of neighbouring residential amenity, which is a key material

consideration in the determination of householder planning applications.

Residential Amenity, Scale and Design:

I have significant concerns regarding the scale, massing, height and overall design of the proposed development and the relationship it would create with my property. Due to its depth, height and proximity to the shared boundary, the proposal has the clear potential to result in:

- Material loss of daylight and sunlight as a consequence of increased overshadowing;
- An overbearing and enclosing impact on my home;
- Overlooking and loss of privacy to my conservatory, which I use as my principal living area; and
- A demonstrable adverse impact on the enjoyment and usability of my patio/terrace and rear garden.

These impacts are directly relevant to the assessment of residential amenity and are matters to which the Council ordinarily affords significant weight when determining applications of this nature.

Daylight, Sunlight and Outlook - Application of the 25 and 45 Tests:

I draw the Planning Authority's attention to the Borough Design Guide technical guidance on the 25-degree and 45-degree tests, which form an established and recognised methodology used by Wokingham Borough Council to inform judgements on daylight, sunlight and outlook impacts on neighbouring properties.

Having reviewed the submitted drawings, I am concerned that the application does not clearly or transparently demonstrate how these tests have been applied, nor does it provide sufficient technical evidence to allow the Planning Authority to be satisfied that neighbouring amenity would be adequately safeguarded.

In particular:

- The rearward projection and depth of the extension raise substantive concerns in relation to the 45-degree test, when assessed from the midpoint of the primary living room window serving No. 25 Sutcliffe Avenue;
- The height, roof form and massing of the rear extension raise concerns in relation to the 25-degree test, when measured from the side-facing living room windows of my property; and
- The absence of clearly drawn, scaled and annotated test illustrations makes it difficult to understand the full extent of the impact and places reliance on assumption rather than objective evidence.

In my view, this creates uncertainty as to whether the proposal would comply with the Borough Design Guide and avoid material harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

Officer Assessment, Consistency and Planning Judgement:

Given the close physical relationship between the two properties, I request that the Planning Officer undertakes a particularly careful

and critical assessment of the proposal, including:

- A detailed appraisal of scale, massing and siting in the context of neighbouring development;
- Consideration of relevant planning history and comparable decisions within Sutcliffe Avenue and the immediate surrounding area; and
- Confirmation that the proposal is consistent with the Council's established approach to protecting residential amenity in similar circumstances.

In the absence of clear and robust technical evidence addressing these matters, it would be difficult to reach a sound conclusion that the proposal would not result in material harm.

Consultation and Further Information:

Given the technical nature of the issues identified, the recent officer site visit, and the circumstances surrounding the original neighbour notification, I request that the Planning Authority considers whether it would be appropriate to:

- Seek additional or amended drawings from the applicant, including explicit and clearly annotated illustrations of the 25-degree and 45-degree tests; and
- Ensure that any such information, together with the officer site visit report, is made available and subject to appropriate re-consultation, enabling affected neighbours to comment meaningfully before the application is determined.

Such an approach would assist in ensuring that any eventual decision is based on a full, transparent and properly evidenced understanding of the proposal's impacts.

Conclusion:

My intention in making these representations is not to oppose development in principle, but to ensure that any decision to approve the application is founded on a sound, transparent and evidence-led assessment, and that the Planning Authority can be fully satisfied that neighbouring residential amenity would not be materially harmed.

I trust that these representations will assist the Planning Officer in reaching a carefully reasoned and defensible decision.

Ms. Gillian Townsend