

PLANNING REF : 260063
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 47 Reeves Way
: Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG41 2PS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Shiven 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:

- 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".
- Wokingham Borough Council's Borough Design Guide (for any new build or extension) states "The primary consideration is impact upon neighbours".
- 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".
- Planning Material Considerations - overlooking, loss of light and overbearing impact.
- "If any part of the extension is within 2 metres of the boundary the eaves height must not exceed 3 metres."

As an immediate neighbour of the proposed development at 49 Reeves Way, I wish to submit the following objections:

1. Visual Impact and Scale of the Proposed Extension

While I understand the applicants' desire to increase their ground floor space, the extension in its current form is, in my view, disproportionately large. From our property at 47 Reeves Way, the outlook from our conservatory (used daily as a dining room/office) would be dominated by a tall, uninterrupted brick wall. This is primarily due to the proposed single pitch roof which rises towards the rear of No. 49, resulting in two substantial brick side elevations reaching up to just below the first floor windows. I would strongly prefer a hipped roof design, with three sloping roof sections, as illustrated on the diagram that will accompany the hard copy version of this objection. A hipped roof sloping inwards from both sides as well as the rear would reduce the imposing height and length of the structure along the boundary and significantly soften its visual impact.

This alternative roof shape would also align with the existing rear extension at 16 Crail Close (directly behind 49 Reeves Way) and with the roofline of our own conservatory, creating a more sympathetic and visually consistent appearance. A shallower roof pitch would further reduce the overbearing effect when viewed from our property.

I would also like to highlight that the gap between the proposed

extension and the boundary line separating our two properties is approximately 1000mm. I believe the 2 Metre Rule applies here, meaning the eaves height must not exceed 3 metres. Given this, I feel that a reduction in both the depth (from 4365mm to 4000mm) and the width (from 11785mm to 9785mm) should also be considered. As proposed, the extension would severely limit the natural light entering our

conservatory. My calculations indicate that it would block around 82% of our side light and obstruct the view by approximately 3470mm. To mitigate this, I have suggested a 2000mm reduction in width moving the extension further away from our shared boundary to prevent the structure from appearing excessively dominant. These amended

dimensions are shown on the diagram that will be submitted with the printed copy of this objection. A photograph illustrating the current light levels from the side of our conservatory, which would be lost under the proposal, will also be included.

2. Proposed New Side Window Overlooking Our Property

The proposal includes a new side facing window at 49 Reeves Way which would directly overlook our conservatory and garden at No. 47. As the window is full height and standard in size, I have serious concerns about loss of privacy.

I therefore object to this window in its current form and would prefer it either to be removed completely or replaced with an obscured glass fanlight window, which would prevent direct overlooking while still allowing ventilation if required.

Conclusion

Given the concerns outlined above, I do not consider my requests to be unreasonable, and I feel they would result in a more proportionate and neighbour friendly development. However, as the plans currently stand, I must object to the proposal.

Attachments (submitted with hard copy version):

- A diagram showing the current planning proposal (top) and our suggested amendments (bottom), including:
 - o A hipped roof design
 - o A set back of the side wall from the boundary
 - o A fanlight window in place of the standard side window
- A photograph showing the existing side light to our conservatory which would be significantly reduced by the proposed extension