

PLANNING REF : 252185
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 5 Silverdale Road
: Wargrave, Berkshire
: RG10 8EA
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Edward Guy Wainwright Beard
DATE SUBMITTED : 13/01/2026

COMMENTS:

I wish to formally object to Planning Application 252185 relating to the commercial development at Thames Wood House Care Home, School Hill, Wargrave.

The application proposes rooftop HVAC units and associated plant which were not included in, nor assessed as part of, the original Planning Application 222456. These elements constitute a material change to the approved development, introducing additional height, bulk, visual intrusion and noise impacts which have not previously been considered.

The siting of mechanical plant at roof level will result in an unacceptable impact on residential amenity for nearby properties, including my own at 5 Silverdale Road. I work from home for the majority of the time and will be directly affected by any increase in mechanical noise, both continuous and intermittent. The proposal risks introducing noise intrusion inconsistent with the quiet residential character of the area and would adversely affect day-to-day living conditions.

The additional height created by rooftop plant will also cause material harm to visual amenity. The building is already large, prominent and visually dominant on the skyline; the introduction of further roof-mounted infrastructure exacerbates this dominance and results in an overbearing form of development when viewed from neighbouring properties. This leads to a clear loss of outlook and degradation of established sight lines from residential windows.

The impact of increased mechanical noise and visual dominance is of particular concern given the family-oriented nature of the area. There are many young children living nearby who regularly play outdoors, and one of the defining characteristics of Silverdale Road is its relatively low level of traffic and mechanical noise. The proposal would erode this established residential environment, contrary to the reasonable expectations of residents.

It is also concerning that such significant infrastructure clearly integral to the operation of the development was omitted from the original planning submission. Given the direct implications for building height, noise generation and visual impact, this should have been fully assessed at the outset. Its retrospective introduction undermines the robustness of the original approval and prevents proper consideration of cumulative impacts.

For the reasons set out above, the proposal would result in material harm to residential amenity through increased noise, visual intrusion and excessive scale, and represents an unacceptable addition to an already dominant development. I therefore object to Planning

Application 252185 and respectfully recommend that it be referred.