

Interested party 32

Comments	I am Nicholas Johnson's partner. His parents, Bill and Margaret, live at 7 Remenham Row, and for the past year or so I have spent time with them there most weeks. I still remember my first visit, because the place was not what I expected. You turn off a busy road, the gate closes behind you, and everything goes quiet - no traffic, no passers-by, nobody about except the residents and the people there to see them. Bill and Margaret don't get out much any more, so the gardens are really their world: Bill does his slow lap of them, and Margaret sits out whenever it's warm enough. I've come to understand that the peace of the place isn't a luxury for them - it's most of what a good day consists of. Nick has shown me the plans and pointed out where the new building would stand: along the wall where there is currently a low single-storey building, replaced by three storeys of flats looking towards the houses and gardens. I find it hard to see how the feel of the place could survive that. What makes Remenham Row work for the people who live there is that nothing looks in on them. This would. Others writing to you know the estate far better than I do, and I will leave the detail to them. I only wanted to add, as a regular visitor, that everything they say about the quiet and the privacy is true - it is the first thing you notice, and it would be the first thing to go. I hope you will let the Council's decision stand and dismiss this appeal. Yours sincerely, Maria Gomez Close
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 33

Comments	Appeal reference: APP/6011062 Council reference: 243125 Site: Thamesfield Retirement Village, Wargrave Road, Remenham, RG9 2LX Appellant: Retirement Villages Development Limited Dear Planning Inspector, I am the son of Bill and Margaret Johnson of 7 Remenham Row, the retirement estate immediately north of the appeal site. I have previously objected to this planning application. I live nearby, visit my parents several times a week, and often spend much of the day there, so I know the estate, its grounds and its daily routines well. My parents have written to you separately; I support their letters and add here only what I have seen for myself. Remenham Row as it actually is:- Remenham Row is a small gated estate of twelve retirement homes. The only way in is an electric gate on Wargrave Road, operated by intercom and residents' remote controls, so no member of the public enters. Inside, a gravel drive circles a central lawn; residents keep their cars in two garage blocks, with marked visitor spaces in this area. A short gravel pathway which is intended for emergency vehicles only runs along the front of Nos 1 to 5 and then stops. Between the homes at Nos 1 to 5 and the Thamesfield boundary wall there is nothing except front gardens, a planted border, and the gravel pathway.
----------	---

I set this out because the Appellant's Statement of Case describes the relationship between the proposed building and these homes as "front-to-front", as if they faced one another across a street. Whatever label is ultimately applied, there is no street here and nobody passes. The ground between the houses and the wall functions as the residents' private garden and the privacy they currently enjoy in it is complete.

How my parents use this place:-

My father can no longer walk far. Most days he makes a slow circuit of the communal grounds with his walking frame; it is his main exercise and one of the real pleasures left to him. My mother's mobility is also limited, and she sits out in the grounds whenever the weather allows. Neither of them can readily go elsewhere: the grounds are not an optional amenity but where much of their daily life actually happens.

What is proposed at the boundary:-

The Thamesfield building along this boundary today is a low single-storey wing: from the gardens and from the homes' front windows you look over its roof to open sky. The appeal scheme replaces it with a three-storey block and will be closer to the boundary wall than the existing single storey building where it faces Remenham Row properties. Thamesfield already has one three-storey building on the far side of the site; the village's own layout has always kept its height away from Remenham Row, with its lowest buildings beside us. This proposal reverses that arrangement, placing the tallest building on the site at its most sensitive edge. The committee report accepts that habitable windows would face the homes, and the drawings show living rooms and bedrooms with Juliet balconies on this elevation.

The trees and the Appellant's illustrations:-

Several of the Appellant's images, including the "Illustrative Master Plan Rev B" show the new building heavily veiled by foliage. In reality there are five medium-sized deciduous trees along the boundary, and they stand on Remenham Row's land, not the Appellant's: RVG acknowledged during the application that there is no space to plant on its own side of the wall, so it can neither add to nor secure the screening its images rely on.

Even now, in full leaf, much of the existing single-storey building is visible between and beneath the canopies; from November to April the trees screen nothing.

What it would mean for my parents:-

If this is built, the openness that defines the estate is gone. My father's daily walk would run beside a three-storey elevation of occupied rooms directly overlooking Remenham Row; my mother would sit within view of it; and their neighbours at Nos 1 to 5, whose living rooms face the site directly, would fare worse still, as their own letters explain. This is not a marginal or merely perceived change: it is the difference between open sky and a large occupied building at close range, in a place whose whole character is quiet seclusion. There would also be a long construction period immediately beside homes whose occupants, my parents included, are elderly and at home nearly all the time; conditions can control working hours, but they cannot relocate the people living a few metres from the hoarding.

Site visit:-

Before deciding this appeal, I would ask you to see the proposal from inside Remenham Row to understand the impact from the residents' perspective. In my experience no plan or photograph, however carefully prepared, conveys this relationship as standing in it does.

For these reasons, and those given by my parents and their neighbours, I ask that the appeal be dismissed and the Council's decision to refuse planning permission upheld.

Yours sincerely,

Nicholas Johnson [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 34

Comments

I previously submitted two objections to this planning application, dated 3rd February 2025 and 19th October 2025, both of which are available on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal. I was naturally delighted when the Council refused planning permission and was therefore deeply disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has chosen to appeal that decision.

My late husband and I purchased our home when Remenham Row was first built, and I have lived here ever since. I am now the longest-serving resident on the estate and have seen first-hand how this unique retirement community has developed over the years.

We chose Remenham Row because it offered the perfect balance: close enough to enjoy everything that Henley has to offer, yet peaceful, secluded and surrounded by beautiful landscaped grounds leading down to the River Thames. One of the things that has always made this such a special place to live is its sense of privacy. We are not overlooked from any direction, and that quiet atmosphere has remained unchanged ever since we moved here.

Before commenting on the Appellant's Statement of Case, I feel it is important to mention that the Council's Planning Officer had not visited Remenham Row before recommending that planning permission should be granted. It was only after residents specifically requested a site visit that he came to the estate, accompanied by the majority of the Planning Committee members, only a few days before the Committee meeting. By that stage, his report recommending approval had already been published.

Although the Planning Officer did not alter his recommendation, the Planning Committee reached a different conclusion after seeing the site for themselves and listening to the concerns of local residents. They recognised that the height, scale, bulk and position of the proposed building would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring properties, and I believe they reached the correct decision.

Having carefully considered the Appellant's Statement of Case, nothing I have read has changed my opinion that this proposal is entirely inappropriate for this location.

The existing building beside our boundary is a modest single-storey structure that sits comfortably within its surroundings and has very little effect on Remenham Row. Replacing it with a substantial three-storey apartment building would transform the relationship between the two developments. Such a large building would dominate the outlook from our estate, particularly for residents living nearest the boundary, resulting in a significant loss of privacy, outlook and natural daylight.

The impact would extend far beyond the neighbouring cottages. The proposed building would become the dominant feature of Remenham Row, fundamentally changing the character of the estate. Instead of looking across to a discreet single-storey building, residents would be faced with rows of apartment windows and Juliette balconies overlooking both our homes and communal gardens. In several places the proposed building would stand even closer to the boundary wall than the building it is intended to replace.

During the planning process, Retirement Villages Group confirmed in writing that there would not be sufficient room between the proposed building and the boundary wall to plant any trees. I therefore find it surprising that the illustration submitted with the appeal depicts what appears to be a substantial line of mature trees along our boundary. That simply does not reflect the site as it exists today. In reality there is only a mixed border containing a small number of medium-sized trees, which would provide little, if any, screening of a building of this height, even when they are in full leaf.

I also disagree with the Appellant's suggestion that the relationship between Thamesfield and Remenham Row should be treated as a front-to-front arrangement under the Borough Design Guide. Having lived here since the estate was first built, I know the layout intimately. There is no public road or public space separating the two developments. They are divided only by residents' gardens, a gravel emergency access track, planting and the boundary wall. Residents therefore enjoy a level of privacy that is quite different from homes facing one another across a street. In my view, the relationship is much more comparable to a back-to-back arrangement.

Nor am I convinced by the visual material submitted with the appeal. The proposed building would remain clearly visible from the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames, particularly during the winter months when the trees are bare. This is an exceptionally sensitive location within the Green Belt and close to important Conservation Areas, and I do not believe a development of this size and appearance would preserve the special character of this historic riverside setting.

Having lived at Remenham Row since it was created, I find it deeply upsetting to think that the peaceful character of the estate could be altered so dramatically. The qualities that first attracted my husband and myself to this community would be lost forever. I am also concerned that such a significant and intrusive development would inevitably have an adverse effect on the value of our homes.

Finally, I am very concerned about the impact of the construction process itself. Demolishing the existing building and replacing it with a development of this scale would inevitably involve many years of noise, dust, construction traffic and disruption. For an elderly community such as ours, this would be far more than an inconvenience. It would seriously affect residents' wellbeing and quality of life during what is likely to be a lengthy building programme.

For all of these reasons, together with those contained in my previous objections, I sincerely hope the Planning Inspector will dismiss this appeal and uphold Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission.

I would also ask the Planning Inspector to visit Remenham Row before reaching a decision. Having lived here since the very beginning, I know that the true relationship between the proposed development and our homes cannot be appreciated from plans and photographs alone. A visit to the site would provide a far clearer understanding of the effect this proposal would have on the residents and on the character of this unique retirement community.

Valerie Dixon
9 Remenham Row [Close](#)

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 35

Comments

I have already objected to the planning application and was very disappointed that Retirement Villages Group have appealed the decision.

Having read the Appellant's Case I would like to make the following comments.

My mother has lived at Remenham Row since the development was first built, and over the years I have come to know the estate very well through my regular visits. It is an exceptionally peaceful retirement community comprising just twelve homes, set within beautifully maintained grounds that extend to the River Thames. The development is entirely private, with no public road or pavement between Remenham Row and the Thamesfield site. The only features separating the two are the residents' gardens, a gravel pathway, landscaped planting and the boundary wall.

The proposal would replace the existing low-rise building, which is barely noticeable from Remenham Row, with a large three-storey apartment block positioned immediately alongside the boundary. The change in scale would be dramatic and, in my opinion, wholly out of keeping with the intimate nature of this small retirement community.

My principal concern is the effect this would have on my mother and her neighbours. Residents in the homes closest to the proposed development would lose the privacy they currently enjoy, with numerous windows and Juliette balconies facing directly towards their properties and outdoor spaces. The increased height and bulk of the building would also reduce natural daylight, dominate the outlook from their homes and create an oppressive sense of enclosure where there is presently openness and tranquillity.

Although the greatest impact would be on properties nearest the boundary, the proposal would fundamentally alter the character of the whole estate. One of Remenham Row's defining qualities is that it feels secluded and completely private, with no overlooking from surrounding development. That sense of peace and security would inevitably be lost if such a substantial building were constructed immediately opposite the residents' homes.

Having considered the proposal and the impact it would have on my mother and the other residents of Remenham Row, I firmly support the Council's decision to refuse planning permission and hope that the Planning Inspector upholds that decision by dismissing the appeal.

Ralph Dixon [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 36

Comments

Appeal 6011062

Dear Planning Inspector,

I am a professional carer. Over the years I have helped the Johnsons, and for the past six weeks I have visited Bill Johnson at 7 Remenham Row every day, so I have come to know Bill's daily routine well.

Bill cannot walk far any more. The shape of his day is simple, and it matters to him: a walk around the communal grounds pushing his frame (slowly, with rests, but he manages it most days) and then time sitting out with his wife Margaret when the weather is kind. The grounds are where he gets his exercise, his fresh air and a good deal of his pleasure. What makes it all possible is the character of the place. It is completely quiet and completely private, and he can take his time out there without feeling watched. I look after elderly people in different homes and settings, and I can say plainly that this one does Bill good. It keeps him moving, settled and independent to a degree I do not often see at his age.

I understand the new building would be three storeys tall and close to the boundary, with windows and balconies facing the houses and grounds. What concerns me is what will happen when elderly residents feel overlooked from close by. They often go out less. They stop sitting in the grounds and they stop taking their usual walks. If Bill stopped his daily circuit of the gardens because he no longer felt private out there, it would not appear in any technical report, but it would be a real loss to his health and independence. I believe that is a genuine risk.

The building work itself also concerns me. Bill is home all day and spends much of his time in the grounds. He cannot go off site to escape noise and dust the way a working household might. A construction project of this size, right next to the estate and lasting a long period of time, would be a constant strain on him however carefully the work is managed.

Bill and Margaret have written to you themselves. From what I see each day, the quiet and privacy they describe are not luxuries, they are what allow them to live as well as they do. If you visit the site, you will see the major impact this development would have on the residents of Remenham Row.

For these reasons I support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse permission, and I hope the appeal will be dismissed.

Regards,
Linda Duffy [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 37

Comments

My name is Janet Snell and I live at 3 Remenham Row.

I submitted two objections to the original planning application for the proposed replacement of the existing single-storey building at Thamesfield with a three-storey apartment building. These representations, dated 12 October 2025 and 29 January 2025, are available on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal. I respectfully ask that the Planning Inspector reads both of my earlier objections, as they set out a number of important concerns that remain fully relevant to this appeal.

Having carefully considered the Appellant's Statement of Case, I remain resolutely opposed to this development and wish to comment on a number of statements which do not accurately reflect the site, or the impact this proposal would have on neighbouring residents.

Section 6.2.5

I respectfully disagree with the appellant's conclusion that the impact on Remenham Row would not be significant.

Remenham Row is a unique and very small private gated retirement development. Unlike many residential developments, there is no public highway separating our homes from the proposed building. Between our cottages and the Thamesfield boundary there is only a flower border, gravel pathway, our front gardens and the boundary wall.

Replacing the existing single-storey building with a substantial three-storey building immediately opposite my home would fundamentally change my living environment. The proposed building would have a major impact on my outlook, privacy and natural light, creating an imposing and overbearing presence. The increased number of apartments would also inevitably introduce more lighting, activity and noise.

Prior to recommending approval, the Council's Planning Officer had not visited Remenham Row to assess the relationship between our properties and the proposed development. It was only after residents requested a site visit that he attended with the majority of the Planning Committee members, shortly before the meeting. By then, his report recommending approval had already been published.

Although the Planning Officer did not change his recommendation, the Planning Committee reached a different conclusion after considering the proposal and residents' concerns. The Committee concluded that the scale, bulk and relationship of the proposed building to neighbouring properties would result in unacceptable harm. This demonstrates the importance of assessing the proposal from the perspective of the homes most directly affected.

Section 6.2.9

I cannot accept the misleading statement that there is already "substantial built form" close to Remenham Row.

The existing building beside our boundary is only a single-storey structure and is barely visible above the wall. The proposal would replace it with a building of a completely different scale, height and massing.

From my living room, the proposed building would dominate my outlook. Instead of seeing open sky above the existing roofline, I would be looking directly at a three-storey building. My lounge, bedroom and bathroom all face towards the development and my bathroom window is clear glazed, meaning the view from the proposed windows and Juliette balconies would create an unacceptable loss of privacy.

Whilst there is an existing three-storey building on the far side of the Thamesfield village, it is well away from the Remenham Row boundary and has no comparable impact on any neighbouring properties. It should not be relied upon as justification for this proposal.

Section 6.2.10

The appellant suggests that the proposed building would have only a diagonal relationship with neighbouring properties. This is not correct in relation to my home.

The proposed building would sit directly opposite my property and, at this point, would also be closer to the boundary wall than the existing building, increasing its visual impact.

Section 6.2.12 – 6.2.16

The photograph of Remenham Row included within the Appellant's Statement does not show the properties most affected by this development and therefore does not provide a true understanding of its impact.

The Appellant considers that the relationship between the proposed development and homes at Remenham Row should be assessed as front-to-front under the Borough Design Guide. However, this does not reflect the reality of the sites in relation to one another.

Remenham Row is a private retirement development with no public road, footway or public space separating it from Thamesfield. The only features between the two are residents' front gardens, a gravel track used for emergency access only, planting and the boundary wall. Residents therefore enjoy a much greater level of privacy than would normally exist where properties face one another across a street. The relationship is much more comparable to a back-to-back arrangement.

The Borough Design Guide recommends a minimum separation distance of 30 metres in these circumstances. The Appellant's own measurements in Table 2 at paragraph 6.2.14 show this is not achieved. Opposite my property at No. 3 Remenham Row, the separation would be only 21.4 metres.

These standards exist to protect residential amenity by maintaining privacy and avoiding an overbearing sense of enclosure. The proposed development fails to achieve this. Its height, scale and proximity would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and dominate the outlook from neighbouring homes.

The Appellant suggests that, even if this were considered a back-to-back relationship, the harm would be limited. I disagree. The argument that the angled position of the building would reduce overlooking does not reflect the position at my property. The proposed windows and Juliette balconies would still face directly towards my home, creating an intrusive and domineering relationship.

Section 6.2.18

I do not believe this section accurately reflects the site.

The proposed building would, in places, be closer to the boundary wall than the existing building. During the consultation process, Retirement Villages Group confirmed in writing that there would be insufficient space for any tree planting.

The illustration shown on page 7 of the planning documents ("Illustrative Master Plan Rev B") depicts what appears to be a substantial bank of trees along the Remenham Row boundary, which does not reflect reality. There are only five medium-sized deciduous trees, which would provide very little screening for a building of this height and scale.

This illustration gives a misleading impression of the existing screening and understates the visual impact on neighbouring residents.

Section 6.2.20

The proposed building would dominate the outlook from my home. Its height, mass and proximity would significantly reduce my sense of openness and create an overbearing presence.

The loss of privacy would also be significant. I would need to keep blinds or curtains closed for much of the day to prevent overlooking from the proposed apartments, further reducing the natural light entering my home.

At present I enjoy an open outlook and views of the sky above the existing building. If this proposal were permitted, that outlook would be replaced by the façade of a substantial three-storey apartment block. This would fundamentally alter my enjoyment of my home and have a significant impact on my quality of life.

The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. The overbearing nature and loss of privacy may result in my husband and me needing to move, but the presence of such a dominant building immediately opposite would also make the property much harder to sell.

I respectfully request that the Planning Inspector dismiss this appeal and I strongly encourage the Planning Inspector to visit Remenham Row before determining the appeal. Only by viewing the proposal from the neighbouring properties can its true impact be fully appreciated. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 38

Comments

Please refer to my previous objection to this planning application, submitted on 16th October 2025.

Having read the Appellant's Statement of Case on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal, I wish to make the following comments.

I find it difficult to accept the Appellant's assertion that this proposal would have only a limited impact on the residents of Remenham Row. In my view, a development of this scale, height and proximity would inevitably have a significant effect on all residents at Remenham Row and in particular those living closest to it. It would result in overlooking, a loss of privacy, reduced natural light and a marked deterioration in the outlook currently enjoyed by neighbouring residents.

I also understand that parts of the proposed building would be positioned even closer to the boundary wall than the existing single-storey building. Given these circumstances, I cannot see how it can reasonably be concluded that the proposal would cause little or no harm to the residents of Remenham Row. It would fundamentally alter both their surroundings and their quality of life.

The Appellant also suggests that there is a significant shortage of retirement accommodation of the type provided at Thamesfield. Based on my knowledge of Henley-on-Thames and the surrounding area, I do not believe that this accurately reflects the current position. There is already a wide range of retirement housing and care accommodation available locally to meet differing needs, and the evidence does not suggest that there is a shortage requiring development of this scale.

By way of example, there are established retirement developments including Remenham Row, Bowling Court and Laureate Gardens, where I live. There is also the McCarthy & Stone development for the over-70s, which opened in 2018 and where, to my knowledge, a number of newly built apartments remain available for sale or rent. In addition, several well-established care homes, including The Manor Care Home, provide accommodation for residents with a range of care needs.

The supply of retirement accommodation is also continuing to increase. A substantial new retirement village is currently under construction on the Fairmile in Henley, which I understand will provide in excess of 100 additional units. Thames Wood House Care Home in nearby Wargrave is also due to open later this year, adding further capacity only a short distance from Thamesfield.

Taken together, these existing and forthcoming developments indicate that there is already a broad and expanding choice of accommodation for older people in the local area. In those circumstances, I do not accept the Appellant's assertion that there is a pressing shortage of retirement accommodation sufficient to justify a development that would cause such significant harm to neighbouring residents and to this sensitive location.

I am also concerned that the proposed building would not sit comfortably alongside the attractive white period Thamesfield building to which it would be attached. Its contemporary appearance, scale and massing would appear incongruous within this historic riverside setting. From the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames, it would be clearly visible and would stand out as an intrusive feature rather than blending with its surroundings.

This site lies within an important Conservation and Green Belt Area, where great care should be taken to preserve the historic character and appearance of the locality. In my opinion, this proposal would fail to respect the special qualities of this unique part of Henley and Remenham.

For these reasons, together with those set out in my previous objection, I respectfully ask the Planning Inspector to dismiss this appeal and uphold Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission.

Sally Burn [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 39

Comments

Thamesfield Retirement Village – Planning Appeal Ref. 6011062

I am the son of Bill and Margaret Johnson of 7 Remenham Row. I have lived aboard since 2015 but visit for around three weeks a year. I objected at the planning application stage; that representation is already before you and I will not repeat it. I now wish to make some comments regarding the appeal.

Having visited regularly over many years, I know the estate well and have seen first-hand why it provides such an exceptional environment for older people. I therefore feel I can comment on the effect this proposal would have on my parents and the wider community.

I do not agree with the Appellant's conclusion that the proposal would have only a limited effect on Remenham Row.

Whenever I visit my parents, one of the things that strikes me most is how peaceful and secluded the development feels. The beautifully maintained grounds down to the river Thames, the absence of through traffic and the open outlook all contribute to a calm environment that is clearly valued by the residents.

There is no public road separating Remenham Row from Thamesfield. Between the homes and the proposed development there are only private gardens, a gravel pathway, planting and the boundary wall. The existing single-storey building is discreet and barely noticeable from Remenham Row.

Replacing it with a substantial three-storey apartment building would completely alter the character of the estate. Instead of an open and attractive outlook, residents would face a much larger building that would dominate the surroundings and create a far more enclosed environment. The proposed design would also sit uncomfortably alongside the existing white period Thamesfield building and would appear out of keeping with this historic riverside setting.

The construction phase would also have a profound effect on residents. This would be a lengthy and disruptive building project involving noise, dust and constant activity. For elderly residents, many of whom spend much of their time at home, the impact on their wellbeing should not be underestimated.

Both my parents' mobility has become increasingly limited and, during my visits, we spend much of our time enjoying the grounds because they are one of the few places where they can walk comfortably and safely. These grounds are an important part of their everyday life, and it is deeply concerning to think that the estate as a whole would be overshadowed by such a large building immediately along the boundary wall.

The Appellant suggests there is already substantial development close to Remenham Row. This is not an accurate description.

The existing building beside the boundary is only one storey high and is barely visible above the wall. It bears little resemblance to the scale of the proposed three-storey apartment building.

Reference is also made to another three-storey building elsewhere within Thamesfield. However, that building is located much further away from Remenham Row and has no comparable relationship with neighbouring homes. It should not be relied upon to justify this proposal.

The Appellant maintains that the relationship between the proposed building and Remenham Row should be regarded as front-to-front for the purposes of the Borough Design Guide. Having spent many years visiting my parents at Remenham Row, this does not reflect the way the two developments actually relate to one another.

Remenham Row is a private, gated retirement community. It is not separated from Thamesfield by a public road or other public space. Instead, the only features between the two developments are residents' gardens, a gravel emergency access track, areas of planting and the shared boundary wall. In those circumstances, residents naturally expect a much greater degree of privacy than would normally exist between properties facing one another across a public street.

For that reason, I consider the relationship to be far more comparable to a back-to-back arrangement than a conventional front-to-front one. The Borough Design Guide recommends a minimum separation distance of 30 metres in such situations, yet the Appellant's own figures in Table 2 (paragraph 6.2.14) show that the proposed building would fall well short of that standard in several places, with separation distances of little more than 21 metres opposite some of the homes most affected.

These guidelines exist to protect residents' living conditions by safeguarding privacy and preventing developments from creating an overbearing or oppressive environment. This proposal would fail on both counts. Given the height, mass, scale and proximity of the building, neighbouring residents would experience a substantial loss of privacy together with a much more dominant and intrusive outlook.

The Appellant also suggests that the angled orientation of the proposed building would reduce overlooking and minimise its impact. Having stood in the grounds at Remenham Row on many occasions, again this does not reflect the reality on site. The proposed windows and Juliette balconies would still look directly towards the neighbouring homes, and the slight angle of the building would do nothing to lessen the visual impact or protect residents' privacy.

The proposed building would be even closer to the boundary wall than the existing building in several locations.

During the original application process, Retirement Villages Group confirmed there was insufficient room to plant trees between the building and the boundary. Despite this, the appeal documents include an illustration showing what appears to be a substantial belt of mature trees along the boundary. This is simply not an accurate representation of the site. Only a small number of medium-sized deciduous trees exist along the Remenham Row boundary and they would provide very little screening, particularly during the winter months.

I cannot accept the Appellant's conclusion that neighbouring amenity would not be materially affected.

The proposed building would become the defining feature when viewed from Remenham Row. Its size, height and proximity would fundamentally alter the character of this small retirement community and have a particularly harmful effect on those living nearest the boundary.

During every visit I make from New Zealand, I spend time with my parents in the grounds because they are such an important part of life at Remenham Row. They provide residents with somewhere peaceful to walk, sit and enjoy the surroundings. The prospect of those grounds being overlooked and dominated by a large apartment building is deeply disappointing.

For these reasons, together with those contained in my previous objections, I respectfully ask the Planning Inspector to dismiss this appeal and uphold Wokingham Borough Council's decision.

Finally, I sincerely hope the Inspector will visit Remenham Row before determining the appeal. Only by viewing the proposal from the neighbouring properties can the true relationship between the development and this unique retirement community be fully appreciated. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents