
Interested party 2

Comments

Planning Services
Wokingham Borough Council

Re: Strong Objection to Planning Application 243125 - Thamesfield Retirement Village, Remenham, RG9 2LX

I write to object in the strongest possible terms to planning application 243125 at Thamesfield Retirement Village.

I am writing as a relative of a resident of Remenham Row, immediately affected by this proposal. My mother's bathroom, bedroom and living room windows would all be overlooked by the proposed development. This is a wholly unacceptable impact on her privacy, light and day-to-day enjoyment of her home.

Loss of privacy and overlooking

The most serious objection is the direct overlooking that this proposal would create. The increase in height, scale and massing of the proposed 2.5/3-storey extension would introduce clear views towards neighbouring homes at Remenham Row, including into my mother's bathroom, bedroom and living room.

That would amount to a serious and intrusive loss of privacy. A person's bedroom, living room, and especially bathroom are among the most private parts of a home. It is unreasonable for residents to be exposed in this way by a new development of this scale and proximity.

This concern is fully consistent with the reported refusal reasons, which found that the proposal's bulk, scale, height and proximity to neighbouring dwellings at Remenham Row would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking and perceived loss of privacy.

Overbearing and unneighbourly impact

The proposal would also create an overbearing and oppressive presence for neighbouring residents.

The building is too large, too tall and too dominant for this part of the site. It would loom over nearby homes and would have an intrusive physical presence entirely out of keeping with the existing relationship between Thamesfield and Remenham Row. The result would be an unneighbourly form of development that would materially harm the living conditions of nearby residents.

Excessive scale, bulk and overdevelopment

This scheme is plainly an overdevelopment of the site.

Even with revisions to the roof design, the proposal remains far too bulky, too high and too visually assertive for such a sensitive location. It represents a substantial intensification of built form on the northern edge of the site and would be out of scale with both the existing development and the surrounding area.

The concerns already raised by Henley Town Council on grounds of overdevelopment and harm to visual amenity are therefore well founded.

Harm to the conservation area and riverside setting

This site lies in a highly sensitive location within the Remenham and Henley Bridge Conservation Area, close to the River Thames and opposite Henley.

The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this special area. Its excessive massing and prominence would harm the conservation area, the wider heritage setting, and the important riverside character of this location. It would also be visually intrusive from the river and from surrounding viewpoints.

The committee report confirms heritage concerns and conflict with policy TB24, while the refusal reporting states that the scheme failed to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of both the Remenham and Henley Bridge Conservation Area and the Henley-on-Thames Conservation Area.

Lack of demonstrated need

I also question whether this proposal is needed at all.

This form of development is not required in Henley, particularly when Thamesfield has not managed to fill the places it already has available. More broadly, Henley is already swamped with retirement-style accommodation. In those circumstances, the claimed need for further units should be treated with caution and should not be given significant weight, especially where the proposal causes clear and direct harm to neighbouring residents.

Even if additional retirement accommodation is said to be desirable in principle, that cannot justify a scheme which so clearly harms neighbours' privacy and the character of a sensitive conservation area.

Conclusion

For all these reasons, I strongly object to application 243125 and urge the Council to refuse planning permission.

The proposal would cause:

direct overlooking of my mother's bathroom, bedroom and living room windows
serious loss of privacy
an overbearing and unneighbourly impact
harm through excessive bulk, scale and massing
overdevelopment of the site
harm to the conservation area and riverside setting
unjustified development where no clear local need has been demonstrated
This is the wrong development in the wrong place, and its impact on nearby residents at Remenham Row would be unacceptable.

Yours faithfully,

Sarah Mercer

Relative of a resident at Remenham Row [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents
