

Interested party 5

Comments

I previously objected to this Planning Application and was very disappointed to learn that Thamesfield Retirement Group have submitted an Appeal following the Wokingham Borough Council Planning Committee's decision to reject the application.

I live in Henley and I regularly visit friends who live in the adjoining properties at Remenham Row and therefore know the area well.

From a visitor's perspective, this proposal represents a clear case of overdevelopment. The scale and bulk of the building would be out of proportion with the site and would have an unacceptable impact on the privacy of the neighbouring properties and their residents.

The development would also be visually out of keeping with the surrounding area and importantly sits within the Conservation Area and the Remenham Bridge Conservation Area. The River Thames is an important feature of the Conservation Area.

Importantly, the impact would not be limited to this side of the river. The River Thames is a shared landscape, and any large-scale development on one bank is clearly visible from the other, particularly during the winter when the trees lose their leaves. In this case, the proposal would also harm views from the Henley side of the river, affecting the wider setting and enjoyment of the river corridor as a whole.

The proposed materials do not reflect the character of the existing buildings nearby, which contribute significantly to the peaceful and attractive atmosphere of this part of the river.

Overall, the scheme would be intrusive, poorly integrated into its surroundings, and harmful to the character and enjoyment of the area.
For these reasons, I request that the Inspector dismisses the appeal.

Anne Long [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 6

Comments

I have twice previously objected to the Thamesfield building project plans using the formal process. My elderly mother lives at 4 Remenham Row and her quality of life would be irrevocably and negatively impacted should the appeal be successful.

I do not have not the legal language nor the breadth of knowledge that the appellants have and yet I trust that in this process it is the Councils intention to consider all comments.

The appellant has conveniently relied on the most subjective and literal translation of fact and claims that residents have 'materially overstated' the potential impact of a 3 story build that overlooks this quiet retirement dwelling. I understand that before approving the build there was no site visit so it may have been difficult to connect with the context of the proposed change to the quality of life of residents, not to mention the impact on the Henley riverside vista by a behemoth new build.

The images provided by the appellant of the proposed angle of overview is simply wrangled to appear benign. The trees in the illustration are in fact decorative and provide no 'cover' or privacy from a neighbouring view. Also, it takes true ignorance to suggest that human eyes only follow the graph of a line on an illustration.

'Materially overstating' as an appeal is, at best, patronising to these residents and, at worst, dismissing highly valid, and evidenced feedback to the Council. My mother will immediately feel an absence of psychological safety knowing that anyone can look into her bedroom, can make as much noise as they choose from their Juliet balcony, she will feel watched from her own home.

That is before you reconsider the loss of natural light as mentioned in my previous objection.

The photograph of the buildings in Remenham row are angled in such a way (conveniently?) that my mothers property isn't even showing.

All my previous points still stand. I would strongly suggest that a site visit is conducted by the Council so that they can meet the residents, see their homes, understand their fears of being swallowed by an amorphous company who seeks only to monetise the space, whilst ignoring the human, environmental and heritage cost of their profit-making pursuits.

It is my understanding that the reason we have a Council is to protect the land, to support the citizens and to be better at our decision making than Artificial Intelligence. Progress is important, it just needs mitigating and monitoring appropriately and with true consideration to the human cost - otherwise we might as well let the computers run everything. [Close](#)

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

Interested party 7	
Comments	First and foremost the Council did not comply with procedures relating to notifying those who opposed the planning appeal by Thamesfield. At no time have I been informed by the Council that Thamesfield had lodged an appeal and I only found out by others in the community. It is clear from the Councils original refusal that the planned development will have a huge impact on adjoining properties with many of those residents elderly and some unable to speak for themselves. By allowing this development the Council will be opening doors for similar developments in the future that will without doubt impact on the surrounding area of Henley-on-Thames. I strongly object to allowing this proposed appeal by Thamesfield to materialise. Close
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 8

Comments	Having attended the relevant meeting, on the evening of the 10th of December 2025, at Wokingham Borough Council, I was in full agreement with the Council's decision to refuse planning permission. That decision, which was not taken lightly, was fairly based on the unacceptable size of the proposed building which, without doubt, would have a considerable negative and mental impact on several Remenham Row residents as well as materially impacting the value of each home. Para 6.2.5. Appellant's view about limited impact. The houses that would face the proposed development are not facing a road; there are small front garden plots, a narrow gravel path for access and emergency vehicles only, a flower border, a few medium-sized gapped trees and a brick boundary wall. The houses in question would indeed face the proposed huge 3 storey building, which would have a great impact on personal privacy within their own homes. Para 6.2.9. The Appellant states that the new building would only be seen at an angle. As already mentioned, in reality, that is incorrect. Some would actually have their bedrooms and bathrooms directly facing the proposed 3 storey building. Regarding the mention of a 3-storey building elsewhere in the area; that particular building is opposite the Leander Club, not far from the approach to Henley Bridge and therefore not at all close to Remenham Row nor Thamesfield.
----------	---

Para 6.2.12 - 6.2.16. Regarding the photograph of some Remenham Row dwellings. Rather to my surprise, the photograph shows my house in the centre, number 6 - and numbers 5 & 7. Indeed, beyond the front garden plots of those houses, there is a clear view ahead of a small green, a dovecote, various garden areas, a vehicle-access gravel road surrounding the green, 6 visitors' parking bays, a site-manager's office plus some residents' garages. In other words - quite a pleasant view and one which does not expose us to the main road outside i.e. the busy Wargrave Road. The dwellings 1 - 4, around the corner, would indeed have their current view and privacy affected by the proposed 3 storey building. It should be borne in mind that not all dwellings at Remenham Row are terraced houses; there are 4 flats and 8 houses and the internal configuration, in each, is very different.

To describe a front-to-front relationship between Remenham Row and Thamesfield is not at all realistic and a visit by the Inspector to the RR site would immediately confirm that. The Borough Design Guide mentions a back-to-back development where greater distance between sites is expected and therefore more acceptable. A minimum separation of 30 metres is mentioned and yet the Appellant's statement (para 6.2.14) mentions much shorter distances i.e. 21.4 metres. The Borough Design Group emphasises privacy and a limit to the sense of an enclosure and I believe that Wokingham Borough Council must have taken that into consideration when turning down the Thamesfield application.

Para 6.2.18. I find the Appellant's description of the Thamesfield site rather misleading and confusing. Parts of the proposed new Thamesfield building would actually be closer than the current building to the Remenham Row boundary wall! I am not sure how that can be justified but, surely it would mean that there would not be an appropriate area in which to plant trees - which of course would help to screen the view of such a huge building. On the Remenham Row side, and contrary to a Thamesfield illustration, we do not have a row of mature trees but in actual fact only four medium sized trees, inter-spaced, which are not sufficient to offer any meaningful screening.

Para 6.2.20. For the Appellant to say that the 3-storey building proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on Remenham Row neighbours is to be expected. In reality, the new building would be much higher and larger; those facing it would have greatly reduced privacy as well as an entirely different outlook to the one that they currently have. In addition, the garden and flower bed area on the immediate Remenham Row side of the boundary wall would be affected too by blocked sunlight.

As well as Thamesfield wishing to accommodate the elderly and help with the care issues of some - equal consideration ought to be given to the residents of Remenham Row which is designed for those aged from 55 years. Sadly, we have a few residents here, in their 80's and 90's, who cannot drive, cannot walk unaided and whose main pleasure in daily life is to enjoy the various garden areas within Remenham Row and to enjoy pleasant views.

I should be very grateful if, before making a final decision, that the Inspector could very kindly pay a visit to Remenham Row so as to fully appreciate the adverse impact the proposed new building would have on its residents.

Mrs. Kay Robertson
6 Remenham Row. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 9

Comments

I have already submitted two objections to this planning application, which can be found on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal. I was delighted when Wokingham Borough Council refused planning permission and was therefore very disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has appealed that decision.

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

I cannot agree with the Appellant's conclusion that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on Remenham Row.

Remenham Row is a unique and very small retirement development of just 12 homes. It is a private gated community with no public road separating our homes from the proposed development. Between our properties and the Thamesfield boundary there is only a flower border, a gravel pathway, our front gardens and the boundary wall. The beautifully maintained gardens lead down to the River Thames and create a peaceful and attractive setting. It is exactly the sort of place many of us chose for our retirement.

The proposal would replace a modest single-storey building, which is barely visible above the boundary wall, with a substantial three-storey block of apartments. Such a large building so close to Remenham Row would have an overwhelming and overbearing effect on our small community. It would inevitably reduce privacy, natural daylight and the pleasant outlook currently enjoyed by residents, particularly those living closest to the boundary.

The size and scale of the building would have a serious impact on the whole estate. My neighbours in the properties directly opposite would lose much of their privacy, with large windows and Juliette balconies overlooking their homes, gardens and living areas. They would also experience a significant loss of daylight and outlook, creating an oppressive sense of enclosure where none exists today. At present, Remenham Row is not overlooked from any direction, and that feeling of privacy is one of its greatest attractions.

One of the things I most enjoy is walking around our beautiful grounds and admiring the carefully maintained gardens. The thought of looking towards a large apartment building with rows of windows overlooking our estate would completely change the peaceful character of the place and take away much of the enjoyment I currently have.

The proposal would also bring increased activity associated with a much larger number of apartments, leading to additional noise and light pollution, particularly during the evenings, which would inevitably affect the quiet atmosphere that residents currently enjoy.

I also disagree with the Appellant's assertion that there is already "substantial built form" close to Remenham Row. As only mentioned the existing building beside the boundary is only a single-storey structure and is barely visible above the wall. It bears no comparison with the scale, height and bulk of the building now proposed.

The Appellant also refers to an existing three-storey building elsewhere within Thamesfield. However, that building is situated well away from the Remenham Row boundary on the southern side of the site and has no comparable effect on neighbouring homes. It should not therefore be used to justify this proposal.

I am also concerned by the illustration shown on page 7 of the planning documents ("Illustrative Master Plan Rev B"), which gives a misleading impression of the existing planting along the Remenham Row boundary. It suggests there is a substantial line of trees screening the proposed development. In reality, there are only five medium-sized deciduous trees. Even when they are in full leaf they would provide very little effective screening of a building of this height and scale, and during the winter months, when the leaves have fallen, they would provide virtually none.

Despite the Appellant's illustrations, the proposed building would remain clearly visible from the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames, particularly during the winter months. This is a highly sensitive location within both the Green Belt and the Conservation Area, close to the historic riverside setting of Henley. A building of this size and appearance would fail to preserve the special character of this important historical area.

Like many people who have chosen to live at Remenham Row, I bought my home because of its peaceful surroundings, attractive outlook and beautiful riverside setting. I am deeply concerned that this proposal would permanently alter the character of our community, make it a far less enjoyable place to live and inevitably have a detrimental effect on the value of our homes.

Also the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a development of this scale would inevitably result in a prolonged period of noise, dust and disruption. This would have a considerable impact on the daily lives and wellbeing of elderly residents, both at Remenham Row and at Thamesfield itself. For all of these reasons, together with the concerns I raised in my previous objections, I sincerely ask the Planning Inspector to dismiss this appeal and uphold Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission. Finally, I would kindly ask the Planning Inspector, if at all possible, to visit Remenham Row before making a decision on this appeal. I truly believe that only by seeing the site in person and understanding just how close this very large building would be to our homes can its full impact on those of us who live here be properly appreciated. A visit would, I hope, provide a much clearer picture than can ever be gained from plans and photographs alone.

Barbara Silver
11 Remenham Row [Close](#)

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

Interested party 10

Comments

I previously submitted two objections to this planning application and was extremely pleased when Wokingham Borough Council decided to refuse planning permission. I was therefore saddened and disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has chosen to appeal against that decision. Remenham Row is a quiet and attractive retirement community, surrounded by beautiful gardens, with a real sense of space and tranquillity and totally private, not over looked from any side. It provides exactly the sort of peaceful environment that people hope to enjoy in later life. Having carefully read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I remain firmly of the opinion that this proposal is unsuitable and would like to make the following comments.

The proposal would replace the existing low single-storey building with a much larger three-storey apartment block immediately adjoining Remenham Row. In my view, a building of this size would have a considerable effect on neighbouring homes, resulting in a loss of privacy, reduced natural daylight and a much poorer outlook for those living closest to the boundary.

The Appellant suggests that the relationship between the proposed building and the homes at Remenham Row should be treated as front-to-front when applying the Borough Design Guide. Having lived here and know the layout for myself, I do not believe that description reflects the reality of the site.

This is not a typical situation where houses face one another across a public road or street. Remenham Row is a private retirement development and the only features separating our homes from Thamesfield are residents' front gardens, a gravel track used solely for emergency access, areas of planting and the shared boundary wall. There is no public road, pavement or other publicly accessible space between the two developments.

Because of this arrangement, residents reasonably expect a much higher level of privacy than would normally exist between properties facing each other across a highway. The relationship is therefore much more comparable to a back-to-back arrangement for the purposes of applying the Borough Design Guide.

I am also not persuaded by the illustrations submitted by the Appellant. The proposed building would still be plainly visible from the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames, particularly during the winter when the trees have lost their leaves. Given the prominent location within both the Green Belt and the Conservation Area, I believe a development of this scale would detract from the character and appearance of this important historic riverside setting rather than preserve it.

One of the main reasons I chose to move to Remenham Row was its peaceful atmosphere and attractive surroundings. I fear that this development would overpower and permanently alter the character of the estate and diminish the enjoyment of those of us who live here. I am also concerned that such a significant change would inevitably have an adverse effect on the value of our homes.

I am equally concerned about the disruption that would result from demolishing the existing building and constructing one of this size. The work would inevitably involve a lengthy period of noise, dust, heavy construction traffic and general disturbance, which would be particularly difficult for elderly residents at both Remenham Row and Thamesfield, and this would have a serious impact on the mental health, wellbeing and quality of life of many residents throughout the construction period.

Taking all of these matters into account, together with the concerns set out in my previous objections, I sincerely ask the Planning Inspector to reject this appeal and allow Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission to remain in place.

Finally, I would respectfully encourage the Planning Inspector to visit Remenham Row before reaching a decision. I believe that only by seeing the relationship between the proposed development and the neighbouring homes in person can the true impact of this proposal be fully appreciated.

Derick Silver

11 Remenham Row [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents
