
Interested party 11

Comments

Please refer to my previous objection, dated 16 October 2025, which is available on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal.

I was extremely disappointed to learn that Thamesfield Retirement Village has chosen to appeal against Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission. Having read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I wish to make the following observations.

This proposal is entirely unsuited to its surroundings. The size and appearance of the building would introduce a form of development that is quite at odds with the established character of this part of Henley. Rather than blending into its setting, it would become an intrusive and conspicuous feature, readily seen not only from Remenham Row but also from the Oxfordshire bank of the River Thames and from many of the well-used public viewpoints along the riverside.

The location itself is one of considerable historic and visual importance. Thamesfield occupies a prominent position close to Henley Bridge and the River Thames, within an area that is admired for its attractive architecture, mature landscape and tranquil riverside setting. Together these elements create the distinctive character for which Henley-on-Thames is so well known, and they deserve to be protected from development that would detract from their appearance and setting.

Henley is internationally celebrated for its historic riverside environment and, above all, for the Henley Royal Regatta, which attracts many thousands of visitors each year. I was fortunate enough to attend the Regatta last week with friends from Remenham Row, and this week the Henley Festival is once again drawing large numbers of visitors to the town. Many arrive by boat and spend time on the river, where they are able to admire the beautiful historic buildings and the attractive riverside setting that make Henley such a special place.

The introduction of a large contemporary apartment building into this important setting would cause considerable harm to these cherished views and diminish the visual quality of the riverside landscape and also have a major impact on the amenity for the residents of Remenham Row.

Although the Appellant maintains that the design has been influenced by the surrounding architecture, clearly this objective has not been achieved. The proposed building, by reason of its size, proportions and modern appearance, bears little resemblance to the established character of this part of Henley. Rather than sitting comfortably within its surroundings, it would appear conspicuous, intrusive and wholly out of keeping with this highly sensitive location, which sits in Conservation and Green Belt Areas. The purpose of these planning designations is to ensure that places of recognised historic and environmental importance are protected for future generations. Therefore, this proposal would not achieve that objective. Instead, it would detract from the distinctive riverside character of this part of Henley and diminish the special qualities that have long made the town so admired.

qualities that have long made the town so admired.

The illustrations submitted in support of the appeal do not present a true picture of how the development would appear in reality. They give the impression that existing trees would provide a significant degree of screening, whereas this is simply not the case. The proposed building would be plainly visible from throughout Remenham Row and would become an imposing feature that would dominate and overpower the small retirement community. It would also remain clearly visible from a number of locations beyond the site, particularly from the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames and during the winter months when the deciduous trees are bare.

For all of these reasons, I fully support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and sincerely ask the Planning Inspector to dismiss this appeal.

Margaret Griffiths-Eyton [Close](#)

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

Interested party 12

Comments

I previously submitted two objections to this planning application, which can be found on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal, dated 17 October 2025 and 31 January 2025.

I was extremely pleased when Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Committee refused planning permission, and I am very disappointed that Retirement Villages Group has chosen to appeal that decision. Having read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I would like to make the following comments:

- Paragraph 6.2.5 states that the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties at Remenham Row has been materially overstated. I simply cannot agree with this. I live at No. 4 Remenham Row, and the proposed building would be directly opposite my home. At present, the existing single-storey building does not overlook my property and I enjoy complete privacy. This would change completely if a large three-storey building with floor-to-ceiling windows and Juliette balconies were built opposite my home. Residents of the proposed apartments would be able to look directly into my living accommodation, resulting in a serious loss of privacy. It would also have a significant impact on my natural daylight and outlook.
- The proposed development would inevitably create increased noise and light pollution. Remenham Row is currently a very peaceful retirement community, and in the evenings there is only low-level lighting around the estate. The additional activity associated with a large apartment building would fundamentally change the quiet environment that residents currently enjoy.

- I would also point out that the Council's Planning Officer did not visit Remenham Row before recommending that planning permission should be granted. It was only after residents wrote to members of the Planning Committee asking them to visit that he came to see the site, just a few days before the Committee meeting. By that stage, his report recommending approval had already been published on the Council's Planning Portal.
- The proposed building would have a very overbearing effect on Remenham Row, particularly on properties 1 to 5, and would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of those residents.
- I also believe that the Appellant's description of the site is misleading. In several places, the proposed building would actually be positioned closer to the boundary wall than the existing single-storey building, increasing its impact on neighbouring homes.
- I would also like to refer to the illustration entitled "Illustrative Master Plan Rev B", which shows what appears to be a continuous line of mature trees along the Remenham Row side of the boundary. This does not reflect the reality of the site. There is a flower border with shrubs and only four trees, three of which are medium-sized and one relatively small. All of these trees are deciduous and lose their leaves during the winter, providing very little screening. During the consultation process, Retirement Villages Group also confirmed in writing that there was insufficient space between the proposed building and the boundary wall to plant any additional trees. I therefore feel that this illustration gives a misleading impression of the amount of screening that exists.
- The Appellant seeks to describe the relationship between the two sites as front-to-front in order to rely on the lower separation distances within the Borough Design Guide. However, this does not reflect the reality. There is no public road between my home and the proposed development. Instead, there is a gravel pathway serving the residents of Remenham Row, together with our gardens, planting and open grassed areas leading towards the River Thames. It is a private retirement community, not a conventional street. I therefore do not believe this comparison is appropriate. Unfortunately, I am unable to provide photographs with my representation, but I hope the Inspector will visit the site to appreciate this for themselves.
- The photograph of Remenham Row included within the Appellant's Statement does not show my property, even though it is one of the homes that would be most directly affected by the proposal. I do not believe this helps to illustrate the true impact of the development.
- I am also very concerned about the wider impact this proposal would have on the character of Henley-on-Thames and this important riverside Conservation Area. Thamesfield occupies a prominent position close to the River Thames, Henley Bridge and the historic riverside, which attracts visitors from across the country and around the world. We have recently seen this during the Royal Regatta, when thousands of people visited the area. The proposed building would be clearly visible from the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames and from many public viewpoints along the river. This large modern building would sit uncomfortably alongside the beautiful white Victorian building and would detract from the attractive character of this special location.
- I am also very concerned about the disruption that such a large building project would cause. Demolishing the existing building and constructing a three-storey apartment block would inevitably take a considerable amount of time. During that period, we would have to live with constant noise, dust, heavy machinery and the general disturbance that comes with a major construction site.

site.

Many of us moved to Remenham Row because it is such a peaceful and quiet place to spend our retirement. We enjoy sitting in the gardens, chatting with our neighbours and making the most of the lovely surroundings. Having to endure years of building work would take away that peace and would have a serious effect on the wellbeing of everyone who lives here.

At our stage of life, a calm and settled environment is so important. I genuinely believe that the prolonged noise, dust and disruption would be extremely distressing for many residents and would significantly reduce our quality of life.

For all of these reasons, together with those set out in my previous objections, I strongly support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and respectfully ask that the appeal be dismissed.

Finally, I would ask the Inspector to visit Remenham Row before determining the appeal. I believe that only by seeing the relationship between our homes and the proposed development in person can the full impact of this proposal be properly understood.

Beth Smith
4 Remenham Row [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 13

Comments

My name is Sandra Dent and I have previously submitted two objections to this planning application. I was therefore very disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has appealed Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission.

I remain strongly opposed to this proposal.

I live in Henley and have enjoyed living in this area for many years. One of the things I value most is the beautiful riverside setting and the peaceful character that makes this part of the Thames so special.

I have visited Remenham Row on many occasions, as I have friends who live there. It is a small and attractive retirement community, set in lovely gardens, and it has a quiet, private atmosphere which is one of the reasons people choose to live there.

I simply cannot understand why such a large three-storey building is being proposed in this location. It would be completely out of scale with the existing surroundings and would have a very different character from the buildings already at Thamesfield.

The effect on the residents of Remenham Row would be considerable. The proposed building would overlook neighbouring homes, reduce their privacy, block daylight and completely change the pleasant outlook that residents currently enjoy. It would also sit extremely close to the boundary wall, making its impact even greater.

I am also concerned that the design of the proposed building bears little resemblance to the attractive white period building beside it, or to the character of the surrounding area. From across the River Thames it would be clearly visible and would stand out as an intrusive feature in what is currently a very attractive riverside setting.

This is an important Conservation Area, and any new development should respect its surroundings and preserve the special character that makes this part of Henley and Remenham so distinctive.

I have great sympathy for the residents of Remenham Row. Retirement should be a time to enjoy peace, privacy and the surroundings in which you have chosen to live. I can only imagine how upsetting it must be for them to face the prospect of such a large development being built immediately next to their homes.

For all of these reasons, and for those I set out in my earlier objections, I respectfully ask that the Planning Inspector dismisses this appeal and upholds Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 14

Comments

My name is Sonya Sharman and I live at 8 Remenham Row.

I have already submitted two objections to this planning application and was very pleased when Wokingham Borough Council refused planning permission. I was therefore very disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has appealed that decision.

Although I have not lived at Remenham Row for very long, it did not take me long to appreciate what a special place it is. It is a small, peaceful retirement community with attractive gardens and a wonderful sense of openness. It is exactly the sort of environment many of us hoped to enjoy in our retirement.

Having read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I remain firmly opposed to the proposal and wish to make the following comments.

The proposal would replace a modest single-storey building with one of a completely different scale immediately alongside Remenham Row creating an overbearing impact. This would inevitably reduce privacy, natural light and the pleasant outlook currently enjoyed by neighbouring residents.

Despite the appellant's illustrations, the building would remain clearly visible from the opposite side of the River Thames, particularly during the winter months when the trees are without leaves. This is an especially sensitive location within both the Green Belt and the Conservation Area, and the proposal does not preserve the character of this important setting.

Like many people who have chosen to live at Remenham Row, I invested in a home here because of its peaceful surroundings and attractive outlook. I am concerned that this proposal would permanently change the character of our community and make it a much less pleasant place to live and have an adverse impact on property prices.

The demolition and construction of a development of this scale would inevitably cause prolonged noise, dust and disruption, significantly affecting the day-to-day lives of those here at Remenham Row and the residents at Thamesfield, causing significant harm.

For all of these reasons, together with those set out in my previous objections, I respectfully ask that the Planning Inspector dismisses this appeal and upholds Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission.

Finally, I would strongly encourage the Planning Inspector to visit Remenham Row before determining the appeal. Only by seeing the relationship between the proposed development and the neighbouring properties first-hand can the full impact of this proposal be properly appreciated.

Sonya Sharman [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 15

Comments

I have already submitted two objections to this planning application dated the 10th February 2025 and the 19th October 2025, which are available on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal. I was extremely pleased when the Planning Committee decided to refuse planning permission and I was therefore very saddened and disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has chosen to appeal that decision.

Having read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I feel it is important to write again because I simply do not agree with the suggestion that this development would have only a limited effect on those of us who live at Remenham Row.

Remenham Row is a very small retirement community of just 12 homes. It is a peaceful, private place with beautifully maintained gardens that lead down to the River Thames. There is no public road between our homes and Thamesfield. We are separated only by our front gardens, a flower and shrub border, a gravel pathway and the boundary wall. It is a quiet and attractive setting, and one of the main reasons I chose to make my home here some 12 years ago.

The existing building on the Thamesfield side of the boundary is only a single-storey building and is hardly noticeable. The proposal would replace it with a large three-storey apartment block immediately beside our estate. I cannot see how anyone could conclude that this would not have a major impact. A building of this size and magnitude would feel overwhelming and completely out of scale with our small retirement community. I cannot understand why such a large building has to be positioned so close to our homes when there appears to be sufficient space on the southern side within the Thamesfield site where it could be built with no impact on neighbouring residents.

I feel particularly sorry for my neighbours whose homes face directly towards the proposed development. They would lose much of the privacy they currently enjoy, with large windows and Juliette balconies overlooking their homes and gardens. They would also lose daylight and the pleasant outlook that they have today. At present none of us feels overlooked, and that sense of privacy is one of the things that makes Remenham Row such a lovely place to live.

Unfortunately, I have mobility problems and am no longer able to walk very far. One of my greatest pleasures is being able to sit in the beautiful communal gardens and enjoy the peace, the flowers and the open outlook. I feel that a building of such magnitude would completely change the character of the surroundings and take away much of the enjoyment and comfort that I currently find in spending time outdoors.

I am also concerned that a much larger number of apartments would inevitably bring more people, more activity, more lighting and more noise, particularly during the evenings. Remenham Row is a wonderfully quiet place to live, and I believe that peace and tranquillity would be lost.

I also cannot agree with the Appellant's suggestion that there is already substantial development close to Remenham Row. The existing building beside our boundary is only one storey high and is barely visible above the wall. It is simply not comparable with the large building that is now being proposed.

The Appellant also refers to another three-storey building elsewhere within Thamesfield. However, that building is located much further away from Remenham Row, on the opposite side of the site, and has no comparable effect on neighbouring homes. I do not believe it can reasonably be relied upon to justify this proposal.

I was also concerned to see the illustration on page 7 of the planning documents on the Portal which gives the impression that there is a substantial row of trees along the boundary in Remenham Row. This is not an accurate reflection of what is actually there. In reality there are only a few medium sized deciduous trees. Even when they are in full leaf they would provide very little screening of a building of this height and size, and during the winter months they would provide virtually none at all.

Despite the illustrations provided by the Appellant, the proposed building would remain clearly visible from the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames. This is an especially sensitive important location within both the Green Belt and the Conservation Area, close to the historic riverside setting of Henley. A building of this scale would fail to preserve the character of this beautiful and historic area.

Like so many of my neighbours, I chose to move to Remenham Row because it offered a peaceful retirement in beautiful surroundings. I am deeply concerned that this proposal would permanently alter the character of our community, make it a much less pleasant place to live and inevitably have a detrimental effect on the value of our homes.

I am also very worried about the disruption that such a major development would cause. The demolition of the existing building and the construction of a large apartment block would mean many months of noise, dust and disturbance. For elderly residents, many of whom spend much of their time at home, this would have a considerable impact on our health, wellbeing and quality of life, as well as on the existing residents of Thamesfield.

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.

Before reaching a decision, I would be very grateful if the Planning Inspector could visit Remenham Row and see the site for themselves. It is only by standing where we live and looking towards the proposed development that the true scale of the building, and the effect it would have on our homes and our peaceful surroundings, can really be understood. I sincerely hope a site visit will be made before this appeal is determined.

Margaret Johnson
7 Remenham Row [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 16

Comments

Thamesfield Retirement Village – Planning Appeal Ref. 6011062
I previously submitted two objections to this planning application, dated 9th February 2025 and 19th October 2025, which can both be found on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal.

I was extremely pleased when Wokingham Borough Council refused planning permission, so I was very disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has appealed that decision. Having now read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I would like to make the following comments.

Before commenting on the appeal, I think 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 asked for a visit that he came to see our estate, together with most of the Planning Committee members, just a few days before the Committee 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 seeing the site and listening to the concerns of local residents. They decided that the bulk, scale height and position of the proposed building would cause unacceptable harm, and I fully agree with that decision.

Paragraph 6.2.5

The Appellant says that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on Remenham Row. I simply cannot agree.

My wife and I moved to Remenham Row about twelve years ago because it is such a peaceful and attractive place to spend our retirement. The gardens are beautifully kept and lead down towards the River Thames. It is quiet, private and has a wonderful feeling of openness. There is nothing overlooking us, and that is one of the reasons we chose to live here.

Between our homes and Thamesfield there is no road or public pavement. There are only front gardens, a gravel pathway, a flower border and the boundary wall. The existing building on the Thamesfield side is only one storey high and is hardly noticeable.

Replacing that modest building with a large three-storey block of apartments would completely change the character of our little community. It would dominate the view, take away the feeling of openness and make the whole area feel enclosed. I also do not believe the proposed materials are in keeping with either the attractive white Victorian building at Thamesfield or the character of Remenham Row.

The building work itself would also have a huge effect on those of us who live here. This is not a small project but a major construction scheme that would continue for a long time. At my age, I do not want to spend my remaining years living beside a building site with constant noise, dust and disruption.

Sadly, I can no longer walk very far, so I rarely leave the estate unless I am taken somewhere by car. Because of this, the grounds at Remenham Row mean a great deal to me. Every day I enjoy walking slowly around the gardens with my walking frame. It gives me great pleasure and helps me keep active. If this large building is constructed, it would completely change the outlook and take away much of the enjoyment I get from spending time outdoors in the place I now call home.

For these reasons, I believe the Appellant greatly understates the effect this proposal would have, not only on those of us at Remenham Row but also on many of the existing residents of Thamesfield.

Paragraph 6.2.9

The Appellant states that there is already substantial development close to Remenham Row. I do not believe that is a fair description.

The building next to our boundary is only a single-storey structure and can barely be seen above the wall. It is nothing like the three-storey building that is now being proposed.

The Appellant also refers to another three-storey building elsewhere within Thamesfield. However, that building is much further away from our boundary and does not affect our homes in any way. It should not be used as a reason for allowing this proposal.

Paragraph 6.2.10

The Appellant suggests that neighbouring residents would only see the new building at an angle.

That is not how it would appear in reality. The building would stand directly opposite properties 2 to 5 and, in places, would actually be closer to the boundary wall than the existing building. Those residents would be the ones most seriously affected.

Paragraphs 6.2.12 – 6.2.16

I also noticed that the photograph of Remenham Row included in the Appellant's Statement does not show the row of cottages that would be most affected by the proposal. I do not think this helps the Planning Inspector understand the true relationship between the proposed building and the neighbouring homes.

The Appellant also describes the relationship between Thamesfield and Remenham Row as being "front-to-front". I do not believe that reflects the way the two sites actually relate to each other.

Remenham Row is a private retirement community. There is no public road, pavement or public area between us and Thamesfield. The only things separating us are our gardens, the gravel path, planting and the boundary wall. Because of this, we enjoy a much greater degree of privacy than people whose houses face each other across a public road.

For that reason, I believe this relationship is much closer to what the Borough Design Guide describes as back-to-back development, where a greater separation distance is expected. The Appellant's own figures show that the recommended distance is not achieved.

These guidelines are there to protect residents' privacy and prevent buildings from feeling overbearing, this proposal clearly fails to do that.

Paragraph 6.2.18

The proposed building would, in several places, be closer to the boundary wall than the existing building which is already very close to our boundary wall.

During the planning process, Retirement Villages Group confirmed that there would not be enough room between the building and the wall to plant any trees.

I was therefore surprised to see the illustration showing what appears to be a thick line of trees along our boundary. That is simply not what is there today. There are only a few medium-sized deciduous trees, and they would do very little to hide such a large building at any time of the year. This gives a totally misleading impression of how well the building would be screened.

Paragraph 6.2.20

The Appellant says the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on neighbouring residents. Sadly, I cannot agree.

This building would become the dominant feature of Remenham Row and would have a very harmful effect on those living closest to it. It would completely change the appearance and peaceful character of our small retirement community.

I am also worried about the effect it would have on our gardens. They are beautifully looked after and are one of the greatest pleasures of living here. Our gardener has told us that such a large building would block sunlight to parts of the flower beds and gardens, making it much harder for many of the existing plants to thrive.

For someone like me, who now spends much of his time enjoying these gardens because I cannot easily go elsewhere, that would be a great loss.

For all of these reasons, together with the concerns I raised in my earlier objections, I sincerely hope that you will dismiss this appeal and uphold Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission.

Finally, I would be most grateful if you could visit Remenham Row before reaching your decision. I believe that only by standing where we live and seeing how close this proposed building would be to our homes can its true impact on our retirement community be fully understood.

Thomas Bromley Johnson
7 Remenham Row [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 17

Comments

I previously submitted an objection to this planning application, dated the 16th October 2025, which is available on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal. Having now read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I remain firmly opposed to the proposal and wish to make the following comments.

I do not accept the Appellant's assertion that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the residents of Remenham Row. In my view, this seriously underestimates the impact that such a large building would have on a very small retirement community.

The proposed development would replace a modest single-storey building with a substantial three-storey apartment block positioned very close to the boundary with Remenham Row. Its height, scale and bulk would make it an imposing and dominant feature, particularly for those properties closest to the boundary. The effect on neighbouring residents would be far greater than the Appellant suggests.

It is difficult to understand how a building of this size could be considered appropriate in such a sensitive location. The proximity of the proposed apartments to the boundary wall would inevitably result in a significant loss of privacy for neighbouring residents, together with a much greater sense of enclosure than exists today. The proposal would also transform the outlook from many homes, replacing open views with the façade of a large overpowering apartment building.

I live nearby and visit Henley-on-Thames regularly, both for shopping and to enjoy everything the town has to offer. Last week I attended the Henley Royal Regatta with friends from Remenham Row, as I have done on many occasions over the years. It is one of the country's most iconic events and attracts visitors from across the United Kingdom and around the world. The river, the historic buildings and the attractive surroundings all contribute to the unique character that makes Henley such a special place.

For that reason, I am particularly concerned about the wider impact this proposal would have. Thamesfield occupies a prominent riverside position and the proposed building would be clearly visible from the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames, where it would stand out rather than blend into its surroundings. It would sit immediately alongside the existing white period Thamesfield building, which is such a familiar and attractive feature when viewed from the river. Rather than complementing this handsome building, the proposed development would contrast sharply with it in both its design and appearance, creating a discordant addition that would look entirely out of keeping with the established character of this historic riverside setting.

This is an especially important location within the Green Belt and Conservation Area. These planning designations exist to protect places of special landscape, architectural and historic value and this proposal does not respect those qualities. Instead, it would detract from the character of the area and introduce an unnecessarily large and visually intrusive building into one of Henley's most attractive settings.

Unfortunately the appellant has underestimated the overall impact of the proposal and it is not simply the appearance of the building that gives rise to concern, but the lasting effect it would have on neighbouring residents and on the wider setting of this important riverside location.

For these reasons, together with the concerns I raised in my earlier objection, I fully support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and sincerely hope that the Planning Inspector will dismiss this appeal.

appellant

Before determining this appeal, I hope the Planning Inspector will take the opportunity to visit Remenham Row. Seeing the site in person, from the perspective of those homes that would be most affected, would provide a far clearer understanding of the scale of the proposal and the effect it would have on both neighbouring residents and the character of this unique retirement community.

Miriam Staines [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 18

Comments

My name is Shiraz Khan and I am the Estate Manager at Remenham Row.

I previously submitted an objection to this planning application, which is available on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal.

I was extremely disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has appealed against Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission. Having carefully considered the Appellant's Statement of Case, I wish to make the following comments from my perspective as Estate Manager.

Remenham Row is a small, private retirement community comprising just 12 properties. As Estate Manager, I am responsible for the day-to-day management of the estate and have regular contact with all of our residents. I therefore have a clear understanding of how the estate is used and the importance that its peaceful surroundings, privacy and open outlook have on the wellbeing of those who live here.

The Appellant seeks to describe the relationship between Thamesfield and Remenham Row as though it were a conventional residential street. It is nothing of the sort. There is no public highway, footway or public realm separating the two sites. Between the proposed building and our residents' homes there are only private gardens, a gravel pathway, landscaped planting and the boundary wall. In planning terms, and more importantly in reality, residents rightly enjoy a much greater expectation of privacy than they would if the properties faced one another across a public road.

For that reason, I agree with the Council that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on neighbouring residential amenity. The Borough Design Guide recommends a minimum separation distance of 30 metres in these circumstances, yet the Appellant's own measurements confirm that the closest point would be only 21.4 metres. Residents living in Properties 1 to 5 would inevitably experience a substantial loss of privacy, outlook and natural daylight.

From my daily contact with residents, I know that many have mobility difficulties and spend much of their time within the estate. The landscaped grounds are not simply attractive surroundings; they are an essential part of everyday life. Many residents enjoy gentle walks around the estate for exercise.

Views would be replaced by the close presence of a substantial three-storey apartment building. Instead of open gardens, residents would be looking towards rows of apartment windows and Juliette balconies overlooking the estate. This would fundamentally alter both the appearance and atmosphere of Remenham Row. The sense of peace, openness and privacy that residents currently enjoy would be permanently lost.

I am also concerned that the visual material submitted by the Appellant does not accurately represent the existing landscaping. The illustration entitled Illustrative Master Plan Rev B suggests that a substantial row of trees screen the boundary with Remenham Row. This is simply not the case. There are only a small number of medium-sized deciduous trees, which provide very limited screening even during the summer months and virtually none during winter.

This is particularly surprising because Retirement Villages Group confirmed during the original consultation process that there was insufficient space between the proposed building and the boundary wall to accommodate any tree planting. Furthermore, in several places the proposed building would actually be positioned closer to the boundary than the existing single-storey building.

As Estate Manager, I am equally concerned about the practical consequences of constructing a development of this scale. The demolition of the existing building followed by the construction of a large apartment block would inevitably result in years of noise, dust, heavy construction traffic and general disturbance. This would not simply be an inconvenience. It would have a significant effect on the health, wellbeing and quality of life of all residents, some of whom are frail and spend the majority of their time within the estate. A prolonged building project of this nature would be extremely distressing for residents both at Remenham Row and at Thamesfield, and unquestionably impacting their mental health.

In my professional opinion, this proposal would fundamentally change the character of Remenham Row. It would erode the qualities that make it such a desirable retirement community and would have a lasting and detrimental effect on those who have chosen to spend their retirement here.

For all of these reasons, I fully support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and sincerely hope that the Planning Inspector dismisses this appeal.

Finally, I would respectfully ask the Planning Inspector to visit Remenham Row before determining the appeal. Only by seeing the site first hand, from within the estate itself, will it be possible to fully appreciate the close relationship between the proposed building and the neighbouring homes, and the significant impact this development would have on the residents and the character of this unique retirement community.

Shiraz Khan
Estate Manager – Remenham Row and resident of Henley [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 19

Comments

Our names are Trevor & Jeryl Wheeldon and we have recently become residents at 10 Remenham Row. This is our first opportunity to provide feedback on the adjacent property Thamesfield, operated by Retirement Villages Group (Appellant), planning application and subsequent appeal against planning application refusal.

In order to provide context for our comments on the planning refusal appeal we have summarised below the background to our decision to move to Remenham Row.

Remenham Row's unique location and setting were the two key reasons for our decision to relocate into this development of just 12 retirement age properties which were built around the year 2000 with what we believe was the express intention of ensuring a quiet, peaceful and secluded non-urban setting nestled among many trees and adjacent to the 'quiet' side of the river Thames with the 'built' landscape occupying what appears to be less than 10% of the overall plot. It is clear that the developers of Remenham Row worked with the Wokingham planning authority to ensure that the planning guidelines were followed with neighbouring developments and landscape fully taken into account including the unique central Henley riverside location in a protected green belt area with visibility from the river and Henley. The end result has been acknowledged by many as one of the best examples of 'sympathetic' new development of its type in the country.

In reviewing the Appellant planning application together with the subsequent refusal and recent appeal, we were immediately struck by the degree to which the Appellant has shown disregard for both the letter and spirit of all the relevant planning guidelines and in particular propose changing the view of the development from the river of a substantial period house centrally located on the riverside plot to a much larger 'urban style' apartment block immediately adjacent to the boundary with Remenham Row. The proposal appears to be completely out of keeping in terms of design, layout, scale and in particular the extent of overlook of Remenham Row.

Responding specifically to the Appellant's appeal:

Paragraph 6.2.9

The Appellant asserts that there is already substantial built form adjacent to Remenham Row. This is incorrect.

The current Thamesfield buildings adjacent to and along the boundary with Remenham Row are single storey and provide no direct overlook of Remenham Row properties.

The proposed 3 storey 'urban style' apartment block immediately adjacent to the Remenham Row boundary will not only be out of keeping in form and design with existing buildings but more importantly have completely overbearing outlook over the Remenham Row development.

In addition, if this proposal is allowed to proceed it will undoubtedly be the basis of a future proposal to extend the 3 storey apartment block concept further along the Remenham Row boundary (in the same way that the current apartment block elsewhere on the Appellant site is being used erroneously as a 'relevant' comparative reference point).

Paragraph 6.2.12 – 6.2.16

The Appellant says that the proposed building should be treated as facing the homes at Remenham Row in the same way as houses facing each other across a normal road. I do not believe that is an accurate description of the site.

Remenham Row is a private gated retirement community. There is no public road, pavement or passing traffic between our homes and the proposed building. The only things separating us are our front gardens, a gravel path, some planting and the boundary wall. Because of this, we enjoy a much greater level of privacy than people living opposite each other across a street.

The Borough Design Guide recommends a separation distance of 30 metres in situations like this. However, the Appellant's own figures show that the distance opposite one of the Remenham Row properties directly facing the proposed building would be only 21.4 metres, which is well below that recommendation.

The purpose of these guidelines is to protect people's privacy and to stop buildings from feeling too large and overbearing and this proposal clearly fails to do that. A building of this height and scale, positioned so close to our estate, would have a serious impact on both privacy and outlook.

The Appellant also suggests that any harm would only be minor and that the slight angle of the proposed building would reduce overlooking, which is incorrect. Although the building is not perfectly square it would still face directly towards several homes for all practical purposes. The slight offset would make very little difference, and it would not prevent the loss of privacy or reduce the overwhelming effect of such a large building being so close to these homes.

Paragraph 6.2.18

I do not believe the Appellant has accurately represented the existing situation.

In a number of locations, the proposed building would be positioned nearer to the boundary wall than the current single-storey building. During the planning process, Retirement Villages Group also confirmed in writing that there would not be enough space between the new building and the boundary wall to allow for any tree planting.

For that reason, I was surprised to see the drawing entitled "Illustrative Master Plan Rev B", which shows what appears to be a continuous screen of mature trees along the Remenham Row boundary. This does not reflect what is actually on site. There are only four medium-sized trees in this area, and even when they are in full leaf they would do very little to screen a three-storey building of this size.

In my view, the illustration gives a misleading impression of the amount of existing screening and significantly understates the visual impact that the proposed development would have on the residents of Remenham Row.

Paragraph 6.2.20

I cannot accept the Appellant's view that the proposal would not have a significant effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

If this development goes ahead, the new building would become the most prominent feature seen from Remenham Row. Because of its size, height and how close it would be to our homes, it would dominate the outlook and make the area feel much more enclosed. The open aspect that we currently enjoy would be replaced by the imposing frontage of a large three-storey apartment block.

The overlooking from the proposed windows and Juliette balconies would result in a significant loss of privacy, both for the individual properties most directly affected and for Remenham Row as a whole.

It is therefore unsurprising that Wokingham Borough Council concluded that the proposal would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking, loss of privacy and an unneighbourly overbearing impact. We completely agree with this conclusion.

For these reasons, we strongly support the Council's decision to refuse planning permission and respectfully ask that the appeal is dismissed.

I respectfully hope that the Planning Inspector will undertake a site visit to Remenham Row before reaching a decision. Viewing the site first hand would provide a complete understanding of the relationship between the proposed development and the neighbouring properties, and of the significant impact it would have on the residents of this small retirement community.

Trevor & Jeryl Wheeldon
10 Remenham Row [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 20

Comments

My name is Rosemary Pitkeathley and I have lived in Henley-on-Thames and the surrounding area for many years.

I have only recently become aware of the planning application, and subsequent appeal, submitted by Retirement Villages Group for the construction of a substantial three-storey apartment building at Thamesfield. Had I been aware of the original application, I would certainly have submitted a formal objection at that time. I therefore wish to take this opportunity to express my strong objection to the appeal.

My concerns relate principally to the impact that this proposal would have on the wider character of Henley-on-Thames, its riverside setting and the surrounding Conservation Areas.

This is an exceptionally important and sensitive location. Thamesfield occupies a prominent position close to the River Thames, Henley Bridge and the historic riverside which attracts visitors from across the country and around the world. It is part of the setting that gives Henley its unique identity and contributes significantly to the town's special character.

The proposed building is too large for such a sensitive site. Its scale, bulk and massing would make it a dominant feature within the riverside landscape. It would be clearly visible from the Oxfordshire side of the River Thames and from many public viewpoints along the river, including those enjoyed by residents and visitors throughout the year.

Henley is internationally recognised for its historic riverside setting and, in particular, the Henley Royal Regatta, which attracts many thousands of visitors annually. The views across the river towards Thamesfield form part of the experience of visiting the town and contribute to its distinctive historic character. Introducing a large contemporary apartment building into this setting would, in my view, detract from these important views and diminish the visual quality of the riverside environment.

Although the appellant suggests that the building has been designed to reflect local architecture, I do not believe that this has been achieved. The overall scale, proportions and contemporary appearance of the proposed development are not sympathetic to the established character of this part of Henley. Rather than complementing its surroundings, the building would stand out as an overly dominant and intrusive addition to a highly sensitive location.

I am also concerned that some of the visual representations submitted by the appellant appears to understate the prominence of the proposed building by relying on selective viewpoints and existing vegetation. The reality is that the building would be visible from many locations where little or no screening exists, particularly during the winter months when deciduous trees are without leaves.

This site lies within the Green Belt and important Conservation Areas. These designations exist for good reason and are intended to protect places of special historic and environmental significance. This proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this unique riverside setting and would erode the established townscape that makes Henley so special.

I therefore fully support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and respectfully ask the Planning Inspector to dismiss this appeal. [Close](#)

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

Interested party 21

Comments

I have already objected to this planning application and I wish to now submit the following comments in response to the appeal lodged by Retirement Villages Group (RVG).

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep disappointment that RVG has chosen to appeal Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission for this development.

I am the owner of Ian Hargreaves Garden Services and have been responsible for maintaining the beautiful grounds at Remenham Row, including the gardens extending down to the river, for approximately 25 years.

Remenham Row is a small, peaceful retirement community set within extensive, well-maintained landscaped grounds. One of its defining characteristics is that it is currently not overlooked by neighbouring properties. The proposed three-storey building, positioned close to the boundary wall, would have a significant and detrimental impact on the residents, particularly those whose homes run parallel to the boundary. It would substantially reduce their privacy, obstruct their views, and diminish the natural light they currently enjoy.

From my professional perspective, as the gardener responsible for maintaining these grounds, I am also extremely concerned about the effect that such a large and intrusive building would have on the gardens. The increased overshadowing and loss of sunlight would have a significant adverse impact on the mixed flower borders, lawns, and the residents' own flower beds immediately outside their homes. Both residents and visitors frequently comment on the beauty and quality of the landscaped grounds, which are an integral part of the appeal and character of Remenham Row. I firmly believe that this proposal would not only harm the residents' quality of life but would also cause lasting damage to the carefully maintained gardens that have been nurtured over many years.

I would also like to draw attention to the Appellant's illustration on page 7 of the document entitled 1-53 Illustrative Masterplan Rev B, available on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal. This illustration is misleading, as it depicts a continuous row of mature trees along the boundary with Remenham Row. In reality, the boundary consists of a mixed flower and shrub border with only five deciduous trees. As a gardener, I know that these trees are neither large enough nor dense enough to screen a three-storey building, even in summer. During the winter months, when they have lost their leaves, they would provide no screening at all. Furthermore, when questioned, RVG acknowledged that the proposed building would be positioned so close to the existing boundary wall that there would not even be sufficient space to plant a single tree along this boundary.

In addition, paragraph 4.9 of the Appellant's Thamesfield Statement of Case, under the heading Benefits of the Scheme, states that the proposal includes "robust landscaping and planting proposals throughout the site." In relation to the boundary adjoining Remenham Row, this statement is misleading and does not reflect the reality of the proposal. Given the extremely limited space between the proposed building and the boundary wall, meaningful landscaping or tree planting would simply not be possible.

In light of the concerns outlined above, I respectfully urge the Planning Inspector to undertake a site visit to Remenham Row. Only by viewing the site in person will it be possible to fully appreciate the scale of the proposed development and the serious detrimental impact it would have on both the residents and the unique landscape setting of this retirement community.

Ian Hargreaves [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 22

Comments

We previously submitted an objection to the planning application to demolish the existing single-storey building at Thamesfield and replace it with a three-storey apartment block.

We were delighted when Wokingham Borough Council refused planning permission and were therefore very disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group had appealed that decision.

Having read the Appellant's Statement of Case, we wish to make the following comments.

In paragraph 6.2.5, the Appellant states that the proposed development would not have a significant effect on Remenham Row. We do not share that view.

Remenham Row is a small and peaceful retirement community. There is no public road between our homes and Thamesfield; the two sites are separated only by our front gardens, a gravel pathway, planting and the boundary wall.

The existing Thamesfield building is single storey and barely noticeable from our home. Replacing it with a substantial three-storey apartment block would completely change our surroundings. Instead of the open outlook we currently enjoy, we would face a large building that would dominate our home and create an overwhelming sense of enclosure.

We are extremely concerned about the loss of privacy, natural light and outlook. The development would also bring greater activity, lighting and noise. This is certainly not the environment we expected when we chose to spend our retirement here.

We also wish to point out that the Council's Planning Officer did not visit Remenham Row before preparing his report recommending approval. It was only after residents requested a site visit that he attended with members of the Planning Committee, just days before the Committee meeting and after his report had already been published.

In paragraph 6.2.9, the Appellant refers to "substantial built form" close to Remenham Row. This is not an accurate description.

The existing building beside our boundary is a modest single-storey structure, barely visible above the wall. It bears no comparison with the height, scale and bulk of the proposed building.

The Appellant also refers to an existing three-storey building elsewhere at Thamesfield. However, this is much further away from Remenham Row and has no comparable impact on neighbouring homes. It should not be used to justify a three-storey building immediately adjacent to our estate.

Paragraph 6.2.10 suggests that neighbouring residents would view the proposed building only at an angle. This is not the case for our property. The building would stand directly opposite our home and its height and bulk would be clearly apparent.

We are particularly worried about the loss of daylight and sunlight. As retired people, we spend a considerable amount of time at home and greatly value the natural light we currently enjoy. Replacing a single-storey building with a three-storey block so close to us would inevitably affect our outlook and quality of life.

We are also concerned about the impact on existing Thamesfield residents, many of whom are our friends. We understand that the covered walkway linking parts of the retirement village would be removed, making access to communal facilities more difficult, particularly during poor weather.

We further understand that several existing apartments would no longer meet recommended daylight levels, with some losing more than 40% of their existing daylight. Flats 9 and 10 would also have the proposed three-storey building less than eight metres from principal living room windows. This seems extremely close and would surely result in a much darker and more enclosed environment.

The proposal would therefore harm not only residents of Remenham Row but also a number of existing Thamesfield residents.

In paragraphs 6.2.12 to 6.2.16, the Appellant describes the relationship between Thamesfield and Remenham Row as "front-to-front" for the purposes of the Borough Design Guide. We do not believe this reflects the reality of the site.

Remenham Row is a private gated retirement development with no public highway or public space between the two sites. There are only private gardens, a gravel pathway, planting and the boundary wall. In our view, this is far more comparable to a back-to-back relationship, where a greater level of privacy should be expected.

The Borough Design Guide recommends a minimum separation distance of 30 metres in these circumstances. However, the Appellant's own figures in Table 2 at paragraph 6.2.14 show that the distance between the proposed building and our home would be only 23.8 metres, well below the recommended standard.

Furthermore, the photograph of Remenham Row included in the appeal documents does not show the row of properties most affected by the proposal, including our home. It therefore fails to demonstrate the true relationship between the proposed building and those properties that would experience the greatest impact.

With regard to paragraph 6.2.18, the proposed building would, in places, be closer to the boundary wall than the existing building. Retirement Villages Group also confirmed during the planning process that there would be insufficient space to plant trees between the proposed building and the boundary.

We were therefore surprised to see an illustration suggesting a substantial belt of trees along the Remenham Row boundary. This is not an accurate representation. There are only a small number of medium-sized deciduous trees, which would provide little effective screening of a building of this scale and virtually none during the winter months.

The illustration therefore gives a misleading impression that the proposed building would be screened from Remenham Row when, in reality, it would remain clearly visible.

Turning to paragraph 6.2.20, we cannot agree that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring homes. A building of this height and size would dominate the outlook from our property and create an oppressive and overbearing presence.

We are also deeply concerned about overlooking and the loss of privacy. We believe we would have little choice but to keep our curtains and blinds closed for much of the day to prevent people in the proposed apartments looking towards our home. This would further reduce the natural daylight we currently enjoy.

For all of these reasons, together with the concerns raised in our original objection, we fully support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and ask that the appeal be dismissed.

Finally, we would encourage the Planning Inspector to visit Remenham Row before reaching a decision. Seeing the site from our homes would, we believe, give a much clearer understanding of the very real impact this proposal would have on the residents who live here.

Maureen & Leon Summers
5 Remenham Row [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 23

Comments

My name is Margaret Spratley and I live at 2 Remenham Row.

I previously submitted two objections to the planning application to replace the existing single-storey building at Thamesfield with a three-storey apartment building. These were submitted to Wokingham Borough Council on 4 February 2025 and 13 October 2025.

I was very pleased when the Council refused planning permission and was therefore extremely disappointed to learn that Retirement Villages Group has appealed that decision. Having read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I wish to make the following comments.

Paragraph 6.2.5

The Appellant states that the development would not have a significant impact on Remenham Row. I simply cannot agree.

Remenham Row is a small and peaceful retirement community. There is no public road between our homes and Thamesfield, we are separated only by our front gardens, a gravel path, planting and the boundary wall.

The existing building is only a single storey and is barely noticeable from my home. Replacing it with a large three-storey apartment building would completely change the character of the estate. Instead of enjoying an open outlook, I would face a substantial building that would dominate my home and create an oppressive sense of enclosure.

I am particularly concerned about losing privacy, natural light and the pleasant outlook that I currently enjoy. The proposal would also introduce far greater levels of activity, lighting and noise than exist today. That is certainly not the peaceful retirement environment I expected when moving here.

I also think it is important to mention that the Council's Planning Officer did not visit Remenham Row before recommending approval of the application. It was only after residents requested a site visit that he attended with members of the Planning Committee, shortly before the meeting, after his report had already been published. Anyone visiting the site can immediately appreciate how close this proposed building would be to neighbouring homes.

Paragraph 6.2.9

The Appellant suggests there is already substantial development close to Remenham Row. I do not believe this is an accurate description.

The existing building beside the boundary is only one storey high and barely visible above the wall. It bears no comparison with the size, height and bulk of the proposed building.

From my living room I currently enjoy looking towards open sky. If this proposal were approved, that outlook would be replaced by a large three-storey apartment building. My living room, bedroom and bathroom all face towards Thamesfield, and because my bathroom window is clear glazed, the proposed windows and Juliette balconies would result in a serious loss of privacy.

The Appellant also refers to another three-storey building elsewhere within Thamesfield. However, that building is much further away from Remenham Row and has no comparable impact on neighbouring homes.

Paragraph 6.2.10

The Appellant says the proposed building would only be viewed at an angle. That is not the case for my property. It would stand directly opposite my home, making its scale and bulk even more apparent.

I am also very concerned about the loss of daylight and sunlight. Although I am not an expert in technical standards, it is obvious that replacing a single-storey building with one three times the height, so close to my home, would significantly reduce the natural light I enjoy. In fact the levels would fall below those recommended in the BRE guidance. As someone who spends much of my time at home, this would have a considerable effect on my quality of life.

I am equally concerned about the impact on existing Thamesfield residents, many of whom are friends. I understand that the covered walkway would be removed, making access between buildings more difficult, particularly during poor weather.

I also understand that nine existing apartments would no longer achieve recommended daylight levels, with some losing over 40% of their current daylight. Flats 9 and 10 would have the proposed building less than eight metres from their principal living room windows. I find it difficult to understand how this could improve the lives of existing residents at Thamesfield.

Paragraphs 6.2.12–6.2.16

The Appellant describes the relationship between Thamesfield and Remenham Row as front-to-front. I do not believe this reflects the reality of the site.

There is no public highway, passing traffic or pedestrian activity between the two developments. Remenham Row is a private retirement community, making the relationship much closer to a back-to-back arrangement where a greater degree of privacy should reasonably be expected.

The Borough Design Guide recommends a separation distance of 30 metres in these circumstances. However, the Appellant's own figures in Table 2 (paragraph 6.2.14) show that the distance to my property would be only 23.4 metres.

The photograph included within the appeal documents also fails to show the row of properties most affected by the proposal, including my home, and therefore does not accurately illustrate its impact.

Paragraph 6.2.18

The proposed building would, in places, be closer to the boundary wall than the existing building. During the planning process, Retirement Villages Group confirmed there would be insufficient space to plant trees between the building and the boundary wall.

I was therefore surprised to see an illustration showing what appears to be a substantial line of trees along the boundary. This is misleading. Only a few medium-sized trees exist, and they would provide very little screening of a building of this height and scale.

Paragraph 6.2.20

The Appellant concludes that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring homes. Sadly, I believe the opposite is true.

The building would dominate the outlook from my home, make it feel much more enclosed and result in a significant loss of privacy. I believe I would have little choice but to keep my curtains or blinds closed for much of the day to avoid being overlooked, which would also reduce the natural daylight entering my home.

One of the things I value most is the open outlook from my living room and the feeling of space created by being able to see the sky above the existing building. That would be replaced by the wall and windows of a large apartment block, fundamentally changing the enjoyment I get from my home.

For all of these reasons, together with those set out in my previous objections, I fully support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and ask that the appeal be dismissed.

Finally, I cannot emphasise strongly enough the importance of the Planning Inspector visiting Remenham Row before reaching a decision. Without seeing the proposal from the perspective of the residents who would be most affected, it is impossible to fully appreciate the scale, proximity and overbearing nature of the proposed building, or the significant impact it would have on our homes and quality of life. [Close](#)

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

Interested party 24

Comments	My name is Patricia Basden and I live at 1 Remenham Row. I have already submitted two objections to the original planning application, which can be found on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal dated 16th October 2025 and 2nd February 2025. Having read the Appellant's Statement of Case, I wish to make the following comments. Paragraph 6.2.5 I consider the Appellant's conclusion, that the impact on Remenham Row would not be significant, to be incorrect. Remenham Row is a unique retirement development comprising just 12 dwellings. It is a private gated community with no public highway 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. I chose to move to Remenham Row because my home enjoys beautiful views across the grounds towards the River Thames. At present, Thamesfield residents cannot overlook my property, my first-floor balcony or the decking outside my living room. Replacing the existing single-storey building with a substantial three-storey apartment building immediately opposite my home would fundamentally change the way I live. The proposed apartments would overlook not only my outdoor areas, but also my lounge, dining room, bedroom and bathroom. The building's height, scale and proximity would reduce natural light, dominate my outlook and create an oppressive sense of enclosure.
----------	---

The increased number of apartments would also result in greater noise, lighting and activity. I also understand that a seating area is proposed immediately opposite my home on the Thamesfield side of the boundary, introducing further disturbance where none currently exists.

Before recommending approval, the Council's Planning Officer had not viewed the proposal from Remenham Row. It was only after residents requested a site visit that he attended with members of the Planning Committee, shortly before the meeting and after 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 seeing the site and reading residents' concerns. It concluded that the scale, bulk and relationship of the proposed building to neighbouring homes would result in unacceptable harm. This demonstrates how important it is to assess the proposal from the properties most directly affected.

Paragraph 6.2.9

The conclusion reached by the Appellant that there is already "substantial built form in close proximity to Remenham Row" is inconsistent with the physical relationship between the two sites and the impact residents would experience.

The building adjoining our boundary is only a single-storey structure and is barely visible above the wall. It bears no comparison with the proposed three-storey apartment block.

From my living room the proposed building would dominate my outlook instead of currently enjoying views of open sky. If this proposal were allowed, that outlook would be replaced by a large apartment building. My lounge, dining room, bedroom and bathroom all face towards the proposed development and, because my bathroom window is clear glazed, the proposed windows and Juliette balconies would create an unacceptable loss of privacy.

The Appellant also refers to another three-storey building elsewhere within Thamesfield. However, it is situated well away from the Remenham Row boundary and has no comparable effect on neighbouring residents. It should not therefore be relied upon to justify this proposal.

Paragraph 6.2.10

The Appellant suggests the proposed building would be viewed at an oblique angle. Whilst it would not sit perfectly square to my home, the offset is minimal and would do nothing to reduce overlooking, loss of privacy or the building's dominant appearance.

Paragraphs 6.2.12 - 6.2.16

The photograph of Remenham Row included in the Appellant's Statement does not show my home or the row of properties that would be most affected. It therefore fails to illustrate the true relationship between the proposal and neighbouring residents.

The Appellant also argues that this should be regarded as a front-to-front relationship under the Borough Design Guide. This is not correct.

Remenham Row is a private retirement development separated from Thamesfield only by private gardens, an emergency access track, planting and the boundary wall. There is no public road or other public space between the two sites. Residents therefore enjoy a much greater expectation of privacy than would normally exist across a public highway, making this relationship far 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 Table 2 confirms that opposite my home the separation distance would be only 26 metres, well below the recommended minimum.

The Appellant further argues that, even if the relationship was considered to be back-to-back the result in harm would be limited. Based on the guidance this cannot be the case as the guidance exists to protect residents' privacy and living conditions and should be given proper weight.

Paragraph 6.2.18

This section does not accurately represent the site.

In several places the proposed building would stand closer to the boundary wall than the existing building. During the consultation process Retirement Villages Group confirmed in writing that there would not be enough space to plant any trees between the building and the boundary wall.

I was therefore surprised to see the "Illustrative Master Plan Rev B" showing what appears to be a substantial belt of trees along our boundary. In reality there are only five medium-sized deciduous trees, which would provide very little screening for a building of this height and scale, particularly during the winter months.

Paragraph 6.2.20

Paragraph 6.2.20

The Appellant states that "whilst the views may change to the front elevation of Remenham Row, with the adequate separation distances being met, this would not cause a significant overbearing impact".

Replacing a modest single-storey building with a substantial three-storey apartment block immediately opposite my home would inevitably dominate the outlook, reduce the sense of openness and create an overbearing presence because of its height, bulk and proximity. It has already been proven that the separation distances cannot be met.

The resulting loss of privacy would also be considerable. The degree of overlooking would leave me with little practical alternative but to screen my windows for much of the day, resulting in a noticeable reduction in natural daylight and enjoyment of my home.

The combined effect of the loss of privacy, reduced outlook and overbearing nature of the proposal would seriously affect my enjoyment of my home and could ultimately leave me feeling I have no option but to move. I also fear that such a dominant building immediately opposite would make my property considerably more difficult to sell.

For all of these reasons, together with those set out in my earlier objections, I fully support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and respectfully ask the Inspector to dismiss this appeal.

Finally, I strongly encourage the Inspector to visit Remenham Row before determining the appeal. Only by viewing the proposal from the neighbouring properties will it be possible to gain a full appreciation of the relationship between the two sites and the significant harm this development would cause to residents. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 25

Comments	I wish to object to the proposed expansion of Thamesfield.
	The proposed plan will have a significant impact on the residents of Thamesfield, namely the loss of an enclosed walkway resulting in reduced accessibility to communal areas. This access provides a safe route for residents particularly after dark and during periods of inclement weather which is essential for the type of residents living at Thamesfield loss of light and privacy to existing apartments due to the planned 3 storey building. the loss of the lounge with beautiful river view which is used for many communal activities as well as providing air-conditioned space which is essential in hot weather. The plans do not suggest an equivalent communal facility. The river view is integral to life at Thamesfield and epitomises the character of the site. In addition to the harm caused to residents, the view of the building from the river will be diminished by the proposed demolition of the lounge and the building of the proposed new 3 storey apartments which will be visible from the river. The compromised design of the apartments makes them less appealing to intended residents due to their size and lack of balcony / terrace which is what makes apartments more desirable. The proposal also impacts the residents of Remenham Row whose privacy will be compromised due to the proposed 3 storey building. Close
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 26

Comments	My name is Geoff Snell and I reside at 3 Remenham Row.
	I previously submitted two detailed objections to the original planning application for the demolition of the existing single-storey building at Thamesfield and its replacement with a substantial three-storey apartment building. These representations are available on Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Portal, dated 12th October 2025 and 2nd February 2025. Having carefully considered the Appellant's Statement of Case, I remain firmly opposed to this proposal. Whilst the Appellant seeks to minimise the impact of the development, I believe several statements within the appeal documentation fail to accurately reflect the physical relationship between Thamesfield and Remenham Row or the significant harm that would be caused to neighbouring residents. Section 6.2.5 I cannot agree with the Appellant's assertion that the impact upon Remenham Row would be limited. Remenham Row is a small gated retirement development with a unique and peaceful setting. There is no road, public space or meaningful separation between our homes and the proposed building. The only features between my property and the Thamesfield boundary are a flower border, gravel pathway, front gardens and the boundary wall.

The proposal would replace an unobtrusive single-storey building with a large three-storey apartment block directly opposite my home. The difference between the existing and proposed situation is substantial. The development would significantly reduce privacy, outlook and natural daylight, while creating an oppressive sense of enclosure that does not exist today. The additional apartments would also inevitably bring increased activity, lighting and noise, changing the character of this quiet retirement environment.

I also consider it important to note that the Council's Planning Officer did not initially assess the proposal from the perspective of Remenham Row. It was only after residents requested a site visit that he attended, shortly before the Planning Committee meeting, although his report recommending approval had already been published. Despite maintaining his recommendation, the Planning Committee reached a different conclusion after considering the proposal and the concerns raised by residents, including the building's scale, massing and impact on neighbouring amenity. This highlights the importance of understanding the proposal from the location most affected.

Section 6.2.9

The Appellant's statement that there is already "substantial built form" adjacent to Remenham Row is misleading.

The existing building alongside our properties is only a single-storey structure and is barely visible above the boundary wall. It bears no comparison with the height, bulk and mass of the proposed apartment building.

From my living room, the proposed development would dominate my outlook. Instead of looking towards open sky above a low building, I would face the façade of a substantial apartment block. My living room, bedroom and bathroom, which has clear glass, all face the proposed development and the proposed windows and Juliette balconies would result in direct overlooking and an unacceptable loss of privacy.

The Appellant also refers to another three-storey building elsewhere within Thamesfield. However, that building is located well away from Remenham Row and has no comparable effect on neighbouring residents. It is therefore not a valid comparison or justification for this proposal.

Section 6.2.10

The Appellant suggests that the relationship between the proposed building and neighbouring properties is diagonal. This does not reflect the situation at my home.

The proposed building would directly face my property and would be closer to the boundary wall than the existing building. This would increase both its visual dominance and impact on privacy.

Sections 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 the proposal, including my own. It therefore does not provide an accurate understanding of the relationship between the proposed building and properties 1–5 Remenham Row.

The Appellant argues that the relationship should be considered front-to-front under the Borough Design Guide. I do not believe this reflects the reality of the site.

Remenham Row is a private retirement development with no public highway, passing traffic or pedestrian activity between the two sites. The relationship is therefore much more comparable to a back-to-back arrangement, where residents can reasonably expect a greater degree of privacy.

The Borough Design Guide recommends a minimum separation distance of 30 metres in these circumstances. However, the Appellant's own figures in Table 2 (paragraph 6.2.14) confirm that this is not achieved, with only 21.4 metres opposite my home at No. 3 Remenham Row.

These standards exist to protect privacy and prevent an overbearing sense of enclosure. Given the height, scale and proximity of the proposed building, these objectives would not be met.

The Appellant also suggests that the angled alignment of the building would reduce overlooking. However, this does not reflect my property's situation. The building would sit directly opposite my home and the windows and Juliette balconies would still face towards my living accommodation, resulting in a significant loss of privacy and view.

Section 6.2.18

The Appellant's description of the site is inaccurate.

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

I am therefore concerned by the illustration entitled "Illustrative Master Plan Rev B", which appears to show a substantial row of mature trees along the Remenham Row boundary. This does not reflect the existing situation. In reality, there are only five medium-sized trees, which would provide no significant screening for a building of this height and scale.

The illustration therefore gives a misleading impression of the level of screening available and understates the visual impact of the development.

Section 6.2.20

The Appellant's conclusion that neighbouring amenity would not be materially harmed is an extraordinary statement.

The proposed building would become the dominant feature when viewed from my home. Its height, scale and proximity would replace the current feeling of openness with the imposing presence of a large apartment building.

The overlooking from windows and Juliette balconies would seriously affect my privacy. I would likely need to keep blinds or curtains closed for much of the day to avoid being overlooked, reducing the natural light entering my home and changing how I am able to enjoy my property.

At present, I can enjoy an open outlook and views of the sky above the existing building. If this proposal proceeds, this would be replaced by the walls and windows of a three-storey apartment block. The effect on my quality of life would be profound and permanent, causing significant harm.

I therefore support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and respectfully ask that this appeal is dismissed.

Finally, I strongly encourage the Planning Inspector to visit Remenham Row before determining this appeal. Only by viewing the proposal from the homes that would be directly affected can the true scale and impact of this development be fully understood. [Close](#)

Supporting documents

No documents
