

FIRETHORNE HOUSE
STATION ROAD
ALVESCOT
OX18 2PS

July 13th 2026

Dear Planning Inspector,

Appeal against refusal of planning permission at Thamesfield

My mother lives at 2 Remenham Row, immediately adjoining the Thamesfield site. I submitted an objection to the original planning application last year. I welcomed Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission, and having read the Appellant's Statement of Case I wish to make the following representations in support of the Council's decision.

Paragraph 6.2.5

The Appellant states that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the residents of Remenham Row. Respectfully, I disagree.

Remenham Row is a small retirement community with a quiet and peaceful character. There is no public road separating my mother's home from Thamesfield. Instead, her property is separated only by her front gardens, a gravel path, a flower border and the boundary wall. The existing building adjacent to the boundary is single storey and has very little impact on her property. Replacing it with a substantial three-storey apartment building would fundamentally alter the relationship between Thamesfield and Remenham Row. Rather than looking towards open sky above the existing building, my mother's outlook would be a much larger and more dominant structure directly opposite her home.

The proposal would have a significant effect on her outlook, privacy, daylight and general enjoyment of her home. It would also introduce increased activity, lighting and noise compared with the current situation.

I also consider it relevant that the Council's Planning Officer did not visit Remenham Row before preparing his recommendation to approve the application. It was only after residents requested a visit that he attended the site, together with members of the Planning Committee, shortly before the Committee meeting. By that stage his report had already been completed. In my view, anyone standing in Remenham Row can immediately appreciate how close the proposed building would be and the effect it would have on me and neighbouring residents.

Paragraph 6.2.9

The Appellant suggests there is already substantial development close to Remenham Row. I do not believe this accurately reflects the existing relationship.

The current building adjacent to her boundary is only one storey high and is barely visible above the wall. It bears little resemblance to the scale and massing of the proposed three-storey building.

From my mother's living room she currently enjoy an open outlook towards the sky. If the proposal were allowed, that outlook would instead be dominated by a substantial apartment building. As my mother is now less mobile, it's increasingly important for her mental health to have a pleasing and light outlook as she spends a lot more time in her living room.

Her living room and bedroom both face towards Thamesfield. Her bedroom window is of course clear glazed and the proposed windows and Juliet balconies would result in increased opportunities for overlooking towards her home, leading to a significant loss of privacy.

The Appellant also refers to an existing three-storey building elsewhere within Thamesfield. However, that building is much further away from Remenham Row and has no comparable impact on me or neighbouring residents. It is therefore not an appropriate comparison.

Paragraph 6.2.10

The Appellant states that the proposed building would only be experienced at an angle from neighbouring properties. This is not the case for my home. The building would sit directly opposite her property and would therefore appear particularly prominent and overbearing. I am also concerned about the loss of daylight and sunlight. The technical assessments submitted with the application indicate that her property would experience reductions beyond the normally accepted BRE guidelines. While I am not an expert in those standards, the conclusions reinforce what is evident from the proposal itself: replacing a single-storey building with a much taller building in such close proximity will inevitably reduce the natural light reaching my mother's home.

My mother spends much of her time at home, this would materially reduce my quality of life and enjoyment of her property.

I am also concerned by the proposal's effect on existing Thamesfield residents. The submitted plans appear to show the removal of the covered walkway connecting parts of the retirement village. This seems likely to reduce convenience and shelter for residents moving between buildings, particularly during poor weather.

The submitted daylight assessment also indicates that several existing Thamesfield apartments would experience significant reductions in daylight, with a number falling below recognised BRE guidance. In addition, Flats 9 and 10 would have the proposed three-storey building located less than eight metres from principal living room windows. That relationship appears likely to create an oppressive sense of enclosure as well as reducing natural light.

Although my principal concern is the impact on my mother's property, these matters reinforce my view that the proposal would not provide a satisfactory living environment for either my mother, her neighbouring residents or some existing Thamesfield residents.

../3

Paragraphs 6.2.12–6.2.16

The Appellant argues that the relationship between the proposed building and Remenham Row should be regarded as front-to-front rather than back-to-back for the purposes of the Borough Design Guide.

In my opinion, that does not reflect the reality on site. Remenham Row is a private residential environment with no intervening public highway, passing traffic or significant pedestrian activity. The relationship functions much more like a back-to-back arrangement than properties separated by a public street.

For that reason, I consider the 30-metre separation distance identified within the Design Guide to be the more appropriate standard. The proposed building would be approximately 23.4 metres from my mother's property and would therefore fall significantly short of that guidance.

I also note that the photograph included within the appeal documents does not show the row of properties that would experience the greatest impact from the proposal, including my mother's home. As a result, it does not provide a fair impression of the development's impact on my mother and other affected residents.

Paragraph 6.2.18

The proposed building would be positioned closer to the boundary wall than the existing building in several locations. During the planning application process, the Appellant confirmed that there would be insufficient space to establish meaningful tree planting between the building and the boundary.

I was therefore surprised to see an illustration suggesting substantial tree screening along the boundary. That illustration does not reflect the current situation. Only a limited number of medium-sized trees exist and they would provide very little screening of a building of this size.

I believe the illustration significantly overstates the extent to which the development would be screened from Remenham Row.

Paragraph 6.2.20

The Appellant concludes that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties in Remenham Row. I respectfully disagree.

The proposed building would dominate the outlook from my mother's home and create an overbearing sense of enclosure. It would also result in a substantial loss of privacy, to the

extent that I believe she would often feel the need to keep curtains or blinds closed, thereby further reducing the natural daylight available within her home, and the quality of her life.

.../4

One of the qualities she values most about living at Remenham Row is the open outlook from her bedroom and living room. The ability to see open sky above the existing building creates an important sense of space. That would be replaced by the walls, windows and balconies of a three-storey apartment building, fundamentally changing the character and enjoyment of her home.

For all of these reasons, I fully support Wokingham Borough Council's decision to refuse planning permission and respectfully ask that the appeal be dismissed.

Finally, I would ask that, if possible, you visit Remenham Row during your site inspection. Viewing the proposal from the perspective of the neighbouring residents would, I believe, provide a clear understanding of the relationship between the proposed building my mother's home, the others affected, and the degree of impact it would have.

Thank you for considering my objections.

Yours faithfully,

Ann Cadogan
Daughter of Margaret Spratley
2 Remenham Row