

2 REMENHAM ROW
WARGRAVE ROAD
HENLEY ON THAMES
RG9 2LQ
Tel: 01491 575670

RECEIVED

4 FEB 2025

Head of Development Control
Wokingham Borough Council
BY EMAIL AND VIA POST

Dear Sir/Madam

Ref: Application 243125 at Thamesfield, Wargrave Road, Henley on Thames

I live at number 2 Remenham Row and write to register my complete shock and serious heart felt objection to the proposed three storey extension being proposed to Thamesfield Retirement home that would sit hard up against the common boundary with my home at 2 Remenham Row.

My property, alongside the others, is a simple, two storey cottage style red brick home, with small and appropriately scaled windows and details. The existing massing seen in the D&A Statement pages 11 and 18 show the current relationship between the properties being of low density and small residential scale. This is further amplified by the section B-B on Page 37 showing our building being small in scale and design that could now if approved, face a vertical façade, a commercially proportioned blank flat roofed block as depicted in the Application submissions.

Our front Elevations face directly at the proposed three storey wing shown in the Design Engine drawing section drawing number 2212-P-301 which you can see rises in these proposals from a modest single storey existing development under pitched roofs, to a vertical bulk under flat roof of three storeys, very close to the common boundary.

The proposed Site Plan on Page 20 of the Design Statement shows the dense new block but not in the context of what is removed or what is beyond this boundary, the First floor Plan that follows on Page 21 shows the intensified development layout with habitable rooms including bedrooms, living rooms and balconies that would now face my living room directly, these drawings conveniently show the proposed views to the river from the new apartments at an oblique angle, perhaps they should be more honest and note these at 90 degrees and as "Views to the residents Living rooms at Remenham Row" !

The common boundary from my house is 16.5 mtrs from the bay window in my living room. The existing Thamesfield flank at this point is only 2.7mtrs from the common boundary but with single story pitched roof profiles and small domestic style windows, separated by masonry gaps. The sky is visible from the living rooms of our houses above these existing pitched roofs which not only provides daylight to the gardens and houses but relief from the already overbearing Thamesfield extensions.

The plans supplied do not have dimensions on so it is difficult to estimate the proximity between these new habitable rooms and the overall increases in heights. In the Statement Page 33 it refers to the council's guidance on Flats to houses within the Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD Extract (2012) and depending on the individual conditions this ranges from 26-30mtrs "Back to Back". The pre application feedback shown in the Design engine Statement also confirms officers felt that the:- *"mass and scale going from single storey to three storeys the proposal would have an effect of dominance."*

Even allowing for part of the proposal being set slightly further back than the already overbearing existing extensions, it looks to be at most a further two or three mtrs making the gap between our developments in the order of 22 perhaps 23 mtrs "back to back" and therefore far closer than the councils guide shown on page 33 at between 26 and 30 mtrs flats to houses. These guidelines, it is accepted, are for new developments where development it is necessary within Government policies to generate dense development that is necessary for housing growth. This however should not apply to semi-rural independent companies seeking financial gain through private development. These dimensions in any event are very much the minimum standards and have, I believe been breached in these proposals.

The Daylight and Sunlight Analysis provided to accompany the Design Engine Planning Statement focusses generally on the amenity and existing daylight for existing residents at Thamesfield within the development, justifying the impact on itself being acceptable and does not show how this additional height, bulk and blank design will affect daylight and sunlight into Remenham row especially on the common boundary. I would have thought this should be a fundamental consideration for the council not only in terms of neighbourliness but, as with the Party Wall Act in London under Law. This should be a material consideration in any dense proposal like this one and a study that has not been provided here nor proven. There is only one Section BB that addresses the daylight Angle which does not meet any accepted BRE or British Standard Assessment of daylight impact on neighbouring development.

The riverside diagrams on page 28 show the relative building scaling above the existing Thamesfield house, in that the grey ceramic tiled upper storey and the blank side elevation will show above the existing white Mansion House which will very much dominate the river scene as well as Remenham Row.

If you were to sit in my living room and face the common boundary, I currently have clear view of the sky over the rooftop opposite. This will be replaced by a red brick three story mass wall with grey ceramic tiles which is completely unjustified. This development is totally unneighbourly and will make living in the units on this side of Remenham Row unbearable.

This development is unacceptable, the site already over developed and I would ask the Council's officers to visit our side of the development and listen to the residents at Remenham Row who are the only members of the public to be directly affected by these proposals.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Margaret Spratley". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'M'.

MARGARET SPRATLEY