

PLANNING REF : 260917
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Parish Office
: Swallowfield Street, Swallowfield, Reading
: RG7 1QX
SUBMITTED BY : Swallowfield Parish Council
DATE SUBMITTED : 14/05/2026

COMMENTS:

260774 and 260917 (Hart DC 26/00541/OUT) Sun Lane Riseley
The main app here is 260774, and the application is for outline permission for up to 44 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access. The other WBC reference arises because the site access (Sun Lane off Basingstoke Road) is in Hart District. The Hart application also contains the full application.

This is of course a cause for concern for many residents of Riseley and other parishioners.

I propose we put up the following OBJECTION on all three of the planning references above:

"Swallowfield Parish Council strongly objects to this application. There are many known adverse conditions which apply. These have been detailed in previous objections to developments in Riseley (Duke's Field: 83 dwellings) and in Swallowfield (three developments on Trowes Lane: 20 and 81 dwellings approved, 79 pending). Approval of this application would compound the problems created by these developments.

TO RESTATE, the area suffers from the following

1) Traffic levels:

The Residential Travel Plan Statement suggests (in sections 3.3.4 and 3.2.5) that local roads "are unlikely to carry significant traffic flows" and refers to "quiet mixed traffic streets and lanes". In reality there are significant rush hour queues at both ends of the A33 (Wellington Roundabout and Three Mile Cross/M4 Junctions) as well as at the junction of Basingstoke Road and the B3349 about 130 metres south of the proposed Sun Lane site entrance. All other roads around Riseley are narrow rural roads and locals already have well justified concerns about traffic levels.

In Hart DC's decision on Duke's Field 18/00242/REM, condition 5 is that non-emergency traffic should not access Basingstoke Road from the Duke's Field site due to safety concerns: The same situation exists here: Sun Lane is opposite the Duke's Field emergency access. So it would be equally inappropriate to allow Sun Lane to be used as access.

2) Bus service:

one bus per hour Monday to Saturday north to Reading only. Funding for this service is not confirmed beyond mid 2027. This is inadequate.

3) School provision:

The village and parish have NO pre-school, primary, secondary or sixth form provision nearby. We note that Hart DC put a condition of Duke's Field that Robert May's secondary school should have

places funded for extra demand due to that development. We strongly believe WBC should be providing easily accessible LOCAL school places for children from our Parish: our school situation is dire.

4) Medical and dentistry:

Swallowfield Medical Practice is overloaded. There is no nearby dental service.

5) Shops: there are no nearby supermarkets.

Swallowfield Parish store is too small for a full shop. The nearest shop for comestibles is Wellington Farm Shop which sells only high end goods.

The proposed development would have 40% affordable housing. However, without schools or adequate public transport and local facilities, residents are dependent on cars. In such an area, affordable/social housing is inappropriate.

6) Flooding: despite the Environment Agency maps, there is a history of surface water flooding along Bull Lane and Sun Lane. Swallowfield Flood Resilience Group and WBC worked together to provide some natural flood alleviation features to the north of Bull Lane around two years ago. Several houses close to the site were flooded in July 2007 due to runoff.

7) There are limited local employment opportunities.

8) The appeal Inspector for the Trowes Lane application (Appeal Ref PPX0360/w/24/3340006, WBC app 230422) concluded that the application failed on almost all points, but that "tilted balance" led to approval. We believe the tilted balance has been taken too far in this parish and that the application should be refused.

Concerns specific to this site on Sun Lane include:

9) The site is outside the village envelope and is not suitable for development. It has been rejected in the past (1990 and 1996/7). Planning Inspectorate Decision Notice T/APP/X0360/A/97/288963/P7 details the dismissal of appeal (copy available on request).

10) The local landscape is of high quality and there are reports of nesting buzzards. There are other protected species in the area as well.

11) With respect to surface water drainage, foul drainage and drinking water infrastructure, we refer to and endorse the comments posted by Graham Stanley, chair of Swallowfield Flood Resilience Group. All aspects of these essential services are inadequate. We understand that Thames Water consider Riseley area to be a "red Zone" for current inadequate water supply. It makes no sense to load this system further.

12) Several homes on Sun Lane and Bull Lane were flooded in 2007.

Loss of capacity in this field could increase risk of recurrence.

13) The area is subject to regular power cuts. Extra load on the system is not justifiable.

14) The character and environment of Listed Buildings on or near the site will be damaged. This is ably discussed by Miss Jessica Hughes in her objection to this application.

Should WBC and Hart DC be minded to approve, we request a number of conditions:

- i. No work until satisfactory foul drainage and water supply installed.
- ii. A fully independent flood survey and to clearly identify exposures, followed by properly designed and installed protection measures including protection for exposed existing houses.
- iii. School provision near to Swallowfield Parish
- iv. A condition that boundary vegetation be retained/enhanced for continued privacy of neighbouring properties
- v. Medical services expanded
- vi. Continued funding of bus service.

Swallowfield

Parish Council strongly objects to this application. There are many known adverse conditions which apply. These have been detailed in previous objections to developments in Riseley (Duke's Field: 83 dwellings) and in Swallowfield (three developments on Trowes Lane: 20 and 81 dwellings approved, 79 pending). Approval of this application would compound the problems created by these developments.

TO

RESTATE, the area suffers from the following

1) Traffic levels:

The Residential Travel Plan Statement suggests (in sections 3.3.4 and 3.2.5) that local roads "are unlikely to carry significant traffic flows" and refers to "quiet mixed traffic streets and lanes". In reality there are significant rush hour queues at both ends of the A33 (Wellington Roundabout and Three Mile Cross/M4 Junctions) as well as at the junction of Basingstoke Road and the B3349 about 130 metres south of the proposed Sun Lane site entrance. All other roads around Riseley are narrow rural roads and locals already have well justified concerns about traffic levels.

In Hart DC's decision on Duke's Field 18/00242/REM, condition 5 is that non-emergency traffic should not access Basingstoke Road from the Duke's Field site due to safety concerns: The same situation exists here: Sun Lane is opposite the Duke's Field emergency access. So it would be equally inappropriate to allow Sun Lane to be used as access.

2) Bus service:

one bus per hour Monday to Saturday north to Reading only. Funding

for this service is not confirmed beyond mid 2027. This is inadequate.

3) School provision:

The village and parish have NO pre-school, primary, secondary or sixth form provision nearby. We note that Hart DC put a condition of Duke's Field that Robert May's secondary school should have places funded for extra demand due to that development. We strongly believe WBC should be providing easily accessible LOCAL school places for children from our Parish: our school situation is dire.

4) Medical and dentistry:

Swallowfield Medical Practice is overloaded. There is no nearby dental service.

5) Shops: there are no nearby supermarkets. Swallowfield Parish store is too small for a full shop. The nearest shop for comestibles is Wellington Farm Shop which sells only high end goods.

The proposed development would have 40% affordable housing. However, without schools or adequate public transport and local facilities, residents are dependent on cars. In such an area, affordable/social housing is inappropriate.

6) Flooding: despite the Environment Agency maps, there is a history of surface water flooding along Bull Lane and Sun Lane. Swallowfield Flood Resilience Group and WBC worked together to provide some natural flood alleviation features to the north of Bull Lane around two years ago. Several houses close to the site were flooded in July 2007 due to runoff.

7) There are limited local employment opportunities.

8) The appeal Inspector for the Trowes Lane application (Appeal Ref APPX0360/w/24/3340006, WBC app 230422) concluded that the application failed on almost all points, but that "tilted balance" led to approval. We believe the tilted balance has been taken too far in this parish and that the application should be refused.

Concerns specific to this site on Sun Lane include:

9) The site is outside the village envelope and is not suitable for development. It has been rejected in the past (1990 and 1996/7). Planning Inspectorate Decision Notice T/APP/X0360/A/97/288963/P7 details the dismissal of appeal (copy available on request).

10) The local landscape is of high quality and there are reports of nesting buzzards. There are other protected species in the area as well.

11) With respect to surface water drainage, foul drainage and drinking water infrastructure, we refer to and endorse the comments posted by Graham Stanley, chair of Swallowfield Flood Resilience

Group. All aspects of these essential services are inadequate. We understand that Thames Water consider Riseley area to be a "red Zone" for current inadequate water supply. It makes no sense to load this system further.

12) Several homes on Sun Lane and Bull Lane were flooded in 2007. Loss of capacity in this field could increase risk of recurrence.

13) The area is subject to regular power cuts. Extra load on the system is not justifiable.

14) The character and environment of Listed Buildings on or near the site will be damaged. This is ably discussed by Miss Jessica Hughes in her objection to this application.

Should WBC and Hart DC be minded to approve, we request a number of conditions:

- i. No work until satisfactory foul drainage and water supply installed.
- ii. A fully independent flood survey and to clearly identify exposures, followed by properly designed and installed protection measures including protection for exposed existing houses.
- iii. School provision near to Swallowfield Parish
- iv. A condition that boundary vegetation be retained/enhanced for continued privacy of neighbouring properties
- v. Medical services expanded
- vi. Continued funding of bus service.