

PLANNING REF : 252430
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 39 Foxborough Swallowfield
: Reading, Berkshire
: RG7 1RW
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Philip Guard
DATE SUBMITTED : 10/11/2025

COMMENTS:

This application is deficient in accuracy and uses very selective interpretation to justify its position. It should also be summarily rejected based on Section 5.4.48 (Sustainability Appraisal 2024):

'The final HELAA potentially suitable site is then Land east of Trowes Lane, Swallowfield (85) homes. This site is identified as potentially suitable through the HELAA but can be ruled out / not progressed to the RA growth scenarios once account is taken of the strategic

context. Specifically, an adjacent site recently gained permission at appeal for 81 homes, and allocation of both sites would amount to

over-allocation in the Swallowfield context, e.g. noting the lack of a village primary school'.

1. Definition of the Site: The Masterplan diagram includes the whole field and woodland area, but in the rest of the document the area to the east of the proposed SuDS is excluded from the 'Site'. This is at best disingenuous, and downplays a number of the potential impacts, particularly on flooding and full accessibility. The Amenity area must be included as part of the Site to allow proper assessment of the Application. The field is also described as rough grazing. This is not true, it was cultivated arable land until a few years ago since when it has been left unproductive by the owners. It has not been used for any grazing during this century and in the absence of any stock fencing or stock-proof hedging probably not for any time when before that. Such deliberate mislabelling casts doubt on the integrity and transparency of the whole application.

2. Local Plan: Not in the current draft update and outside the village boundaries, although City & Country are trying to add the site at the Plan Inspection stage. Over the past 30 years the village has expanded by the Naylor's, Foxborough, Curly's Way and the Pippins, with the

Meadows (Cove) and Croudace (with planning approval) to come. No concomitant increase in village amenities, infrastructure or resources has been provided. According to the VDS there were 200 houses in 1985, which had increased to 290 by 2003. Since then, new developments have added/ adding a further 133. Clearly a further development of 79

houses without a major uplift in infrastructure and facilities in advance is inappropriate and damaging to all residents, current or incoming. This increase is out of proportion with the rest of the borough. C&C state, without evidence, that the need for housing in an undefined 'sub-area' is limited because of the DEPZ (which already impinges on Swallowfield) and that only Shinfield and Swallowfield are suitable sites. The claim that 79 houses is appropriate when compared to 375 allocated to Shinfield in this 'sub-area' is nonsense. This would be a 25% increase in the size of Swallowfield compared to 4% for Shinfield.

3. Impact on the community: There are no additions to the community amenities and just this would just add further pressures. The Doctors surgery is oversubscribed with no NHS plan to resolve the issue. Swallowfield is outside the catchment area of all primary

schools, with none planned to provide spaces for children from the village. There is no public transport direct to the district centre of Wokingham and it has been acknowledged in previous planning decisions that most journeys will be by car, for which all major routes are

severely delayed by bottlenecks for commuting and school runs. It was also noted that most routes out of the village are only safe for experienced cyclists, contrary to sustainable travel policies. The current unviable Bus Service, serving Reading is dependent on future developer payments, which may take years to become available, if ever. Any further development must be preceded by correction of the current deficiencies.

4. Flood Risk: This field is often waterlogged and drains to the Blackwater across Part Lane a road notorious for flooding, despite many attempts to improve drainage. This pressure will be further increased by flood drainage from the Croudace site, which stated the ditch and field as the route for flood overspill to the Blackwater. Their theoretical assessment is flawed in several ways. It only uses surface water falling directly on the restricted definition of the site, ignoring potential threat from the surrounding high-risk areas. It also fails to be aware of the history of flooding to the east,

where Part Lane is regularly under water, despite many attempts at remediation.

5. Provision of services to the site: The recently approved site (Croudace) immediately opposite Pithers has yet to acquire confirmation of adequate water supply, surface water drainage and foul wastewater disposal capacity. The adequacy of the electricity supply for a further development is uncertain. In ignoring this issue, for example, C&C just state that foul waste water will just be pumped into the Trowes lane sewer. This is clearly inadequate based on the evidence given at the Croudace appeal and the conditions imposed as result.

6. Archaeology. The claim that no full survey and evaluation is justified is not supportable. The field opposite, which has been treated in the same way for at least 30 years has had a full programme of work imposed as binding condition following the appeal. This was agreed by all involved despite both a desktop review and exploratory works being carried out before the original application.