



Reading
Borough Council

Working better with you

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
APPEAL UNDER SECTION 78**

**APPEAL BY FAIRFAX (READING) LTD AND READING GOLF CLUB (SODC) LTD
AGAINST THE NON-DETERMINATION BY READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
OF PLANNING APPLICATION REF. PL25/0691/OUT FOR OUTLINE
PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 70 HOMES
(INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING), NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS,
ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING (ALL MATTERS RESERVED
EXCEPT FOR ACCESS)**

AT

LAND WEST OF KIDMORE END ROAD, OXFORDSHIRE, RG4 8SG

**INSPECTORATE REFERENCE: APP/E0345/W/25/3377314
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL REFERENCE: 25/0691/OUT**

**STATEMENT OF CASE
ON BEHALF OF READING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Date: 11th March 2026

Assistant Director of Planning,
Transport & Public Protection
Reading Borough Council
Civic Offices,
Bridge Street
Reading,
RG1 2LU

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	Page 2
2. Site Description	Page 3
3. Planning History	Page 3
4. Relevant Drawings and documents	Page 3
5. Legal and Planning Policy Context	Page 3
6. The Council's Case	Page 4
7. Conclusion	Page 7

Appendices

- A. Highway/Transport Statement of Case, prepared by Chirs Saunders of Motion (Transport Consultant)
- B. LPA Suggested Conditions
- C. RBC Officer report to 4th February 2026 RBC Planning Applications Committee (RBC application ref. PL/25/0691/OUT)
- D. RBC Officer update report to 4th February 2026 RBC Planning Applications Committee (RBC application ref. PL/25/0691/OUT)
- E. RBC Minutes from 4th February 2026 RBC Planning Applications Committee
- F. SODC Officer report to 3rd December 2025 SODC Planning Applications Committee (SODC application ref. PL/25/S1431/O)
- G. SODC Decision Notice (SODC application ref. PL/25/S1431/O).
- H. RBC consultation response to SODC in relation to SODC application ref. PL/25/S1431/O (RBC Officer report to 5th November 2025 RBC Planning Applications Committee)
- I. RBC consultation response to SODC in relation to SODC application ref. PL/25/S1431/O (RBC Officer update report to 5th November 2025 RBC Planning Applications Committee)
- J. RBC consultation response to SODC in relation to SODC application ref. PL/25/S1431/O (minutes from 5th November 2025 RBC Planning Applications Committee)
- K. RBC planning permission decision notice ref. PL/22/1312/VAR
- L. Approved Site Layout Plan for planning permission ref. PL/22/1312/VAR

This Statement of Case (SoC) has been prepared by me, Matthew Burns. I am a Principal Planner at Reading Borough Council with 16 years Development Management experience in a local authority setting. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in Geography and a Masters degree in Town and Regional Planning, both from Sheffield University. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

I am familiar with the appeal site, its surroundings, and its context within the Borough. I am familiar with planning policies at local and national level which are relevant to the consideration of this appeal.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 An Outline planning application was received by Reading Borough Council under reference 25/0691/OUT on 9th May 2025 for *'Outline planning application for the development of up to 70 homes (including affordable housing), new vehicular access, associated parking and landscaping (all matters reserved except for access)'*
- 1.2 The application site traverses the administrative boundaries of both Reading Borough Council (RBC) and South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC). The significant majority of the proposed development and application site is within South Oxfordshire with just parts of the accesses to the site located within Reading Borough. The parts of the application site proposed to accommodate new dwellings and associated areas of open space is all on land within South Oxfordshire.
- 1.3 Two identical planning applications were submitted to both SODC (ref. PL/25/S1431/O) and RBC (ref. PL/25/0691/OUT) on 9th May 2025, with each LPA responsible for determination as to whether or not planning permission should be granted for the parts of the proposed development within their administrative area.
- 1.4 RBC was consulted on the SODC application and comments were provided following consideration of a report on that application as presented to the Planning Applications Committee on 5 November 2025. In summary, there were no objections with observations provided and a request that an additional S106 contribution be secured to mitigate transport/traffic impacts.
- 1.5 Planning permission for the parts of the development in South Oxfordshire was refused by SODC at their Planning Applications Committee on 3rd December 2025 where the committee overturned the SODC officers' recommendation to grant planning permission. The SODC Officers committee report and SODC decision notice are attached as appendix F and G to this statement.
- 1.6 The Appellant lodged an appeal (ref. APP/Q3115/A/25/3377313) against SODC's decision to refuse planning permission for the parts of the development within South Oxfordshire on 22nd December 2025, and at the same time lodged an appeal for non-determination of the planning application for the parts of the development within Reading Borough (ref. APP/E0345/W/25/3377314).
- 1.7 This statement relates to the appeal against the non-determination of the planning application for the parts of the development within Reading being dealt with by RBC. The start date for the appeal is 4th February 2026 and accordingly a report was taken to the Local Planning Authority's Planning Applications Committee on 4th February 2026. The report (attached at Appendix C) set out all the relevant planning policies and relevant material planning considerations and invited Members to confirm the decision they would have made if they had been able to determine the planning application, with the officer recommendation being to grant, subject to conditions and completion of a s106 legal agreement. An

Update Report was also provided to members on the day of the Committee Meeting, and this is attached at Appendix D.

- 1.8 The committee agreed with the recommendation of Officers that had they been able to determine the planning application they would have resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of a s106 legal agreement. The minute of the 4th February 2026 Planning Application Committee, as amended at Planning Applications Committee on 4th March 2026, confirming the committee's resolution is attached as appendix E to this statement.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 This is detailed at section 2 of the planning officer's committee report (attached as appendix C) and for brevity is not repeated here.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1. This is detailed at section 4 of the planning officer's committee report (attached as appendix C) and for brevity is not repeated here.

4.0 DRAWINGS AND DOCUMENTS

- 4.1 An agreed list of core documents is set out within the Statement of Common Ground.

5.0 LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 Relevant national and local planning policy is set out under section 6 of the officer report to committee (attached as appendix C).

6.0 THE COUNCIL'S STATEMENT OF CASE

- 6.1 The officer report to committee and associated updated report (attached as appendix C and D to this report) that were presented to the Council's Planning Applications Committee on 4th February 2026 provide a full assessment of the application and together with the committee minutes (attached as appendix E) set out the Council's position in respect of this application.
- 6.2 This proposal is a cross-boundary development with the significant majority of the application site and development located on land under the jurisdiction of an adjacent authority (SODC). The parts of the proposed development that are located within Reading Borough relate only to the site accesses which are in part located within Reading. Vehicular access to the development is proposed from Kidmore End Road connecting through an existing development of 223 dwellings that is under construction on the part of the former golf course site that is entirely located within Reading and which was granted under planning permission ref. PL/22/1312/VAR. A copy of the planning permission decision notice is attached as appendix K to this report and the approved site layout plan for this development attached as appendix L. The other parts of the proposed development located within Reading are a cycle and pedestrian (active travel links) connecting from the development onto Highdown Hill Road and a pedestrian connection from the development onto Kidmore End Road.
- 6.3 Within Reading, the proposed access arrangements are considered technically acceptable, notably vehicular access to the development would make use of an existing road already constructed to serve the adjacent development. No significant adverse impacts are identified in respect of character and appearance of the area, residential amenity or the natural environment within Reading as a result of the proposed accesses to the development.
- 6.4 Whilst the development would add modest levels of vehicular traffic and pedestrian and cycle movements to the highway network local to the development within Reading, this impact can be adequately mitigated through a financial contribution to be secured as part of the s106 agreement towards highway improvement work at the Peppard Road/Henley Street/Westfield Road/Prospect Street junction or towards other highway/active travel enhancements within the locality. Pedestrian and cycle connectivity of the development would be strengthened through new pedestrian and cycle links with s278 highway works agreements to provide these connections to also be secured as part of a s106 agreement. Accessibility to key local services is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.5 Overall, as set out within the officer report to committee and associated updated report (attached as appendix C and D) the parts of the proposed development located within Reading Borough are considered to comply with the relevant national and local planning policies and guidance, subject to the imposition of planning conditions and the appellant entering into a S106 legal agreement to secure the necessary planning obligations in order to mitigate the impacts of the

development upon Reading. Had RBC been in a position to determine the application, then planning permission would have been granted on this basis.

- 6.6 The officer report to the committee (attached as appendix C) within paragraphs 7.19 to 7.28 and the associated update report (attached as appendix D) within paragraphs 1.6 to 1.9 set out the Council's reasoning for seeking a highway improvement works contribution of £50,000 by way of s106 agreement towards junction improvements to the signalised control at the Peppard Road / Henley Street / Westfield Road / Prospect Street junction to mitigate for the additional trips that would be generated by the proposed development.
- 6.7 As set out in the committee minutes (attached as appendix E) the committee resolved that this contribution should be increased to £150,000 and that this contribution should go towards identified highway/active travel (pedestrian and cycling) improvement works within the local area, which would be impacted by trips to and from the development. The LPA's justification for this level of contribution and where it would be used is detailed within the separate transport statement of case attached as appendix A to this statement. The Statement of Common Ground submitted by the Appellant confirms that a highway works contribution of up to £150,000 is agreed, to be secured by way of section 106 agreement.
- 6.8 This statement together with all appendices, should be taken as the Council's Statement of Case for this appeal.
- 6.9 If the appeal is to be allowed, the Council requests that the conditions enclosed at appendix B be secured.

Appeal Procedure

- 6.10 Reading (RBC) is seeking a hybrid appeal and considers that matters relevant to RBC can be dealt with via written representations given the Planning Applications Committee has resolved that had the non-determination appeal not been submitted then RBC would have granted planning permission for the parts of the proposed development within Reading. As noted by the appellant's draft Statement of Common Ground for the RBC appeal there are no principal matters of disagreement. The only details still to be agreed between the appellant and the Council is the value of the highway mitigation contribution and any conditions which the LPA considers can be addressed via written representations, and within the statement of common ground and s106 agreement.

SODC planning application ref. PL/25/S1431/O and related appeal ref. APP/Q3115/A/25/3377313

- 6.11 RBC provided consultation comments to SODC prior to determination of the planning application they are dealing with (ref. PL/25/S1431/O) for the parts of the development within South Oxfordshire. The officer reports, which informed these comments, were considered at RBC Planning Applications Committee on 5th November 2025. The officer reports to the committee and committee minutes

are attached as appendices H, I and J. The reports outline that RBC did not object to the parts of the development within South Oxfordshire subject to mitigation being secured as part of the SODC application towards addressing a number of impacts RBC officers had identified that the proposed development would have upon Reading Borough. This included the highway works contribution discussed above in the context of the RBC planning application, as well as contributions towards bus services and to mitigation impacts upon healthcare and leisure facilities within Reading, given that the location of the development is such that future residents would very likely utilise infrastructure and services within Reading rather than South Oxfordshire.

- 6.12 It is confirmed in the SODC officer Planning Application Committee report (attached as appendix F) that SODC and the Appellant agree to secure the bus service, healthcare and leisure contributions sought by RBC, with RBC being party to a s106 agreement to achieve this. The draft Statement of Common Ground submitted by the appellant also lists the bus service, healthcare and leisure contributions as matters that are agreed and to be secured by way of s106 agreement. Subject to these contributions being secured as part of a section 106 agreement then RBC raise no objection to the SODC application and parts of the development located within South Oxfordshire.
- 6.13 Once SODC determined to refuse planning permission for their application (ref. P25/S1431/O) RBC Officers, when reporting on the RBC application to the RBC Planning Applications Committee, recommended that the highway mitigation contribution previously requested as part of the RBC consultation response to SODC in relation to the application for the parts of the development within South Oxfordshire was instead secured as part of a s106 linked to the RBC planning application (ref. PL/25/0691/OUT). This was because the accesses to the development are all located within Reading and are fundamental to facilitating the additional vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements within the Borough. This is set out in the officer report and update report to 4th February 2026 RBC Planning Applications Committee (attached as appendix C and D). Had the appeal against non-determination of the RBC application not been submitted officers would have sought to secure the highway mitigation contribution as part of this application with the separate bus service, healthcare and leisure contributions remaining to be secured as part of the SODC planning application with RBC being party to that agreement.
- 6.14 However, given a joint appeal has been submitted in relation to both the RBC and SODC application, preparation of a joint s106 with the appellant and both SODC and RBC being party to the agreement has commenced. This overarching s106 agreement, if completed, and in the event that the Planning Inspectorate determines to grant planning permission for the development, would encapsulate relevant infrastructure obligations for both RBC and SODC.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 As set out in this statement and appendices, the LPA would have granted planning permission for the parts of the proposed development within Reading had the appeal for non-determination not been submitted.
- 7.2 The LPA would have granted planning permission, subject to conditions (with the LPA's suggested list of conditions set out in Appendix B to this statement) and completion of a section 106 agreement to secure the proposed highway works and a highway impact mitigation contribution. A section 106 agreement is in the process of being drafted to secure these obligations. The LPA's case and details of the requested s106 obligations is set out in the officer report (and update report) to 4th February 2026 Planning Applications Committee and the minutes from the meeting which are attached as appendices C, D and E to this statement. The committee's resolution on the application increased the highway mitigation contribution recommended by officers from £50,000 to £150,000 and the LPA's case for seeking this increased contribution is set out in the separate Transport Statement of Case attached as appendix A to this statement. The Statement of Common Ground under section 4 confirms that the Appellant agrees to the principal of the s106 obligations and to a highway mitigation contribution of up to £150,000.
- 7.3 In terms of the planning application for the parts of the development within South Oxfordshire, this statement and appendices set out that RBC raise no objection to the SODC planning application which forms part of this joint appeal, but under separate appeal reference no. APP/Q3115/A/25/3377313, subject to RBC being party to a section 106 legal agreement to secure infrastructure contributions towards bus service improvements and leisure and healthcare facilities within Reading to mitigate for the impacts of the development upon the Borough. The LPA's case in respect of these contributions is set out within the officer report (and update report) to 5th November 2025 Planning Applications Committee and the minutes of that meeting which are attached as appendices H, I and J to this statement. The Statement of Common Ground under section 4 confirms that the Appellant agrees to the s106 infrastructure obligations sought by RBC.
- 7.4 From an RBC perspective the only matters to be agreed as part of the appeal, should the outcome be to allow the appeals, are the proposed planning conditions and exact value of the highway impact mitigation contribution which can be suitably addressed via the Written Representations procedure, statement of common ground and completion of a s106 legal agreement.

