

Planning Applications Committee

28 May 2025



Reading
Borough Council
Working better with you

Title	PLANNING APPEALS
Purpose of the report	To note the report for information
Report status	Public report
Report author	Julie Williams, Development Manager (Planning & Building Control)
Lead Councillor	Councillor Micky Leng, Lead Councillor for Planning and Assets
Corporate priority	Inclusive Economy
Recommendations	The Committee is asked: 1. To note the report.

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. To advise Committee on notifications received from the Planning Inspectorate on planning appeals registered with them or decision made and to provide summary reports on appeal decisions of interest the Planning Applications Committee.

2. Information provided

- 2.1. Please see Appendix 1 of this report for new appeals lodged since the last committee.
- 2.2. Please see Appendix 2 of this report for appeals decided since the last committee with summary reports provided.

3. Contribution to Strategic Aims

- 3.1. The Council Plan has established five priorities for the years 2025/28. These priorities are:
- Promote more equal communities in Reading
 - Secure Reading's economic and cultural success
 - Deliver a sustainable and healthy environment and reduce our carbon footprint
 - Safeguard and support the health and wellbeing of Reading's adults and children
 - Ensure Reading Borough Council is fit for the future
- 3.2. In delivering these priorities, we will be guided by the following set of principles:
- Putting residents first
 - Building on strong foundations
 - Recognising, respecting, and nurturing all our diverse communities
 - Involving, collaborating, and empowering residents
 - Being proudly ambitious for Reading
- 3.3. Defending planning appeals made against planning decisions contributes to creating a sustainable and healthy environment with supported communities and helping the economy within the Borough as identified as the priorities within the Council Plan.

4. Environmental and Climate Implications

- 4.1. The Council declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 26 February 2019 (Minute 48 refers).
- 4.2. The Planning Service uses policies to encourage developers to build and use properties responsibly by making efficient use of land and using sustainable materials and building methods

5. Community Engagement

- 5.1. Planning decisions are made in accordance with adopted local development plan policies, which have been adopted by the Council following public consultation. Statutory consultation also takes place on planning applications and appeals, and this can have bearing on the decision reached by the Secretary of State and his Inspectors. Copies of appeal decisions are held on the public Planning Register.

6. Equality Implications

- 6.1. Under the Equality Act 2010, Section 149, a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—
 - eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 6.2. It is considered that an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is not relevant to the decision on whether sites need to be visited by Planning Application Committee. The decision will not have a differential impact on people with the protected characteristics of; age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (gender) or sexual orientation.

7. Legal Implications

- 7.1. Public Inquiries are normally the only types of appeal that involve the use of legal representation. Only applicants have the right to appeal against refusal or non-determination and there is no right for a third party to appeal a planning decision.

8. Financial Implications

- 8.1. Public Inquiries and Informal Hearings are more expensive in terms of officer and appellant time than the Written Representations method. Either party can be liable to awards of costs. Guidance is provided in Circular 03/2009 “Cost Awards in Appeals and other Planning Proceedings”.

9. Timetable for Implementation

- 9.1. Not applicable.

10. Background Papers

- 10.1. There are none.

APPENDIX 1

Appeals Lodged:

WARD:	KATESGROVE
APPEAL NO:	APP/E0345/W /25/3363345
CASE NO:	PL/24/0661
ADDRESS:	Folk House Church Street Reading
CASE OFFICER:	Matthew Harding
PROPOSAL:	Replacement of timber windows with UPVC windows
METHOD:	Written Representation
WARD:	CAVERSHAM HEIGHTS
APPEAL NO:	APP/E0345/ /D/25/3365141
CASE NO:	PL/24/1696
ADDRESS:	340 Hemdean Road, Caversham
CASE OFFICER:	Gary Miles
PROPOSAL:	Erection of part double part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Removal of existing lean to side porch
METHOD:	Householder Written Representation
WARD:	THAMES WARD
APPEAL NO:	APP/E0345/ W/25/3364774
CASE NO:	PL/24/0900
ADDRESS:	Land adjacent to 24 George Street, Caversham
CASE OFFICER:	Ethne Humphreys
PROPOSAL:	This application seeks planning permission for the erection of 5 x bed dwelling houses within a terrace. Indicative landscaping is shown, with cycle and bin storage. It is proposed to be a car free development
METHOD:	Written Representation
WARD:	REDLANDS
APPEAL NO:	APP/E0345 Y/25/3363142/
CASE NO:	PL/24/1111
ADDRESS:	97 London Road
CASE OFFICER:	Matthew Harding
PROPOSAL:	Proposed restoration of brick boundary wall and paving of frontage and new bin store
METHOD:	Written Representation
WARD:	TILEHURST
APPEAL NO:	APP/E0345/D/25/3364230
CASE NO:	PL/25/0217
ADDRESS:	49 Recreation Road
PROPOSAL:	Single storey rear extension (retrospective)
CASE OFFICER:	Mishga Marshall
METHOD:	Written Representation
WARD:	CHURCH
APPEAL NO:	APP/E0345/ Z/25/3364611
CASE NO:	PL/25/0221
ADDRESS:	211 Shinfield Road
PROPOSAL:	Erection of a D6 Small Format Advertisement Display
CASE OFFICER:	Gary Miles
METHOD:	Written Representation

WARD: REDLANDS
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345 /25/3361380
CASE NO: PL/24/1054
ADDRESS: 11Newcastle Rd
PROPOSAL: Change of use from a dwelling (class c3) to 7 person house in multiple occupation (sui generis) and associated works.
CASE OFFICER: Matthew Harding
METHOD: Written Representation

WARD: KATESGROVE
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345 /25/ Z/25/3359854
CASE NO: PL/24/1345
ADDRESS: 70-72 Whitley Street, Reading
PROPOSAL: Replacement of internally illuminated D48 poster with digital displayEdit
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representation

APPENDIX 2

Appeals Decided:

WARD: TILEHURST
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/24/3356199
CASE NO: PL/24/0691
ADDRESS: 122 Westwood Road
PROPOSAL: Retrospective permission sought for Wooden garage to front of existing house
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Householder Written Representation
DECISION: Appeal Allowed
DATE DETERMINED: 07/04/2025

WARD: KENTWOOD
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/24/ 3348748
CASE NO: PL/24/0095
ADDRESS: 16a Kentwood Hill
PROPOSAL: Side and rear extensions to 2no. existing flats to convert them into 2no. self-contained dwelling houses
CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: Appeal Dismissed
DATE DETERMINED: 30/04/2025

WARD: CAVERSHAM HEIGHTS
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/24/ 3353393
CASE NO: PL/23/1590
ADDRESS: 2 Consiboro Way
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing dwelling house and construction of replacement dwelling house
CASE OFFICER: Marcelina Rejwerska
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: Appeal Dismissed
DATE DETERMINED: 09/05/2025

Case Officer Comments: This appeal was mainly concerned with the biodiversity value of the site. This is a vacant and subsequently quite overgrown plot, where the applicant had completed substantial clearance prior to submission of the planning application. As the proposed replacement dwelling was comparatively large to the neighbouring properties and included an annexe in the rear garden, this left little space for meaningful soft landscaping to address the biodiversity net loss on site. The Inspector addressed the fact that Policy EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network) does not contradict the new legislation relating to Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain, and therefore the reason for refusal based on biodiversity net loss on site was supported by the Inspector. The other reasons for refusal relating to the large scale and footprint of the dwelling were not supported by the Inspector as the plot is larger than those in the surrounding area and can therefore support a larger dwelling. The appeal was dismissed due to the harm to biodiversity identified.

WARD:	BATTLE
APPEAL NO:	APP/E0345/D/24/3352227
CASE NO:	PL/23/1491
ADDRESS:	21 Western Elms Avenue
PROPOSAL:	Proposed construction of three town houses
CASE OFFICER:	Marcelina Rejwerska
METHOD:	Written Representation
DECISION:	Appeal dismissed with costs to Reading Borough Council
DATE DETERMINED:	09/05/2025

Case Officer Comments: This is another appeal mainly concerned with biodiversity of the site. Again, the applicant had completed extensive site clearance, with some of the site falling within an identified Green Link. The appellant was unable to demonstrate what the ecological value of the site would have been prior to clearance, and therefore officers were unable to fully assess the extent of the resultant harm. The appellant then submitted the previously requested ecological surveys at the appeal stage, requiring officers to spend a considerable amount of time assessing this new information. Regardless, the Inspector agreed with the Council that the development, although acceptable in its design, posed considerable harm to the ecological value of the site and this outweighed the benefit of 3x new dwellings and the appeal was dismissed on that basis. Due to the late submission of documents, the Council submitted a counter-appeal for an award of costs, which was allowed. Officers have submitted a claim for almost £10,000 in full costs to be recovered from the applicant, which will now be put forward to the applicant's agents for agreement.