

UPDATE REPORT

PLANNING APPEALS

10 September 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. Information

- 1.1. The purpose of this update report is to correct errors in the original appeals report (decisions being recorded as “refused” when should have read “dismissed”), where appeal decisions had already been received and to provide some narrative on appeal decisions.

APPENDIX 1

Appeals Lodged:

WARD: _____ EMMER GREEN
 APPEAL NO: _____ APP/E0345/D/25/3368161
 CASE NO: _____ PL/25/0165
 ADDRESS: _____ 151 Peppard Road
 CASE OFFICER: _____ Louise Fuller
 PROPOSAL: _____ Erection of annexe (Retrospective)
 METHOD: _____ Written Representation
 APPEAL Decided – see appendix 2

WARD: _____ TILEHURST
 APPEAL NO: _____ APP/E0345/W/25/3367970
 CASE NO: _____ PL/24/1534
 ADDRESS: _____ Peter Moss Services 20 Norcot Road, Tilehurst
 CASE OFFICER: _____ Anthony Scholes
 PROPOSAL: _____ Demolition of existing garage workshops, canopy extension, and detached spray booth building, and replacement with metal clad building for General or General Industrial purposes (Class B2 – Vehicle Workshop and Vehicle Body Spraying) accessed via Lemart Close, with carparking, and waste storage
 METHOD: _____ Written Representation

WARD: THAMES WARD
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Z/25/3367583
CASE NO: PL/25/0468
ADDRESS: Thames Valley Service Station, George St, Caversham
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
PROPOSAL: 1no D6 (digital advertisement) screen
METHOD: Written Representation

WARD: BATTLE
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Z/25/3368994
CASE NO: PL/25/0557
ADDRESS: Milk and More, 1 Portman Road, Reading RG30 1EA
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
PROPOSAL: Proposed 48 Sheet LED Advertising Billboard, 5.76m x 2.88m
METHOD: Written Representation
APPEAL Decided – see appendix 2

WARD: EMMER GREEN
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/25/3369443
CASE NO: PL/25/0167
ADDRESS: 16 Jefferson Close, Emmer Green, Reading
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
PROPOSAL: Single Storey Rear Extension and Internal Alterations
METHOD: Written Representation

WARD: KATESGROVE
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Z/25/3371390
CASE NO: PL/25/0866
ADDRESS: 70 Whitley Street, Reading
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
PROPOSAL: Retrospective advertising consent for illuminated signboard for Turkish Halal Food Centre
METHOD: Written Representation

APPENDIX 2

Appeals Decided:

WARD: KATESGROVE
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/W/25/3363345
CASE NO: PL/24/0661
ADDRESS: Folk House Church Street Reading
PROPOSAL: Replacement of timber windows with UPVC windows
CASE OFFICER: Matthew Harding
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: DISMISSED
DATE DETERMINED: 23.07.2025

WARD: CAVERSHAM HEIGHTS
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/25/3359487
CASE NO: PL/24/0824
ADDRESS: The Shanty, 145 The Warren
PROPOSAL: Extensions and alterations to dwelling
CASE OFFICER: Nathalie Weekes

METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: DISMISSED
DATE DETERMINED: 25.07.2025

WARD: CAVERSHAM HEIGHTS
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/C/24/3354050 & APP/E0345/C/24/3354051
CASE NO: Enforcement Appeal
ADDRESS: 19 Richmond Road
PROPOSAL: Without planning permission, the material change of use of a garden building incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse to a mixed-use that includes business purposes (treatment room)
CASE OFFICER: Stephen Hammond
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: ALLOWED
DATE DETERMINED: 31.07.2025

Officer comments:

The Inspector focused on the question of the planning unit and whether the use of the outbuilding as a beauty treatment room was a material change of use on a fact and degree basis, taking into account the scale and intensity of use in the context of the planning unit taken as a whole. In this instance the Inspector decided that the use was incidental to the main dwelling with no definable or significant difference to the character of the planning unit – and so no material change of use had occurred. Although the outcome is disappointing, it nevertheless provides some useful insights into the relevant considerations when assessing the use of outbuildings and the tipping point for deciding whether a change of use has occurred.

WARD: TILEHURST
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/25/3364230
CASE NO: PL/25/0217
ADDRESS: 49 Recreation Road, Tilehurst
PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension (retrospective)
CASE OFFICER: Mishga Marshall
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: DISMISSED
DATE DETERMINED: 08.08.2025

WARD: Abbey
APPEAL NO: APP/TPO/E0345/9429
CASE NO: PL/22/1070
ADDRESS: Chancery Mews, Russell Street
PROPOSAL: Crown Reduce, crown lift & crown thin two Yew trees
CASE OFFICER: Sarah Hanson
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: DISMISSED
DATE DETERMINED: 19 June 2025

Officer comments:

A tree works application (ref: PL/22/1070) was submitted on 20 July 2022 and sought approval for works to two Yew trees; that being a reduction of the height by approx. 6-10ft/2-3m and a reduction of the crown by approx. 6-10ft/2-3m, crown lifting and crown thinning. The reasons cited for the works were *'to keep the tree clear of the gutter and windows, increase light levels for occupiers and reduce risk of snow damage'*. The overall reductions were refused on 14 November 2022 due to the harm to the amenity value of the trees and that reductions alongside thinning was not good arboricultural practice. Lesser works were approved, consisting of pruning to provide better clearance from the building, alongside the crown lifting and crown thinning. The appeal was finally decided on 19 June 2025 and was dismissed with the Inspector concluding that *'I am satisfied that the tree contributes to the appearance and character of the conservation area and that the proposed work is likely to have a detrimental*

impact on this contribution. No evidence has been submitted to justify the proposed works over and above what has already been approved'. Officers are pleased that the Inspector appreciated the detrimental impact of the works on the trees and on the wider area.

WARD: KATESGROVE
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Z/25/3359854
CASE NO: PL/24/1345
ADDRESS: 70-72 Whitley Street
PROPOSAL: The development proposed is the replacement of internally illuminated D48 poster with a digital display
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: ALLOWED
DATE DETERMINED: 19.08.2025

Officer comments:

The Inspector considered that the large digital display would be comparable to the existing paper poster light box and would not appear out of keeping with the surrounding area. The decision does not sit well with the overarching aims of enhancing the character of the recently extended Conservation Area, a significant aspect of which would be to reduce visual clutter from signage and improve the quality of the signage which remains. It is a matter of opinion as to whether the existing poster display is comparable and mitigates the harm of the proposed digital display, but officers believe that the appearance of the modern sign would be harmful to the character of the area.

WARD: EMMER GREEN
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/25/3368161
CASE NO: PL/25/0165
ADDRESS: 151 Peppard Road, Emmer Green
PROPOSAL: Erection of annex (retrospective)
CASE OFFICER: Louise Fuller
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: ALLOWED
DATE DETERMINED: 21.08.2025

Officer comments:

The Inspector noted that at the time of the visit the annexe did not contain a fitted kitchen. The Inspector decided that the annexe was physically and functionally related to the main dwelling and was an incidental use. The Inspector raised no concern over the effect on the character of the area, or the effect on the amenity of the immediate neighbour to the rear of the site. This is an unusual decision given the size, nature and degree of separation of the annexe.

WARD: BATTLE
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Z/25/3368994
CASE NO: PL/25/0557
ADDRESS: Milk & More 1 Portman Road
PROPOSAL: Proposed 48 Sheet LED Advertising Billboard, 5.76m x 2.88m
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representation
DECISION: DISMISSED
DATE DETERMINED: 27.08.2025