

Planning Applications Committee

07 January 2026



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 (lists of applications viewable on our website).

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. More guidance about costs awards is in MCHLG's [Planning Practice Guidance](#).

9. Timetable for Implementation

- 9.1. Not applicable.

10. Background Papers

- 10.1. There are none.

APPENDIX 1

Appeals Lodged:

WARD: Caversham Heights
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/W/25/3376303
CASE NO: PL/25/0422
ADDRESS: 92 Albert Road, Caversham
PROPOSAL: Erection of detached dwelling
CASE OFFICER: Louise Fuller
METHOD: Written Representations
START DATE: 09/12/2025

WARD: Southcote
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/W/25/6001950
CASE NO: PL/25/0422
ADDRESS: 92 Albert Road, Caversham
PROPOSAL: Erection of five detached 4-bed dwellings, and associated works, following demolition of detached bungalow
CASE OFFICER: Catrin Davies
METHOD: Written Representations
START DATE: 09/12/2025

WARD: Caversham
APPEAL NO: 6002434 & APP/E0345/Z/25/3376710
CASE NO: PL/25/01352 & PL/25/1357
ADDRESS: Pavement o/s 29 Church Street, Reading, RG4 8BA
PROPOSAL: The proposed installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated existing BT payphone(s).
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representations
START DATE: 11/12/2025

WARD: Katesgrove
APPEAL NO: 6002488
CASE NO: PL/25/1228
ADDRESS: 81 London Street, Reading, RG1 4AQ
PROPOSAL: Temporary change of use from private parking to commercial car park for up to 3 years
CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
METHOD: Written Representations
START DATE: 15/12/2025

WARD: Thames
APPEAL NO: 6002475 & APP/E0345/Z/25/3376733
CASE NO: PL/25/01351 & PL/25/1356
ADDRESS: Pavement o/s Great Brigham Mead, Caversham Road, RG1 8DJ
PROPOSAL: The proposed installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated existing BT payphone(s).
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representations
START DATE: 16/12/2025

WARD: Battle
 APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Z/25/3376684
 CASE NO: PL/25/1358
 ADDRESS: Pavement o/s Norcot Service Station, 856 Oxford Road, RG30 1EL
 PROPOSAL: The proposed installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated existing BT payphone(s).
 CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
 METHOD: Written Representations
 START DATE: 17/12/2025

APPENDIX 2

Appeals Decided:

WARD: Tilehurst
 APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/W/25/3367970
 CASE NO: PL/24/1534
 ADDRESS: Peter Moss Services, Land rear of 20 Norcot Road, Tilehurst
 PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing garage workshops, canopy extension, and detached spray booth building, and replacement with metal clad building for General Industrial purposes (Class B2 – Vehicle Workshop and Vehicle Body Spraying) accessed via Lemart Close, with carparking, and waste storage.
 CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
 METHOD: Written Representations
 DECISION: Dismissed
 DATE DETERMINED: 08/12/2025
 Officer Note: In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposals failed to demonstrate that the proposals would not harm neighbouring amenity in terms of noise, fumes and odour. The inspector found the appearance of the building to be acceptable in its context. Officers consider that this is a helpful decision which provides clarity for future Planning involvement in this site.

WARD: Katesgrove
 APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Z/25/3371390
 CASE NO: PL/24/0866
 ADDRESS: 70 Whitley Street, Reading
 PROPOSAL: Retrospective advertising consent for illuminated signboard for Turkish Halal Food Centre.
 CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
 METHOD: Written Representations
 DECISION: Dismissed
 DATE DETERMINED: 15/12/2025

Officer note: The Inspector did not agree with the reason for refusal concerned with harm to public safety nor any harm to the amenity considerations specific to living conditions of nearby residents but did agree with the Council's concerns for the impact on the character and appearance of the Christchurch Conservation Area. The case will now be followed up by Planning Enforcement.

WARD: Church
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/25/3374709
CASE NO: PL/24/0806
ADDRESS: 57 Birdhill Avenue, Reading, RG2 7JU
PROPOSAL: Retrospective application for a single storey rear extension and rear side change in garden level

CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Dismissed
DATE DETERMINED: 22/12/2025

Officer note: In dismissing the appeal, the inspector found that the extensions would remain subservient to the original house and were in keeping with extensions to other houses in the street. However, it was found that the raising of ground levels to the rear of the property had allowed views over the neighbouring garden and across the rear of the neighbouring house and that this had resulted in substantial harm with the privacy of neighbours being seriously compromised. The decision to refuse was taken on this basis. The case will now be followed up by Planning Enforcement.

WARD: Abbey
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Y/25/3363075
CASE NO: PL/24/0954
ADDRESS: The Sun Public House, 16 Castle Street, Reading, RG1 7RD
PROPOSAL: Retrospective application for erection of illuminated sign to front elevation

CASE OFFICER: Matthew Harding
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Allowed
DATE DETERMINED: 23/12/2025

Officer Note: In allowing the appeal, the Inspector found that the signage is not overly prominent, has a traditional character and is largely sensitive to the building's historic aesthetics. The lighting is acceptable. The Inspector noted that historic photographs show there was previously a painted sign in a more prominent position on the gable. Overall, the works were found to preserve the special interest of the listed building.