

Planning Applications Committee

29 April 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	Mark Worringham, Planning Policy Manager and Acting 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: Katesgrove
APPEAL NO: 6006433
CASE NO: PL/25/1836
ADDRESS: 2A, 2B & 2C West Hill, Reading, RG1 2PN
PROPOSAL: Retrospective development for the erection of 3no. dwellings to be used as 3no. C4 - small HMO's with associated parking & landscaping, including cycle and bin storage

WARD: Abbey
APPEAL NO: 6006025
CASE NO: PL/25/1802
ADDRESS: Russell House, 117 – 119 Oxford Road, Reading, RG1 7UH
PROPOSAL: Retrospective installation of aluminium fascia signage

WARD: Southcote
APPEAL NO: 6007612
CASE NO: PL/25/11124
ADDRESS: 2A, 2B & 2C West Hill, Reading, RG1 2PN
PROPOSAL: The erection of 2no two-bedroom semi-detached dwellings comprising two storeys, together with on-site car parking, secure cycle parking, refuse storage and landscaping. Vehicular and pedestrian access via Wingrove Road, following the demolition of all structures on the Site.

APPENDIX 2

Appeals Decided:

WARD: Caversham
APPEAL NO: APP/TPO/E0345/10604
CASE NO: PL/25/0209
ADDRESS: 2b Kidmore Road, Caversham, Reading RG4 7LU
PROPOSAL: Fell two Yew trees
CASE OFFICER: Sarah Hanson
METHOD: Written Representation
Decision: Allowed

The Inspector recognised the amenity value of the two trees and their contribution to the street scene, agreeing that *'the effect of the removal on the character and appearance of the area would therefore be unacceptable'*. However, the reason for removal related to the trees contributing to a health condition experienced by one resident of the property and on balance the Inspector considered that removing the trees to assist in alleviating this, although the benefit could not be quantified, should be given greater weight. The appeal was therefore allowed, and the trees have been felled. Officers accept the Inspector's balanced decision, albeit the loss of both tree is disappointing given the appellant accepted only one impacted the resident's health. Officers have written to PINS to query the loss of both trees, given this point, and are awaiting a response.

WARD: Abbey
APPEAL NO: 6001748
CASE NO: PL/25/1210
ADDRESS: 3 West Street, Reading, RG1 1TT

PROPOSAL: Installation of black metal security shutters (retrospective).
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representations
Decision: Dismissed

The FUL application was submitted for retrospective permission for externally mounted roller shutters to a shopfront at 3 West Street in the centre of Reading town centre. Officers advised the applicant that the external mounted shutters were harmful and they should be removed and should consider an alternative design such as laminated safety glazing. The applicant wished to submit a retrospective application for the externally mounted roller shutters which officers advised would be recommended for refusal so recommended the application be withdrawn. The applicant failed to withdraw the application, so the application was refused for its unsympathetic form and materials, incongruent appearance, and inappropriate siting, and failure to respect the character and appearance of the host building. It would result in a discordant and detracting feature, disrupting the architectural and historic significance of the Victorian shopfront and high-street.

The inspector agreed with the officers' reasons for refusal, finding the shutters harmful for a range of reasons. The inspector therefore refused the appeal on harm to character and appearance of the host property and wider streetscene.

WARD: Southcote
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/25/3374554
CASE NO: PL/25/0851
ADDRESS: 78 Burghfield Road, Reading, RG30 3LP
PROPOSAL: Prior Approval Part 1 Class A.1(ea): Larger home extension
CASE OFFICER: Sian Hickey
METHOD: Written Representations
Decision: Dismissed

A pleasing appeal decision that upheld the Council's interpretation of permitted development rights, and upheld the decision to refuse.

WARD: Church
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/D/25/3374757
CASE NO: PL/25/1217
ADDRESS: 33 Birdhill Avenue, Reading, RG2 7JT
PROPOSAL: Rear extension measuring 5.0m in depth, with a maximum height of 3.16m, and 3.0m in height to eaves level. Notification of the construction of an extension under class A Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representations
Decision: Dismissed

Another permitted development appeal. Permitted Development rights allow householders to improve and extend their homes without the need to apply for planning permission. The inspector concluded the proposed extension does not constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GDPO and dismissed the appeal.

WARD: Caversham Heights
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/W/25/337514
CASE NO: PL/23/0663

ADDRESS: Flat 1 92 Albert Road, Caversham RG4 7PL
PROPOSAL: The proposed development is erection of hoarding as a means of Enclosure to secure an unoccupied building
CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
METHOD: Written Representations
Decision: Allowed

This is a disappointing decision. However, the appeal allowed the hoarding to remain only on a temporary basis of 18 months (until August 2027), with the Inspector accepting that the proposal does result in harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to the policies of the Local Plan. However, the Inspector concluded that there would be significant benefit in terms of public safety through preventing the public from entering the site and harming themselves, and the security of the site/building.

WARD: Southcote
APPEAL NO: 6001950
CASE NO: PL/25/0350
ADDRESS: 58 Bath Road Reading RG30 2AY
PROPOSAL: Erection of five detached 4 bed-dwellings and associated works, following the demolition of detached dwellings
CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
METHOD: Written Representations
Decision: Dismissed

This is a pleasing decision, the Inspector followed their own guidance on not accepting additional information at appeal that had not already been supplied at application stage. The Inspector upheld reasons for refusal relating to privacy and overlooking, as well as overshadowing of neighbouring development, the failure to demonstrate no net loss of biodiversity and unsuitable information to enable determination of a mandatory net gain, and a failure to enter into a legal agreement for off-site affordable housing.

An application for costs was also dismissed but there was limited justification provided by the Appellant for a costs award. However, a late costs application was also made by officers, but it was not awarded either. This was made because the Appellant provided new information during the 'final comments'. This new information was not accepted by the Inspector, and officers advised that they were content that they would not seek such costs if the information was not considered.

WARD: Abbey
APPEAL NO: 6001870
CASE NO: PL/25/0929
ADDRESS: Pinnacle, 20 Tudor Road, Reading, RG1 1NH
PROPOSAL: Change of use of from Class E (offices) to C3 (dwelling houses) to comprise 58 flats. Prior Notification under Class MA, Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (amended by plans received on 11 August 2025).
CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
METHOD: Written Representations
Decision: Dismissed

This is an excellent decision which upheld the Council's reason for refusal relating to flood risk for future occupants in prior approval conversions.

WARD: Katesgrove
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/W/25/3376563
CASE NO: PL/24/1079
ADDRESS: Trinity Hall, South Street, Reading, RG1 4QU
PROPOSAL: Change of use of existing building and extensions to provide 18
apartments.
CASE OFFICER: Ethne Humphreys
METHOD: Hearing
Decision: Allowed