

**Planning  
Applications  
Committee**  
01 July 2026



**Reading**  
Borough Council  
**Working better with you**

<b>Title</b>	<b>PLANNING APPEALS</b>
<b>Purpose of the report</b>	To note the report for information
<b>Report status</b>	Public report
<b>Report author</b>	Mark Worringham, Planning Policy Manager and Acting Development Manager (Planning & Building Control)
<b>Lead Councillor</b>	Councillor Micky Leng, Lead Councillor for Planning and Assets
<b>Corporate priority</b>	Inclusive Economy
<b>Recommendations</b>	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:
1. Promote more equal communities in Reading
  2. Secure Reading's economic and cultural success
  3. Deliver a sustainable and healthy environment and reduce our carbon footprint
  4. Safeguard and support the health and wellbeing of Reading's adults and children
  5. 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:
1. Putting residents first
  2. Building on strong foundations
  3. Recognising, respecting, and nurturing all our diverse communities

4. Involving, collaborating, and empowering residents
5. 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—
  1. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act.
  2. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
  3. 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**

Not applicable.

## **10 Background Papers**

There are none.

### **APPENDIX 1**

#### **Appeals Lodged:**

WARD: Emmer Green  
APPEAL NO: 6010473  
CASE NO: PL/26/0428  
ADDRESS: 20 Mallory Avenue, Caversham, Reading, RG4 6QN  
PROPOSAL: Extension of 1.8 metre high fence to enclose an area of residential garden (retrospective)

### **APPENDIX 2**

#### **Appeals Decided:**

WARD: Abbey  
APPEAL NO: 6004763  
CASE NO: PL/25/1491  
ADDRESS: 1 St Mary's Butts, Reading, RG1 2LN  
PROPOSAL: Retrospective Roller Shutter and Illuminated Signage  
CASE OFFICER: Nathalie Weekes  
METHOD: Written representations  
DECISION: Dismissed

The FUL application was submitted for retrospective permission for externally mounted roller shutters to a shopfront at 1 St Mary's Butts at the side of Broad Street Mall 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. 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 St Mary's Butts streetscene and the setting and significance of the nearby St Mary's Butts/Castle Street Conservation area. Conditions suggested by the applicant as part of the appeal proposed ensuring the shutter was translucent from a 10m distance and/or to limit the timing of the shutter usage, neither of which was considered acceptable by the planning inspector as the proposed conditions would not address the harm arising from the lack of active frontage when the shutter is lowered or address harm to the viewpoints towards the setting of the St Mary's Butts /Castle Street Conservation area.

WARD: Battle  
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/Z/25/3376684  
CASE NO: PL/25/1353 & PL/25/1358  
ADDRESS: Pavement o/s Norcot Service Station, 856 Oxford Road, Reading, 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

DECISION: Dismissed

These are part of a series of BT Street Hub appeals and we will report on these collectively when all decisions are received.

WARD: Emmer Green/Out of Borough  
APPEAL NO: APP/E0345/W/25/3377314  
CASE NO: PL/25/0691  
ADDRESS: Land West of Kidmore End Road, Oxfordshire, RG4 8SG  
PROPOSAL: 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).  
CASE OFFICER: Matthew Burns  
METHOD: Inquiry  
DECISION: Dismissed

The Inspector dismissed the appeal relating to SODC's decision to refuse planning permission for the parts of the development within South Oxfordshire. The Inspector concluded that the proposal located on the boundary with Reading Borough would blur the current distinct transition between the settlement edge of Reading and open countryside beyond. He found that the development would erode the rural character, harming and disrupting the established settlement pattern by expanding Reading into South Oxfordshire closer to Chalkhouse Green and suburbanising the setting of Cucumber Wood Ancient Woodland.

In dismissing the appeal the Inspector found the development to be sub-optimal in terms of sustainability with distance to bus stops and cycling infrastructure considered to be poor as a result of the steep gradients around the site and despite SODC not being able to demonstrate a five-year housing supply, he found that the contribution the scheme would make to that supply would be modest and therefore he applied limited weight to these aspects. The Inspector also attached limited weight to the applicant's proposed benefits of the development in providing significant off-site areas of open space and BNG to the north of the site around Cucumber Wood, given his concerns about how this would be secured and managed.

The Inspector also found that the proposals conflicted with the Kidmore End Parish Neighbourhood Plan which did not plan for this level of development in this location. As per paragraph 14 of the NPPF, where such conflict with a Neighbourhood Plan occurs, this harm will likely significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, and the Inspector found this to be the case in this instance.

In terms of the RBC application which was appealed on grounds of non-determination and just related to the accesses to the development from Kidmore End Road and Highdown Hill Road, the Inspector refused planning permission stating that having established the unacceptability of the parts of the development within South Oxfordshire, the parts of the development within Reading cannot logically be allowed because it forms an integral part of the scheme and therefore cannot be considered in isolation. Disappointingly, given this approach taken by the Inspector, the decision does not discuss the parts of the development within Reading or their acceptability with the Inspector seeming to refuse the RBC application by default once he found the SODC application to be unacceptable. The benefits of contributions (including those in Reading Borough) were not discussed by the Inspector.

Officers received notification on 18 June that the developer (Fairfax) has sought to challenge the Inspector's decision in the High Court on six Grounds. There is no confirmation at this point whether the challenge will be accepted for examination by the Courts or an anticipated date.

WARD: Norcot  
APPEAL NO: 6004708  
CASE NO: PL/25/1207  
ADDRESS: 21 Park Crescent, Reading, RG30 2NL  
PROPOSAL: Single Storey extension and garage conversion  
CASE OFFICER: Mishga Marshall  
METHOD: Written representations  
DECISION: Dismissed

The Inspector dismissed the appeal, which hinged on the garage conversion's impact on the neighbouring property (No. 20): the increased height and massing were found to appear dominant, overbearing, and harmful to outlook. Although the rear extension itself and the design impacts were considered acceptable, the overall scheme was found to conflict with local plan policies protecting residential amenity.