

**Planning
Applications
Committee**
09 September 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:
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:	Abbey
APPEAL NO:	6014625
CASE NO:	PL/26/0588
ADDRESS:	65a Bedford Road, Reading, RG1 7EX
PROPOSAL:	Rear elevation dormer extension and internal alterations
WARD:	Abbey
APPEAL NO:	6015413
CASE NO:	PL/26/0609
ADDRESS:	24 Baker Street, Reading, RG1 7XX
PROPOSAL:	Change of use of property from C4 use class (6 bedroom HMO) to Sui generis use class for seven bedroom HMO
WARD:	Church
APPEAL NO:	6015126
CASE NO:	PL/25/1198
ADDRESS:	3 Chagford Road, Reading, RG2 8AY
PROPOSAL:	Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of an outbuilding within the rear garden.
WARD:	Park
APPEAL NO:	6013122
CASE NO:	PL/26/0114
ADDRESS:	7 Eastern Avenue, Reading, RG1 5RU
PROPOSAL:	Proposed Change of Use of C3 (Dwellinghouses) to C2 (Residential care home)
WARD:	Thames
APPEAL NO:	6014535
CASE NO:	PL/24/0846
ADDRESS:	Napier Court, Napier Road, Reading
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of new buildings of 11 storeys to provide 570 build to rent residential dwellings (Class C3) with residential amenity space, parking, landscaping and associated engineering works (amended description)

APPENDIX 2

Appeals Decided:

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.

CASE OFFICER: Marcelina Rejwerska
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Dismissed

The application for advertisement consent was refused on 6 February 2026 due to the harmful impact on the Russell Street/Castle Hill/Oxford Road Conservation Area. This Conservation Area is identified by Historic England as 'Heritage At Risk' and the Conservation Area Appraisal identifies cluttered and overbearing advertisements as a negative feature of the area. The Inspector agreed with our assessment that the new advertising (fascia board and canopy awning) is unsympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area, and as these have already been erected, the matter is now with the Planning Enforcement team.

WARD: Caversham
APPEAL NO: 6005740
CASE NO: PL/25/1597
ADDRESS: 18 Church Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7AD
PROPOSAL: The construction of a 1.5-storey side extension and a double-storey rear extension. removal of a masonry upstand/short brick wall and replacement with glass guarding and the regrading of existing garden steps.
CASE OFFICER: Mishga Marshall
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Allowed

The main issues were the effect on the conservation area and impacts on bats. The Inspector found that the extended dwelling would be largely unobtrusive from important views and in comparison to neighbouring properties and that there would be no harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The Inspector did find a tension with policy EN3 that requires a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, but that there was no overall conflict with the development plan. In terms of bats, the Inspector found that the surveys carried out were proportionate and that provision for bat roosts secured by condition would be adequate mitigation.

WARD: Caversham Heights
APPEAL NO: APP/TPO/E0345/11058
CASE NO: PL/25/1611
ADDRESS: 83 Kidmore Road, Caversham, RG4 7NQ
PROPOSAL: Fell one Western red cedar tree.
CASE OFFICER: Sarah Hanson
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Allowed

An application was received on 10/11/25 seeking consent to fell the mature tree located in the rear garden, primarily due to human health reasons; one member of the family experiencing allergic reactions to the tree. The Inspector's decision primarily focuses on the impact on amenity from the trees' removal, concluding that it 'would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area because of its lack of visibility and the presence of so many other mature trees'. Setting aside the debate on this point, officers are disappointed that the Inspector has not discussed allergenic potential, given this was the reason cited for felling, to give an indication of the weight PINS puts on this matter in order to guide future decisions. Replacement planting is required.

WARD: Coley
APPEAL NO: 6008475

CASE NO: PL/25/1803
ADDRESS: 4 Prospect Street, Reading
PROPOSAL: Retrospective application for the replacement roof tiles
CASE OFFICER: Marcelina Rejwerska
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Dismissed

This was also a retrospective application, which was refused on 6 February 2026. The original natural slate roof tiles have been replaced with modern fibre cement tiles. As the work has already been completed, it was plain to see how alien the material looked compared to the natural slate in the surrounding area. This site is also located in the Russell Street/Castle Hill/Oxford Road Conservation Area, designated as 'Heritage At Risk'. The Inspector visited the site and agreed that the appearance of the modern materials is unsympathetic to the local character. The matter has been passed on to Planning Enforcement.

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)
CASE OFFICER: Gary Miles
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Allowed

This is a disappointing decision that centred around the effect of the enclosure on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector accepted that there had been some loss of visual amenity, but considered that the harm was not particularly significant due in particular to the mitigating effect of the adjacent grass verges.

WARD: Katesgrove
APPEAL NO: 6008519
CASE NO: PL/26/0232
ADDRESS: Regents Gate, 25-41 Crown Street, Reading, RG1 2PQ
PROPOSAL: Change of use of existing building from Class E (offices) to C3 (dwelling houses) to comprise 29 new apartments. Prior Notification under Class MA, Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015.
CASE OFFICER: Catrin Davies
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Allowed

Planning permission was originally refused due to insufficient information having been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable flood risk. Following the refusal, the appellant submitted additional flood risk information as part of the appeal process. The same information was also submitted under a subsequent planning application (PL/26/0539), which was approved on the basis that the additional evidence satisfactorily addressed the Council's previous concerns regarding flooding.

In determining the appeal, the Inspector took account of the additional information submitted after the original decision had been made and concluded that the flooding concerns had been adequately addressed. As a result, the appeal was allowed. Whilst the decision is accepted, it is disappointing that the Inspector gave weight to information that was not available to officers at the time the original decision was taken. Officers remain of the view

that, had the additional flood risk information not been submitted, the appeal would likely have been dismissed for the reasons set out in the Council's original decision notice

WARD: Redlands
APPEAL NO: 6009767
CASE NO: PL/26/0147
ADDRESS: 69 London Road, Reading, RG1 5BW
PROPOSAL: Erection of digital display advertising device (2.4m x 1.23m)
CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Dismissed

A positive appeal decision was received in which the Inspector upheld the Council's concerns regarding both amenity and highway safety. The proposed advertisement was considered harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area and listed walls which adjoin the proposal and would have been situated within a complex highway environment, involving multiple junctions, pedestrian crossing facilities, lane changes and competing traffic movements. The Inspector agreed that these circumstances gave rise to legitimate concerns regarding driver distraction and public safety, and dismissed the appeal on both grounds.

WARD: Southcote
APPEAL NO: 6007612
CASE NO: PL/25/1124
ADDRESS: 47 Parkside Road, Reading, RG30 2BT
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.
CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
METHOD: Written Representations
DECISION: Allowed

This application was refused by officers in October of 2025, for 6 reasons. The reasons related to what was considered to be inappropriate plot coverage, layout, detailed design, including extent of hardstanding to the frontage, and lack of suitably sized, and private garden space. Reasons for refusal also related to failure to demonstrate no net loss of biodiversity, and failure to completed a legal agreement to secure affordable housing.

The decision by the Inspector to allow the appeal, is disappointing, as officers had considered the scheme carefully, and put forward good justification for refusing the development. In allowing the appeal, the Inspector considered that the proposal, within a transitional area between two distinctly different residential character areas, was a suitable arrangement of space, and architectural detailing, which would not harm the appearance of the area, or impact upon residential amenity.

Notwithstanding the disappointment in the decision, officers are pleased that a policy compliant offsite affordable housing contribution was secured by s106. In addition, officers suggested conditions relating to securing landscaping, materials, and construction method statement details were included by the Inspector. In addition, the Inspector included provision of M4(2) adaptable dwellings conditions as required by policy H5.