

**Planning
Applications
Committee**
07 October 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 reporting on appeals lodged and decided to 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 Health Implications

- 7.1 The decision to note the appeals lodged and decided will not have a differential impact on health. Implications for health may be a matter that is considered as part of the relevant appeals.

8 Legal Implications

- 8.1 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.

9 Financial Implications

- 9.1 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](#).

10 Timetable for Implementation

Not applicable.

11 Background Papers

There are none.

APPENDIX 1

Appeals Lodged:

WARD: Southcote
APPEAL NO: 6015961
CASE NO: PL/26/0594
ADDRESS: 7 Glennon Close, Reading, RG30 3HT
PROPOSAL: Change of use from Residential Dwelling (Class C3b) to Residential Care Home (Class C2)
STATUS: Valid

APPENDIX 2

Appeals Decided:

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
CASE OFFICER: Nathalie Weekes
METHOD: Written representations
DECISION: Dismissed

The Inspector found that the proposed rear dormer would appear very large and bulky, and as a result would both unduly dominate its host property and would be an overly large and incongruous feature in the street scene. The decision is also notable due to specifically citing the policy (DP3) on principles for well designed places in the new NPPF in dismissing the appeal.

WARD: Caversham
APPEAL NO: 6007941
CASE NO: PL/25/1020
ADDRESS: Land between 75 and 99 Star Road, Caversham, Reading
PROPOSAL: Construction of a terrace of four 3-bedroom 2.5 storey dwellings, parking, and hard and soft landscaping.
CASE OFFICER: Ethne Humphreys
METHOD: Written representations
DECISION: Dismissed

In terms of flooding, the Inspector decided that as he was not aware of any sequentially preferable sites in terms of flooding, the development passed the 'sequential test' with

regard to its location within Flood Zone 3a. However, he was not satisfied that there would be an ability to easily access safe areas, nor was he satisfied that the issue of displacement of floodwater had been addressed. Overall, he concluded that the proposal was not safe in flood terms and would not avoid increased risk of flooding elsewhere. He found that the repetitious design, bulk and massing and small gardens would contribute to a development which was not well-designed, would not provide sufficient amenity space and would not allow for meaningful soft landscaping. He found that the arrangement of parking spaces was not suitable in terms of highway visibility. Whilst there was engagement from the Appellant in terms of affordable housing viability, no s106 unilateral undertaking was provided, therefore he concluded that there was conflict with Policy H3. On biodiversity, the Inspector accepted that the small gardens would not allow for on-site BNG improvements, but was satisfied that this could be addressed with an off-site BNG condition. Overall, the Inspector concluded that the advantages of a brownfield redevelopment and the identified shortfall of housing supply did not outweigh the harm he had identified in respect of flood risks and design. Officers welcome this decision which accords with the majority of the shortcomings of the scheme which led to its refusal.

WARD: Kentwood
APPEAL NO: 6004809
CASE NO: PL/25/0102
ADDRESS: 1029 Oxford Road, Tilehurst, Reading
PROPOSAL: Development of new building to provide 2no.2 bedroom and 6no. 1 bedroom flats along with the creation of 6 parking spaces and associated landscaping following the demolition of the existing building.
CASE OFFICER: Anthony Scholes
METHOD: Written representations
DECISION: Dismissed

The Inspector discussed various aspects of the design and bulk of the proposed building in some detail and concluded that it would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. He was not satisfied that the development would provide adequate living conditions to adjacent properties, or sufficient outlook/privacy for the proposed flats themselves. The Inspector was content that the development was suitable in highway/parking terms. In this particular case, he considered that there was not a requirement for three-bedroom units. The Inspector noted that the Appellant had set out an affordable housing offer and had presented this within a s106 unilateral undertaking, however, he noted that the LPA had highlighted various deficiencies with it (including its enforceability), and he therefore made no detailed commentary on the matter as he was dismissing the appeal on the Grounds above. A separate application for costs from the Appellant was also dismissed. Whilst it would have been helpful for the Inspector to have provided a judgment in relation to affordable housing, this is nevertheless a pleasing decision, where the Inspector considered that the benefits of the scheme (mix, unit supply, sustainable location) did not overcome the significant design shortfalls he identified.

WARD: Tilehurst
APPEAL NO: 6002960 & 6002961
CASE NO: PL/25/1394 & PL/25/1403
ADDRESS: Pavement outside The Triangle, Tilehurst, Reading, RG30 4RN
PROPOSAL: Proposed installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 2no. digital 75" LCD advert screens, and associated BT Phone Kiosk removal.
CASE OFFICER: Huimin Chen
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.