



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/25/3368161

151 Peppard Road, Emmer Green, Reading RG4 8TR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Jeremy Simmons against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
- The application Ref. is PL/250165.
- The development proposed is for the erection of an annexe.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an annexe at 151 Peppard Road, Emmer Green, Reading RG4 8TR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/250165, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 151 Peppard Road.

Preliminary Matter

2. The outbuilding was substantially complete and occupied at the time of my site visit; and which appeared to have been built in accordance with the proposed drawings. Whether or not the planning application, the subject of the appeal, was retrospective in nature does not alter the character of the proposed development, nor does it constitute development itself. I have therefore utilised the description as set out on the planning application forms with the exception of the word 'retrospective' and have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 38 Buckingham Drive, with specific reference to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

4. The outbuilding is used as an annexe to the main dwelling and has no fitted kitchen. It forms part of the rear garden of the host dwelling with shared amenity space and parking facilities. I am therefore satisfied that it is physically related to no151 along with a functional relationship as it is occupied by the appellant's son, which does not appear to be disputed by the Council.
5. Notwithstanding that the host dwelling has benefitted from an extension and a garage which projects within the rear garden, there is still ample space between all built elements; and the Council has not stipulated that any private amenity space standards would be conflicted by allowing this appeal. The appeal site is of

generous proportions and consequently I consider that no overdevelopment of the plot has been caused with the relationship between the annexe and the host dwelling appearing a logical one, and in any case largely concealed from public view by high fencing and vegetation, situated along the northern and western site boundaries.

6. A Public Footpath runs adjacent to the northern boundary of the site, which leads to nos 32 – 38 Buckingham Drive with the latter property sharing a boundary with the site. The subject building projects forward of the front elevation of no38, although in reality it is no higher than the trellis topped fencing along the shared boundary. Any views of the proposed building from the front of the neighbouring property would at best be oblique and largely screened by the aforementioned fencing and trellis. I consider that the outbuilding does not have a visually domineering presence within the locality and that no demonstrable loss of outlook would be caused to the occupants of that property or to the wider character and appearance of the area.
7. I note that there are 2no windows on the west facing elevation of the appeal building but, bearing in mind that they look out upon the boundary fence, I consider that there would be no loss of privacy to the neighbouring residents. There is nothing in the evidence before me to suggest that the high level of boundary treatment would not be retained in the long term, but in the event that it falls into disrepair, it would be in the interests of the appellant to replace it, in order to protect their own privacy.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area and would protect the living conditions of the occupants of 38 Buckingham Drive. From this basis I find that the proposal complies with both Policies CC7 and CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) which together require development to be of high quality design that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area, whilst making sure that development will not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
10. Due to the retrospective nature of the proposal, I consider that it is not necessary to impose conditions appertaining to the implementation of permission, materials or compliance with the plans. The Council have also suggested a fourth condition be imposed restricting the use of the building to incidental purposes, they have not explained why this should be so, but it is quite clear that the proposal is for a form of ancillary living accommodation as opposed to something purely incidental. Therefore I consider it would be unreasonable to impose such a condition, however, I have imposed a condition that prevents the outbuilding from being occupied at any other time other than purposes ancillary to the residential use of 151 Peppard Road, in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area, as well as the future living conditions of both no151 and the annexe.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR