



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2026

by **E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/25/3374554

78 Burghfield Road, Reading, Berkshire RG30 3LP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Nafeesah Yunas against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/0851.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension measuring 6.0m in depth, with a maximum height of 4.0m, and 3.0m in height to eaves level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development provided on the application form is not fully legible, therefore I have taken the description in the banner heading above from the decision notice, removing wording which does not refer to an act of development.
3. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
4. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, paragraph A.4(3) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed extension would be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO

Reasons

6. Paragraph A.1(j) of the GPDO states that development is not permitted by Class A if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.

7. Paragraph A.1(ja) establishes that development is not permitted development where 'any total enlargement (being the enlarged part together with any existing enlargement of the original dwellinghouse to which it will be joined) exceeds or would exceed the limits set out in sub-paragraphs (e) to (j).'
8. The evidence indicates that the appeal property has previously been extended to the side via a single storey garage and by a single storey rear extension. The appellant has not provided any substantive evidence to the contrary.
9. The proposed extension would be attached to the existing single storey rear extension which in turn is joined to the side garage extension. Together these extensions would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwelling. The width of the total enlargement would exceed half of the width of the original dwellinghouse. Thus, the total enlargement would exceed the limit set out in paragraph A.1(j)(iii) of the GPDO.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension does not constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR