



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/25/3374757

33 Birdhill Avenue, Reading RG2 7JT

- 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 V Margarint against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/1217.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. 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.
3. 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

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

Reasons

5. 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.
6. 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).'

7. There is an existing structure to the side of the original dwelling which comprises a corrugated plastic roof supported by joists which are attached to the side wall of the appeal property to one side and to vertical timber posts on the other. The structure is not fully enclosed with open sections above the fence along the western boundary and above the gate leading into the garden. The north elevation of the structure is formed by double gates and a timber infill panel and to the south it adjoins an existing garage.
8. The appellant contends that this structure should not be considered as an enlargement for the purposes of the GPDO because it is not fully enclosed and does not provide internal floorspace. The term 'enlargement' is not defined in the GPDO. However, the structure comprises development which creates additional volume and massing to the side of the property, which is contained by a roof. It therefore has the effect of enlarging the original dwellinghouse. As such it represents an existing enlargement of the property, even though it is not fully enclosed or used as a habitable room.
9. The proposed extension would be joined to the existing enlargement to the side of the dwelling. Taken together these enlargements 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