

DELEGATED FUL PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Witley

App Ref: PL/25/1121

Address: Erection of single storey outbuilding with 1. 8-metre-high front boundary fence with electric gate and pedestrian access following demolition of existing outbuilding.

Proposal: 69 Whitley Wood Lane, Reading, RG2 8PW

Case Officer: Louise Coveney-Fuller

Applicant: Mr Usman Asif

Decision date: 14/10/2025

APPLICATION SITE

69 Whitley Wood Lane comprises of a link-detached, two-storey family dwelling, currently in residential use. The property has been subject to various modifications over time, and an existing outbuilding is located to the rear of the plot.

In terms of the surrounding context, the area is predominantly characterised by open frontages and low-level boundary treatments. These typically consist of modest brick walls, hedgerows, or post-and-rail fencing, all of which contribute to a strong sense of openness and visual cohesion within the established street scene.

PROPOSAL

Erection of single storey outbuilding with 1. 8 metre high front boundary fence with electric gate and pedestrian access following demolition of existing outbuilding.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

A site notice was displayed on 22nd August 2025 and remained in situ for the duration of the consultation period which ended on the 12th September 2025.

At the time of writing this report no letters of representation have been received.

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Highways- Objection

Equality Act 2010:

In determining this application, the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore, in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Policy

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

TR1 (Achieving the Transport Strategy)

TR3 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The key issues for consideration are:

i Impact on the character and appearance

ii Impact on residential amenity

iii Transport Considerations

Impact on character and appearance

Policy H9 states that an extension to a house will be acceptable where it respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design and respects the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, and any important existing building line. Policy CC7 also sets out relevant considerations for design.

This application seeks to obtain planning permission for the erection of single storey outbuilding with 1.8-metre-high front boundary fence with electric gate and pedestrian access. It is noted that there is an existing outbuilding on site that is to be demolished, and a new outbuilding erected.

The proposed outbuilding is considered to constitute overdevelopment of the site. The scale and footprint of the structure will significantly reduced the amount of private garden space available to the host dwelling, thereby undermining the overall quality of amenity provision for future occupiers. The internal layout and positioning of the outbuilding raise serious concerns regarding its intended use, particularly given its close proximity to both the host property and the side boundary. Its siting, bulk, and design result in a visually dominant form that fails to respect the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the wider surrounding area.

Further concern is raised in relation to the substantial loss of usable private amenity space to the rear of the main dwelling. The form and appearance of the outbuilding—particularly its scale, massing, and domestic-style design—bear strong resemblance to that of a self-contained, single-storey residential unit, rather than a typical ancillary structure.

Overall, the proposal is considered to be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the locality, and by virtue of its excessive scale and siting, results in an incongruous and overbearing addition that fails to preserve or enhance the character of the area.

The proposed 1.8-metre high front boundary fence and electric gate are considered inappropriate within the context of the surrounding area, which is predominantly characterised by open frontages and low-level boundary treatments. These typically comprise modest brick walls, hedging, or post-and-rail fencing, contributing to a sense of openness and visual continuity within the street scene.

The introduction of a tall, solid boundary treatment in the form proposed would appear overly prominent and visually intrusive, failing to harmonise with the established character of the area. Furthermore, the scale and design of the fence and gate are considered out of keeping with the host dwelling, eroding the openness and suburban character that currently define the locality.

As such, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the street scene and represents a discordant addition within an otherwise coherent pattern of development.

Accordingly, when assessed both as a whole and in terms of its individual elements—namely, the outbuilding and the proposed front boundary treatment—the development is considered to be in clear conflict with Policy CC7: Design and the Public Realm, of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) , which seeks to ensure that new development responds positively to the local character and contributes to a high-quality built environment.

Impact on Amenity

Policy CC8: Safeguarding Amenity recognises that development must be designed so that an acceptable living environment for both existing and new residents is provided. Without careful planning, an intensified use of a building may result in a poor standard of development and may harm the residential amenity of prospective occupants and nearby residents.

No overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing concerns are considered to occur. In addition, it is also considered that there will be no impacts on noise and disturbance as a result of the development, as such the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard.

Transport Considerations

Policies TR1 (Achieving the Transport Strategy) and TR3 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters seek to address access, traffic, highway and parking relates matters relating to development.

The proposed fence would obstruct to visibility splays from the applicant's driveway and neighbouring driveways. Visibility splays and sight lines allow vehicles exiting the site to see cyclists, vehicles and pedestrians on the main road and the erection of a 1.8 metre high fence would be detrimental to road safety. Within the visibility splay or sight line envelope, there should be no obstructions to vision such as fences, walls or vegetation over a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level. In addition, pedestrians would not be able to see an emerging vehicle from safe distance.

As such, the proposed layout fails to demonstrate that it complies with the Local Planning Authority's standards in respect of access and visibility. The proposed 1.8 metre high front boundary fence would object visibility splays from the driveway and neighbouring properties compromising the safety of users of the transport network including pedestrians and cyclists, contrary to Policies TR1 and TR3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

CONCLUSION

The proposal has been assessed against the relevant local policies and national guidance as outlined within the officer report. Accordingly, when assessed both as a whole and in terms of its individual elements—namely, the outbuilding and the proposed front boundary treatment—the development is considered to be in clear conflict with policy CC7: Design and the Public Realm, of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) . As such, refusal of planning permission is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE planning permission for the reasons outlined within the decision notice.

CONCLUSION

The proposal has been assessed against the relevant local policies and national guidance as outlined within the officer report. Accordingly, when assessed both as a whole and in terms of its individual elements—namely, the outbuilding and the proposed front boundary treatment—the development is considered to be in clear conflict with policy CC7: Design and the Public Realm, of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) . As such, refusal of planning permission is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE planning permission for the reasons outlined within the decision notice.