

Planning Statement on behalf of
Royle Berkshire Developments Ltd

78, Basingstoke Road

Reading RG2 0EL

Project Ref 9310-24

Date. Dec 25

1. Introduction

This statement supports a full planning application for the erection of a single-storey outbuilding within the rear garden of 78 Basingstoke Road, Reading, RG2 0EL.

The property is an established 9-bedroom sui generis House in Multiple Occupation (HMO), in such use for over ten years and licensed by Reading Borough Council. The outbuilding is proposed to provide ancillary storage and secure cycle storage to support the existing lawful HMO use. No increase in the number of rooms or occupants is proposed, and no other works form part of this application.

Key site and floorspace figures are as follows:

- Site area: 165.64 m²
- Existing building footprint (main house): 76.00 m²
- Proposed total footprint (house + outbuilding): 89.87 m²
- Proposed outbuilding footprint: 13.86 m²

The outbuilding therefore occupies only around 8% of the overall site area, and remains clearly subservient to the main dwelling in both scale and function.

2. Site and Surroundings

78 Basingstoke Road is a mid-terrace Victorian property on the western side of Basingstoke Road, a main radial route into Reading town centre. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with a mix of family dwellings, HMOs and some commercial and service uses along the main road.

To the rear, the property benefits from a long garden enclosed by close-boarded fencing, with a rear access lane running along the backs of the plots. Outbuildings and sheds of varying sizes are already a common feature in rear gardens along this terrace.

The site lies close to a group of Grade II listed buildings at 64–70 Basingstoke Road, but is not itself listed and is not within a conservation area.

3. Planning History and Appeal

In 2024, planning application ref. 240765 sought permission for a combined scheme at No. 78 comprising:

- Roof enlargements and three rear dormer windows;
- Single-storey rear and side/rear extensions; and
- A single-storey outbuilding at the far end of the rear garden.

That application was refused on 24 October 2024 for two reasons:

1. That the overall combination of extensions, roof enlargements and the outbuilding would result in an excessive increase in built form to the rear, failing to respect the design and character of the dwelling and plot, contrary to Policy CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan.
2. That the rear/side infill extension constructed on the boundary with 80 Basingstoke Road would create an overbearing and enclosing impact on that neighbour's outlook, contrary to Policy CC8.

Within the delegated officer report, the Council also confirmed that the outbuilding itself raised no concern in terms of its impact on the residential amenity of either neighbouring property, reflecting its modest height and rear-garden location.

The refusal was appealed and considered by the Planning Inspectorate under ref. APP/E0345/W/25/3359426, with the decision issued on 17 September 2025. In assessing the proposal, the Inspector considered the elements separately and concluded that:

- The single-storey rear extensions and the outbuilding would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the appeal building or the wider area; and
- The harm to character and appearance arose from the cumulative roof enlargement and three dormers, which were found to be overly bulky and incongruous; and
- The harm to neighbouring amenity arose from the side/rear infill extension on the boundary with No. 80, which would create a significantly more enclosing outlook for that property.

The appeal was therefore dismissed because of the roof alterations and boundary infill extension, not because of the outbuilding.

This new application isolates the outbuilding as a standalone proposal, relying on the Inspector's positive findings as to its impact, and seeks to regularise only that element of the earlier scheme which has been found acceptable in both design and amenity terms.

4. Proposed Development

The proposal is for a single-storey outbuilding located at the far end of the rear garden of 78 Basingstoke Road.

In broad terms:

- The outbuilding has a footprint of 13.86 m², set across part of the rear of the garden;
- It is of single-storey height with a flat or shallow-fall roof, substantially lower than the existing main house;
- External walls will be in brickwork or similarly robust materials, designed to be sympathetic to the main building and typical of domestic garden structures;
- Any openings (doors/windows) will face inward towards the garden of No. 78, not towards neighbouring gardens.

The building is intended for ancillary use only, including:

- Secure cycle storage for HMO residents; and
- General household and maintenance storage.

It will not be used as an independent unit of accommodation or for any separate commercial use.

5. Planning Policy Context

The main planning policy considerations are:

- Reading Borough Local Plan (Adopted November 2019)
 - Policy CC7 – Design and the Public Realm
 - Policy CC8 – Safeguarding Amenity
 - Policy EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 - Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
 - Relevant heritage policies relating to the setting of listed buildings

Given the modest, ancillary nature of the proposal, no other policies are significantly engaged.

6. Planning Assessment

6.1 Design, Character and Appearance – Policy CC7

Policy CC7 requires new development to be of high quality, to respond positively to local context and to respect the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Rear-garden outbuildings of modest scale are a familiar characteristic of the plots along Basingstoke Road and adjoining streets. In this context:

- The proposed outbuilding is clearly subordinate in scale to the main dwelling;
- Its footprint (13.86 m²) is limited and occupies only around 8% of the total site area (165.64 m²);
- Its single-storey height and simple form ensure that it sits comfortably against boundary fences and existing garden structures;
- It lies at the very rear of the plot, largely screened from public vantage points by existing development and boundary treatments.

The Planning Inspector, in considering appeal ref. APP/E0345/W/25/3359426, explicitly concluded that the outbuilding would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of either the appeal building or the wider area, distinguishing it from the much more substantial roof alterations and dormers. The current proposal follows the same approach in terms of principle, scale and siting.

Accordingly, the proposal is consistent with the local pattern of rear-garden development and complies with Policy CC7 and the design objectives of Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

6.2 Residential Amenity – Policy CC8

Policy CC8 seeks to safeguard the amenity of existing and future occupiers, including in terms of outlook, privacy, daylight and noise.

The outbuilding will:

- Be sited at the rear of the garden, well away from the main rear elevations of Nos. 76 and 80;
- Be limited to single-storey height, comparable with or lower than existing boundary fencing and typical garden buildings;
- Have no side-facing windows, with any openings directed into No. 78's garden.

In the earlier application, the Council explicitly confirmed that the outbuilding raised no concern in terms of its impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. The Inspector did not identify any amenity harm from the outbuilding either; the amenity objection related solely to the boundary-hugging infill extension beside No. 80, which is not part of this proposal.

The outbuilding will not:

- Cause unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy;
- Result in significant overshadowing or loss of daylight to neighbouring properties; or
- Generate noise or disturbance beyond what is typical of an ancillary domestic store.

The proposal therefore complies fully with Policy CC8.

6.3 Heritage – Policy EN1

Policy EN1 seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment, including the significance and setting of listed buildings.

The site is located near the Grade II listed terrace at 64–70 Basingstoke Road, but the outbuilding:

- Is positioned to the rear, screened by existing houses and boundary enclosures;
- Is of modest domestic scale and typical outbuilding form; and
- Does not alter the primary public views by which the special interest and character of the listed buildings are appreciated.

The Inspector, in dealing with the previous appeal, confirmed that small-scale development of this nature within rear gardens, including at No. 78, would have a neutral effect on the setting and significance of the nearby listed buildings.

The proposal therefore preserves the setting of the listed terrace and complies with Policy EN1 and the relevant heritage provisions of the NPPF.

7. Conclusion

This application seeks permission for a single-storey ancillary outbuilding only, at the rear of 78 Basingstoke Road. While a previous, more extensive scheme (ref. 240765) was refused and dismissed on appeal, both the Council's officer report and the Planning Inspector's decision make clear that:

- The harm to character and appearance arose from the roof enlargement and three dormers, not from the outbuilding; and
- The harm to neighbour amenity arose from the side/rear infill extension on the boundary with No. 80, which does not form part of this proposal.

The outbuilding itself was found not to cause material harm to either the character of the area or to residential amenity.

The current proposal:

- Provides a modest, subservient outbuilding of only 13.86 m² footprint (around 8% of the site area);
- Supports the existing lawful HMO use with appropriate ancillary storage and cycle parking;
- Respects the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area (Policy CC7);
- Safeguards neighbouring amenity (Policy CC8); and
- Preserves the setting of nearby listed buildings (Policy EN1).

On this basis, the development accords with the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) and the NPPF, and there are no material considerations that indicate planning permission should be withheld.

Planning permission is therefore respectfully requested.