

Appeal 6013028

Appeal details

Appeal type	Householder
Appeal procedure	Written Part 1
Appeal site	Owl End, Willow Lane, Wargrave, RG10 8LG
Agent contact details	H Venners henry.venners@jppc.co.uk 01865326823
Application number	260923

Before you start

Which local planning authority (LPA) do you want to appeal against?	Wokingham Borough Council
---	---------------------------

What is your appeal about?	Householder planning
----------------------------	----------------------

What date did you submit your application?	16 Apr 2026
--	-------------

Was your application granted or refused?	Refused
--	---------

What is the date on the decision letter from the local planning authority?	15 Jul 2026
--	-------------

Appellant's appeal

Was the application made in the appellant's name	No
--	----

Applicant's name	Mr & Mrs du Plessis
------------------	---------------------

Contact details	H Venners the John Phillips Planning Consultancy
-----------------	---

Phone number	01865326823
--------------	-------------

Site address	Owl End Willow Lane Wargrave RG10 8LG
--------------	--

What is the area of the appeal site?	900 m ²
Is the site in a green belt	Yes
Site fully owned	Yes
Will an inspector need to access the land or property?	No
Site health and safety issues	No
Application reference	260923
Enter the description of development	Garage/car port
Did the local planning authority change the description of development?	Yes
Why are you appealing?	The Council has not considered the application in the light of the application made nor in the light of the latest NPPF. The Council ignores that paragraph 154 has multiple 'allowances' for Green Belt development. In this case the site is either in a village (Wargrave is a village) where 154e applies, or, if for some reason the site is not considered to be in the settlement then, the entire site would be previously developed land to which 154g applies. (The definition of pdl applying differently within or without a settlement). The LPA has denied the possible applicability of these 'other' allowances, and applied an unduly narrow test- i.e. only 154c- which was not part of the application. In effect, the LPA is in denial that the NPPF makes provision for anything other than not disproportionate extensions to dwellings. This is plainly wrong and yet no consideration was given to the possibility that the NPPF does allow for other scenarios for development at a dwelling house or in its garden. The LPA's delegated report must be read to see where the inadequacy of consideration exists. The LPA inexplicably refers to an appeal decision from another LPA that predates the current NPPF. It gives no reasons for why this development is not infilling in a village or is not limited infilling on previously developed land, and page4 misquotes 154g. WBC does however agree that effect on openness is limited, which is implicit agreement that there is no substantial harm to openness.
Significant changes since application	Other: we did not agree the change of description. i have written to advise PINS that it is impossible to answer the appeal questions accurately. My answer the description of development is therefore wrong. ----- there was correspondence with the Council, the officer had recommended approval.

Are there other appeals linked to your development?	No
Did the appellant apply for an award of appeal costs?	Yes

Appellant's documents

Application form	ApplicationForm.pdf (/published-document/aefb07e1-bd05-47ec-9f55-ae2f6316b532)
Decision letter	refusal 260923 owl end garage 15 july 2026.pdf (/published-document/752a75d4-a439-4ed2-b342-5d475e231818)
Evidence of agreement to change description of development	description agreement.docx (/published-document/c83c9ee6-2d89-409a-a8e1-62181f8adb17)
Costs application	No

Additional documents

Additional documents	2026 08 25 HV letter to PINS - NPPF 2026.pdf (/published-document/15ce77a2-a4fb-4399-b7ab-addfcc48fd3a)
-----------------------------	---