

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PART 1

FOR INFORMATION

Planning Appeal Decisions

Set out below are summaries of the appeal decisions received recently from the Planning Inspectorate on appeals against the Council's decisions. Copies of the full decision letters are available from the Members Support Section on request. These decisions are also monitored in the Quarterly Performance Report and Annual Review.

WARD(S) ALL

Ref	Appeal	Decision
APP/J0350/W/24/3355245	5, Meadfield Road, Slough, SL3 8HL Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission P/06440/013 dated 26/04/2021 (alterations to first floor and loft plans and amendments to elevations) (retrospective)	Appeal Dismissed 20 th March 2025
APP/J0350/D/25/3359945	190, Stoke Road, Slough, Slough, SL2 5AY Retrospective application for a front and side boundary wall Application P/01860/014 was a retrospective application for a front and side boundary wall, which was refused on 8 th November 2024. The main issues were the height for design and materials of the railings and slinging gate were considered to be visually obtrusive and an incongruous feature to the area, and the lack of appropriate visibility from the dropped kerb would cause a highway safety problem which would create conflicts between vehicles and other highway users on the B416 Stoke Road. The Inspector stated that in this case the use of render to match the host dwelling assists, visually, with the overall acceptance of the proposal given that the render to the host dwelling applied in 2019 appears in a good state. In reference to the front boundary, the inspector did not agree that the proposal was visually obstructive or abrasive, and found that the boundary treatments and general appearance of the frontages of dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site to be varied in character and appearance and find that the proposal is appropriate in terms of the varied character and appearance of the street scene. With respect to the second reason for refusal, The Inspector found the speed of traffic in and around the appeal site to be very slow largely as a result of the appeal site's proximity to a traffic light junction which regularly holds traffic, outside the appeal site, until it is their turn to cross the junction in question. The Inspector also noted that similar if not higher boundary treatments than the proposed was accessed by several vehicles and therefore the proposal would result in better visibility than the	Appeal Granted 26 th March 2025

	<p>existing hedgerow previously on site.</p> <p>Overall, the Inspector considered that the proposal appropriate in the context of matching the finish of the host dwelling and there being a varied character and appearance in terms of boundary treatments and means of enclosure within the vicinity of the appeal site itself and would not cause concern or a highway safety problem which would create conflicts between vehicles and other highway users on Stoke Road not any conflict with pedestrian access to the neighbouring Lynch Hill Academy and Arbour Park Leisure Centre</p>	
APP/J0350/D/24/3355581	<p>242, London Road, Slough, SL3 7HT</p> <p>Retrospective application for a single storey side and part single part double rear extension, hip to gable loft conversion with 2no side dormers.</p> <p>The planning application subject to the appeal is retrospective for a single-storey side, part single, part double rear extension, and loft conversion with 2 No side dormers and the LPA's reason for refusal is only on the accumulation of additions at roof level.</p> <p>The Inspector states that the changes to the form and height of the front roof slope combined with the size and scale of the side dormers and the resulting crown roof, including from part of the building's rearward extension, significantly breach the SPD's guidance at EX29, EX33 and EX34 and the "alterations cannot reasonably be considered to be subordinate, proportionate, or sympathetic to the form of the original dwelling". However, the Inspector accepts that judgements over appearance were not part of the Council's consideration when the certificate of lawfulness was issued, but attributes significant weight to the fallback position that it established and notes other hip to gable changes nearby. The Inspector states the proposal is "an aesthetically more pleasing and balanced change when compared with two exposed side dormers that would have been set equally just up from the eaves and which would have been openly seen to dominate the side slopes of the original roof" as per the certificate of lawfulness application.</p> <p>Overall, the Inspector states that despite the conflict with the SPD, the development appears as a reasonably integrated addition that is neither visually intrusive nor harmful to the character or appearance of the appeal property or wider area and finds no conflict with Policies H12, H15 (Residential Extensions), EN1 (Standard of Design) and EN2 (Extensions) and part 2 of CS Core Policy 8 or the NPPF 2024.</p>	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>31st March 2025</p>
APP/J0350/W/24/3356327	59, Willoughby Road, Slough, SL3 8JH	Appeal

	Planning application for the retention of last known use of building as D1 Non-residential institutions (Meditation Classes, Meditation retreats & Seminars, Book stalls/displays and youth group health activities) and rearrangement of external appearance by converting the front flat roof to pitched.	Dismissed 1 st April 2025
--	---	--



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3359945
190 Stoke Road, Slough, SL2 5AY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Jaspreet Arora against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
- The application reference is P/01860/014.
- The development proposed is retrospective, front and side boundary wall.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for retrospective, front and side boundary wall, 190 Stoke Road, Slough, SL2 5AY in accordance with application ref: P/01860/014 and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: (combined plans) drawing no. 2304/PL/03 and 2304/PL/01.
 - 2) The external materials used within the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling and as stated within the application form. Materials will be maintained for the lifetime of the development and any changes shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. Given the refusal reasons and the nature of the changes to the Framework I am satisfied that the changes do not materially impact upon the determination of the appeal in this case, and, in any case, the appeal was submitted after the publication of the revised Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon i) the character of the street scene and ii) highway safety.

Reasons

Character of the Street Scene

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling located on Stoke Road – a short distance from the traffic light junction with Elliman Avenue and Shaggy Calf Lane. At the time of my site visit I found the character and appearance of the street scene

to be quite varied in terms of boundary treatment and frontages. Within the vicinity of the appeal site, I noted that boundary treatments include brick walls, with railings, plain brick walls, hedgerows and some with open frontages. Overall, the height, materials and appearance of the dwellings and their associated frontages I found to be notably varied as part of the overall street scene. Whilst examples of front gates may be more limited, in comparison to the general boundary features noted above, I do not find that the Council's assessment (that there are no other houses that have a means of boundary treatment exceeding a metre in height or that there are no examples of boundary walls and railings within the vicinity of the appeal site itself) is representative of what I saw during my site visit.

5. The appellant evidences that the location of the front boundary wall is in place of a hedgerow boundary. The hedge, shown by the photographs submitted, would have been of a greater height than the boundary treatment which is the subject of this appeal and whilst I note that it would potentially have been visually softer than the current proposal I do not find that, by comparison, the proposal results in an overly dominant and incongruous feature to the detriment of the character of the street scene. I do not find that the proposal appears visually obtrusive or abrasive nor that it disrupts the character and appearance of the frontages of the nearby dwellings. Overall, I find the boundary treatments and general appearance of the frontages of dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site to be varied in character and appearance and find that the proposal before me is appropriate in terms of the varied character and appearance of the street scene.
6. I note the Council raise concern with regard to the application of render which they feel would age poorly over time resulting in an unattractive feature within the street scene, however, in this case the use of render to match the host dwelling I find assists, visually, with the overall acceptance of the proposal. The render on the host dwelling itself is stated, by the appellant, to have been applied in 2019 during refurbishment of the property and at the time of my site visit I did not find that the existing render was aging so poorly that it would be sufficient to warrant refusal of the proposal before me based upon the finish. I note that the Council make reference to previously refused similar applications such as P/04776/001 and appeal reference APP/J0350/W/20/3257478, however, no further information has been submitted in relation to these cases to allow consideration as to any similarity or consistency in approach in relation to the appeal site which is before me.
7. The proposal would be consistent with the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 (LP) Policy EN1 which requires development of proposals to be of a high standard of design and be compatible with their surroundings and Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (CS) Core Policy 8 which seeks to ensure development is of a high-quality design which respects its location and surroundings.
8. The proposal would also be consistent with the guidance set out within the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) EX49 which outlines that where planning permission is granted for front boundary walls/gates or other means of enclosures they must reflect the character of the area and, in this case, as outlined I find that the proposal is appropriate in the context of matching the finish of the host dwelling and there being a varied character and appearance in terms of boundary treatments and means of enclosure within the vicinity of the appeal site itself. The proposal would also be consistent with

paragraph 135 of the Framework which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character including the built environment while not preventing or discouraging inappropriate innovation or change.

Highway safety

9. I note the Council's reference, within their delegated report, to permitted development rights and the requirement not to exceed a metre in height when adjacent to a highway used by vehicular traffic with a requirement, within the SPD, that cars leaving a property should have good pedestrian visibility (EX44). Whilst reference to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) may be of some comparison or a general benchmark it should be kept clearly in mind that the proposal that is the subject of this appeal is one which falls to be considered as a full planning application. I appreciate, however, that inclusion of an extract from the GDPO has been done so in order to reiterate the Council's stance as to obstruction of the view of persons using any highway used by vehicular traffic.
10. The appeal proposal that is before me stands at a height of in the region of 1.7 metres (at its highest point – the pillars) and I note that it is located directly adjacent to the footpath. Despite this the design of the boundary treatment would result in views being available through the top of the boundary treatment with the solid part of the boundary wall having an actual height in the region of 1.19 metres. I find that this would offer some views through the boundary treatment which would assist in visibility for vehicles and pedestrians particularly in comparison to the existing green hedge which was in place. I acknowledge the comments of the Transport and Highways consultee, however, taking into account the existing boundary treatment at the appeal site and also the general set up and visibility splays along Stoke Road as a whole as a result of similarly arranged access points I do not find that this is sufficient to warrant refusal on this occasion.
11. At the time of my site visit I found Stoke Road, and the general area, to be very busy in terms of vehicular traffic as well as pedestrian movements. Whilst I appreciate that my site visit is only a snapshot in time, I found the speed of traffic in and around the appeal site to be very slow largely as a result of the appeal site's proximity to a traffic light junction which regularly holds traffic, outside the appeal site, until it is their turn to cross the junction in question. Whilst outside the appeal site I witnessed several vehicles utilise access points in close proximity to the appeal site with similar, if not higher, boundary treatments (for example hedging) without issue or conflict and I find that the proposal would result in better visibility than the existing hedgerow previously on site.
12. Overall, I find that the proposal would not cause concern or a highway safety problem which would create conflicts between vehicles and other highway users on Stoke Road not any conflict with pedestrian access to the neighbouring Lynch Hill Academy and Arbour Park Leisure Centre. The proposal would also be consistent with CS Core Policy 7 which seeks to confirm that development proposals will improve or make appropriate provision for road safety. The proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Framework, paragraph 116 - that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impact would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Conditions

13. The Council's questionnaire does not suggest any conditions as necessary in the event this appeal is allowed. Whilst the Council's delegated report does allude to other conditions being explored, particularly in relation to opening and closing of the gates, this has not been pursued or reiterated within the Council's questionnaire. A time condition is not necessary as the application is made on a retrospective basis. A condition requiring development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define development which is granted consent, and a materials condition is required to ensure an appropriate finish in accordance with the details submitted – to match the host dwelling.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/24/3355581

242 London Road, Slough, SL3 7HT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kris Navaratnam against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/17891/006.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey side, part single, part double rear extension, and loft conversion with 2 No side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey side, part single, part double rear extension, and loft conversion with 2 No side dormers at 242 London Road, Slough, SL3 7HT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/17891/006, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The windows hereby permitted in the flank walls at first and second floor levels shall be retained hereafter glazed in obscure glass and shall be non-opening below a height of 1.7 metres measured from the internal finished floor level, as shown on Drg Nos PL-01 Rev P2 and PL-02 Rev P2.
 - 2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the flank elevation of the development hereby permitted.
 - 3) The roof area of the single-storey rear extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was made retrospectively. At the time of my visit I saw that the development was complete.

Background and Main Issue

3. There is some extensive planning history to the appeal property. Prior approval was given in November 2020 for the erection of a 6m deep single-storey rear extension as permitted development (Ref Y/17891/001). In April 2021, a certificate of lawful development was issued for works described as *'hip to gable loft conversion with 2no side dormers and 1no front velux window'* (Ref P/17891/005). In June 2021,

planning permission was granted for development described as '*Construction of single storey side extension and part single/part double storey rear extension and demolition of existing garage*' (Ref P/17891/003).

4. The works that have been implemented, and which are the subject of the appeal, are an alternative amalgam of these past decisions.
5. The Council has raised no concern with regard to the size, scale or appearance of the single-storey side extension or the part single, part double rear extension parts of the proposal. Given the planning history I have no reason to disagree. The main issue therefore is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the street scene, with particular regard to the accumulation of additions at roof level.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling within a row of detached and semi-detached houses of broadly similar age but with some variation to their appearance that are fairly prominent within the street scene. The property falls within a stretch of London Road that is defined as a residential area of exceptional character by Policy H12 (*Residential Areas of Exceptional Character*) of The Local Plan for Slough, adopted in March 2004 (LP). The policy states that development proposals will not be permitted within the defined area which would have a detrimental impact upon the character and amenity of residential units, specifically extensions which would change the scale and nature of the property.
7. The development has undeniably altered the form and shape of the dwelling's original roof. Its hipped form has been subsumed by a front facing mono-pitch that masks large, tile clad dormers to each side which sit only marginally up from the eaves and which span the full depth of the original dwelling. These both sit behind a false ridge line, which runs parallel to the road, and merge with each other to form a square flat crown roof that sits marginally taller than the dwelling's original ridge height. The two-storey extension to the rear projects the original height and form of the dwelling with a conventional hipped roof.
8. The Council's *Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) was adopted in 2010. Its stated purpose is to principally provide additional guidance on how to interpret and implement Core Policy 8 (*Sustainability and the Environment*) of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 – 2026 (CS) when assessing residential extensions. SPD paragraph 1.2.6 states that the ultimate aim of the guidance is to ensure that the residential areas within Slough remain good places to live and are not adversely affected by inappropriate extensions. Specifically, Design Principle 3 (DP3) advises that extensions should be subordinate and in proportion to the original house without dominating the original building.
9. The SPD deals with two-storey/first-floor rear extensions at section 7.0 and roof extensions/dormer windows/roof lights at section 8.0. Its detailed design guidance at EX29 states that the roof of a two-storey rear extension must respect the original roof form of the house and that flat roofs will not be acceptable. With regard to roof extensions, detailed design guidance at EX33 and EX34 states that alterations that change the shape and/or pitch to the main roof of the house, or by raising the ridge line will not normally be permitted. Further, that dormer windows will normally only be permitted on the rear of a building and should be in proportion with the size of

the original roof. Specifically that they should have a minimum set down of 0.5m below the main ridge, a minimum set in distance of 1m at either end of the main roof slope on which they sit, a minimum 1m set above normal eaves level, and that they must not occupy more than 50% of the width of the existing roof slope on which they sit.

10. The changes to the form and height of the front roof slope combined with the size and scale of the side dormers and the resulting crown roof, including from part of the building's rearward extension, significantly breach the SPD's guidance at EX29, EX33 and EX34. The alterations cannot reasonably be considered to be subordinate, proportionate, or sympathetic to the form of the original dwelling, which has been significantly remodelled as a consequence of the works.
11. However, when seen directly face on from London Road, the dwelling has the appearance of a traditional gabled form with a subordinate retained hipped feature over its original two-storey front bay. This merely reflects hip to gable changes that are evident on other properties nearby, including immediately adjoining at No 240, where I saw the symmetry of an original semi-detached pair had been disrupted by such a change. Despite the marginal increase to the ridge height at No 242, the front roof appears neither disproportionate nor out of keeping within the street scene.
12. The side dormers are openly seen as large roof additions in angles of vision from London Road, but each from only limited viewpoints between the fairly narrow gaps between both neighbouring properties. Moreover, I am mindful of the size, scale, form, and visual impact of the dormers that were confirmed as permitted development in April 2021. If constructed, these would have had a significant impact upon the shape and appearance of the original dwelling. I accept that judgements over appearance were not part of the Council's consideration when the certificate of lawfulness was issued, but I attribute significant weight to the fallback position that it established. Furthermore, despite the scale and somewhat unorthodox approach that has been adopted for the roof extensions, I share the appellant's view that the result is an aesthetically more pleasing and balanced change when compared with two exposed side dormers that would have been set equally just up from the eaves and which would have been openly seen to dominate the side slopes of the original roof.
13. Overall, despite the identified conflicts with the SPD, having regard to the background and specific circumstances at No 242, I am satisfied that the development appears as a reasonably integrated addition that is neither visually intrusive nor harmful to the character or appearance of the appeal property or wider area. As such, I find no conflict with Policy H12, or the similar requirements reflected by LP Policies H15 (*Residential Extensions*), EN1 (*Standard of Design*) and EN2 (*Extensions*) and part 2 of CS Core Policy 8, which between them seek to ensure that all development displays a high quality of design that is respectful of, and compatible with, its surroundings. For the same reasons there is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's aims and objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

14. I note a neighbour's comment regarding the introduction of flank windows at first and second floor levels, and associated disturbance from noise and light. However,

the fenestration pattern as built resembles closely that which either formed part of the originally approved extensions to the appeal property, or those that could be built as permitted development. Moreover, the plans show all first and second floor flank windows to be obscurely glazed and fixed shut up to a height of 1.7m above finished floor level. I share the Council's view that this would avoid any impact upon any neighbouring occupiers' living conditions that would be harmful. I am not persuaded that any light spillage from flank windows would mutually impact any neighbouring living spaces to a degree that would be harmful.

15. I note a neighbour suggestion that the premises are being used as a care home. There is also reference to this in the officer's report. However, the application for the extension works was retrospective and was made as a householder application for planning permission for extension to a dwelling. Furthermore, the application form stated that the works were started in May 2021 and completed in November 2023, and I also note the officer's report, dated October 2024, stated that, at that time, the property was currently used as a detached family house. I have no substantive reason not to consider the appeal based on how the application was submitted and determined by the local planning authority.

Conditions

16. Given that the application was made retrospectively, there is no need for me to impose the standard time limit permission or one that would require works to be carried out with matching materials.
17. To safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, I have imposed a condition that would require the glazing of the new first and second floor flank windows to be retained with obscure glazing and fixed shut up to a height of 1.7m, as shown on the submitted plans. For the same reason, I agree with the Council that conditions are also required to prevent any further windows being installed in the flank elevations of the extensions hereby permitted at first and second floor levels, and that any outside use of the flat roof over the single-storey rear extension should be prohibited.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR