

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PART 1

FOR INFORMATION

Planning Appeal Decisions

October 2025

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

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Appeal</u> | <u>Decision</u> |
|------------------------|--|---|
| APP/J0350/D/25/3359570 | <p>93, Ledgers Road, Slough, SL1 2RQ</p> <p>Retrospective application for single storey detached outbuilding with flat roof for the use of gym and home office.</p> <p>This appeal was for a fairly substantial outbuilding that was significantly greater than the footprint of the original dwelling. There were also concerns over whether this would truly be ancillary given it comprises three decent sized rooms with a fully fitted bathroom (including bathtub). A 'store' room had all the pipework for a boiler and what appeared to be 'filled in' sockets half way up the walls at a convenient height for kitchen counters.</p> <p>The appellant used a different agent for the appeal itself and amended drawings were provided during the course of the appeal - the amended drawings confirmed that the building was in fact wider and deeper than shown in the original application - to my knowledge, neighbours were never given the opportunity to comment on this and we, as the LPA, weren't permitted to introduce any new arguments (i.e. It was for information only).</p> | Appeal Granted 25 th September 2025 |
| APP/J0350/W/25/3369021 | <p>140, Langley Road, Slough, SL3 7TG</p> <p>Variation of condition no. 8 of P/00679/010 rewording the condition by removing the following words 'or used in multiple occupation'</p> <p>Planning permission was granted on 23 March 2023, ref P/00679/010, for construction of 2 semi-detached, 5-bedroom dwellings, following demolition of a 4-bedroom dwelling; condition 8 had the following wording: <i>The dwellings hereby permitted shall not be sub-divided or used in multiple occupation without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.</i> The purpose of the condition was to prevent the use of the dwellings for HMOs for up to 6 people, which would otherwise be permitted development; the</p> | Appeal Granted 30 th September 2025 |

| | | |
|---------|--|--|
| | <p>use of an HMO for more than 6 people requires planning permission as it does not benefit from permitted development rights.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector allowed the appeal to vary the condition, and provided the following wording: <i>Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the dwellings hereby permitted shall not be used for any use within Class C4 of The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or such other legislation as may subsequently supersede it.</i></p> <p>The effect of this variation of condition prevents the use of the dwellings for small HMO (use class C4), and specifically refers to the relevant legislation; the Inspector highlighted that subdivision of the dwellings (to create flats) requires separate planning permission, and therefore omitted this from the condition, as it was not necessary.</p> | |
| 6000500 | <p>32, Stanley Green East, Slough, Slough, SL3 7RF</p> <p>Retrospective application to retain canopy at the end of a single storey rear extension.</p> <p>This proposal related to a timber canopy (pergola style extension) at the rear of an existing single storey rear extension. We had concerns with the overall depth and conflict with EX25 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines SPD relating to secondary extensions (and the breach of EX20 given the combined depth being much greater than 3.65m).</p> <p>The Inspector acknowledged conflict with the SPD but considered that the canopy extension itself was visually subordinate to the host dwelling (even when taken in combination with the existing s/s rear extension).</p> <p>Moreover, the Inspector considered that the proposal by its open sided design and canopy nature, would not result in harm to the adjacent neighbour with regard to outlook or light.</p> <p>As it was retrospective, no conditions were imposed (I recall we requested a plans condition for certainty but that hasn't been imposed).</p> | <p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>8th October 2025</p> |
| 6000444 | 56, Boarlands Close, Slough, SL1 5DD | Appeal Granted |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Construction of a single storey front extension</p> <p>The proposal was for a front extension which was across the entire width of the dwelling</p> <p>The Inspector stated that even though the proposal would extend across the full width of the 2-storey terraced house and would not accord with all the guidelines set out in the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines, the modest scale and low height of the proposed development would mean it would read as a subservient addition and compatible and sensitive addition to the original house.</p> <p>This was because in terms of its scale, roof form and design detailing, the proposed development would have a similar appearance to the single-storey projection on the front of the adjoining house at number 54 Boarlands Close (no. 54). Moreover, the front of the extension would be in general alignment with the fronts of the porches of the neighbouring houses at numbers 58, 60, and 62 Boarlands Close. For these reasons, and because it would be stepped back from the front of the house at number 54, the extension would not be harmfully prominent or incongruous in relation to nearby development.</p> | <p>8th October 2025</p> |
| APP/J0350/W/25/3368263 | <p>41-43, Lake Avenue, Slough, SL1 3BY</p> <p>Construction of first floor rear extensions to 41 & 43 Lake Avenue</p> <p>LPA Reason for refusal:</p> <p>The proposal, by virtue of its width, roof form, and relationship to previous enlargements would not result in a high quality of design that would be visually compatible with the form and design of the existing or original structure</p> <p>The Inspector concluded:</p> <p>The scale and volume of the extensions would be substantially less than that of the pair of semi-detached houses originally constructed on the site. Its height would also be significantly lower than the ridge of the host properties. As such, and even though their width would equal to the width of the rear of the original buildings, the extensions would be clearly subordinate to them.</p> <p>Moreover, and despite the proposed extensions having an irregular roof shape, the overall proportions and appearance of the rear and sides of the host buildings would be improved by the development. This is because it would reduce the</p> | <p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>9th October 2025</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | extent of the long flat-roofed single-storey elements to the rear of the buildings. Furthermore, and in common with parts of the roofs of many nearby properties, the roofs of the extensions would include a hipped form. | |
| APP/J0350/C/23/3334644 | <p>18, Lynwood Avenue, Slough, SL3 7BH</p> <p>Without planning permission, the material change of use of a single family dwelling house to two separate dwellings and facilitating works.</p> | <p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>10th October 2025</p> |
| APP/J0350/D/25/3369460 | <p>9, Hinksey Close, Slough, SL3 8EB</p> <p>Retrospective application for a front porch, two storey side, 6m single storey wrap around, part first floor rear extension and a single storey rear outbuilding for use of home office, gym, shower room & storage with pitched roof with render following demolition of existing garage.</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to front porch, two storey side, 6m single storey wrap around, part first floor rear extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey rear outbuilding for use of home office, gym, shower room and storage with pitched roof with render following demolition of existing garage at 9 Hinksey Close, Slough, SL3 8EB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20217/007.</p> <p>The Inspector considers that collectively and together with the recent rear flat roofed dormer extension (outside the scope of the appeal), the development has materially changed the character and appearance of the host dwelling and interrupted the uniformity in the design and appearance of the pair of dwellings, the row of houses and the street scene. Due to the size and appearance of the flat roofed dormer together with its juxtaposition with the rear first floor extension, the resultant rear elevation and roofscape appears poorly proportioned and incongruous.</p> <p>The use of light coloured render on the side and front walls of the two story side extension appears stark and out of character with the row of two storey houses. Its impact is materially exacerbated by the light colour render on the front elevation of the host dwelling. This together with the introduction of a larger landing window and deep gable roofed porch has materially changed the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Conversely the approved side extension with its matching materials at first floor level and mono</p> | <p>Appeal Dismissed/ Granted</p> <p>13th October 2025</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | hipped roof porch would respect the proportions, character and appearance of the host dwelling and the pair of dwellings. The increase in roof height is not included as a reason to refuse the appeal. | |
|--|---|--|



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3359570

93 Ledgers Road, Slough SL1 2RQ

- 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 Tariq Ali against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
- The application Ref is P/20708/000.
- The development is application for single storey detached outbuilding with flat roof for the use of Gym and Home Office.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey detached outbuilding with flat roof for the use of Gym and Home Office at 93 Ledgers Road, Slough SL1 2RQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20708/000, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no: 826-OB-01 Rev 2 except in respect of the details showing the extent of the outbuilding shown on the Location Plan and Block Plan.
 - 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 shall be formed in the southern flank elevation of the development hereby permitted.
 - 3) 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), the detached outbuilding hereby permitted shall be used only for domestic purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the main dwelling and shall not be used as a separate self-contained residential dwelling or for any industrial, commercial or business use.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

2. A building has been erected that is similar in scale and appearance to that shown on the submitted drawing. However, a revised drawing was submitted with the appeal (drawing no 826-OB-01 Rev 2). The appellant identifies that the drawings that were originally submitted to the Council did not accurately show the development that has been built and the revised drawing sought to address this. The appellant identified on the application form that the development has been completed, and it is clear that the application sought permission to retain what was built. The Council also determined the application on that basis, given the language of its report. Therefore, I am satisfied that interested parties would not be

prejudiced if the appeal was determined in accordance with the revised plans given that the revised plans merely depict what has actually been built.

3. I have removed the word 'retrospective' from the description of development in the banner heading and my formal decision, as this is not an act of development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The outbuilding has been built to the rear of 93 Ledgers Road (no 93). The house is an end terrace two storey dwelling and there is an alleyway between it and the neighbouring property. It has a relatively deep garden, similar in size to the neighbouring dwellings and to the rear of it is an embankment leading to a railway line.
6. An outbuilding has been built at the rear of the garden, the location of which is generally in accordance with the submitted plans. This is a single storey building with a shallow mono pitched roof and is constructed from red brick and white UPVC windows and doors. The outbuilding extends most of the width of the garden but maintains a gap between it and the boundary wall with 91 Ledgers Road.
7. Policy EX48 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that the minimum garden or amenity space required for a three bedroom dwelling, like the appeal property, should be 9 metres (m) or 50 square metres (sqm). As identified by the appellant the separation distance between the outbuilding and the rear wall of no 93 is around 11m and based on the information before me, I find no reason to dispute with this figure. As such, the retained garden exceeds that suggested in the Policy EX48 of the SPD.
8. Policy EX39 of the SPD identifies a number of criteria that shall be used to determine the acceptable scale / size of outbuildings. It is not disputed between the parties that the footprint of the outbuilding is larger than the original dwelling. However, the plot for no 93 is large and the appellant identifies that the garden space between the two buildings would be approximately 87 sqm and the Council do not dispute this. As such, the remaining garden space is significantly larger than that recommended in the SPD for a dwelling of this size. Additionally, the appellant identifies that they intend to occupy the dwelling, and the outbuilding would provide ancillary living space for them and their family. The building is located towards the rear of the garden, and the central garden area is relatively rectangular in shape and therefore provides useable space for typical garden activities, such as hanging out washing and socialising.
9. The dwellings in the area are a mix of terrace or semi-detached properties and as a result of this high-density development, the rear gardens are generally screened by the houses themselves. Whilst there is an alleyway between no 93 and the neighbouring dwelling, the single storey scale of the building means that it is not notably visible within the street scene. Even when viewed from passing trains, the outbuilding would be seen alongside other outbuildings in a predominantly residential area where this would not be uncommon. Additionally, these would only

be brief, glimpsed views. The garden has a relatively flat ground level, and the outbuilding appears to have been built at a similar level to the host dwelling. The garden is also bound by existing boundary walls and the railway embankment to the rear which screens the outbuilding from further viewpoints.

10. The gross internal area of the outbuilding itself is relatively large when compared to the footprint of the host dwelling and other buildings nearby. However, it is a single storey building and when taking into consideration the size of the retained garden land and the scale of the two-storey host dwelling, the outbuilding appears subordinate to the host dwelling. Additionally, the modest height of the outbuilding ensures it does not appear dominant alongside the host dwelling or from nearby gardens. Given the modest height of the proposal, as well as the existing pattern of development, the outbuilding is also relatively well screened and even if it was seen, it would be viewed as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling. Consequently, the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and generally accords with the criteria set out in the SPD.
11. Each case must be determined on its own merits and there are site specific circumstances that have led to this decision. As such, there is no substantive reasoning to refuse permission based upon the assumption permission here would set a precedent for other schemes nearby.
12. Therefore, the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and granting permission would not set a precedent for similar development. Consequently, the development would comply with Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of The Local Plan for Slough and Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document. These expect development, amongst other matters, to achieve high-quality design having regard to matters such as, scale, height, massing/bulk, layout, siting, building form and design, visual impact and relationship to nearby properties.

Other Matter

13. Although tenancy agreements are not typically material planning considerations, the availability and usability of the garden space for current and future occupants has been assessed and found to be policy compliant.

Conditions

14. Given that the development has been completed, the statutory commencement condition is not necessary. However, a condition requiring the development is carried out in accordance with the plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. However, I have revised this to state that it should be except in respect of the details showing the extent of the outbuilding shown on the Location Plan and Block Plan which show part of the building demolished which is not sought as part of this appeal. The Location Plan still identifies the location of the appeal site, and the Existing Site Layout shows the siting and extent of the outbuilding with respect to the host dwelling and other buildings nearby at scale and thus is suitable in place of the Block Plan.
15. Condition 2 is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of 95 Ledgers Road with regard to privacy.

16. A condition specifying that the building should only be used for domestic purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of no 93 [3]. However, I have amended the suggested wording of this condition to remove reference to kitchen facilities as it has not been substantiated that the installation of a kitchen results in a material change of use from an annexe to a separate residential unit. If there was a material change of use this would require a separate grant of planning permission. I have also made amendments to the condition in the interests of precision and enforceability.

Conclusion

17. The development complies with the development plan, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by P Burley BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/25/3369021

140 Langley Road, Slough SL3 7TG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Mr Amrit Aggarwal against Slough Borough Council.
- The application Ref is P/00679/014.
- The application sought planning permission for Demolition of existing 4-bedroom dwelling (use class C3) and construction of 2 semi-detached, 5-bedroom dwellings (use class C3) with associated private amenity space and 3no. off street parking spaces each, without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref P/00679/010, dated 23 March 2023.
- The condition in dispute is No 8 which states that: The dwellings hereby permitted shall not be subdivided or used in multiple occupation without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
- The reason given for the condition is: To ensure that the site is developed in accordance with the submitted application and to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenity of the area, which may occur if the property is sub-divided or used in multiple occupation in accordance with the provisions of Policy H20 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission Ref P/00679/010 for the demolition of existing 4-bedroom dwelling (use class C3) and construction of 2 semi-detached, 5-bedroom dwellings (use class C3) with associated private amenity space and 3no. off street parking spaces each, granted on 23 March 2023 by Slough Borough Council, is varied by deleting condition 8 and substituting the following condition:
 - 8) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the dwellings hereby permitted shall not be used for any use within Class C4 of The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or such other legislation as may subsequently supersede it.

Background and Main Issue

2. This appeal has been made pursuant to section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) which provides the right to appeal where an application for planning permission is granted subject to conditions. The appellant wishes to vary Condition 8 of planning permission P/00679/010 to remove the words 'or used in multiple occupation'. Section 79 of the Act provides that I may allow or dismiss

such an appeal, or reverse or vary any part of the decision of the local planning authority, and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

3. The Council did not determine the appeal application. However, it has indicated that had it been able to issue a decision, it would have refused to grant planning permission to minimise the impact from use of the dwellings as houses in multiple occupation (HMO) upon the amenity of the area and to allow it to assess the impact of the use of the dwellings as HMOs. Therefore, the main issue is whether the condition is reasonable and necessary in the interests of the living conditions of existing occupiers of nearby dwellinghouses.

Reasons

4. In situations where changes of use have not been restricted, The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) permits the change of use between a Class C3 dwellinghouse and a Class C4 HMO without having to make an application for planning permission.
5. With reference to paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the appellant has argued that planning conditions restricting permitted development rights should only be used in exceptional circumstances and that Condition 8 does not meet the 'exceptional circumstances' test. However, the Framework states that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so – it does not require the demonstration of exceptional circumstances. In addition, the Planning Practice Guidance states that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use may not pass the tests of reasonableness or necessity.
6. A Class C4 HMO can accommodate between 3 and 6 unrelated individuals. Thus, the exercise of permitted development rights could allow for the change of both dwellings to HMOs and result in the occupation of the appeal site by up to 12 unrelated individuals.
7. The Council has explained that the condition was imposed to prevent a more intensified level of activity than would be experienced if the site comprised two single family dwellinghouses, and to prevent the related noise and disturbance caused by an intensification of use resulting from multiple, unrelated occupants, impacting upon neighbours and the character of the area.
8. Levels of activity would vary according to the number of individuals, and it is possible that small HMOs could have impacts that are similar to or lesser than 2 single-family dwellings. However, if this appeal were to succeed it would allow for occupation of the approved dwellinghouses by up to 12 unrelated people. Even though this might not result in any material harm to the character or appearance of the area or conflict with policies relating to design, housing types, sustainability, and the environment as has been noted by the appellant, it could nevertheless result in materially-different impacts when compared with single dwellings, for example in terms of comings and goings, the number of vehicles associated with the properties and the availability of parking.
9. Although the appellant has said that the Council has not provided technical evidence such as parking surveys, noise assessments, or local HMO saturation

data to support its position, the appellant has also not provided any such evidence to support its argument that the condition is not necessary.

10. Furthermore, the absence of a similar condition on a previous planning permission for this site does not necessarily suggest inconsistency in decision-making; each application must be considered on its own merits and having regard to the policy that is in force and relevant material considerations at the time that the decision is made. Similarly, whilst the Council has referred to other appeal decisions in the borough relating to similar conditions, I have based this decision on the particular circumstances of the appeal site.
11. The existence of Condition 8 does not indicate that harm would arise from the use of the properties as small HMOs. Rather, it would enable full consideration to be given, by way of a planning application with accompanying supporting evidence, to the effects of a change of use on the living conditions of occupiers of other dwellinghouses nearby in order to avoid unacceptable harm being caused. Such an application would also provide an opportunity for other considerations, such as wider housing delivery and national housing need, to be taken into account and to balance any harms against benefits. Therefore, I consider a restriction on the ability to occupy the dwellings as HMOs to be justified and necessary. It would not prevent use of the site as 2 single dwellings as was originally applied for and, therefore, I do not consider the condition to be unreasonable.
12. The condition is clearly relevant to planning and relevant to the development permitted, and I see no reason why it would not be enforceable. However, The PPG advises that the scope of conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use needs to be precisely defined, by reference to the relevant provisions of the GPDO so that it is clear which rights have been limited or withdrawn. Therefore, I consider that reference to the GPDO should be made within the condition, along with reference to the use class for small HMOs (Class C4) to ensure it is sufficiently precise. The inclusion of 'without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority' within the condition is also ambiguous and insufficiently precise as to what is required, and I have therefore omitted it.
13. Condition 8 also seeks to prevent the sub-division of the dwellinghouses. However, according to section 55 of the Act, sub-division would be a material change of use which would require planning permission. Therefore, this part of the condition serves no useful planning purpose and is not necessary and, accordingly, I have removed it.
14. Therefore, I find that a restriction on the change of use of the existing dwellinghouses to HMOs would be reasonable and necessary in this case. It would enable proper consideration to be given to the effects of a change of use on the living conditions of the existing occupiers of nearby dwellinghouses in order to avoid unacceptable harm being caused. These objectives are supported by Core Policy 8 of The Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 (2008) and Policies H12 and H20 of The Local Plan for Slough (2004) which together say that development, including the use of a property as an HMO, should respect the amenities of adjoining occupiers, and should not have a detrimental impact upon the character and amenity of residential units included within the Residential Area of Exceptional Character within which the appeal site is located.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I find that a condition to restrict permitted development rights for use of the dwellings as HMOs is necessary and reasonable, but that the condition should be varied as set out in the formal decision.

P Burley

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2025

Section 78 Appeal Ref: 6000500

Proposal: a canopy at 32 Stanley Green East, Slough SL3 7RF.

Application Ref: P/19971/004

Decision – allowed and planning permission granted

Preliminary matters

1. Words that do not describe acts of development are omitted from the description of the proposal in the banner above.
2. This appeal is considered on the basis that the development has already been undertaken.

Reasons

Issue – effect on the character and appearance of the area

3. The canopy has a different structure, form, and materials from the host dwelling. However, its open sides and rear, together with its low height and fairly short length, give it a subordinate and less substantial appearance than both the original house and the modest single-storey rear extension it adjoins. That being the case, and even if it would not accord with all the guidelines in the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document¹, its height, scale, and appearance are compatible with and subservient to the original dwelling. This is whether the canopy is considered on its own or in combination with the previous rear extension.
4. Many of the houses within both the terrace the appeal site forms part of and the terrace it backs onto have had rear extensions and/or outbuildings erected within the rear gardens. These are of different sizes and designs and use a range of external materials. Consequently, there is considerable variety in the appearance and form of development to the rear of these houses. That being the case, the modest canopy on the rear of the host dwelling is not an incongruous or prominent addition to the area.
5. For these reasons, the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the area, and in this respect, it accords with the policies cited on the decision notice.

¹ Slough Borough Council – Slough Local Development Framework – Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document – Adopted Jan 2010

Issue – effect on the living conditions of occupiers of number 34 Stanley East Green (no. 34), with particular regard to light and outlook

6. Notwithstanding the presence of the single-storey extension to the rear of the house on the appeal site, and despite the proximity of the canopy to the house and rear garden at no. 34, the occupiers of this neighbouring property have a reasonable outlook over and above their moderately sized rear garden. This is at least partly because the canopy is only a little higher than the tall trellis-topped close-boarded fence on the shared boundary between these properties, and because of its fairly short length and open sides.
7. For the same reasons, any reduction in daylight to number 34 from the construction of the canopy has been negligible. Moreover, and due to the location of the canopy, any associated reduction in sunlight has been restricted to a small part of the rear garden and limited to the mornings only. This being the case, the occupiers of number 34 are still able to secure reasonable levels of sunlight and daylight.
8. Consequently, the proposal does not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of number 34, with particular regard to light and outlook, and it accords with the relevant policies cited in the decision notice.

Other matters

9. In respect of the issues raised above, I have found that the proposal has not caused harm. That being the case, allowing this appeal would not create a precedent for harmful development in the area.
10. Even if the materials used in the canopy are not as durable as those in the main part of the house, I have no reason to doubt that it will be kept in good repair.
11. As the proposal has been undertaken, there is no need for any conditions to be imposed.

Conclusion

12. The proposal complies with the development plan as a whole and nothing indicates a decision otherwise.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by **V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2025

Section 78 Appeal Ref: 6000444

Proposal: Erection of a single storey front extension at 56 Boarlands Close, Slough SL1 5DD.

Application Ref: P/20845/000

Decision – allowed and planning permission granted

Reasons

Issue – effect on the character and appearance of the area

1. In terms of its scale, roof form and design detailing, the proposed development would have a similar appearance to the single-storey projection on the front of the adjoining house at number 54 Boarlands Close (no. 54). Moreover, the front of the extension would be in general alignment with the fronts of the porches of the neighbouring houses at numbers 58, 60, and 62 Boarlands Close. For these reasons, and because it would be stepped back from the front of the house at number 54, the extension would not be harmfully prominent or incongruous in relation to nearby development.
2. Even though it would extend across the full width of the 2-storey terraced house on the appeal site, the modest scale and low height of the proposed development mean it would read as a subservient addition to the original house. Consequently, and even if the development would not accord with all the guidelines set out in the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document¹, it would read as a compatible and sensitive addition to the original house.
3. For these reasons, the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, and in this respect, it would accord with the development plan policies cited on the decision notice.

Conclusion

4. The proposal complies with the development plan as a whole, and nothing indicates a decision otherwise.

Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

¹ Slough Borough Council – Slough Local Development Framework – Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document – Adopted Jan 2010

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no's: Location Plan produced 03 June 2025, 2518 EX01, 2518 PR02, and 2518 PR03.
Reason: Certainty
- 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
Reason: Protect character and appearance of area.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR



The Planning Inspectorate

3C
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 444 5354
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: west2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Planning Mgr C/O Daniel Ray
Slough Borough Council
Observatory House
25 Windsor Road
Slough
BERKSHIRE
SL1 2EJ

Your Ref: P/03038/003
Our Ref: APP/J0350/W/25/3368263

02 July 2025

Dear Sir / Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Appeal by Mr Gul Nawaz

Site Address: 41 & 43 Lake Avenue, Slough, Berkshire, SL1 3BY

I have received appeal forms and documents for this site. I am the case officer. If you have any questions, please contact me. I have checked the papers and confirm that the appeal(s) is valid. If I later find out that this is not the case, I will write to you again.

The procedure and starting date

The appellant(s) has requested the Written representations procedure. In accordance with s319A of the Act we have applied the criteria and considered all representations received, including the appellant(s) preferred choice. We consider that the Written representations procedure is suitable and we intend to determine this appeal by this procedure.

The date of this letter is the **starting date** for the appeal(s). The timetable for the appeal(s) begins from this date.

Sending documents to us and looking at the appeal(s)

A timetable is set out below. No reminders will be sent, and any documents sent after the deadlines will normally be returned.

You can use the Internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is <https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate>.

If emailing documents, please use the email address above. If posting documents (other than the Questionnaire) please send 2 copies of everything. Whichever method you use, please make sure that all documents/emails are clearly marked with the full reference number.

Guidance on communicating with us electronically can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-appeals-procedural-guide>.

Timetable

The following documents must be sent within this timetable.

By 09 July 2025

You must notify any person who was notified or consulted about the application in accordance with the Act or a development order and any other interested persons who made representations to you about the application, that the appeal(s) has been made. You should tell them:-

- i) that any comments they made at application stage will be sent to me and the appellant(s) and will be considered by the Inspector (unless they withdraw them within the 5 week deadline). If they want to make any additional comments they must submit 3 copies within 5 weeks of the starting date, **by 06 August 2025**. If comments are submitted after the deadline, the Inspector will not normally look at them and they will be returned;
- ii) when and where the appeal documents will be available for inspection;
- iii) that the Planning Inspectorate will not acknowledge representations. We will, however, ensure that letters received by the deadline are passed on to the Inspector dealing with the appeal(s);
- iv) that they can get a copy of our booklet 'Guide to taking part in planning appeals proceeding by Written representations' either free of charge from you, or on GOV.UK <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/taking-part-in-a-planning-listed-building-or-enforcement-appeal>; and
- v) that the decision will be published on GOV.UK.

You must send a copy of a completed appeal questionnaire and supporting documents, a copy of your notification letter and a list of those notified to the appellant(s) and me.

By 06 August 2025

Please send me your statement of case if the appeal questionnaire does not give full details of your case. Please include a list of any conditions or limitations you would agree to, if the appeal were to be allowed. I will send you and the appellant(s) a copy of any comments received from other interested persons or organisations and I will also send a copy of your statement to the appellant(s).

By 20 August 2025

The appellant(s) must send me any final comments they have on your statement. Both you and the appellant(s) may comment on any representations received from interested persons or organisations. No new evidence is allowed at this stage. I will send you a copy

of any final comments received from the appellant(s).

Site visit

We will arrange for one of our Inspectors to visit the appeal site. If it is decided that the Inspector should be accompanied by the main parties, we will send you details of these arrangements nearer the time. If, however, an unaccompanied or an 'access required' site visit can be made, you will **not** be informed in advance. Inspectors will not accept any documents or discuss the merits of the appeal(s) at the site visit.

Planning obligations - section 106 agreements

If you intend to submit a planning obligation, you must read the guidance provided on GOV.UK - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-appeals-procedural-guide>. A certified copy must be submitted to me no later than 7 weeks from the date of this letter.

Withdrawing the appeal(s)

If you hear that the appeal(s) is to be withdrawn, please telephone me immediately. If I receive written confirmation of this from the appellant(s), I will write to you.

Costs

The appellant(s) has been directed to GOV.UK for further information regarding costs - <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/appeals/>. You should also be aware that costs may be awarded to either party.

Additionally, a Planning Inspector or the Secretary of State may on their own initiative make an award of costs, in full or in part, if they judge that a party has behaved unreasonably resulting in unnecessary appeal expense.

Further information

Further information about the appeals process can be accessed at GOV.UK - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-appeals-procedural-guide>. I recommend that you read the relevant guidance.

Yours sincerely,

Cassandra Low
Cassandra Low

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notices>



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3369460
9 Hinksey Close, Slough, SL3 8EB

- 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 Mrs V Rohira against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
- The application Ref is P/20217/007.
- The development proposed is retrospective application for a front porch, two storey side, 6m single storey wrap around, part first floor rear extension and a single storey rear outbuilding for use of home office, gym, shower room and storage with pitched roof with render following demolition of existing garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to front porch, two storey side, 6m single storey wrap around, part first floor rear extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey rear outbuilding for use of home office, gym, shower room and storage with pitched roof with render following demolition of existing garage at 9 Hinksey Close, Slough, SL3 8EB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20217/007, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the following approved plans: ART/2024/REG9HC/OUT AE EE, ART/2024/REG9HC/APPOUT and ART/2024/REG9HC/SPLP.
 - 2) Notwithstanding the terms and provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), the outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used for domestic purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling, with no cooking facilities installed, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The outbuilding shall not be used as separate self-contained residential accommodation or for any industrial, commercial or business use.

Preliminary matters

2. The proposed development has already been implemented. The application description as set out on the council's decision notice refers to the proposal as being a retrospective application. As planning permission cannot be granted retrospectively, I have deleted this wording in this decision.
3. The description for the proposal does not specifically refer to various works that the applicant has sought to regularise as part of the application. The council has

however confirmed that in addition to the items set out in the description for the proposal the following works do fall within the terms of the application: Also, the doors and Juliet balcony in the flat roofed dormer extension are clearly addressed in the Council's planning application report.

- Coloured render on the whole house
- Raising the main ridge line of the host dwelling by 50mm
- Replacement first floor landing window
- Replacement first floor bedroom window with doors and Juliet balcony
- Replacement of first floor windows with smaller windows

Also, the doors and Juliet balcony in the flat roofed dormer extension are clearly addressed in the Council's planning application report. The appeal has been determined on this basis.

4. The appellant has submitted a revised elevation drawing with the appeal (Drawing No: ART/2024/REG9HCPE). It includes cladding at first floor level on the front elevation; and a smaller first floor window above the main entrance to the dwelling. It also partially addresses the council's third reason for refusal concerning the accuracy of the submitted drawings, by including obscure glazed Juliet balconies and obscure glazing in the first floor side window, although it does not include the solar panels on the roof of the outbuilding. Other than the obscure glazed Juliet balcony and side facing window, which could be dealt with by condition, these changes and the existing solar panels have a material impact on the character and appearance of the resultant dwelling and outbuilding. As such they would first need to be formally considered by the Council and made available for public comment. Accordingly, I am unable to take them into account in the determination of the appeal proposal or deal with them by condition.

Main Issues

5. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

6. Hinksey Close is characterised by small groups of uniformly designed pairs of semi-detached two storey houses and chalet dwellings from a limited range of designs. The pairs of two storey houses are symmetrically designed with large central front gable projections, gable ends, matching fenestration and external materials. Within the front gable projections this includes red tile hanging, buff coloured brick detailing and a panel of red bricks under the ground floor windows. To the sides of the front gables the dwellings have dark coloured horizontal boarding or tiles at first floor level and buff coloured brick at ground floor level. On some of the dwellings the colour of the bricks is deliberately swapped around. The dwellings predominantly have brown tiled roofs, although there are several red/dark grey tiled roofs.
7. A number of these dwellings have two storey side extensions, some of which are flush with the front building line and ridge line and others are recessed behind the front building line and set below the ridge line. Both forms have blended into and form an integral part of the existing street scene. These extensions have either

horizontal timber cladding or red tiles at first floor level, and buff/red brick at ground floor level and on the flank elevations.

8. The chalet dwellings are similarly uniformly designed and have adjoining flat roofed dormers which sit below the ridge line and above the eaves level. They are primarily clad with red brick although some have white coloured dormer cheeks and cladding. Some of the dwellings also have white painted render at ground floor level on the front elevations and red/buff coloured bricks on their flank elevations. A number of these dwellings have been extended and most extensions follow a similar pattern and have been readily assimilated in to the street scene.
9. The consistency in styles, detailing, materials and front building lines, together with the open plan nature of Hinksey Close contributes to its spacious, cohesive and uniform character and appearance. This consistency and character prevails within the local area.
10. Notwithstanding this, there are a number of other extensions and alterations to both the houses and chalet dwellings in the local area which have introduced new styles of fenestration, detailing and mix of materials. They have blended in with the host buildings and the street scene with varying degrees of success. Much depends on how well they respect and reflect the existing proportions, design, detailing and use of materials and colours of the host and adjoining dwellings. Hence, rather than set a precedent they highlight the need to assess each proposal on its individual merits and in accordance with the prevailing planning policies. This is to ensure that they do not detract from the uniform and cohesive character and appearance and the area.
11. The appeal dwelling is situated alongside the end of a row of chalet style houses and at the end of a row of two storey pairs of houses. It comprises one of a pair of symmetrically designed two storey dwellings with uniformly sized and designed fenestration; red tile hanging on the front gable with buff and red brick detailing; horizontal dark coloured cladding at first floor level to the sides of the front gable; and buff brick elsewhere.
12. The front and side elevations of the attached dwelling at No.7 appear largely unaltered. To the rear it has a full width flat roofed single storey extension with buff coloured brick walls to match the host dwelling.
13. Together and amongst other things Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) and policies H15, EN1 & EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough (LP) require new development to be of a high quality. It should be attractive, be compatible with its surroundings and improve the quality of the environment. Extensions should be of a high quality design and use materials which are in keeping with the host property and the surrounding area. They should be compatible with the scale, materials, form, design, fenestration, architectural style, layout and proportions of the host building. Poor designs that are not in keeping with their surroundings and those that result in overdevelopment of a site will be refused.
14. Section 5 and Policies DP6, DP8 & EX26 of the Slough Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), advises that extensions should not be overbearing or result in loss of outlook or privacy. Two storey side extensions should be visually subordinate and should not detract from the original dwelling or the character of the surrounding area. They should be set back from

the front wall by at least one metre, from the main ridge height of the dwelling by 0.5 metres and from the side boundary by at least one metre to avoid a terracing effect. Two storey rear extensions should be subordinate to the host dwelling and their roofs should respect the original roof form.

15. SPD Policy EX33 advises that roof alterations which involve raising the ridge line will not normally be permitted. Rear dormer windows should be set below the main ridge line, above the eaves line and should not occupy more than 50% of the width of the roof slope. Paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework have similar objectives and seek to make effective use of land.
16. The proposed additions and changes to the appeal property have been implemented. Collectively and together with the recent rear flat roofed dormer extension they have materially changed the character and appearance of the host dwelling and interrupted the uniformity in the design and appearance of the pair of dwellings, the row of houses and the street scene.
17. The existing flat roofed rear dormer, which fills the whole of the roof-slope of the original dwelling, falls outside the scope of this appeal. It forms a dominant feature on the dwelling and within the rear garden environment, which is exacerbated by the introduction of full height doors and Juliet balcony.
18. The proposed single storey extension is visually uncluttered and whilst it is deep, it does not detract from the appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst the two storey pairs of semi-detached houses were not designed with rendered walls, the ground floor rear extension is largely contained within the rear garden. As such its white painted walls do not materially impact on the character of the pair of dwellings or the street scene.
19. Conversely the first floor rear wall appears rather stark and detracts from the uniformity of the pair of dwellings. This is due to a combination of the expanse of light coloured render and the introduction of smaller windows and its siting under the large flat roofed dormer extension. Together these features upset the uniformity of the pair of dwelling.
20. On their own the form and design of the proposed side/rear two story extension blend in appropriately with the original host dwelling. Whilst it sits just below the ridge line, this is consistent with the approved scheme and is also comparable with other side extensions within the locality. Its eaves line and the proportions and the alignment of its fenestration respect those of the original dwelling. The rear first floor projection would be modest in height and form and would sit alongside the existing rear two storey projection at No.11. Also, the full height doors and Juliet balcony help relieve the horizontal lines of the resultant rear elevation of the dwelling.
21. Notwithstanding this, due to the size and appearance of the flat roofed dormer together with its juxtaposition with the rear first floor extension, the resultant rear elevation and roofscape appears poorly proportioned and incongruous. As stated by the appellant the rear first floor projection does help to screen the rear flat roofed dormer from the wider rear garden environment. However, this benefit does not outweigh the harm to the roofscape of the pair of dwellings and the surrounding rear garden environment.

22. The use of light coloured render on the side and front walls of the two story side extension appears stark and out of character with the row of two storey houses. Its impact is materially exacerbated by the light colour render on the front elevation of the host dwelling. This together with the introduction of a larger landing window and deep gable roofed porch has materially changed the character and appearance of the host dwelling. More importantly, collectively they have unbalanced and materially detracted from the uniform character and appearance of the pair of dwellings and the row of dwellings.
23. Conversely the approved side extension with its matching materials at first floor level and mono hipped roof porch would respect the proportions, character and appearance of the host dwelling and the pair of dwellings.
24. I appreciate that some of the above features may fall within the current permitted development tolerances or do not amount to development which requires planning permission. As such they may be able to be retained irrespective of this decision. However, as they form an integral part of the proposal they need to be assessed on their individual and collective merits and in light of the prevailing planning policies. In particular, it is necessary and reasonable to take account of their effect on the merits of the proposed extensions.
25. Finally, from my site visit it was apparent that the ridge line of the host dwelling is now slightly higher than that of No.7. The difference is very modest and largely unnoticeable. Whilst it has a small impact on the relationship between the appeal dwelling and No.7, it would not in itself amount to a reason for dismissing this appeal. As the increase in the height of the roof appears to be less than 50mm I am satisfied that this is a matter that could be dealt with by condition without prejudice to any party.
26. Overall, I find that the proposed extensions and alterations to the host dwelling have materially harmed the character and appearance of the host dwelling and undermined the strong sense of uniformity in the pair of dwellings and the street scene as a whole. This harm would outweigh the benefits they provide for the appellant and their family and is not something that could be satisfactorily dealt with by conditions.
27. The proposed rear outbuilding is modest in form and reflects the uncluttered form of the single storey rear extension. Its fenestration, including the sky lights are domestic in appearance and will provide the building with a good level of natural daylight. It is set in from the side boundaries of the site and is largely screened from the surrounding rear garden environment. For these reasons it respects the character and appearance of its rear garden environment.
28. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposed alterations and extensions to the host dwelling unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it conflicts with LP Policies EN1, EN2 & H15, CS Policy 8, the SPD and paragraphs 131 and 135 of the Framework. Conversely the proposed rear outbuilding blends in readily with the rear garden environment and complies with the above policies and advice.

Living conditions

29. The proposed first and second floor doors and Juliet balconies do facilitate views over the neighbouring properties gardens. By having full height doors views are

gained from a wider area within the rooms they serve. However, as suggested by the appellant by having obscure glazing in the Juliet balconies the outlook from the doors would be comparable to a typical bedroom window in the locality. This would address the concerns raised and is something that could be secured through the imposition of a condition.

30. Similarly, a condition which requires the first floor side window in the side extension to have restricted opening and obscure glazing would prevent any overlooking of the windows in the side elevation at No.11. There would be no need to require the ground floor window in the side elevation to be obscure glazed as their outlook would be towards a tall boundary wall.
31. There would also be no need for conditions which prevent the creation of any additional windows in the side elevation of the proposed side extension. This is because any new windows above ground floor level would require planning permission. Similarly, the use of any flat roofs for sitting out would require planning permission.
32. The appellant has stated that the proposed outbuilding would be used for a home office, gym and shower. Such uses would be unlikely to result in a loss of privacy or undue noise and disturbance for the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings. However, a full residential or commercial use would have the potential to result in an over-development of the site and undue noise and disturbance. To Address this the council has suggested the imposition of a condition which prevents such changes of use.
33. For these reasons the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupiers of the adjacent dwellings. Accordingly, in this respect the proposal would comply with LP Policies EN1 & EN2, and SPD Policies DP6, DP8 & EX26.

Other matters

34. In view of the acceptability of the proposed outbuilding I have considered the possibility of making a split decision. As the outbuilding is physically and functionally separate to the main house a split decision is possible and appropriate.

Conclusion

35. Having regard to the conclusions of the main issues and all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed in-so-far as it relates to the proposed front porch, two storey side, 6m single storey wrap around, part first floor rear extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey rear outbuilding for use of home office, gym, shower room and storage with pitched roof with render following demolition of existing garage.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR