

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PART 1

FOR INFORMATION

Planning Appeal Decisions

November 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.

Ref	Appeal	Decision
6000461	<p>9 Yew Tree Road, Slough, SL12AA</p> <p>Construction of a single storey rear extension</p> <p>The appeal sought to challenge the reasonableness and necessity of condition 6 - applied to permission P/1390/006, which granted consent for the construction of a single storey rear extension.</p> <p>Condition 6 reads:</p> <p><i>The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be sub-divided or used in multiple occupation without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>REASON: To ensure that the site is developed in accordance with the submitted application and to ensure that the proposed development does not result in an increase in on street parking with the provisions of Policy T2 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.</i></p> <p>The appeal inspector upheld the appeal, stating that "the disputed condition prevents the sub-division of the property. However, in light of section 55(3)(a) of the Act, this would require planning permission in any event and so condition 6 is unnecessary in these respects".</p> <p>With regards to the HMO aspect, the Inspector states that the use of the dwelling as a house in multiple occupation (HMO) is defined as permitted development under the terms of Article 3(1) and Class L of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). The disputed condition could be seen to remove this permitted development right, but it is noteworthy that the Planning Practice Guidance says conditions that restrict the future use of permitted development rights may not pass the test of reasonableness or necessity.</p>	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p style="text-align: center;">17th October 2025</p>

	<p>The Inspector goes onto state with regards to the Council's concerns over parking that there is little information provided on any parking standards the Council would apply in respect of HMOs, and no evidence that the change in use would generate a greater demand for parking compared to it being used as a single household residence, particularly given the limited size of the property and the limited provision for on site parking. It is also noted that whilst Policy T2 seeks to ensure that development does not lead to safety, amenity of visual impact concerns, it does not preclude development that would lead to street parking, and that any street parking associated with the HMO would be unlawful on Yew Tree Road as parking is prohibited by double yellow lines on both sides of the highway. Parking is allowed on other nearby streets but there is little evidence to indicate associated HMO roadside parking would cause any of the potential problems identified under LP policy T2.</p>	
APP/J0350/W/25/3365433	<p>1 Cannon Gate, Slough, SL2 5NH</p> <p>Removal of condition 4 (Garage use for parking only) of planning permission P/14635/000 dated 26/11/2009</p> <p>The appeal was made against the refusal to grant 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.</p> <p>The site is within a housing development comprising a mix of houses and apartments set around a shared private parking court.</p> <p>The original application (P/14635/000, dated 26/11/2009 refers) was approved for the conversion of an existing garage to habitable accommodation and the erection of an attached garage with pitched roof to the front of the original garage.</p> <p>That consent was subject to a number of conditions, including Condition 4 which stated: The garage(s) hereby permitted shall only be used to accommodate cars which are used ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwelling-house on the site and shall not be used for any trade or business purposes; nor adapted as habitable room(s) without the prior permission in writing from the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The reason given for the condition was: To ensure that adequate on-site parking provision is available to serve the development and to protect the amenities and visual amenities of the area in</p>	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>23rd October 2025</p>

	<p>accordance with Policy T3 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004.</p> <p>The application the subject of the appeal sought permission for the removal of condition 4 with the intention being, as set out in the supporting statement submitted with the application, to enable the existing garage to be converted to habitable accommodation utilising permitted development rights which could also enable replacing the garage door with a window.</p> <p>As a preliminary matter the Inspector accepted the Council's position that reference to Policy T3 of the Local Plan for Slough on the original decision notice was a typing error and that it should have referred to Policy T2, as Policy T3 was not a saved policy at the time of the decision on the original application. In refusing the application the subject of the appeal, the LPAs position was that there were inconsistencies with the submitted documentation and it was not therefore possible to verify whether the loss of the integral parking space through the removal of Condition 4 would comply with the policies in the development plan as they relate to car parking and amenity considerations.</p> <p>However, the Inspector concluded that from his site observations there would be sufficient parking available for the occupiers of the appeal property either within the wider development or nearby on surrounding roads such that the loss of one garage parking space for the appeal property would not cause unacceptable harm to highway safety. Both parties in the appeal made applications for an award of costs but the Inspector found no unreasonable behaviour by either party and no costs were awarded.</p> <p>The decision highlights the difficulties the LPA experiences when refusing minor developments on highways grounds.</p>	
APP/J0350/W/25/3369635	<p>16, St Michaels Court, Slough, SL2 2NF</p> <p>Part retrospective application for retention of change of use of the land from green verge to garden curtilage and associated fencing and planting</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>24th October 2025</p>
APP/J0350/W/25/3369688	<p>10, Ramsey Court, Slough, SL2 2PB</p> <p>Retrospective application for material change of use of the land from green verge to garden curtilage and erection of boundary treatment</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>24th October 2025</p>
APP/J0350/W/25/3369708	<p>12, St Michaels Court, Slough, SL2 2NF</p> <p>Part retrospective application for retention of change of use of the land from green verge to garden curtilage and associated fencing and planting</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>24th October 2025</p>

APP/J0350/W/25/3369727	<p>6, Ramsey Court, Slough, SL2 2PB</p> <p>Retrospective application for material change of use of the land from green verge to garden curtilage and erection of boundary treatment</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>24th October 2025</p>
APP/J0350/W/25/3369842	<p>7, Ramsey Court, Slough, SL2 2PB</p> <p>Retrospective application for material change of use of the land from green verge to garden curtilage and erection of boundary treatment</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>24th October 2025</p>
6000798	<p>8, Shortfern, Slough, SL2 5SL</p> <p>Construction of a single storey front porch with WC</p> <p>"The Planning Inspector acknowledged that the porch would exceed the depth permitted by the Residential Extensions Guidelines SPD, but it was only a marginal amount. Furthermore, the scale and massing would be proportionate to the host dwelling.</p> <p>The Inspector acknowledged the LPA's concerns with the fact that No.4 Shortfern's porch did not benefit from planning permission but nonetheless the scheme at No.8 was 'broadly comparable'. As such, the proposals were considered to respect the character of the street scene, and the appeal was allowed."</p>	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>4th November 2025</p>
6000651	<p>10, Furnival Avenue, Slough, SL2 1DW</p> <p>Single storey front, side and rear extension with 2no roof lights</p> <p>The application sought permission for a porch and single storey wrap around extension to the side and rear elevations of a semi-detached house. The addition extended 6m to the rear of the dwelling and 1.1m from its side elevation, enclosing the gap to the boundary with the neighbouring property to 1.1m.</p> <p>We refused the application as we had concerns that it would have an overbearing impact and provide a poor outlook for the residents of the neighbouring 8 Furnival Avenue, particularly when viewed from the rear garden.</p> <p>The Inspector disagreed, stating that the single storey flat roofed design and restricted height of the extension coupled with the fact that it would be situated 0.85m from the boundary that is shared with no. 8, would ensure that its visual impact</p>	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>5th November 2025</p>

	<p>would be limited when seen from the neighbouring garden, and that the neighbours outlook and sense of openness would be largely unaffected. Further to this, it was considered that the large size of the neighbouring rear garden and the distance of the extension from it would ensure that it would not meaningfully alter the enjoyment of the garden for the occupiers of no. 8.</p> <p>Is such, it was concluded that the development is in accordance with the guidance given in paragraph 2.2.1 of the SPD1 which provides that the size and siting of an extension should not lead to an extension which is visually imposing or overbearing for neighbouring properties, including creating a sense of enclosure (that is being boxed in) or a loss of outlook when viewed from habitable room windows.</p>	
6000771	<p>3, Cedar Way, Slough, SL3 7JT</p> <p>Construction of a Loft conversion with hip to gable and rear dormer, and 2no front roof lights</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>7th November 2025</p>
APP/J0350/W/25/3366004	<p>1-2, The Drive, Langley, Slough, SL3 7DB</p> <p>Partial conversion of single storey detached outbuilding to provide caretaker accommodation (ancillary use to the main dwelling)</p> <p>1-2 The Drive comprises 10 flats, which have been a result of various planning permission for subdivision, extensions and roof alterations. Planning permission was refused on 9 May 2025 for partial conversion of single storey detached outbuilding to provide caretaker accommodation for the flats; the outbuilding benefits from planning permission granted on 21 January 2016, ref P/07663/016 to provide a utility room, gym and store room for the benefit of the flats and planning permission granted on 21 December 2020, ref P/07663/030 indicated an alternative layout for the outbuilding generally dividing the floor area into two rooms to provide an increased cycle parking (due to an increase in the number of flats), and a storage area.</p> <p>The LPA considered the internal layout of the outbuilding to be tantamount to an additional dwelling, as it had all the necessary facilities for self-contained accommodation such as areas for eating, washing and sleeping (although the floor plan indicated “seating and rest area”), and did not consider that dedicated caretaker accommodation was commensurate with the duties associated with</p>	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>13th November 2025</p>

	<p>10 flats. In the event that the outbuilding was used as a dwelling there would be implications regarding living conditions for the occupiers and neighbours.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector granted planning permission for part of the outbuilding to be used for caretaker accommodation, with conditions that it is used only for purposes ancillary to the residential units at the site, and as a rest area for a caretaker of those units; the outbuild cannot be used as a separate self-contained dwellings or any other purpose which is not incidental to the use of the flats. A condition was imposed requiring fences and boundary treatment to be installed (which was the subject of a separate planning permission) to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers from views from within the outbuilding.</p> <p>A cost award was made by the appellant, claiming the LPA had acted unreasonably, requiring the appellant to incur costs related to the appeal. The Planning Inspector did not award costs in favour of the appellant, as despite the decision by the Inspector to grant planning permission, the LPA was not found to have acted unreasonably in its decision to refuse planning permission.</p>	
<p>APP/J0350/W/25/3368464 APP/J0350/H/25/3372198</p>	<p>150-152, High Street, Slough, SL1 1JP</p> <p>Planning Application for the change of use of from vacant retail (E(b) use class) to a betting shop (Sui Generis use class) and associated Advertisement Consent for 1no. Illuminated Signage Panel along the Fascia and 1no Double Sided Projecting Sign.</p> <p>Appeal A relates to full planning for the change of use. The Inspector states that the proposed use would replicate that of existing betting shops already operating within the primary frontage and does not offer any diversification of commercial activity and would intensify the concentration of betting shops in the town centre, reinforcing their visual and functional dominance. Whilst the Inspector notes that proposal would bring a vacant unit back into use, the Inspector also queries if there was sufficient marketing for the unit to attract potential other tenants. The typical partitions and screening to support customer privacy in betting shops and lower footfall betting shops experience would diminish the active frontage otherwise associated with Class E units. The Inspector also supports the Council’s position that there is no evidence that the proposal would safeguard the health and wellbeing of people, noting that data suggests a “direct and concerning correlation” between gambling centres and deprived areas. The</p>	<p>Appeal A Dismissed 14th November 2025</p> <p>Appeal B Granted 14th November 2025</p>

	<p>Inspector has therefore dismissed this part of the appeal.</p> <p>Appeal B relates to the advertisement consent, which Officers raised no design concerns with, but refused on the basis that the full planning is refused. As the two appeals are separate, the Inspector has therefore allowed this part.</p>	
6000772	<p>20, Bridge Close, Slough, SL1 5JF</p> <p>Construction of a single storey front and side extension, first floor side and part first floor rear extension</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed 17th November 2025</p>



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: 6000461

9 Yew Tree Road, Slough SL1 2AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act) against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
- The appeal is made by Mr Jay K Nijjar against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/13960/006 was approved on 10 June 2025 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
- The development permitted is construction of a single storey rear extension.
- The condition in dispute is No 6 which states that: The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be sub-divided 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 result in an increase in on street parking with the provisions of Policy T2 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the planning permission Ref P/13960/006 for construction of a single storey rear extension at 9 Yew Tree Road, Slough SL1 2AA granted on 10 June 2025 by Slough Borough Council, is varied by deleting condition No 6.

Main Issue

2. Paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that planning conditions should only be imposed where they meet various tests. In this case, the main issue is whether the disputed condition is necessary.

Reasons

3. The Council's decision notice states the planning permission is granted in accordance with the planning application and accompanying plans. Also, condition 2 requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the specified drawing. Therefore, condition 6 is not needed to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the application.
4. The second part of the reason for the disputed condition refers to Policy T2 of the Local Plan for Slough adopted 2004 (the LP). This policy states that parking will be restricted to a maximum level within developments that attract an increase in trips. The proposed extension would allow an existing kitchen and dining room to be used as an additional bedroom and so it may result in more parking associated with the property. However, the front garden area is hard surfaced and of a shape and size to accommodate 3 vehicles. The Council officer's report on the planning application states that this is the maximum parking provision that is required and so the development would accord with LP policy T2 in these regards.

5. The disputed condition prevents the sub-division of the property. However, in light of section 55(3)(a) of the Act, this would require planning permission in any event and so condition 6 is unnecessary in these respects.
6. Condition 6 also prevents the use of the dwelling as a house in multiple occupation (HMO). Such a change of use is defined as permitted development under the terms of Article 3(1) and Class L of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). The disputed condition could be seen to remove this permitted development right. It is noteworthy that the Planning Practice Guidance says conditions that restrict the future use of permitted development rights may not pass the test of reasonableness or necessity¹.
7. There is little information before me on any parking standards the Council would apply in respect of HMOs. Consequently, there is no substantive evidence that a change in use of the appeal property to a HMO would generate a greater demand for parking compared to it being used as a single household residence. In any event, it seems likely that any increase in parking demand as a result of the property being used as a HMO would be limited given the size of the property, the potential number of occupiers and the amount of on-site parking space.
8. Moreover, it is unclear how any extra parking would be unacceptable as LP policy T2 does not preclude development that would lead to street parking. Instead, the last part of the policy seeks to ensure residential development includes parking space at a level to overcome road safety problems, to protect the amenities of adjoining residents and to avoid an adverse visual impact. Any street parking associated with the appeal property being used as a HMO would be unlawful on Yew Tree Road as parking is prohibited by double yellow lines on both sides of the highway. Parking is allowed on other nearby streets but there is little evidence to indicate that roadside parking connected with a HMO use of the appeal property would cause any of the potential problems identified under LP policy T2.
9. Therefore, I conclude the disputed condition is unnecessary in order to ensure the appeal development would be acceptable when assessed against LP policy T2. Also, it is not required for any other reason. Consequently, the condition does not meet the tests as set out in the Framework.

Other Matter

10. The planning application leading to this appeal attracted concerns from an interested party. However, the Council found the development to be acceptable in all respects and granted planning permission. I find no reason to disagree with the Council on the overall acceptability of the proposed development.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I conclude the appeal should succeed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning Practice Guidance, Use of planning conditions, Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 21a-017-20190723, revision date 23 07 2019.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2025

by C Billings BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/25/3365433

1 Cannon Gate, Slough, SL2 5NH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant 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 Amarjit Singh against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/14635/001.
 - The application sought planning permission for conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation and erection of an attached garage with pitched roof without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref P/14635/000, dated 26/11/2009.
 - The condition in dispute is No 4 which states that: The garage(s) hereby permitted shall only be used to accommodate cars which are used ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwelling-house on the site and shall not be used for any trade or business purposes; nor adapted as habitable room(s) without the prior permission in writing from the Local Planning Authority.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To ensure that adequate on-site parking provision is available to serve the development and to protect the amenities and visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy T3 of the Local Plan for Slough 2004.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation and erection of an attached garage with pitched roof at 1 Cannon Gate, Slough, SL2 5NH, in accordance with the application Ref P/14635/000 dated 26/11/2009 and plan No AS/1/01 Rev A, dated July 2009.

Applications for costs

2. Applications for costs have been made by Mr Amarjit Singh, the appellant, against the Council and also, by the Council against the appellant. These are subject to separate decisions.

Preliminary Matters

3. While the reason for condition 4 of the original planning permission ref. P/14635/000 refers to Policy T3 of the Local Plan for Slough, yet the informative given on the Council's decision notice refers to Policy T2. The Council sets out that reference to Policy T3 was a typing error on the decision notice and that it should have referred to Policy T2, as Policy T3 was not a saved policy at the time of its decision on the original application. However, even though an incorrect policy was referenced by the Council when it made its decision on the original application, I have referred to relevant adopted development plan policies in reaching my decision on the appeal proposal, as required by s.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).

4. Even though the Council assert that the correct ownership certification was not completed for the application, the Council accepted and subsequently determined the planning application. Therefore, the validity of the appeal proposal is not a matter for my consideration in this appeal.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the condition is reasonable and necessary having regard to the effect of the appeal development on highway safety, the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Highway safety

6. The appeal site is within a housing development comprising a mix of houses and apartments set around a shared private parking court. From my site observations, the parking spaces are not specifically marked or allocated to a particular dwelling. Also, from the evidence provided and signage at the development, only residents of the housing development with a parking pass are authorised to park within the parking court and other private parking spaces around the periphery of the development, including those located along Holmedale.
7. Therefore, regardless of how many vehicles the appellants own or their vehicle registration numbers, they may only park within the private parking areas of the development if they have a valid parking pass. Furthermore, subject to having the appropriate parking passes, they could park within any space available within the wider development and not just within their garage currently.
8. The parking court and access thereto is private, with parking passes controlled by a private company. Therefore, parking in such spaces would not likely be guaranteed for the appellant indefinitely in any case. The Council asserts that the space in front of the garage is not suitable for parking, due to its size, relationship to a footway and ownership. However, the proposal would still involve the loss of one existing parking space overall at the appeal site.
9. I viewed the private parking areas and the surrounding roads on two separate occasions, including in the early evening on one day and in the morning the next day. While only snapshots in time, on both occasions, there were spaces available within the wider development, particularly most of the private parking spaces off Holmedale were available during my visits. Also, there were some spaces available within the private parking court and in designated on-street parking bays along the slip road, only a short walk from the appeal site. Similarly, the Council's planning officer noted in the delegated report, that during their daytime site visit, there was no evident shortfall of parking capacity locally.
10. Although the proposal would involve the loss of one garage parking space for the appeal property and even though no detailed parking surveys have been provided, the evidence and my site observations indicates that there would be sufficient parking available for the occupiers of the appeal property either within the wider development or nearby. Even if the Council's maximum parking standards would not be met, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would result in undue pressure on local parking, or road safety issues, including from road user conflict,

increased traffic accidents, or negative disruption to the free flow of traffic in the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed loss of one garage parking space for the appeal property would not cause unacceptable harm to highway safety.

11. In view of the above, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on highway safety. Accordingly, it would not conflict with saved Policy T2 and H15 of the Slough Local Plan (March 2004) (LP) and Core Policy 7 (Transport) of the Slough Local Development Framework (December 2008) (LDF), which amongst other matters, require appropriate parking provision and consideration of road safety.

Living conditions and character and appearance

12. The appeal site is within a predominately residential area. No external alterations or additional built form are proposed to the host property. Therefore, the proposal would not have any visual impact on the surrounding area, nor would it result in any harmful impact on the outlook or privacy of nearby occupiers. Additionally, the proposal would not generate any increase in vehicular movement to or from the appeal property or the wider private parking areas as the overall size of the host dwelling is not being increased by the proposal. Consequently, it is unlikely to cause undue noise and disturbance to nearby residents. In view of such and, given my findings that sufficient parking is available in the surrounding area to accommodate the displaced parking space, the proposal would not result in any detrimental impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.
13. Furthermore, as the proposal would not make any discernible changes to the host property or its surroundings, with the garage remaining associated with its residential use, the proposal would not be harmful to the residential character and appearance of the surrounding area.
14. In view of the above, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings or the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with saved Policies T2, H14, H15, EN1 and EN2 of the LP or Core Policies 7 and 8 of the LDF, which amongst other matters, require development to safeguard the amenities (living conditions) of adjoining residents and protect the character of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

15. Even if some of the appellant's supporting information is misleading, this does not mean that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety, the living conditions of nearby residents, or the character and appearance of the area. While no comments have been received from the Council's highway engineer, based on the evidence before me and my site observations, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable harm to highway safety in this instance. Furthermore, although no substantive evidence has been provided regarding the development approved at 58 Station Road, that example has a different site context and is in a different location and so, is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. As such, these are neutral matters in relation to my findings on the main issues.

Conditions

16. By allowing this appeal, a new planning permission is created. The Planning Practice Guidance sets out that decision notices for the grant of planning permission under section 73 should restate the conditions imposed on the earlier

permission that continue to have effect unless they have already been discharged. As the development has already been implemented, it is not necessary for me to include the standard time limit condition or a condition to ensure suitable matching external materials are used. Although, to define the permission, it is necessary and reasonable to include reference to the approved plan in my decision.

17. An informative would have no weight on the planning decision. However, if the converted garage were used for purposes not incidental or ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, there would be other appropriate mechanisms to deal with such. Therefore, an informative in regard to such would be unnecessary.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposal would accord with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate otherwise. Therefore, the disputed condition is not necessary or reasonable and should be removed.

19. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Billings

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2025

by **Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2025

Appeal Ref: 6000798

8 Shortfern, Slough SL2 5SL

- 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 Carol Foster against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/20820/000.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as, "Single storey front porch with WC".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a single storey front porch with WC at 8 Shortfern, Slough, SL2 5SL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20820/000, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location And Block Plan Proposed (Drawing No. ABGS PL-101), Floor Plans And Elevations (Drawing No. CSWS PL-201).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the measures specified in section 4 (Mitigation Measures) of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment. The measures implemented shall be retained thereafter.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised description of development was agreed in writing by the Council and the appellant, and the application was determined on that basis. This has been reflected in the formal decision, above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises 8 Shortfern (No 8), a 2-storey end-of-terrace dwelling situated at the end of a run of similarly-designed modestly-sized properties, in a predominantly residential area. No 8 benefits from an existing porch. The proposed development seeks to demolish this porch, and to construct a single-

storey front porch with WC in its place. Policy EX1 of the SPD¹ provides that front extensions shall be single storey and normally restricted to front porches only. As a single-storey front porch, the proposed development would reflect these characteristics.

5. Policy EX2 of the SPD provides that, amongst other things, front extensions should have a maximum depth of 1.5 metres for terraced houses. Paragraph 1.2.7 of the SPD makes clear that each planning application will be judged on its own individual merits. In this case, the proposed development would exceed this depth, but only by a marginal amount. Its depth would be similar to the existing porch and it would not protrude excessively from No 8's front elevation. Its mono-pitched roof would be suitably positioned below No 8's upper-floor windows. Much of No 8's front elevation would remain visible in the street scene. As such, even though its footprint would be greater than the existing porch, its scale and massing would be proportionate with No 8. Furthermore, its materials would match those existing, thereby ensuring that the appearance of No 8 would be respected.
6. Moreover, its scale and massing would be broadly comparable with the existing porch at 4 Shortfern (No 4), located a short distance from the site. Another porch is present at 5 Shortfern, which whilst smaller than the porch at No 4, due to its height and depth is a noticeable feature in the street scene. Although the Council has raised concerns relating to the planning history of these existing porches, they are established features in the street scene. I also observed numerous front porches of a considerable size and scale on Knolton Way, many of which are visible from Shortfern near the site. Hence, the proposed development would respect the character of the street scene and the design and appearance of the original house, as required by paragraph 3.2 of the SPD.
7. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy² and with Policies H15, EN1, and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan (adopted 2004) which collectively provide that, amongst other things, all development in the Borough shall be of a high quality design.

Conditions

8. I have considered the need for conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
9. Conditions are necessary, in the interests of clarity and enforceability, setting out the timescale for the commencement of development (condition 1) and the approved plans (condition 2), respectively. A condition is necessary controlling external materials to ensure that the proposed development would have an acceptable appearance (condition 3). A condition is necessary requiring that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the proposed mitigation measures detailed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, to ensure that the proposed development does not increase flood risk elsewhere (condition 4).
10. As this appeal relates to a householder application, the biodiversity gain condition is not applicable.

¹ Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2010)

² Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 – 2026 Development Plan Document (adopted 2008)

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2025

by **Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2025

Appeal Ref: 6000651

10 Furnival Avenue, Slough SL2 1DW

- 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 Ishtiaq Hussain against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/20729/001.
 - The development proposed is single storey front, side and rear extension with 2no roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front, side and rear extension with 2no roof lights at 10 Furnival Avenue, Slough, SL2 1DW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20729/001, and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Furnival Avenue, with particular regard to visual impact and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises 10 Furnival Avenue (No 10), a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated in a predominantly residential area. No 10 benefits from off-street parking to the front and a private garden to the rear.
4. 8 Furnival Avenue (No 8) is a semi-detached dwelling situated on an adjacent plot to No 10. An accessway runs alongside the side of No 8 closest to No 10, which leads to a wide paved area to the rear of No 8. An outbuilding is situated on this paved area. Beyond the rear of the outbuilding is a garden, which stretches for some length towards the rear of No 8's plot. I observed that the outlook from the paved area to the rear of No 8 is interrupted by the fence on the common boundary, by part of the side elevation of 16 Furnival Avenue (at a distance), and by trees situated further afield. Overall, despite the presence of these features, the outlook from the paved area is fairly clear and open.
5. The proposed extension would extend beyond the rear wall of No 10 by approximately 6 metres, and would link to the proposed side extension element of the proposed development. However, it would be single-storey only with a flat roof and would be sited approximately 0.85 metres away from the boundary with No 8. As such, due to its maximum height and its distance from the common boundary, its visual impact would be limited when seen from the paved area. For the same reasons, the existing mostly open outlook from the paved area would be largely unaffected.

6. The proposed extension would not extend past the existing outbuilding at No 8. When viewed from No 8's rear garden, the proposed extension would be seen against No 10's rear elevation. Hence, its impact on both the existing outlook and the sense of openness experienced by users of rear garden would be minimal. Given the large size of the rear garden and the distance of the proposed extension from it, the proposed development would not meaningfully alter the enjoyment of the garden for the occupiers of No 8.
7. Taking all of the above into account, the proposed development would accord with the guidance given in paragraph 2.2.1 of the SPD¹ which provides that the size and siting of an extension should not lead to an extension which is visually imposing or overbearing for neighbouring properties, including creating a sense of enclosure (that is being boxed in) or a loss of outlook when viewed from habitable room windows.
8. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 8, with particular regard to visual impact and outlook. It would comply with Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy² and with Policies H15, EN1, and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan (adopted 2004) which collectively provide that, amongst other things, the design of all development within the existing residential areas should respect the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

9. I have considered the need for conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Conditions imposed

10. Conditions are necessary, in the interests of clarity and enforceability, setting out the timescale for the commencement of development (condition 1) and the approved plans (condition 2), respectively. A condition is necessary controlling external materials to ensure that the proposed development would have an acceptable appearance (condition 3).
11. Conditions are necessary preventing the extension from being used a balcony (condition 4), and to prevent any additional windows being formed on the flank elevations of the extension under permitted development (condition 5), to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 8 and 12 Furnival Avenue, with particular regard to privacy.

Conditions not imposed

12. The windows on the flank elevation facing No 8 would be located sufficiently below the eaves of the proposed single-storey extension such that they would be screened by the existing fence along the common boundary. Thus, no actual or perceived overlooking towards the plot at No 8 would occur. Consequently, a condition requiring these windows to be obscure glazed is not necessary.
13. As this appeal relates to a householder application, the biodiversity gain condition is not applicable.

¹ Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2010)

² Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 – 2026 Development Plan Document (adopted 2008)

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR

Conditions Schedule

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SLP & Proposed Block Plan (Drawing No. 10FA/001/PL) (Rev. A), Existing & Proposed Floor Plans (Drawing No. 10FA/002/PL) (Rev. A), Proposed Elevations (Drawing No. 10FA/004/PL) (Rev. A).
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those specified in the application form (dated: 11th April 2025).
- 4) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.
- 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the flank elevations of the development hereby permitted.

End of Conditions Schedule



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2025

by **C Billings BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/25/3366004

1 - 2 The Drive, Langley, Slough SL3 7DB

- 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 S B Khan against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/07663/033.
 - The development proposed is partial conversion of outbuilding to provide caretaker accommodation (ancillary use).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for partial conversion of outbuilding to provide caretaker accommodation (ancillary use) at 1 - 2 The Drive, Slough, SL3 7DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/07663/033, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs has been made by the appellant, Mr Khan, against the Council. This is subject to a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Since the appeal application was determined, planning permission has been granted for the erection of fences to enclose the gardens of the existing apartments within the appeal site, Council ref P/07663/034. This would separate the respective garden areas of the ground floor apartments at the host property and provide gated access through to the appeal outbuilding.
4. The appellant asserts that the proposed development would be permitted development. Although, as planning permission has been sought, I have determined the appeal proposal on that basis. However, the lawfulness of the proposed development is not a matter for this appeal.
5. I observed during my site visit that the submitted existing plans of the appeal outbuilding do not reflect the building in situ. Previous openings have been blocked up and the internal layout of the building differs in terms of the position and number of internal walls and there was no fitted bathroom or gym within the outbuilding at the time of my visit. Also, I observed the outbuilding was principally being used for storage purposes and not as a self-contained flat. However, I have made my decision based on the submitted plans. The disputed photographs of previous fencing within the appeal site is a neutral matter for this appeal, as fencing does not form part of the appeal proposal and it was not in situ at the time of my visit.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:
- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and,
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby residential properties in regard to privacy, outlook and noise and general disturbance and, whether the proposal would provide adequate facilities for the ancillary caretaker use, in regard to the amount of outdoor space, privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site is within a predominately residential area. The appeal outbuilding is a single storey pitched roof building set within the grounds of an apartment building. The submitted plans set out that no external alterations are proposed to the appeal outbuilding and that its floor area would not change. Therefore, as no significant alterations are proposed to the outbuilding and it is contained within the enclosed appeal site, the proposal would visually have a neutral effect on the host building and would not be prominent from beyond the appeal site. Consequently, the proposed development would not cause visual harm to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area.
8. The proposed ancillary caretaker use would occupy only part of the outbuilding, with the remaining part of it continuing to be used for storage purposes associated with the residential use of the host apartment building. Even though the recently approved fencing, Council ref P/07993/034, would separate the rear garden areas of the apartments in the host building from the outbuilding, gate access is proposed thereto to allow residents of the apartments to continue to use the storage and cycle parking facilities within the outbuilding. Therefore, access to the outbuilding would be no different to that already approved and even with fencing between, the gates would allow physical connection between the outbuilding and host property.
9. Notwithstanding the disputed need for on-site caretaker facilities to support the number of units in the host property and that the proposed internal layout includes certain features commonly found in a dwelling, these factors do not in themselves indicate that the outbuilding would be used as an independent dwelling or separate planning unit. This is particularly the case, given that such use is neither applied for in the description of development nor as intended by the appellant, as set out in their evidence. Furthermore, there is relevant caselaw¹, as referenced by the appellant, whereby it has been held that domestic facilities alone do not create a new planning unit. However, a planning judgement needs to be made, based on fact and degree, as to whether or not the proposed development would be ancillary.
10. The description of development sets out that the proposed caretaker accommodation would be an ancillary use. Also, the evidence submitted sets out how the caretaker facility will be used in conjunction with the residential use of the host property, that no sleeping accommodation is proposed within the outbuilding and that there would be physical connection between the host property and the

¹ Caselaw including, but not limited, Uttlesford DC v SSE & White (1992) JPL 171; Whitehead v SSE & Mole Valley DC (1992) JPL 561; Gravesham BC v SSE & O'Brien (1983) JPL 306

outbuilding via gate access. Additionally, the internal layout of the outbuilding, as shown on the existing plans, is not that different to the proposed layout in terms of the number of separate spaces and includes doors that could be locked and restrict access. Therefore, despite previous planning history, the proposed internal layout and that kitchen and bathroom facilities are proposed within the outbuilding, on balance, I am satisfied that, subject to a condition restricting the use of the caretaker facilities, the proposed development would have physical and functional connection with the residential use of the host property.

11. In view of the above, the proposed form and function of the proposed development would neither conflict with nor harm the predominantly residential character of the surrounding area or host property. Furthermore, due to the proposed ancillary use of the outbuilding and that the building would not be increased in size, the proposal would not result in the harmful overdevelopment of the appeal site. In such circumstances, considerations relating to new dwellings would not apply to the proposal. This includes in regard to patterns of development, density, infill, or backland development and, provision of adequate internal space for new housing.
12. If the outbuilding were to be used as the main residence for anyone and/or no longer used ancillary to the host property, then it would likely become a separate planning unit, whereby change of use would be required. Consequently, any unauthorised use of the outbuilding could be appropriately dealt with by relevant planning enforcement powers, as necessary.
13. To conclude on this main issue, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with Core Policies 4 and 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework (December 2008) (LDF) and Policies EN1 and H13 of the Local Plan for Slough (March 2004) (LP), which principally relate to new dwellings and amongst other matters, require high standard of design in terms of the scale, massing and appearance of new development and that development relates well to its surroundings.

Living conditions

14. Even though the outbuilding is not that far away from the rear windows of the apartments in the host property, close boarded fencing could be erected to the height and location, as approved under Council ref. P/07993/034. This would negate any potential direct overlooking from the caretaker facility windows to the apartments windows and ensure no loss of privacy to the occupiers of the apartments, either inside or outside their dwellings.
15. Additionally, as the outbuilding would not be enlarged or altered externally and given the approved and existing boundary treatment in place, the proposal would not change the outlook of residents in the existing apartments, or that of other nearby dwellings, compared to the existing situation.
16. The proposed ancillary caretaker use of part of the outbuilding would unlikely cause significant additional movement to and from the appeal site. Particularly, as the proposed use would be complementary to the host property and compatible with the residential context of the surrounding area. Therefore, it is unlikely that the proposal would cause any harmful noise and disturbance to the occupiers of nearby residential properties. While the Planning Inspector on the previous appeal ref APP/J0350/W/17/3181792 found there would be undue noise and disturbance

caused by the comings and goings associated with the proposed development, that related to a new studio flat and not an ancillary use and so, was for a different form of development to that now proposed.

17. One side of the appeal outbuilding is located close to the rear boundary fence of 75 Cherry Avenue (No 75). No windows are proposed in the side elevation of the appeal building nearest to this neighbouring property, the existing outbuilding would not be enlarged and, no changes are proposed to the existing boundary treatment with No 75. Also, the use of the part of the outbuilding nearest to No 75 would remain as existing, for storage and cycle parking. Therefore, the proposal would not reduce the amount of natural light, cause additional noise and disturbance, nor have an overbearing impact or affect outlook, to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers of No 75.
18. Due to the proposed ancillary use of the outbuilding and my findings that the proposal would not create a separate dwelling or planning unit, the requirements for new dwellings in terms of the provision of adequate private amenity space and appropriate living conditions for the proposed caretaker facility would not apply.
19. However, the amount of outdoor amenity space to be fenced off from the private gardens of the apartments would be comparable in area to that of the separate outdoor spaces for the ground floor apartments in the host building, as approved under Council ref P/07993/034. Therefore, the amount of outdoor space for the ancillary caretaker facility would be acceptable and provide enough space for outdoor seating or other uses, as needed by the caretaker whilst at the premises.
20. The roof light serving the proposed kitchen/diner would not provide horizontal views in terms of outlook, although it would provide sufficient light to the room and would not be used as part of a separate dwelling. The proposed seating/rest room would have two windows, and even though one window would be close to the approved boundary fence, the second window, facing toward the boundary along The Drive, would provide adequate outlook for the caretaker using this room. Therefore, overall, the caretaker facility would have sufficient outlook for those using it.
21. Additionally, as the caretaker rooms would be used ancillary to the residential use of the host property and not for sleeping or as permanent living accommodation, there would be no habitable room privacy concerns. Also, in view of the intended use, the movement and activities associated with the residents of the host property using the other parts of the outbuilding would unlikely cause harmful noise and disturbance to those using the caretaker areas.
22. Having regard to the above, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby residential properties in regard to loss of privacy, noise and general disturbance and, the proposal would provide adequate facilities for the ancillary caretaker use, in regard to the amount of outdoor space, privacy and outlook. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with Core Policy 8 of the LDF or Policies H13, H14 and EN1 of the LP, which amongst other things, require new development to provide adequate amenity garden space and have a high standard of design, including an acceptable relationship to nearby properties, that does not cause overlooking or loss of privacy.
23. Core Policy 4 of the LDF relates to the type of new housing and where it should be located and density, rather than living conditions and so, is not directly of relevance to this main issue.

Other Matters

24. Due to the proposed ancillary use of the outbuilding to the host property, it is unlikely that it would generate significant additional traffic movement. Also, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed ancillary use would require additional parking provision. Therefore, the proposal would unlikely cause harm to highway safety by reason of additional pressure on on-street parking or impacts on the free flow of vehicles, leading to increased accidents on the highway.
25. The proposal would not affect the amount or use of bin storage areas for the apartments in the host property. Therefore, appropriate bin facilities and access thereto would remain within the appeal site. Concerns of nearby residents about the impact on property values relate to private interests and therefore, is not a consideration I have given weight to.

Conditions

26. Having regard to the advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), in addition to the standard implementation condition, it would be necessary in the interests of certainty to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. To protect the privacy of occupiers of the existing apartments within the host building, it would be necessary to include a condition to require the provision of fencing before it is first used for caretaker rest purposes. Such fencing details should accord with that already approved as part of the recent permission for fencing, as agreed with the appellants.
27. The Council have recommended a condition that there are no locks on the internal doors within the outbuilding, other than to the bathroom, to ensure accessibility to all residents and ancillary use associated with the apartments in the host property. A condition requiring unlocked internal doors is not necessary to make the development acceptable and ensure the outbuilding is used for ancillary purposes. Furthermore, the approved internal layout of the outbuilding included doors that could be locked in any case. However, it would be reasonable and necessary to include a condition that defines the permitted use, as applied for, and to ensure the outbuilding is not used as a separate dwelling unit or any other purpose. If the use is not defined and restricted, it could result in alternative forms of development, whereby other considerations would apply.

Conclusion

28. For the reasons given above, the appeal would accord with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate otherwise.
29. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

C Billings

INSPECTOR

See overleaf for Schedule of Conditions

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: (a) Drawing No. KHAN/PLAN/002, Dated 28th January 2025, (b) Block Plan, Scale 1:500, (c) Site Plan, Scale 1:1250.
3. The parts of the outbuilding identified as kitchen/dinner, a WC/shower room, seating and rest room and the link area between the kitchen/diner and seating and rest room, as shown on drawing no. KHAN/PLAN/002, shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of 1-2 The Drive, as rest facilities for the caretaker of those units. The outbuilding shall at no time be used as a separate self-contained dwelling or for any other purpose that would not be incidental to the residential use of 1-2 The Drive.
4. Before the outbuilding is first used for caretaker rest facility purposes, fencing and gates shall be provided between the outbuilding and garden areas of the ground floor apartments at 1-2 The Drive, in accordance with the details shown on drawing number KHAN/PLAN/001 dated 12 May 2025, as approved under planning permission ref P/07663/034. The gates and fencing shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development.

End of Schedule



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 9 October 2025

by **A Oyebade MSc FCILT**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2025

Appeal A Ref: **APP/J0350/W/25/3368464**

150-152 High Street, Slough SL1 1JP

- 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 Done Brothers (Cash Betting) Ltd against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/01601/028.
 - The development proposed is planning application for the change of use of from vacant retail (E(b) use class) to a betting shop (Sui Generis use class).
-

Appeal B Ref: **APP/J0350/H/25/3372198**

150-152 High Street, Slough SL1 1JP

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a planning application relating to the display of an advertisement.
 - The appeal is made by Done Brothers (Cash Betting) Ltd against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/01601/028.
 - The advertisement concerned is advertisement consent for 1no. illuminated signage panel along the fascia and 1no double-sided projecting sign.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is allowed, and advertisement consent is granted for 1no illuminated signage panel along the fascia and 1no double-sided projecting sign as applied for at 150-152 High Street, Slough SL1 1JP. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the 5 standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Procedural matter and Appeal B

3. It is noted that the Council has concluded that the advertisement proposal forming the subject of Appeal B, namely the installation of an illuminated fascia sign and a double-sided projecting sign (APP/J0350/H/25/3372198), is compatible with, and does not detract from the established character of the town centre shopping area. Having regard to the character and appearance of the area and the nature of the advertisements proposed, I agree that the proposal would not be harmful to amenity or public safety. In consequence, Appeal B should be allowed. No conditions beyond the five standard conditions are necessary. The remainder of this appeal decision focuses on Appeal A.

Main Issue

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

4. The main issue is the effect of proliferation of betting shops on the vitality of the town centre and people's health and wellbeing.

Reasons

Vitality of the town centre

5. The appeal building is located within the Queensmere section of Slough's central shopping area, which includes the Queensmere Shopping Centre. It forms part of a row of 2 and 3-storey mixed-use properties along this side of the High Street, comprising a variety of commercial premises, such as cafés, betting shops, banks, and restaurants, with some residential accommodation situated above.
6. Policy S8 of the Slough Local Plan (Adopted March 2004) identifies certain town centre addresses as the primary shopping frontage comprising 112-228 High Street (evens) and other premises as the secondary frontage including 1-9 Mackenzie Street (odds). Paragraph 4.17 of the Plan emphasises that the primary frontage represents the core retail area, characterised by high rental values, multiple national retailers, and significant pedestrian footfall. To preserve the vitality of this retail function, the policy stipulates that the area should remain predominantly in retail use. Exceptions are limited to complementary uses that enhance activity and footfall, such as fast-food outlets, restaurants, banks, and building societies.
7. Policy S15 supports proposals that seek to diversify activity within Slough town centre, provided it can be demonstrated that they will enhance the centre's vitality and viability, operate at hours compatible with a retail environment, and are not situated within the primary shopping frontage. In addition, Policy S17 makes clear that proposals for new shop fronts will not be permitted where they fail to respect the context, character, and architectural design of the host façade.
8. The appeal site is in a primary shopping frontage, and the proposal does not fall within the definition of a retail use, nor is it one of the complementary uses identified in Policy S8 such as fast-food outlets, restaurants, banks, or building societies, that are typically permitted within the primary shopping frontage. Along this section of the High Street, there appears to be a noticeably higher concentration of betting shops compared to other retail types. Their frequency makes them particularly prominent within the streetscape, standing out in contrast to the more varied and limited presence of other commercial uses.
9. The appellant contends that the proposal would not lead to a net increase in betting shops along this street, as the existing premises at 9 Mackenzie Street, located within the secondary frontage, would be closed and relocated to the appeal site. Nevertheless, the proposed use replicates that of existing betting shops already operating within the primary frontage and does not offer any diversification of commercial activity. Moreover, there is no substantive evidence to confirm that the property at 9 Mackenzie Street would not revert to its original use if the appeal were allowed. I therefore consider that the proposal would intensify the concentration of betting shops in this part of the town centre, further reinforcing their visual and functional dominance.
10. The appellant notes that the appeal property has remained vacant for some time. However, the Council's annual monitoring report shows that, over the past two consecutive years, the vacancy rate for High Street shop units has been

approximately 10 per cent, lower than that recorded in the Queensmere and Observatory sectors of the town centre. This suggests that, with appropriate marketing, the appeal site has the potential to attract a retail occupier more aligned with the intended function of the primary shopping frontage. The Council has also examined advertised rental prices for comparable units in the area, which suggests that the appeal site may have been marketed at a significantly higher rate. This elevated pricing could have deterred potential tenants and contributed to the prolonged vacancy.

11. The appellant states that the new shopfront will be active and transparent, and its design is consistent with town centre character. The Council has provided examples of the internal layout of existing betting shops and amusement centres, including the premises at 9 Mackenzie Street, demonstrating that such uses typically incorporate internal partitions and screening to support customer privacy. As a result, these features diminish the active frontage normally associated with Class E units in retail parades, where visible goods and open displays encourage footfall and shopper engagement. I concur that the presence of active frontage is a key contributor to the overall vitality and attractiveness of the shopping centre.
12. I have considered the appellant's argument that betting shops are identified as main town centre uses under the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), and that they can contribute to vitality and viability through footfall and linked trips. The appellant has also referenced several appeal decisions in Eltham, Huddersfield, Newcastle, and Basingstoke, which support the view that betting shops may play a role in sustaining town centre activity. Additionally, I have reviewed the footfall surveys submitted for six Betfred locations, which purport to demonstrate high levels of customer activity.
13. However, the central issue in this case is not the general role of betting shops, but the specific impact of their over-concentration on the vitality and viability of this town centre. Paragraph 90 of the Framework empowers planning authorities to define the hierarchy of town centres and the appropriate mix of uses within primary shopping areas, an approach that is not based solely on footfall metrics. While Betfred betting shops may be trading successfully at their current locations, the evidence presented indicates that their footfalls are notably lower than those of their surrounding retail units. Consequently, the development would not accord with Policies S8, S15 and S17 of Slough Local Plan, as explained above.

People's health and wellbeing

14. Policies 11 and 12 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted December 2008) stipulate that development of new facilities which serve the recognised diverse needs of local communities will be encouraged and, should be laid out and designed to create safe and attractive environments in accordance with the recognised best practice for designing out crime.
15. The appellant has indicated that there is no evidence to suggest the relocated betting shop would harm local well-being and Betfred has operated nearby without complaints or antisocial behaviour. The Council has highlighted a strong correlation between the location of gambling establishments and areas of multiple deprivation, emphasising the need to safeguard vulnerable communities from the harms associated with easy access to gambling. This concern is illustrated by the

Council's mapping, which shows a concentration of gambling centres in Slough's most deprived areas, as the major cause of the harms.

16. The relationship is further backed by the House of Commons Briefing Paper No. 6919 (17 December 2020) provided by the Council, which cites evidence from The Estates Gazette indicating that over half of the UK's 6,000 betting shops are situated in the most deprived areas, with 56% of those operated by the four largest firms located within the top 30% most deprived areas in England. This data reinforces the Council's position that there is a direct and concerning correlation.
17. The appellant has not provided any evidence to suggest that the appeal proposal would safeguard the health and wellbeing of the people. Therefore, the development would be against Policies 11 and 12 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document, as detailed above.

Other Matters

18. I have also considered the appellant's claim that the proposal would bring a vacant unit back into use and contribute to the evening economy, enhancing local vibrancy and passive surveillance within the town centre. While these benefits may offer some economic and social value, I attach limited weight to them. In my view, they do not outweigh the adverse impact the proposal would have on the overall vitality of the town centre, nor the potential implications for public health and wellbeing.

Conclusion

19. Having considered all other material factors relevant to the proposed development, none provide sufficient justification to depart from the provisions of the development plan. Accordingly, and for the reasons set out above, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.

A Oyebade

INSPECTOR