

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PART 1

FOR INFORMATION

Planning Appeal Decisions

May 2026

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

WARD(S) ALL

Ref	Appeal	Decision
6004839	<p>96A, Upton Road, Slough, SL1 2AW</p> <p>Retrospective application for retention of existing dwelling not built in accordance with approved plans.</p> <p>'The site benefits from planning permission 2 November 2023 for alterations to the former chalet style bungalow, incorporating 8m deep ground floor rear extension and modification of roof to form habitable room in the roof space with roof lights. The alterations were not built in accordance with approved plans, and a retrospective planning application for retention was submitted. The LPA considered that the departures from the approved plans were unacceptable, including increased height of roof to rear extension, alterations to the front elevation (porch, first floor window, bay window and rooflight window). Planning permission was refused on the grounds that there was an unacceptable impact upon the character of the area.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector concluded that whilst the dwelling incorporated modern design, it was not inappropriate, and was compatible with the character of the area. Planning conditions include restrictions on further roof alterations and flank windows, and requiring the side facing windows serving a landing, to be obscurely glazed.'</p>	<p>Appeal Granted 22nd April 2026</p>
APP/J0350/C/23/3335935 APP/J0350/C/23/3335936	<p>16, Mill Street, Slough, SL2 5DH</p> <p>Without planning permission. the material change of use for the storage of motor vehicles</p>	<p>Appeals Dismissed 27th April 2026</p>

6002717	<p data-bbox="596 107 1241 143">109, Harrow Road, Slough, SL3 8SJ</p> <p data-bbox="596 179 1241 318">The erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, with a maximum height of 3m, and an eaves height of 3m</p> <p data-bbox="596 353 1241 837">The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not significantly harm the amenity of neighbours. The decision noted that the substantial size and spaciousness of the existing gardens at 107, 109, 111. This combined with the fact the extension would be of limited height with a flat roof would ensure the extension would be unobtrusive and would not result in a significant feeling of enclosure and would not reduce the amount of daylight or sunlight reaching the neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the Inspector stated that the Council's Residential Extensions SPD limits are guidance and found that the 6m extension was acceptable in this specific context.</p>	Appeal Granted 27 th April 2026
---------	---	---



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2026

by P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004839

96a Upton Road, Slough SL1 2AW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Manpreet Khokar against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is P/12464/014.
 - The development is alterations to former bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to former bungalow at 96a Upton Road, Slough SL1 2AW in accordance with the terms of application ref: P/12464/014 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) This permission relates to the following approved plans: 1:1250 location plan, UTD-1001 Rev. D1 (pre-existing ground floor plan), UTD-1002 Rev. D1 (pre-existing first floor plan), UTD-1003 Rev. D1 (pre-existing roof plan), UTD-1004 Rev. D1 (existing ground floor plan), UTD-1005 Rev. D1 (existing first floor plan), UTD-1006 Rev. D1 (existing loft plan), UTD-1007 Rev. D1 (existing roof plan), UTD-1008 Rev. D1 (pre-existing and existing front elevation), UTD-1009 Rev. D1 (pre-existing and existing rear elevations), UTD-1010 Rev. D1 Rev. D1 (pre-existing and existing side elevation), UTD-1011 Rev. D1 (pre-existing and existing side elevation), UTD-1012 Rev. D1 (proposed block plan and location plan).
 - 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), no first floor windows, other than those hereby approved, shall be formed in the flank elevations of the development.
 - 3) The first-floor window in the western flank elevation of the development serving the landing hereby approved shall be glazed with obscure glass and any opening shall be at a high level (1.8m above internal floor height) only.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the terms and provisions of Class B to Part 1 of Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no addition or alteration to the roof shall be undertaken.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey dwelling of rendered elevations with slate covered deep hipped roof with small central crown roof. It lies along a residential road which contains a variety of sizes and styles of dwellings. To the east of the appeal site is a row of two storey modest cottages. To the west is a pair of traditional semi-detached dwellings and opposite the site are a couple of modern detached dwellings.
4. The appeal site formerly contained a chalet bungalow of traditional design with steep hipped tiled roof. Permission was granted in 2023 for various extensions including modification of the roof to create habitable accommodation within the roofspace (the 2023 scheme).¹ However, the extensions and alterations to the original dwelling that have been undertaken and for which permission is now sought through this appeal do not accord with this approved scheme. The differences include a revised main roof, larger windows and front porch of different design and higher roof over the rear two storey extension.
5. The departures from the approved 2023 scheme have resulted in a building of somewhat more modern appearance incorporating flat roofs to the front porch and windows with square bays. The windows are also greater in size with larger panes emphasising this more modern approach with the bay window at first floor set into the eaves and a large off-set rooflight.
6. Whilst this has resulted in a building which contrasts with its immediate neighbours which are of more traditional appearance, it does not jar unacceptably with them. These adjoining dwelling themselves contain some flat roofed elements with others sited further from the appeal site also having a more modern appearance. The large porch is slightly over-sized and has a rather awkward junction with the ground floor bay window, but this has a fairly minor impact on its overall appearance and that of that of the wider street scene. The first-floor window is only marginally set into the eaves and consists of individual vertical panes reflecting the appearance of the more traditional bay windows of nearby dwellings. The roof light is large in size, but neither this element nor the bay windows appear incongruous as part of the overall modern design approach nor do they unacceptably detract from the wider street scene which contains dwellings of varied age, design and appearance.
7. The roof of the two-storey rear extension is of the same ridge height as the main roof resulting in a long flank elevation with continuous height of roof located on the eastern site boundary extending deep into the site. However, it does not appear unduly out of scale notwithstanding that it can be seen within the Upton Road street scene due to the open gap comprising the side garden of the adjoining dwelling at number 94. Furthermore, given the set back of the dwelling within the street scene, this element is not dominant within it nor due to the gap does it dominate the adjoining dwelling.
8. The rear of the dwelling can be seen from Melrose Gardens to the rear (north) of the site. The main difference compared to the 2023 scheme is the increased bulk of roof over the two-storey rear extension, but this additional bulk is seen against the main roof and does not appear unduly dominating or incongruous.

¹ LPA ref: P/12464/011 approved 2 November 2023

9. Overall, whilst the dwelling appears of greater bulk compared to the 2023 scheme it is not overly dominant as viewed within the street scene or wider area. The overall design approach is overtly more modern and whilst some elements appear over-sized, these nevertheless combine to provide a holistic approach which overall does not unacceptably detract from the street scene and in fact adds to the variety of styles apparent within it.
10. As such the development does not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It complies with Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008-2026 DPD (2008) and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan (2004) which seek sustainable, high-quality design that improves the quality of the environment and respects and is compatible with its surroundings.
11. Whilst not entirely consistent with the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines SPD (2010) which seeks to ensure that extensions reflect the form, materials and design of the original dwelling, the 2023 scheme provides a fall-back position in this instance. Whilst the appeal scheme adopts a more modern, holistic approach, that is not in itself inappropriate and for the reasons set out above is compatible with the character of the area.
12. In addition, the development would be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks good design that functions well and is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

13. As the development has already been completed there is no need for a standard time condition. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which have been reviewed in the context of Framework paragraph 57 and the wording of which has been amended accordingly. A condition to refer to the approved plans is necessary in the interests of clarity and proper planning. I also agree that conditions to ensure that obscure glazing is used in the landing window in the flank elevation and that no further first floor windows are inserted in the flank elevations of the development are necessary to prevent overlooking and to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties. The Council has also suggested a condition to restrict further roof additions or alterations. Given the extent of increase in roof bulk and height that has been undertaken I agree that the effect of any further additions to the roof should be controlled so as to enable an assessment on the character of the area and living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

14. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2026

by **C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002717

109 Harrow Road, Slough, SL3 8SJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sethu Raamasubbu against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is Y/20831/001.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a 6m single storey rear extension with maximum height of 3m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for a 6m single storey rear extension with maximum height of 3m in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: Y/20831/001 and the details submitted with it, including drawings: Location Plan (ref TQRQM25126063229107), Site Plan Proposed (ref TQRQM25126063504848), Proposed Plan (ref 040107-PR001 Version C), Proposed Elevation (ref 040107-PR002 Version C), Proposed Elevation (040107-PR003 Version C).

Preliminary Matters

2. Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)(GPDO) grants permission for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
3. Where any objections are received to a proposal, the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises. Paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the LPA to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. I have considered the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No's 107 and 111 Harrow Road.

Reasons

5. During my site visit I observed that the rear garden space of No. 109 is of a substantial size as a result of its generous length. It also appeared that the

neighbouring gardens of No's 107 and 111 were of similar proportions. With regards to the scheme before me, I acknowledge that the proposed extension would be taller than the existing boundary treatments on either side of the garden, and as such, it would be partly visible from the neighbouring gardens of No's 107 and 111.

6. However, the size of the gardens along the terrace clearly provides a distinct feeling of spaciousness and openness. As a result, I do not consider that the extension would result in the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings having a perception of being cramped or enclosed. Indeed, the flat roof design of the extension would mean that it would be an unobtrusive feature which would not result in harm to outlook.
7. Given that the extension would be of limited height, and that the rear gardens are north facing, there is no reason for me to conclude that the proposal would reduce the amount of daylight or sunlight reaching the neighbouring properties. In addition, the single storey nature of the scheme means that there would be no privacy concerns.
8. On that basis the proposed extension would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would therefore conform with the aforementioned legislative requirements. In reaching my decision, I have also had regard to the development plan policies set out within the Council's decision notice, notably Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006 – 2026) and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Slough Local Plan, March 2004. Taken together, the relevant aspects of these policies seek to ensure that new developments, including extensions, are well designed, including by preserving living conditions. The proposal would conform with these aims.
9. The Council has also noted the requirements of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, January 2010 (the SPD). This sets out that, for terraced properties, rear extensions should not exceed 3.65 metres in length. However, this is just guidance, and I have set out why the length of the proposed development would not result in harm in this instance. As such, the proposal would therefore conform with the overarching aims of the SPD, particularly in relation to good design and living conditions.

Other Matters

10. On the basis of the approved plans, I am satisfied that the width of the proposed extension would not impinge on the existing access that exists to the neighbouring property at No. 107. Matters relating to any issues that might affect the foundations of neighbouring properties are not a planning matter. Finally, matters relating to construction noise are covered by separate legislation, as noted within the Council's officer report.

Conditions

11. Paragraph A4(11) of Part 1, Class A of the GDPO sets out that the development must be carried out in accordance with approved details. I have also listed the relevant plans as part of this decision.
12. I do not find it necessary to impose a condition that would remove certain permitted development rights. Indeed, given the single storey nature of the

proposed extension, there is no reason for me to conclude that the installation of additional windows or roof lights in future would result in any harm. Any proposal to enable the proposed extension to be utilised for anything other than ancillary space would clearly require separate approval.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed, and prior approval should be granted.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR