



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2025

by **C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/W/24/3355245

5 Meadfield Road, Slough SL3 8HL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land carried out without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Palwinder Singh Gill against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/06440/016.
 - The application sought planning permission for alterations to first floor and loft plans and amendments to the elevations, without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref P/06440/013, dated 26 April 2021.
 - The condition in dispute is No. 2 which states that: The development hereby approved shall be implemented only in accordance with the following plans and drawings hereby approved by the Local Planning Authority: a) Location Plan, Floor Plan and Elevations (Dwg No SG/5/2021) received 13/04/2021, b) Transport Statement received 01/04/2020, c) Refuse Entering and Exiting (TR-08) 10.12m received 17/03/2021, d) Refuse Entering and Existing (TR-09) 5m received 17/03/2021, e) Refuse Entering and Existing (TR-09) 5m received 17/03/2021.
 - 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 and to comply with the Policies in the Development Plan
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The original planning permission allowed for the construction of a commercial unit at ground floor level and a two-bedroom flat at first floor level. An application to vary that permission was subsequently approved which enabled the provision of a dormer within the roof space of the building¹. The appeal before me seeks to regularise a breach of that permission.
3. Based on the Council's reason for refusal, the main issue for this appeal is the effect of the development on character and appearance.

Reasons

4. The Council's officer report provides the plans for the dormer as part of the previously approved application (Ref: P/06440/014). The plans demonstrate that the dormer would have been of a fairly modest size, including by being set in from either side of the roof, while also providing space below the ridge and above the eaves. It would therefore have appeared as a well designed and natural addition to the building.

¹ Council ref: P/06440/014

5. In contrast, the dormer that has been built is considerably larger than the approved scheme. Indeed, it takes up much more of the roof space and appears as an overly dominant and imposing feature which clearly detracts from the immediate surroundings. Of particular note is the lack of space between the top of the dormer and the ridge, as well as a similar lack of space to the eaves below. These aspects contravene the guidance contained within Policy EX34 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, January 2010 (the SPD). While only guidance, the conflict with it is indicative of a poorly designed development that has resulted in harm.
6. I acknowledge that the dormer can only be glimpsed side on from Meadfield Road itself. However, the rear of No. 5 does face onto a publicly accessible area where there is parking and service areas for the various commercial premises and dwellings nearby. The development can also be seen from the parking area of the adjacent Harrow Market shopping precinct. As such, it is a clearly visible feature within the street scene.
7. The appellant has sought to draw my attention to a very similar dormer that has been constructed within the rear roof space of the neighbouring property, No. 3. However, the Council has explained that that development does not have planning permission and that it is therefore subject to ongoing enforcement action. As such, its presence attracts very little weight in my decision making. Similarly, another scheme at 120 Hawthorne Crescent is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme given that it could have been built to a similar specification using permitted development rights. It is also quite some distance from the appeal site.
8. As a result, I conclude that the development has resulted in harm to character and appearance. It therefore conflicts with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Core Strategy (2006 – 2026) and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough, 2004. Taken together, the relevant aspects of these policies seek to ensure that new development, including residential extensions, is well designed and that it preserves character and appearance. There is also conflict with the guidance contained within the SPD which has similar aims.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR