



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3359886

3 Long Furlong Drive, Slough SL2 1RD

- 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 Veerinder Singh Bhoda against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/20647/000.
 - The development is a retrospective side, rear and front single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal form uses the description on the decision notice. However, I am satisfied that the description on the application form, which I have used above, accurately describes the development to which the appeal relates. Clarification has been sought on the appellant's name as two different ones were used on the application and appeal forms. The appellant has confirmed that there was just some variation in the last name. As a result, the appellant's name has been taken from the application form.
4. Prior to this decision, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that they do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal and proceeding without further consultation with the main parties would not be prejudicial to their respective cases.

Main Issue

5. The Council have raised no objections to the siting and scale of the rear and side extension, and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, and with the above in mind, my recommendation focusses on the width of the front extension and the material choices of both the front and rear extensions and specifically their effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is an end terrace property within a staggered row of four. They have a pleasant uniformity and repeating rhythm through their external materials,

design, size and front elevations. Wider dwellings are also generally uniform with only a modest variance in material choices. Any instances of front extensions to properties are small scale and recessive. The street scene is pleasant and consistent which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The front extension partially spans across the front elevation of the property and replaces an infilled flat roof porch. It gives an appearance of an overemphasised extension which detracts from the originality of the front elevation. Moreover, its increased width sits uncomfortably with the prevailing character of the four terraced dwellings, their modest porches and relatively unaltered front elevations.
8. The expanse of the grey render against the red brick of the property in conjunction with the width and substance of the extension contrasts harmfully with the wider row. It presents a stark and alien feature which doesn't follow the conventional pattern. Render is not the prevailing material nor dominant within the consistent set of four dwellings. Whilst the appellant has advised that they had the intention to render the property, this is not a matter to be determined as part of this appeal and therefore only little weight can be given to this. In relation to the rear extension, timber cladding is typically seen on sheds or outbuildings rather than extensions. However, in this instance, it is of a high quality and sits comfortably with the dwelling. It is sufficiently shielded so as not to detract from the street scene.
9. With the above in mind, and notwithstanding the lack of harm found to the rear which is neutral in any case, the proposal causes harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of the Slough Local Plan 2004, Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework 2008, the Slough Local Development Framework Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document and the Framework which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matters

10. Whilst there are some inaccuracies in the Council's report surrounding the acceptability of the proposal, the reason for refusal is clear in describing what is considered unacceptable. Any lingering concerns over the Council's handling of the planning application are matters for the main parties to resolve outside of the appeal process. As are any enforcement proceedings. I have no compelling reason to disagree with the Council's findings on the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The appeal scheme would give rise to the harm I have described and, as a result, not comply with the development plan. I would give this substantial weight. I have been given no compelling reason, taking into account the weight I would attach to the other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR