



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 02 July 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3365263**

**18 Upton Court Road, Slough SL3 7LY**

- 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 Lavinder Bains against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref. is P/10326/002.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey side and rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and terrace and their surroundings.

### Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling occupies a corner site in a 'Residential Area of Exceptional Character' (the 'RAEC') as designated in Policy H12 of The Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004 ('The Local Plan'). From my visit to the area and the site I was able to observe that although the parkland on the opposite side of the road from the appeal dwelling makes an important contribution to the street scene of Upton Court Road, the combination of the roadside verge and street trees and the space and greenery within the dwelling curtilages is also significant.
4. In this appeal, there are two factors in particular at No. 18 that carry great weight in the decision on an application for an extension of a substantial scale. Firstly, the house is already of a large size, leaving a fairly modest area of garden. In this regard, I note from the officer's report that the footprints of the original and existing dwelling are 80sqm and 194sqm respectively.
5. The now proposed further increase of 57sqm would result in a total footprint of 251sqm, which would be over 3 times the size of the original. The effect of this cumulative increase is that whilst in my view the property still makes a positive contribution to the street scene, the garden that remains is important to the retention of adequate amenity in both residential and visual terms.
6. I acknowledge that to a large extent the amount of garden space appropriate for residents is only partly a planning issue (although there are minimum standards in many cases) and more a matter of personal preference and/or the quality of the space as regards its amenity value. However, in this case the existing side garden

to Buckland Avenue is significant to the setting of the property and its location in the RAEC designated under Local Plan Policy H12.

7. This is especially the case because of the second particular factor that applies to No. 18, namely its corner location. With the existing gap between the dwelling's flank wall and the boundary fence there is an 'open' area consistent with the building line set by the houses in Buckland. Quite apart from its contribution to spaciousness, this part of the garden includes trees which add to the verdant qualities of the locality.
8. The appeal scheme would leave a gap to the boundary fence of just 1.5m at the front, and although this widens slightly towards the rear, there would be a 10m depth of side garden, including trees, lost to the 4m high extension. Although I consider the extension to be of an acceptable design in itself, this would be more than outweighed by its excessive size in relation to the plot, with an outcome of a cramped siting and loss of openness that would be harmful to the RAEC.
9. I have had regard to all other matters raised in the grounds of appeal, but overall consider that effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and terrace and their surroundings would be in conflict with the Council's policies. These include, in addition to the aforementioned Policy H12, some parts of Local Plan Policy EN1 (Standard of Design); Policy EN2 (Extensions); H14 (Amenity Space) and Policy H15 (Residential Extensions). There would also be harmful conflict with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework revised December 2024.
10. For the above reasons the appeal fails.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR