
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by **Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/J0350/Y/24/3354119

The Ostrich Inn, High Street, Colnbrook, Slough SL3 0JZ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr B Johar against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/12258/014.
 - The works proposed were originally described as 'single storey side/rear extension and alterations to breakfast room'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J0350/W/24/3354211

The Ostrich Inn, High Street, Colnbrook, Slough SL3 0JZ

- 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 B Johar against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/12258/015.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'erection of single storey side/rear extension and internal alterations to breakfast room'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The details in the heading are taken from the application forms. While the descriptions of the proposed works and development vary slightly, the drawings are the same for both the listed building consent appeal and the planning appeal. A single scheme is therefore proposed. On that basis, despite the legal regimes for the appeals being different, I have dealt with them together to avoid repetition.
3. Internal alterations to the breakfast room were omitted from the scheme prior to the Council determining the applications. However, based on my observations on site and the drawings, other site alterations are proposed. I consider these below.
4. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published after the Council made its decisions. However, the main parties had an opportunity to comment on this during the appeals. Moreover, the differences between the current and prior versions of the Framework are negligible in terms of their relevance to the main issues. Therefore, I have not sought further views from the main parties about the matter.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the proposed works and development would preserve the listed buildings or their settings or any features of special

architectural or historic interest they possess, and whether the character or appearance of the Colnbrook Conservation Area (CA) would be preserved or enhanced.

Reasons

6. The site includes The Ostrich Inn and land to its sides and rear that mostly relates to a car park. The inn comprises two connected listed buildings. The principal building is grade II* listed¹. The statutory list description sets out that it is a 16th century, timber framed building with plaster infilling, a machine tile roof, gabled ends, a central carriageway, an oversailing first floor on brackets and corbels, and a range of fenestration. Despite having clearly been subject to several interventions, including rear extensions, its special interest and significance largely derive from its traditional construction and architectural features, together with its age, rarity and continued use as an inn.
7. The other building is to the east and grade II listed². It is described as dating from the 16th or 17th centuries and includes two storeys, front facing gables, first floor sashes with moulded entablature and modern shop windows. According to the appellant's mapping analysis, it was likely originally a house that was potentially joined to the inn during the mid to late 20th century. It has also been subject to alterations and extensions over time, including a two storey rear projection at the building's outer edge, a single storey monopitched element next to it which is attached to an ostensibly historic two storey gabled range, and a modern single storey kitchen extension. Its special interest and significance are informed largely by its traditional and vernacular construction. However, though the rear extensions are eclectic, each is distinct and the legibility of the buildings' evolution add to the special interest and significance.
8. High Street forms part of the settings of the listed buildings, which emphasise their historic and continued use as an inn. While the area to the rear was originally likely a service area and is now dominated by car parking, views from there have some value given the distinctness of the rear extensions, as described above. The listed buildings plainly also have group value in operating as a single entity.
9. The proposal is principally for a single storey side and rear extension to the eastern building. Based on the proposed floor plan, the extension would sit in line with the front of the building and wrap around the two storey projection to join the rear wall of the kitchen extension. In order to accommodate tapering of the site, part of the extension's side wall would be angled and the roof would include three shallow pitched but relatively long slopes, particularly its rearward ones. The drawings also identify the repositioning of a painted sign, the replacement of a rear window to the kitchen extension with a door, and parking alterations. Additionally, fencing to the side and rear would be removed to accommodate the scheme, and a bin storage area beside the building would be relocated.
10. Listed building consent and planning permission have been granted in part for a single storey side and rear extension to the eastern listed building³. While that extension would also wrap around the building to join the kitchen extension and be

¹ List entry name: The Ostrich Public House; List entry number: 1124367

² List entry name: Number 110 and house adjoining to west (Anthonys (79) Ltd); List entry number: 1124408

³ Council references: P/12258/012; P/12258/013

similar to the proposal in other respects, it would project to the rear to a lesser extent and feature a shorter angled section and rearward roof slopes.

11. In joining the rear wall of the kitchen extension and due to its size, the proposed extension would result in modern built form enveloping and dominating older parts of the eastern listed building. This would undermine the distinctness of each element to the rear and thus weaken the buildings' legibility. In addition, the proposed shallow but relatively long rearward roof slopes would be unsympathetic of and poorly juxtaposed against the generally steeper pitched and proportionally shorter roof slopes of the inn, particularly those over the adjacent kitchen extension. The proliferation of incohesive roof slopes would detract from the buildings. Further, the interaction between the proposed extension's roof and the kitchen extension is unclear as the precise roof form of the latter is not shown on the drawings in detail. In these ways, and given the group value identified, the proposal would harm the special interest and significance of both listed buildings.
12. In contrast, as the approved scheme would be smaller, the distinctness of the existing rear elements would be less affected and its shorter rearward roof slopes would be less prominent and jarring with the existing roof slopes. The approved scheme does not therefore justify the greater degree of harm that would be caused by the proposed works and development.
13. The other elements of the proposal specified on the drawings would seemingly alter modern features and so not be harmful. However, for the reasons specified, the scheme would fail to preserve the listed buildings. The replacement of fencing and the relocation of bin storage would not overcome the harm identified. Consequently, the scheme conflicts with the purposes of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), which require special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
14. The Council raises no objection about the CA. Its special interest and significance are informed largely by the surviving medieval street patterns of High Street, Bridge Street and Park Street and the range of historic buildings within it. The inn is a prominent and important positive contributor to the CA. Notwithstanding my concerns about the rear parts of the site and the scheme, views from High Street would be focused mostly on the front of the extension, which would be similar to the approved scheme. Having regard to the prominence of the rear elements from High Street, the scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. As such, there would be no conflict with the purpose of section 72(1) of the Act, which requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. However, this does not resolve the harm to the listed buildings.
15. In this case, the degree of harm to the significance of the listed buildings would be less than substantial in the terms of the Framework. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that where a scheme will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the scheme's public benefits including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.

16. The appellant has put forward that the scheme would provide additional space that would be used flexibly and as a conference room, which is sought after given the site's proximity to Heathrow Airport, and thereby draw visitors to the area that may engage with the local economy. It would reportedly also create just over two full time equivalent jobs and contribute to the viability of the business so as to ensure the conservation of the inn. However, it has not been demonstrated that similar benefits could not be delivered in a less harmful way, such as by implementing the approved scheme. Furthermore, no substantive evidence has been provided which establishes the level of need for conference space or indicates that the inn is unviable or at risk of becoming so without the scheme.
17. Taken together, the public benefits that would arise are modest. In contrast, even the less than substantial harm to the listed buildings must carry great weight. Overall, the sum of the public benefits is insufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the listed buildings.
18. The scheme is therefore contrary to section 16 of the Framework, which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment. In addition to this and the abovementioned conflicts with the Act, in respect of Appeal B, the scheme conflicts with Core Policy 8 and Core Policy 9 of the Core Strategy⁴ and policies EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough. Among other things, these require schemes to respect the character and distinctiveness of existing buildings and their surroundings. The latter policy also specifies that extensions should be compatible with the scale, form, design and proportions of original structures.

Other Matters

19. There are discrepancies between the buildings as observed on site and shown on the drawings. For example, the side wall of the inn to which the extension would attach is slightly angled whereas the ground floor plan indicates that it is straight. Notably, the applicant's intentions for a multi-paned sash window in situ in that wall and a side window to the kitchen extension, which are shown on the existing elevation drawings, are unclear. It is also unclear how the first floor side windows shown for retention would be accommodated given the height of the extension's roof. The Council has made little to no reference to these matters. However, given the outcomes of the appeals, I have not assessed the implications of these otherwise potentially relevant considerations. Similarly, heritage assets beyond those identified in this letter are present in the vicinity of the site, but there is no need to consider these further for the same reason.

Conclusions

20. The conflicts with the Act and the Framework are determinative for Appeal A. In respect of Appeal B, the proposed development is contrary to the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be reached otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
21. Consequently, both appeals should be dismissed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR

⁴ Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document