



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3359570

93 Ledgers Road, Slough SL1 2RQ

- 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 Tariq Ali against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/20708/000.
 - The development is application for single storey detached outbuilding with flat roof for the use of Gym and Home Office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey detached outbuilding with flat roof for the use of Gym and Home Office at 93 Ledgers Road, Slough SL1 2RQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20708/000, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no: 826-OB-01 Rev 2 except in respect of the details showing the extent of the outbuilding shown on the Location Plan and Block Plan.
 - 2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be formed in the southern flank elevation of the development hereby permitted.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the detached outbuilding hereby permitted shall be used only for domestic purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the main dwelling and shall not be used as a separate self-contained residential dwelling or for any industrial, commercial or business use.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

2. A building has been erected that is similar in scale and appearance to that shown on the submitted drawing. However, a revised drawing was submitted with the appeal (drawing no 826-OB-01 Rev 2). The appellant identifies that the drawings that were originally submitted to the Council did not accurately show the development that has been built and the revised drawing sought to address this. The appellant identified on the application form that the development has been completed, and it is clear that the application sought permission to retain what was built. The Council also determined the application on that basis, given the language of its report. Therefore, I am satisfied that interested parties would not be

prejudiced if the appeal was determined in accordance with the revised plans given that the revised plans merely depict what has actually been built.

3. I have removed the word 'retrospective' from the description of development in the banner heading and my formal decision, as this is not an act of development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The outbuilding has been built to the rear of 93 Ledgers Road (no 93). The house is an end terrace two storey dwelling and there is an alleyway between it and the neighbouring property. It has a relatively deep garden, similar in size to the neighbouring dwellings and to the rear of it is an embankment leading to a railway line.
6. An outbuilding has been built at the rear of the garden, the location of which is generally in accordance with the submitted plans. This is a single storey building with a shallow mono pitched roof and is constructed from red brick and white UPVC windows and doors. The outbuilding extends most of the width of the garden but maintains a gap between it and the boundary wall with 91 Ledgers Road.
7. Policy EX48 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that the minimum garden or amenity space required for a three bedroom dwelling, like the appeal property, should be 9 metres (m) or 50 square metres (sqm). As identified by the appellant the separation distance between the outbuilding and the rear wall of no 93 is around 11m and based on the information before me, I find no reason to dispute with this figure. As such, the retained garden exceeds that suggested in the Policy EX48 of the SPD.
8. Policy EX39 of the SPD identifies a number of criteria that shall be used to determine the acceptable scale / size of outbuildings. It is not disputed between the parties that the footprint of the outbuilding is larger than the original dwelling. However, the plot for no 93 is large and the appellant identifies that the garden space between the two buildings would be approximately 87 sqm and the Council do not dispute this. As such, the remaining garden space is significantly larger than that recommended in the SPD for a dwelling of this size. Additionally, the appellant identifies that they intend to occupy the dwelling, and the outbuilding would provide ancillary living space for them and their family. The building is located towards the rear of the garden, and the central garden area is relatively rectangular in shape and therefore provides useable space for typical garden activities, such as hanging out washing and socialising.
9. The dwellings in the area are a mix of terrace or semi-detached properties and as a result of this high-density development, the rear gardens are generally screened by the houses themselves. Whilst there is an alleyway between no 93 and the neighbouring dwelling, the single storey scale of the building means that it is not notably visible within the street scene. Even when viewed from passing trains, the outbuilding would be seen alongside other outbuildings in a predominantly residential area where this would not be uncommon. Additionally, these would only

be brief, glimpsed views. The garden has a relatively flat ground level, and the outbuilding appears to have been built at a similar level to the host dwelling. The garden is also bound by existing boundary walls and the railway embankment to the rear which screens the outbuilding from further viewpoints.

10. The gross internal area of the outbuilding itself is relatively large when compared to the footprint of the host dwelling and other buildings nearby. However, it is a single storey building and when taking into consideration the size of the retained garden land and the scale of the two-storey host dwelling, the outbuilding appears subordinate to the host dwelling. Additionally, the modest height of the outbuilding ensures it does not appear dominant alongside the host dwelling or from nearby gardens. Given the modest height of the proposal, as well as the existing pattern of development, the outbuilding is also relatively well screened and even if it was seen, it would be viewed as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling. Consequently, the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and generally accords with the criteria set out in the SPD.
11. Each case must be determined on its own merits and there are site specific circumstances that have led to this decision. As such, there is no substantive reasoning to refuse permission based upon the assumption permission here would set a precedent for other schemes nearby.
12. Therefore, the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and granting permission would not set a precedent for similar development. Consequently, the development would comply with Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of The Local Plan for Slough and Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document. These expect development, amongst other matters, to achieve high-quality design having regard to matters such as, scale, height, massing/bulk, layout, siting, building form and design, visual impact and relationship to nearby properties.

Other Matter

13. Although tenancy agreements are not typically material planning considerations, the availability and usability of the garden space for current and future occupants has been assessed and found to be policy compliant.

Conditions

14. Given that the development has been completed, the statutory commencement condition is not necessary. However, a condition requiring the development is carried out in accordance with the plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. However, I have revised this to state that it should be except in respect of the details showing the extent of the outbuilding shown on the Location Plan and Block Plan which show part of the building demolished which is not sought as part of this appeal. The Location Plan still identifies the location of the appeal site, and the Existing Site Layout shows the siting and extent of the outbuilding with respect to the host dwelling and other buildings nearby at scale and thus is suitable in place of the Block Plan.
15. Condition 2 is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of 95 Ledgers Road with regard to privacy.

16. A condition specifying that the building should only be used for domestic purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of no 93 [3]. However, I have amended the suggested wording of this condition to remove reference to kitchen facilities as it has not been substantiated that the installation of a kitchen results in a material change of use from an annexe to a separate residential unit. If there was a material change of use this would require a separate grant of planning permission. I have also made amendments to the condition in the interests of precision and enforceability.

Conclusion

17. The development complies with the development plan, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR