



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

**by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 13 October 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3369460**

**9 Hinksey Close, Slough, SL3 8EB**

- 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 Mrs V Rohira against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is P/20217/007.
  - The development proposed is retrospective application for a front porch, two storey side, 6m single storey wrap around, part first floor rear extension and a single storey rear outbuilding for use of home office, gym, shower room and storage with pitched roof with render following demolition of existing garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to front porch, two storey side, 6m single storey wrap around, part first floor rear extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey rear outbuilding for use of home office, gym, shower room and storage with pitched roof with render following demolition of existing garage at 9 Hinksey Close, Slough, SL3 8EB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20217/007, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions.
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the following approved plans: ART/2024/REG9HC/OUT AE EE, ART/2024/REG9HC/APPOUT and ART/2024/REG9HC/SPLP.
  - 2) 6. Notwithstanding the terms and provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), the outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used for domestic purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling, with no cooking facilities installed, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The outbuilding shall not be used as separate self-contained residential accommodation or for any industrial, commercial or business use.

### Preliminary matters

2. The proposed development has already been implemented. The application description as set out on the council's decision notice refers to the proposal as being a retrospective application. As planning permission cannot be granted retrospectively, I have deleted this wording in this decision.
3. The description for the proposal does not specifically refer to various works that the applicant has sought to regularise as part of the application. The council has

however confirmed that in addition to the items set out in the description for the proposal the following works do fall within the terms of the application: Also, the doors and Juliet balcony in the flat roofed dormer extension are clearly addressed in the Council's planning application report.

- Coloured render on the whole house
- Raising the main ridge line of the host dwelling by 50mm
- Replacement first floor landing window
- Replacement first floor bedroom window with doors and Juliet balcony
- Replacement of first floor windows with smaller windows

Also, the doors and Juliet balcony in the flat roofed dormer extension are clearly addressed in the Council's planning application report. The appeal has been determined on this basis.

4. The appellant has submitted a revised elevation drawing with the appeal (Drawing No: ART/2024/REG9HCPE). It includes cladding at first floor level on the front elevation; and a smaller first floor window above the main entrance to the dwelling. It also partially addresses the council's third reason for refusal concerning the accuracy of the submitted drawings, by including obscure glazed Juliet balconies and obscure glazing in the first floor side window, although it does not include the solar panels on the roof of the outbuilding. Other than the obscure glazed Juliet balcony and side facing window, which could be dealt with by condition, these changes and the existing solar panels have a material impact on the character and appearance of the resultant dwelling and outbuilding. As such they would first need to be formally considered by the Council and made available for public comment. Accordingly, I am unable to take them into account in the determination of the appeal proposal or deal with them by condition.

### **Main Issues**

5. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings, with particular regard to privacy.

### **Reasons**

6. Hinksey Close is characterised by small groups of uniformly designed pairs of semi-detached two storey houses and chalet dwellings from a limited range of designs. The pairs of two storey houses are symmetrically designed with large central front gable projections, gable ends, matching fenestration and external materials. Within the front gable projections this includes red tile hanging, buff coloured brick detailing and a panel of red bricks under the ground floor windows. To the sides of the front gables the dwellings have dark coloured horizontal boarding or tiles at first floor level and buff coloured brick at ground floor level. On some of the dwellings the colour of the bricks is deliberately swapped around. The dwellings predominantly have brown tiled roofs, although there are several red/dark grey tiled roofs.
7. A number of these dwellings have two storey side extensions, some of which are flush with the front building line and ridge line and others are recessed behind the front building line and set below the ridge line. Both forms have blended into and form an integral part of the existing street scene. These extensions have either

- horizontal timber cladding or red tiles at first floor level, and buff/red brick at ground floor level and on the flank elevations.
8. The chalet dwellings are similarly uniformly designed and have adjoining flat roofed dormers which sit below the ridge line and above the eaves level. They are primarily clad with red brick although some have white coloured dormer cheeks and cladding. Some of the dwellings also have white painted render at ground floor level on the front elevations and red/buff coloured bricks on their flank elevations. A number of these dwellings have been extended and most extensions follow a similar pattern and have been readily assimilated in to the street scene.
  9. The consistency in styles, detailing, materials and front building lines, together with the open plan nature of Hinksey Close contributes to its spacious, cohesive and uniform character and appearance. This consistency and character prevails within the local area.
  10. Notwithstanding this, there are a number of other extensions and alterations to both the houses and chalet dwellings in the local area which have introduced new styles of fenestration, detailing and mix of materials. They have blended in with the host buildings and the street scene with varying degrees of success. Much depends on how well they respect and reflect the existing proportions, design, detailing and use of materials and colours of the host and adjoining dwellings. Hence, rather than set a precedent they highlight the need to assess each proposal on its individual merits and in accordance with the prevailing planning policies. This is to ensure that they do not detract from the uniform and cohesive character and appearance and the area.
  11. The appeal dwelling is situated alongside the end of a row of chalet style houses and at the end of a row of two storey pairs of houses. It comprises one of a pair of symmetrically designed two storey dwellings with uniformly sized and designed fenestration; red tile hanging on the front gable with buff and red brick detailing; horizontal dark coloured cladding at first floor level to the sides of the front gable; and buff brick elsewhere.
  12. The front and side elevations of the attached dwelling at No.7 appear largely unaltered. To the rear it has a full width flat roofed single storey extension with buff coloured brick walls to match the host dwelling.
  13. Together and amongst other things Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) and policies H15, EN1 & EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough (LP) require new development to be of a high quality. It should be attractive, be compatible with its surroundings and improve the quality of the environment. Extensions should be of a high quality design and use materials which are in keeping with the host property and the surrounding area. They should be compatible with the scale, materials, form, design, fenestration, architectural style, layout and proportions of the host building. Poor designs that are not in keeping with their surroundings and those that result in overdevelopment of a site will be refused.
  14. Section 5 and Policies DP6, DP8 & EX26 of the Slough Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), advises that extensions should not be overbearing or result in loss of outlook or privacy. Two storey side extensions should be visually subordinate and should not detract from the original dwelling or the character of the surrounding area. They should be set back from

the front wall by at least one metre, from the main ridge height of the dwelling by 0.5 metres and from the side boundary by at least one metre to avoid a terracing effect. Two storey rear extensions should be subordinate to the host dwelling and their roofs should respect the original roof form.

15. SPD Policy EX33 advises that roof alterations which involve raising the ridge line will not normally be permitted. Rear dormer windows should be set below the main ridge line, above the eaves line and should not occupy more than 50% of the width of the roof slope. Paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework have similar objectives and seek to make effective use of land.
16. The proposed additions and changes to the appeal property have been implemented. Collectively and together with the recent rear flat roofed dormer extension they have materially changed the character and appearance of the host dwelling and interrupted the uniformity in the design and appearance of the pair of dwellings, the row of houses and the street scene.
17. The existing flat roofed rear dormer, which fills the whole of the roof-slope of the original dwelling, falls outside the scope of this appeal. It forms a dominant feature on the dwelling and within the rear garden environment, which is exacerbated by the introduction of full height doors and Juliet balcony.
18. The proposed single storey extension is visually uncluttered and whilst it is deep, it does not detract from the appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst the two storey pairs of semi-detached houses were not designed with rendered walls, the ground floor rear extension is largely contained within the rear garden. As such its white painted walls do not materially impact on the character of the pair of dwellings or the street scene.
19. Conversely the first floor rear wall appears rather stark and detracts from the uniformity of the pair of dwellings. This is due to a combination of the expanse of light coloured render and the introduction of smaller windows and its siting under the large flat roofed dormer extension. Together these features upset the uniformity of the pair of dwelling.
20. On their own the form and design of the proposed side/rear two story extension blend in appropriately with the original host dwelling. Whilst it sits just below the ridge line, this is consistent with the approved scheme and is also comparable with other side extensions within the locality. Its eaves line and the proportions and the alignment of its fenestration respect those of the original dwelling. The rear first floor projection would be modest in height and form and would sit alongside the existing rear two storey projection at No.11. Also, the full height doors and Juliet balcony help relieve the horizontal lines of the resultant rear elevation of the dwelling.
21. Notwithstanding this, due to the size and appearance of the flat roofed dormer together with its juxtaposition with the rear first floor extension, the resultant rear elevation and roofscape appears poorly proportioned and incongruous. As stated by the appellant the rear first floor projection does help to screen the rear flat roofed dormer from the wider rear garden environment. However, this benefit does not outweigh the harm to the roofscape of the pair of dwellings and the surrounding rear garden environment.

22. The use of light coloured render on the side and front walls of the two story side extension appears stark and out of character with the row of two storey houses. Its impact is materially exacerbated by the light colour render on the front elevation of the host dwelling. This together with the introduction of a larger landing window and deep gable roofed porch has materially changed the character and appearance of the host dwelling. More importantly, collectively they have unbalanced and materially detracted from the uniform character and appearance of the pair of dwellings and the row of dwellings.
23. Conversely the approved side extension with its matching materials at first floor level and mono hipped roof porch would respect the proportions, character and appearance of the host dwelling and the pair of dwellings.
24. I appreciate that some of the above features may fall within the current permitted development tolerances or do not amount to development which requires planning permission. As such they may be able to be retained irrespective of this decision. However, as they form an integral part of the proposal they need to be assessed on their individual and collective merits and in light of the prevailing planning policies. In particular, it is necessary and reasonable to take account of their effect on the merits of the proposed extensions.
25. Finally, from my site visit it was apparent that the ridge line of the host dwelling is now slightly higher than that of No.7. The difference is very modest and largely unnoticeable. Whilst it has a small impact on the relationship between the appeal dwelling and No.7, it would not in itself amount to a reason for dismissing this appeal. As the increase in the height of the roof appears to be less than 50mm I am satisfied that this is a matter that could be dealt with by condition without prejudice to any party.
26. Overall, I find that the proposed extensions and alterations to the host dwelling have materially harmed the character and appearance of the host dwelling and undermined the strong sense of uniformity in the pair of dwellings and the street scene as a whole. This harm would outweigh the benefits they provide for the appellant and their family and is not something that could be satisfactorily dealt with by conditions.
27. The proposed rear outbuilding is modest in form and reflects the uncluttered form of the single storey rear extension. It's fenestration, including the sky lights are domestic in appearance and will provide the building with a good level of natural daylight. It is set in from the side boundaries of the site and is largely screened from the surrounding rear garden environment. For these reasons it respects the character and appearance of its rear garden environment.
28. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposed alterations and extensions to the host dwelling unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it conflicts with LP Policies EN1, EN2 & H15, CS Policy 8, the SPD and paragraphs 131 and 135 of the Framework. Conversely the proposed rear outbuilding blends in readily with the rear garden environment and complies with the above policies and advice.

### **Living conditions**

29. The proposed first and second floor doors and Juliet balconies do facilitate views over the neighbouring properties gardens. By having full height doors views are

gained from a wider area within the rooms they serve. However, as suggested by the appellant by having obscure glazing in the Juliet balconies the outlook from the doors would be comparable to a typical bedroom window in the locality. This would address the concerns raised and is something that could be secured through the imposition of a condition.

30. Similarly, a condition which requires the first floor side window in the side extension to have restricted opening and obscure glazing would prevent any overlooking of the windows in the side elevation at No.11. There would be no need to require the ground floor window in the side elevation to be obscure glazed as their outlook would be towards a tall boundary wall.
31. There would also be no need for conditions which prevent the creation of any additional windows in the side elevation of the proposed side extension. This is because any new windows above ground floor level would require planning permission. Similarly, the use of any flat roofs for sitting out would require planning permission.
32. The appellant has stated that the proposed outbuilding would be used for a home office, gym and shower. Such uses would be unlikely to result in a loss of privacy or undue noise and disturbance for the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings. However, a full residential or commercial use would have the potential to result an over-development of the site and undue noise and disturbance. To Address this the council has a suggested the imposition of a condition which prevents such changes of use.
33. For these reasons the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupiers of the adjacent dwellings. Accordingly, in this respect the proposal would comply with LP Policies EN1 & EN2, and SPD Policies DP6, DP8 & EX26.

### **Other matters**

34. In view of the acceptability of the proposed outbuilding I have considered the possibility of making a split decision. As the outbuilding is physically and functionally separate to the main house a split decision is possible and appropriate.

### **Conclusion**

35. Having regard to the conclusions of the main issues and all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed in-so-far as it relates to the proposed front porch, two storey side, 6m single storey wrap around, part first floor rear extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey rear outbuilding for use of home office, gym, shower room and storage with pitched roof with render following demolition of existing garage.

*Elizabeth Lawrence*

INSPECTOR