
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3368128

White Crest 229 Stoke Road, Slough SL2 5AX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Khalid Mehar against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is Y/17476/006.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two single storey rear extensions, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 8.0m, with a maximum height of 3m, and an eaves height of 3m.
-

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 decision notice includes references to policies of the development plan and a supplementary planning document (SPD). The principle of development is established through the grant of permission by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended (the GPDO), and I am required to assess the proposal as a prior approval application as set out within the parameters of the GPDO. Regard can be given to development plan policies and the SPD insofar as they are material considerations; however, they are not in themselves determinative.

Background and Main Issue

4. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to the satisfaction of expressed limitations, restrictions and conditions.
5. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, paragraph A.4(3) states that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.

6. Paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the local planning authority to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received.
7. The Council are satisfied that the southern extension would not have a harmful effect on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
8. The main issue is, therefore, whether or not prior approval should be granted, considering the northern extension's effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.231 Stoke Road (No.231), with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

9. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached dwelling with a dormer window to the rear and a flat roofed single storey rear extension. The existing single storey element is set away from the boundary with No.231 and is roughly 3 metres deep.
10. No.231 has a modest single storey offshoot to its rear which is flush with the boundary of the appeal site and projects to a similar depth as the existing single storey element to the rear of the appeal dwelling. The properties are separated by a timber fence which transitions into wire fencing further down the gardens. There is currently open outlook over the properties own garden from the rear facing windows and glazed doors.
11. The proposed northern extension would project by 8 metres from the original rear outrigger which was approximately 3 metres in depth. It would infill the gap adjacent to the boundary with No.231. Despite the offshoot at No. 231 and the separating closed boarded fence and vegetation, there would be a very long wall in close proximity to the shared boundary, which would project substantially above the boundary treatments. Notwithstanding the screening provided by the existing soft landscaping, the blank, featureless appearance of the extension would dominate views from the rear of No.231. Due to its proximity to the shared boundary, the extension would have an enclosing effect. As such, the proposal would appear overbearing, unacceptably reducing the quality of the outlook from the neighbouring property.
12. The appellant has provided two shadow diagrams showing the rear garden of No.231 at 12:00 and 13:40 on December 22nd. I have no further evidence from either party to quantify the impact with regard to light levels experienced by the properties beyond this snapshot. Although the extension would be set back from the boundary by 0.85m, I am satisfied that due to the orientation of the properties, the height of the proposal would detrimentally reduce the amount of light entering the garden of No.231 and for a significant portion of the day.
13. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.231, with particular regard to outlook and light. Insofar as they are a material consideration, the proposal would conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy 2006 - 2026 Development Plan Document (December 2008), and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan for Slough (March 2004), where they collectively require development to be of high quality design, which respects the amenities of adjoining occupiers. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure that developments are well designed with a high standard of amenity for existing users.

14. Similarly, the proposal would fail to accord with the Slough Local Development Framework, Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (January 2010), where it advises that extensions should not result in a loss of outlook or light.

Other Matters

15. The Council's application of the prior approval process has been questioned as No.231 did not object to the proposals. However as per the guidance in the General Permitted Development Order 2015 where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, the prior approval of the local planning authority is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, as has occurred in this case.
16. My attention has been drawn to a three storey terrace on an adjacent street which the appellant considers to have had a more harmful impact upon living conditions of the residents of properties on Stoke Road than the proposal would have. However, the existence of other harmful development in the locality does not outweigh the harm identified above. Each proposal must be assessed on its own individual merits and site specific contexts.
17. An extension which projects 5 meters from the original rear elevation has been recently approved (Ref: P/17476/007). This fallback scheme represents a threshold of what would be acceptable without causing significant harm to living conditions. The appeal proposal is however greater in depth by a further 3 metres and height by 0.2 metres. As such, I consider that the appeal proposal would be more harmful than the fallback, and its existence does not alter my conclusions as above.
18. The appellant also refers to a fallback position of erecting a 2.5 metre high outbuilding of a greater depth than the appeal scheme against the boundary with No.231 under the allowances of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E. There is no evidence before me that such a position has been formally established for the appeal site, or an alternative scheme setting out how this might be achieved. As such, I cannot be satisfied that such a scheme would be forthcoming or that it would be more harmful than the proposal before me.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Allen

INSPECTOR