



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/25/3368949

9 Ramsey Court, Slough SL2 2PB

- 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 Jeremy Snowden against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/1209/002.
 - The development proposed is “to extend the garden and move boundary fence and proposed replacement of bushes removed”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development on the planning application form is an explanation of the background to the proposal. I have therefore taken from the description from the Council’s decision notice, which more concisely sets out the development. The development involves a change of use of land and the relocation of the fence, which has facilitated the enclosure of land, and has already taken place; therefore, this is a retrospective proposal.
3. Similar arrangements have also been undertaken for several of the neighbouring properties, and I am aware that planning appeals relating to a number of these properties, seeking retrospective planning permission, have recently been dismissed.¹

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including green space.

Reasons

5. The rear of No.9 Ramsey Court faces towards Portland Close. The erected close-boarded boundary fence has been positioned at the back edge of the footpath and incorporates an area of land that was part of a landscaped verge adjacent to the road. From the details before me, the strip of land extended along the rear of several properties in Ramsey Court and St Micheals Court, and altogether, it would have formed a lengthy green strip providing visual amenity and a buffer between the rear boundaries of the properties and the road.

¹ APP/J0350/W/25/3369635, APP/J0350/W/25/3369708, APP/J0350/W/25/3369727, APP/J0350/W/25/3369842 and APP/J0350/W/25/3369688

6. Policy OSC08 of the Local Plan for Sough (adopted 2024) (Local Plan) protects green space unless the amenity value can be retained and enhanced. The amenity here is in its aesthetic value. The space was not available to be actively used, however, the policy relates to the green spaces, not just to public open space. I find that the verge falls within this category. This was also the position found in the other recent appeal decisions.
7. The repositioning of the boundary results in the loss of this space, and the close boarded fence at a height of approximately 1.8m creates an imposing feature adjacent to the footpath. Together with the similarly aligned fences to the neighbouring properties, it forms a significant length of an enclosing and visually intrusive boundary to the detriment of the character of the area.
8. The appellant advises that the strip of land was overgrown and was subject to fly tipping and other anti-social behaviour. From the photographs, the vegetation exceeded the height of the fencing, and there was some encroachment into the footpath. Although the Council advise that they were not aware of any issues being raised, and the situation appears to stem from a lack of management and maintenance. This, however, does not diminish the value of the space to the street scene, providing a defensive landscaped barrier that also offers some potential ecological value.
9. Policy OSC8 does allow for alterations to areas of green space but requires landscaping plans and the overall amenity to be maintained. Due to the siting of the fence, there is no space for any landscaping. The appellant advises that they are willing to reposition the fencing 1m back. This would provide for a small buffer allowing for potential planting to the road, and from my site visit No.20 St Micheals Court has offset their rear boundary fence accordingly. However, there is also a change in levels between the road and the main garden to No.9, and as such, the details are unlikely to be the same, and there is some uncertainty, given the status of the neighbours' fences, on how the boundaries would relate. Therefore, I do not find that this could be directly conditioned.
10. The extension of the garden provides additional private amenity space for the occupiers of the property, although, whilst small, the existing garden provided an acceptable size of garden. The enclosure would mitigate potential issues linked to the verge, such as littering, overgrown hedging, and anti-social behaviour. However, the new fence is positioned at road level and is lower than the original fence line when viewed from the rear of the property. As a result, privacy for occupiers is reduced, and at the time of my site visit, there was also temporary fencing at the garden level providing additional screening.
11. There are some fences of a similar height in the area, although they are interspersed, and the Council advise that they were permitted several years ago and/or are offset from the back edge of the pavement. Notwithstanding this, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits and for the reasons set out, I find that the development would result in a loss of green space and visual harm to the character of the area. This is intensified by the cumulative effect of neighbouring properties, creating a continuous length of high fencing along the road.
12. I therefore conclude that the development fails to maintain the character and appearance of the area and is contrary to Local Plan policies EN1, EN3 and OSC8 and policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Core Strategy (adopted 2008).

Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure development improves the quality of the environment and is compatible with its surroundings, and to retain the amenity value of green spaces.

Other matters

13. While the appellant advises that they were unaware that planning permission was required due to its height adjacent to the highway, it is an unlawful development and exceeds the limits of permitted development. The ownership of the land does not change this, and while the appellant explains that the situation has been a source of stress, I am required to consider the proposal in accordance with the development plan. Any alternative proposal would need to be submitted to the Council for further consideration.

Conclusion

14. For the reason set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

[