



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3376152

32 Pink Lane, Burnham, Buckinghamshire SL1 8JW

- 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 A Qureshi against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - East Area (Chiltern).
 - The application Ref is PL/25/2154/FA.
 - The development proposed is side, rear and front extensions, garage conversion to habitable space and outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side, rear and front extensions, garage conversion to habitable space and outbuilding at 32 Pink Lane, Burnham, Slough SL1 8JW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/25/2154/FA, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: PL-DR-00-00 - Site & Block Plans, PL-DR-EX4-00-22 - Proposed Loft Floor Plan, PL-DR-EX4-00-23 - Proposed Roof Plan, PL-DR-EX4-00-24 - Proposed Front & Rear Elevations, PL-DR-EX4-00-25 – Proposed RHS and LHS Elevations, PL-DR-EX4-00-21 Rev 1 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan, PL-DR-EX3-XX-71 - Outbuilding Elevations and PL-DR-EX3-00-10 - External Finishes Site Plan.
 - 2) Within 3 months of the date of this permission, details of ecological enhancement measures to include one integrated bat box or integrated swift box, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be fully implemented within 3 months of the approval of such and shall be retained thereafter in perpetuity.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, I have removed the references to 'retention' and 'retrospective' as these are not acts of development. Nevertheless, the application form confirms that the development has been completed, and I was able to see this during my site visit. I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. Amended plans have been submitted as part of the appeal which show the openings in the rear elevation of the extension and side elevation of the

outbuilding 'blocked off'¹, and I observed at my site visit that the development has been carried out in accordance with these plans. While interested parties have not had the opportunity to comment on the revisions, as the alterations to the scheme are minor in nature and do not fundamentally change the proposal, I am therefore satisfied that no injustice would occur should I consider the appeal on the basis of the amended plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached bungalow. It is set back from the highway, with a front garden, parking and driveway, boundary wall and verge between the front elevation of the property and Pink Lane. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, including single storey and 2 storey dwellings of a mix of architectural styles and ages. The appeal proposal includes single-storey side and rear extensions, as well as the conversion of the garage to habitable space, and a detached outbuilding and store to the rear. The Council's main concern relates to the effects of the outbuilding.
6. The outbuilding is substantial in size and is positioned close to the rear elevation of the property. By virtue of its length and rectangular footprint, it extends a considerable distance beyond the rear of the dwelling and continues the built form along almost the entirety of the side boundary to the rear garden. However, despite the overall volume of the building, its scale and bulk are tempered by its single storey, flat roofed form and relatively modest height, which serves to ensure a degree of visual subservience to the host dwelling. Moreover, the flat roof design, and use of materials to match the main dwelling, mean the outbuilding reflects the appearance of the side and rear extensions to the existing dwelling and thus assimilates with the built form.
7. Consequently, the outbuilding is not an unduly visually dominant or anomalous feature given the site context and does not appear significantly at odds with the prevailing character of the appeal property or the surrounding area. While the outbuilding reduces the amount of rear garden at the property, a reasonable amount of outdoor space is nevertheless retained, which maintains a reasonable sense of spaciousness to the rear garden. In light of this and as the outbuilding is not readily perceptible from beyond the site, its presence does not have a tangible effect on the character and appearance of the plot in that regard or the area overall.
8. Taking the above factors into account, I conclude that the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. In that regard it would not conflict with the combined aims of Policies EP3, H11 and H13 of the South Bucks District Local Plan, adopted March 1999 which seek development which is appropriate in terms of scale, height, form, design and external materials and is compatible with the character and amenities of the site the locality in general or Core Policy 8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy, adopted February 2011 (CS), in so far as it requires new development to be of a high

¹ Dwg. No. PL-DR-EX4-00-21 Rev 1 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

standard of design and make a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. While the proximity of the outbuilding to the rear of the dwelling may lead to it being connected to the main dwelling in the future, there is no substantive evidence before me that, any particular harm would arise, should this occur. Furthermore, the retrospective nature of the appeal does not alter the assessment of its planning merits.
10. The Parish Council refer to the risk of precedent, if the proposal were to be allowed. However, there is no compelling reason why, if permission is granted, that it would undermine the Councils ability to exercise its judgement in relation to similar development proposals on other sites, given each case is determined on its own merits.

Conditions

11. Given the retrospective nature of the appeal, a condition relating to the timeframe for implementation of the development is not necessary. I have imposed a drawing numbers condition, to define the planning permission and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition to secure ecological enhancement measures is necessary in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and Core Policy 9 of the CS, which seeks, among other things, the enhancement and net gain in local biodiversity resources as part of development proposals.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is allowed.

E Worley

INSPECTOR