

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PART 1

FOR INFORMATION

Planning Appeal Decisions

June 2026

Set out below are summaries of the appeal decisions received recently from the Planning Inspectorate on appeals against the Council's decisions. Copies of the full decision letters are available from the Members Support Section on request. These decisions are also monitored in the Quarterly Performance Report and Annual Review.

WARD(S) ALL

Appeal Ref	Appeal	Decision
6005836	4 Stanton Way, Slough SL3 7LB Construction of a detached rear outbuilding to be used ancillary to the main dwelling	Appeal Dismissed 14 th May 2026
6003575	18, Skydmore Path, Slough, SL2 2HB Construction of 1no 1 bedroom dwelling with associated cycle and refuse bin stores adjacent to 18 Skydmore Path	Appeal Dismissed 15 th May 2026
APP/J0350/X/25/3359343	15, Upton Park, Slough, SL1 2DA Lawful Development Certificate for proposed single storey detached outbuilding to be used as swimming pool and gym.	Appeal Dismissed 19 th May 2026
6003753	324-372, Bath Road, Slough, SL1 6JA Demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site in two phases incorporating six buildings with maximum heights of five, seven, eight and nine-storeys (excluding parapets) connected by two and three-storey elements. Provision of undercroft parking, circulation space, cycle and refuse storage facilities and associated plant rooms at ground floor level, in addition to commercial floorspace (Use Class E) and residential communal areas. Provision of 231 residential units, private and communal external amenity space on upper floors with associated plant and PV panels at roof level. External areas at ground floor to include vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking, plant, hard and soft landscaping and attenuation pond. Proposed alterations to and widening of existing public right of way and public realm along Bath Road, new pedestrian crossing, and associated works (AMENDED DESCRIPTION AND PLANS).	Appeal Dismissed 21 st May 2026

6004030	Sabar Brothers, 215 Wexham Road, Slough, SL2 5JT Retrospective planning application for the construction of a single storey front extension	Appeal Dismissed 26 th May 2026
6003915	48, Carrington Road, Slough, SL1 3RH Planning application for the change of use of existing 6no. bedroom 6 person HMO (Use class C4) to a 7no. bedroom 7 person HMO.	Appeal Dismissed 29 th May 2026
6004566	524, 526 and 526A Farnham Road, Slough, SL2 1HX Part retrospective application for the part two storey, part single storey rear extension, 3no. Air Heat Pumps and revised fenestration on all elevations. Proposed change of use from C3 to C4, creation of communal garden and removal of outbuilding.	Appeal Dismissed 29 th May 2026
6002293	56, Dawley Ride, Colnbrook, Slough, SL3 0QH Construction of a 2 storey 3no bedroom dwelling with parking and associated amenity space and vehicular access.	Appeal Dismissed 2 nd June 2026
6008566	54, Birch Grove, Slough, SL2 1EP Construction of a proposed single storey front extension Application P/05248/002 for the construction of a front porch at 54, Birch Grove, Slough, SL2 1EP was initially refused due to its design and siting, which was considered out of keeping with the character of the area. The host dwelling forms part of a symmetrical terrace, and it was concluded that the addition of a porch would disrupt the uniform appearance of the street. On appeal, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. The decision noted the presence of similar porches within the street, which reduced the significance of the terrace's original symmetry. Furthermore, the porch was of limited depth at approximately 1m and would maintain the established building line. As such, it was considered a modest addition that would not appear visually intrusive or detract from the overall street scene.	Appeal Granted 4 th June 2026
6008549	2, The Glen, Slough, SL3 7HP Construction of a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer	Appeal Granted 4 th June 2026

	<p>The appeal relates to an application for the construction of a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer.</p> <p>The application was refused for the following reason:</p> <p><i>The proposal to change the design of the main roof from a primary hipped roof to a gable end (with hipped roof extension), with large dormer that keys into a hipped rear outrigger, will unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair of dwellings, and the mix of roof designs and their poor juxtapositions will result in a cluttered appearance thereby detracting from the form, character and appearance of the original house and that of the general street scene contrary to Planning Policy Statement 1, Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local development Framework Core Strategy (2006 - 2026) Submission Document November 2007 and Policies H15, EN1 and EN2 of the Adopted Local Plan for Slough 2004.</i></p> <p>The appeal inspector upheld the appeal, arguing that the extension would not materially detract from the character of the original dwelling as it's original width would remain discernable and the extension would create a satisfactory juxtaposition between the main dwelling and an exiting side extension.</p> <p>It was also deemed that whilst none are visible from the appeal property, there are other examples of hip-gable roof extensions in The Glen, which now contribute to the established character of the street-scene. As such the Inspector states that the conflict with guidance note EX33 of the REGSPD (which states extensions must respect the original roof form/design) may be set aside in this instance.</p> <p>Overall, the inspector concludes that, despite the mix of roof forms, the careful design of the extension would result in an acceptable juxtaposition between them, such that the dwelling retained its original character, and its appearance would be sympathetic and in harmony with the wider area.</p>	
--	---	--

APP/J0350/C/24/3351496	<p>30, Boundary Drive, Slough, SL2 4FQ</p> <p>Without planning permission, the material change of use of an ancillary garage on the Land to a self-contained dwelling with associated facilitating works.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>5th June 2026</p>
<p>APP/J0350/W/25/3366043</p> <p>*See separate Appeal Decision</p>	<p>Land at Manor Farm and land north of Wraysbury Reservoir, Slough</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to comprise a Data Centre (Use Class B8) and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with ancillary substation, offices, associated plant, emergency backup generators and associated fuel storage, landscaping, sustainable drainage systems, car and cycle parking, and new and amended vehicular and emergency access from Poyle Road and other associated works.</p> <p>A proposed hyperscale data centre and storage system have been allowed in grey belt due to overwhelming unmet need. The appeal was 'called in' by the Secretary of State who agreed with the Inspector's recommendation that the proposal did not constitute inappropriate development within grey belt land.</p> <p>The site is part agricultural and part developed land adjacent to Poyle industrial estate and near a major airport reservoir. Adopting the inspector's recommendation to allow the appeal, the Secretary of State held that the land should be classified as grey belt since it failed to strongly contribute to checking urban sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Furthermore, a demonstrable unmet need of over one thousand megawatts was identified within the availability zone, which the Secretary of State judged should be given significant weight. The Council argued that the existing trading estate SPZ could fully absorb future capacity, this position was judged to be unreliable because it ignored the current and future appetite for data centres of increasing scale.</p> <p>Regarding environmental factors, the Secretary of State ruled that landscape and visual impacts would be minor, assigning moderate weight to the localised character effects. Disagreeing with the inspector, the Secretary of State resolved that the contribution toward addressing climate change merited moderate rather than significant weight due to the energy-intensive nature of the use.</p>	<p>Appeal Granted</p> <p>10th June 2026</p>

	<p>Notwithstanding this, he agreed that the BESS (Battery Energy Storage System) would take advantage of the ability to store and distribute 'excess' energy from renewable sources, and also that the data centre itself, through design, commitment to BREEAM Excellent and opportunities for remote working would contribute both directly and indirectly to addressing climate change.</p> <p>The Secretary of State also judged that aspirations for future airport expansion carried only limited weight against the proposal because the historic preparatory work lacked formal status. Great weight was given to the less than substantial heritage harm at designated assets, but the Secretary of State decided that public benefits collectively outbalanced this detraction. Because the most important local policies were found to be out-of-date, the Secretary of State resolved that the tilted balance was engaged, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applied, and permission was granted.</p>	
6005991	<p>4 Wood Lane, Slough, SL1 9EA</p> <p>Construction of a single storey front extension to form porch, part single storey, part two storey side and rear extension to existing dwelling and loft conversion with rooflights.</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed</p> <p>11th June 2026</p>



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2026

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6008566

54 Birch Grove, Slough, SL2 1EP

- 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 A Zain against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/05248/002.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 54 Birch Grove, Slough, SL2 1EP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/05248/002, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following unreferenced approved plans: existing elevations, proposed elevations, existing ground floor plan, proposed ground floor plan (all referenced 54/Bir/01). Site plan and block plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining terrace and the street scene of Birch Grove.

Reasons

3. Birch Grove is a quiet residential street on an estate characterised by mostly similar modern, two storey dwellings arranged in short terraces. The houses are modest in size. All have a flat roofed single storey front projection with the front door and high level side windows which occupies approximately half the width of the house. The appeal dwelling is an end-of-terrace house on a noticeably wider plot and lies adjacent to a gated access to garages. The frontage, in common with other properties is paved and used for parking vehicles.
4. The proposed extension would be about 1m deep, lining up with the existing front projection and maintaining the established building line. It would occupy the full

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

width of the dwelling, incorporating the existing front projection. It would have a lean-to pitched roof. None of the other dwellings in the adjoining terrace or immediate proximity have similar extensions.

5. Nevertheless, I saw a number of similar extensions elsewhere in Birch Grove, on both mid and end terraced houses. In some cases, the extensions created a canopy over an open area to the side of the original front projection and in others the front wall of the dwelling had been extended forward to line up with the front projection. All of these extensions, whether end or mid-terrace, appeared modest and whilst different from the original design, well integrated into the street scene. The proposed extension at the appeal dwelling would likewise appear as a modest and sympathetic enlargement, notwithstanding its visually prominent location.
6. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), 2010, normally resists dominant, full width front extensions and canopies unless they respect the character of the street scene and the design and appearance of the original house. However, the extension's evidently limited depth, no greater than the existing front projection, sympathetic design and single storey height would ensure visible subservience, notwithstanding its width and location. Moreover, notwithstanding that the host dwelling and adjoining terrace are currently uniform in appearance, the proposed extension, owing to its scale and design would respect the character of the street scene, terrace and original house. In consequence, there would be no conflict with the objectives of the SPD.
7. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed single storey front extension would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining terrace or the street scene of Birch Grove. In consequence, it would comply with Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of The Local Plan for Slough, 2004, and Policy 8 of the Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document, 2008. Taken together and amongst other things these expect extensions to be of a high quality design that respects and is compatible in terms of scale and design with the host building and surrounding area. In particular, extensions should respect existing building lines and have no significant adverse effect of the street scene.
8. Turning to conditions, in addition to the statutory commencement condition, conditions are necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in materials that match the host dwelling. This is for the avoidance of doubt and to protect the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2026

by **K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6008549

2 The Glen, Slough, SL3 7HP

- 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 S Sanghera against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/00185/003.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer at 2 The Glen, Slough, SL3 7HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/00185/003, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site plan, Block plan, 02/Gle/01, 02/Gle/02, 02/Gle/13.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed hip to gable conversion and rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene of The Glen and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The Glen is a quiet residential street of mainly traditional semi-detached houses. There are some later infill dwellings and a number of detached houses. Older dwellings were built with traditional hipped roofs and most of these are retained. In some cases, two storey side extensions have been added. The newer dwellings have both gabled and hipped roofs.
4. The appeal dwelling is a traditional semi-detached house on a large plot. It has an existing two storey side extension and single and two storey rear extensions. Its semi-detached pair has a similar side extension. The proposed hip to gable conversion would be to the original roof. It would abut the existing side extension

which has a hipped roof. It would be slightly higher and set forward of the extension, owing to the set down and set back character of the extension.

5. The proposed hip to gable alteration would leave the existing hipped two storey side extension unaltered. There would thus be a visible join between the two elements. The appellant has drawn my attention to a similar arrangement on a comparable dwelling in a nearby street and I saw that there are others nearby. In general, these create a satisfactory juxtaposition between the two elements, with the hipped extension softening the effect of the gable end conversion. I consider that the proposed development would have an equally acceptable effect on the host dwelling.
6. The Council suggests that the proposed extension of the ridge at the appeal dwelling would materially alter its original massing, form and design. However, the original width of the dwelling would remain clearly discernible, owing to the set down of the existing extension. Moreover, Nos 6 and 10 nearby already have side extensions that have resulted in a similar extension to the ridge. The resultant massing and form at the appeal dwelling would not be dissimilar. These other examples differ from the appeal proposal in that the side extensions, whilst having hipped roofs, are not set down or back from the original dwelling. In terms of design, the ability to read the original width would thus be better preserved at the appeal dwelling.
7. The Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, 2010, sets out in EX33 that alterations to a roof including changing its shape will not normally be permitted. The explanatory text sets out that roofs form an important part of the character of the original dwelling and alterations can be highly visible in the street scene. I agree. However, whilst not visible from the appeal property, there are several hip to gable conversions in The Glen on dwellings where the adjoining dwelling remains hipped. These may have been completed as permitted development, nevertheless, they contribute to the established character of the street scene. Moreover, as reasoned above, the proposed conversion, would be less stark than other examples nearby and would not materially detract from the character of the original dwelling. In consequence, it would not appear out of place in The Glen. In that context, I find the conflict with the guidance in EX33 may be set aside in this case.
8. The Council is further concerned that the proposal would unbalance the semi-detached pair but since there would be no change to the overall width of the building or the building line of the façade, and the proposed gable roof form would be tempered by the hip-roofed extension, the degree of unbalancing would be limited and not appear out of place in the street scene.
9. The rear dormer would be set within the extended roof slope, well in from either side, below the ridge and up from the eaves. Whilst large it would not appear overwhelming. Although it would alter the relationship between the roof of the existing two storey rear extension and the original dwelling, this would result in a satisfactory arrangement that would be unseen from the street and masked from the rear by the existing extension.
10. Overall, I consider that, despite the mix of roof forms, the careful design would result in an acceptable juxtaposition between them, such that the dwelling retained

its original character, and its appearance would be sympathetic and in harmony with the wider area.

11. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed hip to gable conversion and rear dormer would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene of The Glen or the surrounding area. In consequence, the development would comply with Policies EN1, EN2 and H15 of The Local Plan for Slough, 2004, and Policy 8 of the Core Strategy 2006-2026 Development Plan Document, 2008. Taken together and amongst other things these expect extensions to be of a high quality design that respects and is compatible in terms of scale and design with the host building and surrounding area. In particular, extensions should be designed such that they are in keeping with the host building and have no adverse effect on the existing street scene.
12. Turning to conditions, in addition to the statutory commencement condition, conditions are necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in materials that match the host dwelling. This is for the avoidance of doubt and to protect the character and appearance of the area.
13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR