

SLOUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PART 1

FOR INFORMATION

Planning Appeal Decisions

July 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

Ref	Appeal	Decision
APP/J0350/X/25/3370127	51, Lydford Avenue, Slough, SL2 1NL Lawful development certificate for proposed single storey detached outbuilding to be used as part garage, part gym.	Appeal Dismissed 22 nd June 2026
6010302	39 Market Lane, Slough, SL3 8BH Construction of a single storey front, side and rear extension and two storey side and rear extension	Appeal Dismissed 23 rd June 2026
6009861	9, Ives Road, Slough, SL3 8PB Retrospective application for a front porch and canopy Appeal against refusal and application for a partial award of costs. The application was refused for a front porch and canopy for two reasons, being that it was considered overly dominant and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original house and detrimental of the overall character of the area and that it had not been demonstrated that the loss of one parking space would not exacerbate existing on-street parking problems. On the first reason, the officer report referred to paragraph 3.3 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document (REGSPD) which sets out that "Front canopies or extensions which span the entire width of a property or dwelling will not normally be permitted unless such extensions form the predominant character of the street as such extensions are considered overly dominant and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original house".	Appeal Granted 24 th June 2026

	The officer report did identify a number of properties locally that did have front porches, some with canopies, including at No.5 Ives Road, but concluded that it could not be said that they form the predominant character of the street such that a relaxation for non-policy compliant development would be acceptable. In contrast, the Inspector found “the porch and canopy to be neither overly dominant nor out of keeping more generally within the area, where various forms of front porch and/or canopy extensions exist. Whilst they are not predominant, they are semi-regular features within the locality such that I was unable to detect any sense of regimentation or uniformity to the street scene at ground-floor level that was significantly impacted by the changes at No 9”. On the second reason for refusal the Inspector acknowledged that there are high levels of on-street parking along Ives Road and surrounding streets but concluded that, “notwithstanding a shortfall in parking when judged against the Council’s standards, I am satisfied that there is sufficient parking at No 9 appropriate to its location” As well as appealing against the Council’s decision, the appellant applied for a partial award of costs and suggested that the Council’s conduct in this case fell within the following categories of unreasonableness: • preventing or delaying development that should clearly have been permitted; • refusing planning permission on vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions; • failing to produce evidence to substantiate each reason for refusal; • ignoring material considerations or relevant fall back positions. In his decision on the costs application, and notwithstanding the decision on appeal, the Inspector found that the Council’s reasons for refusal were well-stated and unambiguous, and their reasoning sufficiently clear. Moreover, given the retrospective nature of the planning application, the Council’s decision did not cause any delay to the development. The decision on the appeal was disappointing and makes it more difficult to resist similar developments but the costs decision provides a robust acknowledgement of your officers’	
--	--	--

	commitment to high quality assessments of planning applications.	
APP/J0350/C/25/3374501	335, High Street, Slough, SL1 1TX Without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a front extension.	Appeal Dismissed 1 st July 2026
6007157	45, Denton Way, Slough, SL3 7DJ Planning application for the installation of an electric vehicle charger on the front wall of the property	Appeal Dismissed 2 nd July 2026
APP/J0350/C/26/3377443	58, Elmwood Road, Slough, SL2 5QF Without planning permission, the material change of use of the land, from single family dwelling house to large House in Multiple Occupation by more than 6 persons (sui generis use) with facilitating timber framed single-story side and rear canopy extensions; and the erection of an outbuilding as a self-contained dwelling	Appeal Dismissed 2 nd July 2026
6005311	17 Langley Road, Slough, SL3 7AE Change of use of existing 6 bed 6 persons HMO to sui generis accommodation for 8 bed 8 persons and ancillary facilities	Appeal Dismissed 7 th July 2026



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2026

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6009861

9 Ives Road, Slough, SL3 8PB

- 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 Harry Chahal against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/20559/003.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front porch and canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front porch and canopy at 9 Ives Road, Slough, SL3 8PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20559/003 and the plans submitted with it.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Harry Chahal against Slough Borough Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. The planning application was made retrospectively. At the time of my visit, I saw the development to be complete.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, and upon car parking and highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. No 9 Ives Road is a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling set behind an open plan frontage and within a residential neighbourhood comprising properties of similar age and typology. The dwelling has previously been extended at single-storey to the rear, together with a loft conversion and rear facing dormer. The appeal relates to a combined single-storey front porch and open canopy to the side with a continuous mono-pitched roof over.
6. The Council's *Residential Extensions Guidelines* was adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in 2010 and seeks to provide basic design principles, amenity considerations, and guidance on specific types of extensions to ensure

that the residential areas within Slough remain good places to live and are not adversely affected by inappropriate extensions. In relation to front extensions, amongst other things, the SPD advises at EX1 that they should be single-storey and normally restricted to front porches only. It goes on to advise that front extensions which span the entire width of the property will not normally be permitted as they are considered to be overly dominant and out of character with the original house. At EX2, the SPD states that the maximum depth for a front extension to a terraced house is 1.5m.

7. The extension projects 1.65m forward of the dwelling's front elevation. Whether it can be considered to span the full width of the property is moot, given that it extends up to a pedestrian access leading to the rear that is shared with No 7 and with both properties part oversailing at first-floor level. Regardless, there is some conflict with the SPD's guidelines. However, the porch element adjoins a similar porch to the front of No 11, matching in style and depth. I find its protrusion to be neither excessive nor intrusive within the street scene.
8. The canopy element is open to the front and side, supported by a single, slender column nearest to No 7. As such, the dwelling's ground floor fenestration and original front façade remain exposed to view. Furthermore, the absence of a solid forward projecting wall across the full width of the extension ensures that it appears as a somewhat lightweight and complementary structure.
9. Overall, I found the porch and canopy to be neither overly dominant nor out of keeping more generally within the area, where various forms of front porch and/or canopy extensions exist. Whilst they are not predominant, they are semi-regular features within the locality such that I was unable to detect any sense of regimentation or uniformity to the street scene at ground-floor level that was significantly impacted by the changes at No 9. Consequently, I find no conflict with Core Policy 8 of the Council's Core Strategy, adopted in 2008, or with Policies H15, EN1 or EN2 of The Local Plan for Slough (LPS), adopted in 2004. Between them these seek to ensure a high quality of design, including for house extensions, which is compatible with the original dwelling and is in-keeping and respectful of its surroundings. For the same reasons there would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's policies for achieving well-designed places.

Car Parking and Highway Safety

10. There is agreement between the parties that prior to the erection of the front porch and canopy, the appeal property was capable of accommodating two parked cars clear of the highway. The on-site parking capacity has been reduced to one space as a result of the development. There is further agreement that this level of parking falls two spaces short of the Council's parking requirements for a four-bedroom dwelling, as in this case.
11. I observed during my visit that frontage parking to the terraced properties along Ives Road and the similar surrounding streets was sporadic. Some properties retained their original low front boundary enclosures with no off-road forecourt parking. Others were entirely open and hard-surfaced with pavement crossovers leading to dual parallel spaces. Others were a combination of both, with space for only one vehicle. It was evident to me that off-street parking provision was not part of the wider estate's original layout. It was also evident that regardless of how any particular property may have been extended in terms of bedroom numbers, the

level of private off-street parking was dependent more upon choice rather than design. As a consequence, there are high levels of on-street parking along Ives Road and surrounding streets.

12. Despite this, there are no parking restrictions operating locally, except where white line markings indicate a dropped kerb and vehicle crossover, and where stopping is controlled by zig-zag road markings at a nearby school. On-street parking is freely available and I have no evidence before me, neither substantive nor anecdotal, to demonstrate that the roads are parked to capacity at any time of the day or night, or that the parking that does occur is problematic and dangerous to other road users or pedestrians.
13. I recognise that excessive amounts of on-street parking within residential areas can lead to indiscriminate and irresponsible parking. This in turn can lead to problems associated with highway safety issues, amenity, and harm to the visual environment. But in this instance, based upon the evidence before me and upon my own observations, I am not persuaded that the loss of one potential off-street parking space at No 9 has contributed significantly to any of these circumstances. The nature of the parking provision that now exists at No 9 merely reflects circumstances repeated over at many properties within the locality. On balance therefore, notwithstanding a shortfall in parking when judged against the Council's standards, I am satisfied that there is sufficient parking at No 9 appropriate to its location in accord with the requirements of LPS Policies H15 and T2.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed. As the development has already taken place, there is no need for me to impose any conditions.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR