



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

**Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 August 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/24/3341026**

**139 Grasholm Way, Slough SL3 8WF**

- 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 Jatinder Dhaliwal against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is P/20414/001.
  - The development proposed is described as "construction of a single storey rear extension and conversion of garage into habitable room with insertion of front window."
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as 'construction of a single storey rear extension and conversion of garage into habitable room with insertion of front window' at 139 Grasholm Way, Slough SL3 8WF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20414/001, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DWL01, DWL02, DWL03
  - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

### 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 Matter and Main Issue

3. The Council do not object to the single storey rear extension element of the appeal scheme. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusion. My recommendation therefore focusses on the conversion of the garage into a habitable room and specifically, its effect on highway safety with particular regard to parking provision and the free flow of traffic.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a terraced dwelling with a garage and vehicle parking to the front. There are surrounding terraced dwellings of a similar nature with no visual evidence of garages having been converted. Grasholm Way and nearby

Blunden Drive do not appear to be part of a controlled parking zone. There is therefore unrestricted parking for all vehicles on the road.

5. There remains some dispute between the main parties on whether the appeal building is or would be a four bedroom dwelling. This is relevant to the fact that parking standards would require two spaces for a three bed and three for a four bed. Whilst the plans show three, I have made my assessment on the basis of it being four and thus adopting the worst case scenario principle.
6. The appeal dwelling is currently served by two spaces on the driveway (which has not been disputed by the highways authority) and one space within the garage. The appellant has advised that the garage has not been used to park a car. It would nevertheless have the capability to. That said, and by virtue of the proposal, only one vehicle space is in dispute, and this may be displaced to the public highway.
7. During my site visit, there was ample capacity on the surrounding roads for sensible and safe parking for one additional vehicle that would not seem to result in the impedance of traffic. Whilst this was a snapshot during the middle of the day, many of the driveways were also empty implying that any returning cars would park there as well as the road. In the absence of any compelling evidence to support the supposition that the appeal scheme would give rise to additional parking stress in the highway (such as current levels at certain times), I can only deduce that the displacement of (potentially) one vehicle to the road would not in and of itself give rise to harm such that the free flow of traffic, and thus highway safety, would be unacceptably compromised.
8. With these matters in mind, the proposal would comply with saved Policy T2 of the Slough Borough Council Local Plan (2004), Core Policy 7 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 - 2026 (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) which together seek to ensure that highway safety is secured for the users of new and existing development.

### **Other Matters**

9. In regard to any precedent value to my findings, I have given consideration to the individual merits of the appeal scheme and thus the potential displacement of one vehicle to the public highway. In theoretical as opposed to actual terms it is perhaps useful to point out. Any future similar schemes will have to be considered in the same vein, it being incumbent on the Council to evidence any harm that may arise as a result.

### **Conditions**

10. I have set out the standard time limit condition and referred to the approved plans for enforcement purposes. In addition, it is necessary to add a condition to ensure that the materials used are to match the host dwelling as to be in keeping with the appearance of the area. The Council have suggested a condition limiting windows on the flank elevations of the development. However, such a condition would not be reasonable due to the modest height of the extension and the existing/potential boundary treatments.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

*E Street*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR