



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: 14 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/24/3342476

1 Moundsfield Way, Slough SL1 5UL

- 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 Quratul Ain Shah against the decision of Slough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/20393/000.
 - The development proposed is described as "conversion of garage into habitable room and replacement of existing garage door with window".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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

3. The description of development on the application form is for "then works will involve removing the existing garage door and wooden frame and replacing it with matching brick wall to the property and installation of a window in the centre". However, for conciseness, I have used the description of development from the decision notice, as this more accurately describes the proposal. This is the same description shown on the appeal form.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the area and b) highway safety with specific regard to parking provision.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is an end of terraced property with garages being the conjoining feature. Its fenestration is proportionate and hierarchical as is the traditional approach to a building of its type and age. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The plans show two different options for the window to replace the garage door. Whilst the ground floor plans and one set of elevations show consistent measurements, the window diagram does not reflect this. The diagram shows the width as accurately

described, but the height of the window is not consistent. Notwithstanding this, based on the proportions given, a letterbox style window would appear squat and therefore awkward and incongruous against the existing window arrangement and would not represent good quality design. The appellant has suggested amended plans could be conditioned to provide a suitable window. Due to the aforementioned plan ambiguity and lack of appropriate consultation I am unconvinced this would be a fair resolution. Particularly since this would not have been the scheme the Council considered as part of the planning application. It is not for the consideration of an appeal, in any case, to seek amended plans.

6. Therefore, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. There would thus be conflict with saved Policy EN1 of the Slough Borough Council Local Plan (2004), Core Policy 8 of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 - 2026 (2008), DP4 and DP5 of the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework) which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Highway Safety

7. The parking provision for the dwelling is to the front of the appeal site and there are two parking spaces with one being on the driveway and one being within the existing garage. The appeal site is on the entrance of Moundsfield Way in which the junction opens out onto Eltham Avenue with no form of parking restriction. Some driveways have also been extended to accommodate additional parking.
8. The existing garage is a parking space as per the Council's standards. The appellant has stated that the garage is too small and the space is used for storage. I have however taken account of the garage for parking on the worst case scenario principle.
9. During my site visit, there was some capacity on the neighbouring driveways for parking. Whilst this was in the middle of the working day, it implies that many of the returning cars would park on the driveways as well as the surrounding roads. There was some capacity for car parking on the surrounding roads in which cars could sensibly and safely park without impeding the free flow of traffic. Whilst the appeal site is on the corner of the junction, by virtue of the dropped kerb, pavement parking in front of the house would be a sufficient distance away from the junction and would not block visibility splays.
10. The appellant has provided some survey evidence in which there were between two and three parking spaces on Moundsfield Way and Eltham Avenue during different times of the day and on different days. The Council counter that there would be additional stress on the highway by virtue of the proposal. However, without any compelling evidence to support this I have to accept the appellant's position. Taking into account that, as a maximum, the appeal may, theoretically, displace only one parking space to the public highway.
11. With these matters in mind, the proposal would not result in harm to the highway that would be detrimental to the safety of users through unacceptably inhibiting the free flow of traffic. Therefore, the proposal would comply with Policy T2 of the Slough Borough Council Local Plan (2004), Core Policy 7 of the

of the Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 - 2026 (2008) and the Framework which together seek to ensure that highway safety is secured for the users of new and existing development.

Other Matters

12. 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.
13. I appreciate the personal needs of the appellant for the additional space, but this would not in itself be the source of harm as I have explained it above. It would not in any event justify a window design such as that proposed. I am not therefore led to recommending the appeal be allowed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. I have found in the appellant's favour on the second main issue but this and other areas where the appeal scheme would be acceptable would be a lack of harm which would be neutral in any balance. There would be harm and subsequent development plan conflict arising out of the first main issue. There are no compelling reasons, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR