



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2020

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT MCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/20/3255349

4 Boyn Hill Road, Maidenhead SL6 4JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Elek Bolygo against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 20/00472, dated 13 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is raising of ridge height, new roof with 2no. front, 1no. side and 1no. rear dormers to facilitate habitable accommodation. Garage conversion, veranda to rear elevation, single storey rear extension and replacement of flat roof to pitched over annexe.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 9 October 2020.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for raising of ridge height, new roof with 2no. front, 1no. side and 1no. rear dormers to facilitate habitable accommodation. Garage conversion, veranda to rear elevation, single storey rear extension and replacement of flat roof to pitched over annexe at 4 Boyn Hill Road, Maidenhead SL6 4JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00472, dated 13 February 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's decision notice as this is a more precise description of the development. This is the same description used by the appellant on the appeal form, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a single storey bungalow with attached garage. The site is located on a plot adjacent to the junction of Boyn Hill Road and Boyn Hill Close. The dwelling appears to have been extended over time, and this includes

- a narrow single storey rear flat roof extension. The surrounding area has a varied and interesting character, which gives the streetscape a pleasing visual.
5. The appeal site forms one of four dwellings on this side of Boyn Hill Road, and each property is set back from the highway with a large grass verge separating the edge of the highway to the front gardens. The dwellings on this section of Boyn Hill Road are varied in their style. The appeal site differs from these neighbouring properties as it appears as the only single storey bungalow, with the other properties appearing both considerably larger in mass, with much taller ridge heights than the appeal site.
 6. The appeal proposal would create first floor accommodation within the roof of the bungalow. In order to achieve this it is proposed to enlarge the roof, and increase the ridge height. This would result in a larger crown style roof, with both pitched and flat roof elements. Furthermore, the existing flat roof on the rear extension would be replaced with a pitched roof. On the front elevation two pitched roof dormers would be provided, with a further pitched dormer on the northern elevation. At the rear of the property a flat roof dormer would be provided.
 7. The Council have concerns that the proposed changes to the property, particularly the changes to the roof arrangement would result in a roof form of excessive scale and visual bulk. I do not agree. Whilst the existing bungalow is relatively diminutive compared to the neighbouring properties, it was evident from my site visit that the roof already appears of a relatively large scale compared to the height of the existing walls. Although the proposal would introduce a slightly higher ridge height, the proposed front dormer windows would, in my view, provide features which help to break up the appearance of the roof.
 8. This therefore would not create an overly bulky addition to the property, it would add a pleasing design feature which is clearly evident in neighbouring properties. I am satisfied that the proposed roof would appear unbalanced and would be of an appropriate scale compared to the dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed pitched roof on the rear extension element of the bungalow would integrate much better with the dwelling than the current flat roof element. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposal would represent a good design and would not appear overly bulky nor incongruous. It would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
 9. The current streetscape of Boyn Hill Road is diverse, which includes the roofscapes. It was evident from my site visit that a number of design features which are proposed as part of this appeal are evident in the locality of the appeal site. This includes pitched and flat roof dormers. I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and given the diverse street scape I am content that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
 10. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. There is no conflict with policy DG1 and H14 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 2003. These policies seek, amongst other things, that house extensions do not have adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the original property or street scene. There is no conflict with paragraphs 127 and 130 of

the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks amongst other things, that development is of a high quality design that add to the quality of the area.

Other matters

11. I note the concerns of the neighbouring occupiers of No.6 Boyn Hill Road that the proposal would harm their living conditions in respect of light and outlook. They have also highlighted issues in respect of subsidence and the subdivision of the appeal site to provide an additional residential unit, which could create issues for parking demand. Turning first to the issue of living conditions; the primary concern is an existing dormer window which faces the appeal site. Whilst the proposal would increase the height of the roof, it would maintain a pitched element on the elevation which faces this window. There is adequate separation distance between this window and the appeal site, and I do not consider the proposal would harm the outlook from this window nor the amount of light it would receive.
12. It has been put to me that the increased loadings from the appeal proposal could introduce subsidence in the garden of No.6. There is currently a height difference between the two properties, with the garden of No.6 being at a lower level than the appeal site. Whilst I appreciate the concerns of the neighbouring occupier in this respect, the submitted evidence which they have provided to demonstrate subsidence is a fair distance away from the appeal dwelling. There is no cogent evidence that such an extension would cause or worsen any existing subsidence.
13. Whilst there are concerns that the unit could be subdivided to provide two separate residential units, the appellant have confirmed that this is not their intention. Furthermore, a planning condition can be imposed to ensure that the extension remains ancillary to the host dwelling.

Conditions

14. The Council have suggested several conditions, and I have amended these in the interest of precision. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. A condition relating to external materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the proposal would be satisfactory. It has been necessary to impose a condition requiring that the rooflights shown in the main roof are fitted with obscured glass and are non-opening. This is to ensure the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers are maintained. A condition requiring that the extension remains ancillary to the dwelling is necessary to prevent the creation of an independent unit of accommodation.

Conclusions

15. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS – APP/T0355/D/20/3255349

- 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: 1770/01 Existing Plans & Elevations dated January 2020, 1770/02 Proposed Plans & Elevations dated January 2020.
- 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the rooflight windows on the south elevation of the main roof have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
- 5) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 4 Boyn Hill, Maidenhead.