



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/24/3338658

7 Pooley Avenue, Egham, Surrey, TW20 8AB

- 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 Alex Zimmermann against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RU.23/1512, dated 1 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a loft extension and first floor side extension, incorporating an increase in eaves and ridge height, addition of side dormers, removal of chimney, and addition of front- and rear-facing gable end windows and rooflights, and alterations to windows and external materials.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Poole Avenue comprises a mixture of detached and semi-detached 1930s properties. There is a consistency in the architectural details, materials and ridge heights. No.7 is a detached property with a gabled roof and the neighbouring property, No.5, is of the same form. The pitched gabled roof to the front is a particular feature along Poole Avenue and creates a rhythm and spacing to the properties. The separation between the appeal property and No.5 is limited, whereas on the other side is an intervening garage and No.9 has an offset alignment.
4. Extending towards No.5, and adding roof dormers to both sides, the proposal would fundamentally alter the appearance of the property, adding significant massing to the roof. It would create a bulky and top-heavy appearance which would be out of keeping with the prevailing roof forms.
5. The dormers are to be set down from the main ridgeline, however, this is achieved by raising the ridge of the original property. This is to accommodate internal ceiling heights, and the increase to the ridge height is limited. Nonetheless, it would erode the symmetry with No. 5 and change the proportions of the property compared to the rest of the street. In my view, this would draw further attention within the street scene, emphasising what would be an alien feature and disrupting the existing pattern of development.

6. While the appellant suggests that the design responds to the semi-detached pair at Nos.1 & 3, the form is different, with smaller front gable projections set down from the main roof. In contrast, the proposed dormers are designed with a flat roof which would create a very different roof profile. I have also been referred to extensions to other properties within the vicinity. While they demonstrate that the Council has permitted increases in ridge heights, side dormers and other extensions, the examples relate to a range of property styles and locations. None are directly comparable to the form and design of the appeal proposal, and each case is to be considered on its own merits.
7. Overall, I find that the proposed development would be a dominant and incongruous addition to the host property and would be visually intrusive in the street scene. The development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and thus would fail to accord with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020). There would also be conflict with the Council's Design - Supplementary Planning Document (2021) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these promote high-quality design and require that development respects the character of the area.

Other Matters

8. I understand the appellant's desire for extra space to accommodate their growing family, and that the scheme has been amended. Nonetheless, whilst there would be some economic and social benefits, the public benefits would be limited, and there are no other matters which outweigh the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR