



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/W/24/3344772

2 Simons Walk, Englefield Green, Egham, Surrey TW20 9SQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Mr P Chhokar against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
- The application Ref is RU.23/1750.
- The application sought planning permission for the demolition of existing house and construction of new dwelling with new piers without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref RU.22/0114, dated 25 March 2022. The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plans: Received 31/01/2022: 6551-28; 6551-29; Received 25/01/2022: 6551-05; 6551-06; 6551-26; 6551-25; 6551-20; 6551-02.
- The reason given for the condition is: To ensure high quality design and to comply with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance in the NPPF.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appeal seeks to vary the approved plans condition on planning application RU.22/0114. The appellant seeks to erect a house of a different design to that approved. The altered design proposes an increase in ridge height and the addition of two rear dormers. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the increased roof height and rear dormers on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is sited on Simons Walk, a residential road characterised by large detached properties. It is positioned between and in close proximity to a bungalow (No. 4) and a two-storey property (2A). Notwithstanding the varying designs of properties in the road, the dwellings have a well-designed cohesive appearance due to the form, size and position of dwellings within their plots. Whilst there are varying ridge heights along the road, taller properties next to smaller ones tend to have lower eaves, thereby reducing the overall bulk and mass of larger dwellings and respecting the form of the neighbouring property.
4. Despite increasing the height of the eaves and being taller than the bungalow at No. 4, the approved scheme retained a ridge height comparable to 2A Simons Walk. As such the approved scheme would be proportionate to the dwellings that it sits between. The proposed increase in ridge height before me would negatively alter this relationship, and result in a significantly taller property between these

dwellings. The impact of the additional height is exacerbated by the appeal property being taller and wider than the neighbouring dwellings and it being in close proximity to them. As such the increased height would not result in a high quality and inclusive design which responds to local context.

5. Reference is made to planning application RU.22/1412 relating to a replacement dwelling at 2A. Whilst this application details a property with a ridge height taller than the existing, it would still be one metre lower than the proposal. Whilst the height difference between the proposal and 2A would be less than the difference with No 4, this would not justify the significant additional height compared to the other properties in this section of Simons Walk. Other variations in ridge height in the road are not comparable to the proposed relationship between the appeal property and its neighbours. This is due to the scale of the appeal dwelling and its position compared to its neighbours.
6. Despite being set down from the ridge, back from the eaves and not occupying the entire roof, the proposed dormers would unacceptably add substantial bulk and mass at roof level. Whilst they would be in broad compliance with the SPD, their proportions fail to harmonise with the dwelling as they would be significantly taller than the doors and windows in the rear elevation and they extend into the enlarged section of roof, thus they would appear disproportionate.
7. The disproportionate size of the proposed dormers suggests that they have been designed to create floorspace rather than provide light (which is what dormers were originally designed to do), this is at the expense of good design. Due to their size, they would be incongruous in this setting, as existing dormers are much smaller than those proposed, and they would also be visible from the A30 (London Road) that runs to the rear of the property.
8. For the reasons above, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan 2020 which requires all development to achieve high quality and inclusive design which responds to local context.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the proposed development maintains residential amenity, the absence of harm is a neutral factor and would not weigh in favour of the proposal.
10. There would be some very modest economic and social benefits associated with the proposed development in terms of employment during construction, providing a larger dwelling and meeting the needs of the appellant. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area identified.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR