



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/24/3352346

48 Crown Street, Egham, Surrey TW20 9BZ

- 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 Mrs Choe Lay against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.24/0446.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 3m back extension as well as a dormer loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024 but its contents do not alter the assessment of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey dwelling with a single storey infill extension situated within the middle of a terrace of 5 dwellings. At the rear, some of the dwellings within the terrace have been altered, including single storey extensions (Nos. 44, 46 and 52) and a roof extension at No. 52. There are rooflights within the rear roofslope of No. 46 and the front roofslope of No. 52. Elsewhere within the area, including the properties identified by the appellant, there are examples of rear roof extensions of varying sizes and designs some of which are not high quality additions whether by reason of their bulk siting or design. For these reasons, and in the absence of their full planning circumstances, these other schemes are given limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
5. The property is situated within the Egham Town Centre Conservation Area where there is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. This duty is echoed in Policy EE5 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (LP). In the consultation response from the Historic Environment Team about the appeal application there is some commentary concerning the buildings along Crown Street but no further details have been provided about the heritage significance, character and appearance of the Conservation Area itself.

6. From what was observed, the heritage significance of the area is primarily associated with the historic buildings fronting High Street and the late Victorian/early Edwardian mainly 2-storey dwellings which are of varying types and designs. However, these dwellings do have a consistency of character and appearance in terms of their height, scale, materials, gable roof forms, siting, detailing and roofscapes. Several of the dwellings have 2-storey rear outriggers with either gable or hipped roof forms. The property, and the terrace within which it is located, is reflective of the characteristics of the dwellings within the residential part of the Conservation Area.
7. The proposed development includes the erection of a rear roof extension with a flat roof. This element of the appeal scheme would be set down below the property's ridge but would substantially extend across the rear roof slope and the outrigger. The proposed extension would be significantly larger than the rear roof addition at No. 52. By reason of its siting, size and roof form, this proposed extension would be an incongruous, bulky and visually conspicuous addition to the host property which would have the appearance of a third floor being added. Further, the design of the extension would not reflect the characteristics of this property, the terrace and the wider character and appearance of the surrounding dwellings within this part residential of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved as demonstrated by other similarly large nearby roof additions.
8. The identified unacceptable harm caused by the proposed roof extension to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, together with the heritage significance of the Conservation Area, would be noticeable from the surrounding dwellings and also from Denham Road through the gaps between properties.
9. The council has not specifically objected to the proposed ground floor additions. However, the absence of any identified harm for these elements of the appeal scheme does not outweigh the unacceptable harm which has been identified associated with the proposed roof extension.
10. The degree of harm to the heritage significance of the Conservation Area associated with the proposed roof extension would be less than substantial. Accordingly, the National Planning Policy Framework requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The appellant's claims associated with wishing to continue living in the area and the potential for the property to be used as a House in Multiple Occupation have been carefully noted, but these do not amount to the type of public benefit which would outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to the heritage significance of the Conservation Area. Claims related to what could be erected as permitted development associated with a dwelling outside a Conservation Area have been given limited weight because the property is located within such an area.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies EE1 and EE5. In addition to heritage considerations, these policies also expect developments to achieve high quality and inclusive design which responds to the local context, including the built and historic character of the area.

12. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR