



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C.** Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/25/3363420

2 Row Town, Addlestone, Surrey KT15 1EN

- 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 Lambert against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is RU.24/1686.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to the existing bungalow to form a two storey property with pitched roof and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of no.4 Row Town with respect to outlook. I deal with both issues together.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the north-western side of Row Town with a wooded area to its east which is part of a recreation ground, and no.4 Row Town to its west. The road is a predominantly residential road in an area where there are a mix of dwelling types from bungalows to detached and semi-detached dwellings. The appeal property faces the entrance to Old Road to its south-east and it is highly visible from this road looking north west.
4. The dwelling on the site is a bungalow with a deep roof which houses a loft with a window on each flank wall. The bungalow is detached and at the rear has a wraparound conservatory and a long catslide main roof covering a rear extension. There is also a detached garage to the rear (east side) and a drive off Row Town. The dwelling has one bedroom which is on the ground floor, along with the other living accommodation. The property sits back from the road with a perimeter wall and a front garden.
5. The proposal is to extend the dwelling to form a two storey property with a pitched roof and a single storey extension to the rear. The second storey element would be constructed above the existing ground floor and the single storey rear extension would partly replace the existing conservatory. There would be only a slight increase in footprint. The proposal would have the same maximum ridgeline height as the existing dwelling.
6. It is situated on higher ground than its neighbour, no.4, as Row Town slopes downwards from east to west in the vicinity of the site. No.4 is a simply-designed two storey dwelling with a pitched roof gable end facing the road. It does not have any flank windows facing no.2. It has

off street parking in front of it and a garage to the appeal site side. The appeal dwelling sits forward of no.4 by approximately 4.5m. 6 and 8 Row Town are both single storey bungalows, as is 55 Row Town opposite the site.

7. In terms of views from the surrounding road network, the appeal property is prominent from Old Road and to a lesser extent from views when moving east and west on Row Town. The proposed development, whilst having a hipped roof, would create a large and visually dominant property. The existing dwelling has a relatively low key horizontal emphasis. The proposed change of existing ground floor windows to sash windows of greater height, as well as the installation of several such windows at first floor level to all elevations (including the south western flank which is visible in the streetscene), and the pillars and porch feature to the front door, would result in a building of emphasised vertical appearance which would significantly exacerbate its prominence in the streetscene.
8. In terms of design, whilst the existing dwellings in the vicinity are varied, the proposed design would not be sympathetic to the character of the area and does not appear to pick up any design cues which would tie the extended dwelling into the existing streetscene. In particular the windows in terms of size, prevalence and design are out of keeping, as is a pillar and portico-type entrance. The contrast in design with no.4 would be striking and would not adequately maintain the visual rhythm of Row Town.
9. Given the difference in levels and staggered relationship with no.4 Row Town, the proposed scale and appearance of the proposal would be oppressive for the occupants on no.4 when using their front forecourt and front entrance.
10. In coming to my decision, I have borne in mind, amongst other things, the benefit of providing a larger family-sized dwelling at the appeal site and more living space but this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the streetscene and would unduly harm the living conditions of the occupants of no.4 Row Town in respect of outlook from the front forecourt. It would be contrary to policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (adopted 2020) and the Runnymede Design Supplementary Planning Document (2021).

Conclusion

12. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector