



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/25/3364781

Holbrook, Cresta Drive, Woodham, Addlestone, Surrey KT15 3SW

- 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 Mr Nick Dyer against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is RU.25/0101.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer loft conversion; raising of the ridge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers as regards outlook and privacy.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that Cresta Drive is a cul-de-sac with a narrow road and includes mid C20th houses and bungalows of a conventional design typical of that period. The plot sizes are modest, with the dwellings occupying most of their width and the front and rear gardens of limited depth.
4. On the first issue, Holbrook, the appeal dwelling, was the subject of substantial alterations and additions, including the rendering of the walls, in 2018. The combination of those changes and the modestly sized plots has already had the effect of the existing building drawing the eye as a more contemporary and prominent house in the street scene than its neighbours.
5. The appeal scheme seeks further alterations and roof extensions including a rear box-dormer. The existing eaves and ridge heights would be raised, and the property altered to three floors of accommodation with the more contemporary design retained. The Council refers to the Runnymede Design SDP 2021 requiring extensions needing to be subservient to the original dwelling and needing to have regard to the scale of the property.
6. The appeal scheme in my view would clearly not be compliant in this regard. And although I accept that not all extensions need to be subservient if they are not discernible as additions to the original building, the proposed increase in height and bulk are unarguable matters of fact. It is the significance of these and their impact that the appeal parties dispute.

7. In my view, to all intents and purposes the introduction of living space at second floor level with dormer fenestration would result in Holbrook being a three-storey dwelling of contrasting design and external materials to its neighbours. And whilst the application for the 2018 development was deemed to be acceptable, the proposed further additions and alterations would be harmfully incongruous, especially when read against Doversmead, the neighbouring chalet bungalow.
8. Moreover, in this tight knit development pattern, the increased dominance and harmful incongruity of the building would be readily apparent over wider surroundings, including from both sides of Cresta Drive and from nearby residences in Fullmer Way. I have carefully considered the arguments in the grounds of appeal that run counter to this, but I am unable to agree with the analysis and conclusions.
9. For these reasons I find that the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings would be adversely affected by the appeal scheme in breach of Policy EE1 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2023; the Design SPD and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
10. Turning briefly to issue (ii) the officer's report equates the increased height of the building and the additional windows in the proposed dormer with a harmful effect on the outlook for neighbours and their privacy. I consider this to be a reasonable assessment, as there would be additional bedrooms and windows at a higher level. The increased height in the eaves and ridge together with a full rear dormer would increase the scale and bulk of the building and thereby affect the outlook. The increase in the property's windows and their higher level would result in the exacerbation of both actual and perceived overlooking, especially of Doversmead and No. 13 Fullmer Way, given the modest distances between these properties and Holbrook.

Conclusion

11. In summary, because of previous extensions and alterations, Holbrook already stands out in a narrow cul-de-sac of mostly smaller properties and different appearance. The appeal proposal would result in the building becoming overly dominant and incongruous, with allied concerns as to neighbours' outlook and privacy. Public consultation on the application has resulted in a letter of support but also several objections on similar lines to the Notice of Refusal.
12. I have taken all the comments both for and against the appeal scheme into account, but my overall finding is that the Council's refusal of the application on the main issues in the appeal is sound and should therefore be supported.
13. The appeal fails accordingly.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR