



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5th September 2025

by **Simon J Cater MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/25/3364505

140 New Haw Road, Addlestone KT15 2DN

- 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 James Willwards against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.24/1729.
 - The proposed development is demolition of existing conservatory, construction of a part double storey part single storey rear and side extensions and alterations to fenestration.
-

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. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of New Haw Road and Bates Walk, forming part of a short row of four detached, two-storey dwellings of similar design. These properties share consistent features, including gable-ended roofs, modest scale, and restrained detailing, which together establish a coherent and visually harmonious streetscape. This uniformity contributes positively to the character of the area and reflects the established pattern of development.
4. The proposal includes a two-storey wraparound extension, a fully hipped roof replacing the existing gable, and a mansard-style flat-roofed rear element. These changes would result in a marked increase in bulk, particularly at roof level, appearing visually dominant when viewed from both New Haw Road and Bates Walk. The loss of the gable-ended roof, a defining feature of the group, would undermine the architectural integrity of the dwelling and diminish its contribution to the street's character.
5. The side extension, while modest in scale, appears as a utilitarian add-on that sits awkwardly alongside the more considered elements of the proposal. Its flat-roofed form, boundary-hugging position, and lack of architectural integration result in a discordant addition that undermines the overall composition. In the context of a visually prominent corner plot, this incongruity is especially pronounced, contributing to a cramped and piecemeal appearance.

6. The proposed roof form represents a significant departure from the gable-ended rhythm that characterises the immediate group. Although flat-roofed elements may exist elsewhere in the wider area, they do not form part of the consistent architectural language of this group. The introduction of a flat roof and fully hipped main roof would appear incongruous and overly complex, disrupting the legibility and coherence of the built form.
7. Whilst the appellant has referred to other developments, I do not have the full details of those cases, including their specific site circumstances. I must therefore determine this appeal based on the evidence before me and the characteristics of the appeal site.
8. Although the proposal would increase internal floorspace, the resulting massing, particularly the wraparound form and roof alterations, would exceed the scale and proportions typical of the group. The presence of larger dwellings nearby does not justify a design that compromises architectural consistency or introduces excessive bulk into the street scene.
9. Additional harm arises from the proposed two-storey glazed front projection, which would extend beyond the established building line and introduce a discordant feature not reflected in the surrounding built form. Its scale, extensive glazing, and prominence would draw undue attention to the development, exacerbating its incongruity, especially given the openness of the corner plot and its visibility from the north along New Haw Road.
10. Taken together, the altered roof form, increased massing, proximity to the boundary, and glazed front projection result in a scheme that fails to respect the architectural character of the host dwelling and appears discordant in relation to neighbouring properties. The development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020) and the Runnymede Design SPD (2021), which require new development to achieve high quality, inclusive design that responds to local character, enhances the public realm and landscape setting, and contributes positively to the townscape through appropriate scale, layout, and detailing.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR