



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by **P Terceiro BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/25/3369437

38 Crown Street, Egham, Surrey TW20 9BQ

- 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 Duggan against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.25/0304.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Section E of the appeal form states that the description of the development has not changed from that stated on the application form. However, a different wording has been provided in the appeal form, which is similar to the description of development provided in the Council's decision notice. In the interests of clarity, I have used the description of development provided in Section E of the appeal form in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Egham Town Centre Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the Egham Town Centre Conservation Area (CA). Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
5. Crown Street is a predominantly residential street lined with detached, semi-detached and terraced houses. The significance of the CA derives, in part, from its historic layout of dwellings accommodated on long and narrow plots, with the buildings positioned behind small frontages. The dwellings are generally built in brick, with some finished with render or painted. Red brick is common, with contrasting brick details, as well as decorative elements like bargeboards and plaques. The roofscape is predominantly characterised by pitched and hipped roofs, sometimes with front gables. Although there are examples of dormers in nearby properties, this type of roof extension is not common in the locale. The

appeal site, as well its neighbouring properties on the same side of Crown Street, back into the Hummer Road car park, which also falls within the CA.

6. 38 Crown Street (No 38) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a pitched roof and a two-storey gabled outrigger to the rear. It is a Victorian house, dating from the 19th century. The dwelling is externally finished in red brick and sits behind a shallow frontage, which is partially enclosed by a low height brick wall with railings and pillars. The plot is long and narrow. Given such, the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
7. The proposed dormer would be installed on No 38's main rear slope. Although it would be marginally set back from eaves and ridgeline, given its width, depth and height, the proposal would nonetheless introduce significant bulk to the roof of the appeal building. The dormer would be substantial in scale and thus would dominate the roof of its host and harm its proportions. In addition, because of its excessive scale, the dormer would join awkwardly with the roof of the existing outrigger. The use of matching materials would not adequately mitigate this harm.
8. Therefore, the proposal would appear as a discordant addition and would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst public views of the proposal within Crown Street would be limited, the dormer would be clearly visible from the car park to the rear, since the existing trees would not fully screen it. Whilst there may be properties within the CA which have evolved over time, the proposed dormer would, for the reasons set out above, reduce the positive contribution that the appeal dwelling makes to the overall significance of the CA, thereby failing to preserve or enhance its character or appearance.
9. For the above reasons, I find that the harm to the CA arising from the proposed dormer would be at a moderate level of less than substantial harm. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that where proposals would lead to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The appellant advises that the proposal would provide much needed additional internal living space. Whereas this may be the case, I have not been provided with compelling evidence to demonstrate that the proposal is the only means to achieve this. As such, this public benefit would be insufficient to outweigh the great weight I must attach to the harm I have identified to the designated heritage asset.
11. Thus, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Egham Town Centre CA, contrary to Policies EE1, EE3 and EE5 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020). Among other things, these policies require development to be of a high-quality design which responds to local context and protects, conserves and enhances the special interest and character and appearance of conservation areas.

Other Matters

12. Reference is made to a planning permission¹ previously granted by the Council for extensions and alterations at the appeal site, including the construction of a rear dormer window. The permission has since expired, and I understand it was not

¹ LPA Ref RU.17/1604

assessed having regard to the current local plan. I have been supplied with the approved plans pertaining to that permission, and these show that the approved dormer was not so substantial in scale like the dormer before me. As such, while both the permitted dormer and the appeal scheme would be contained within the rear roof slope, I do not find that this previous permission would justify the proposed development.

13. In addition, I have been provided with the details pertaining to a recently refused planning application² for the construction of an L shaped rear dormer at the appeal site. Whereas it may be that the size and scale of the dormer before me have been reduced and the design has changed, as set out above, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA in its own right.
14. The appellant has referred me to other dormers within nearby properties. However, some of these structures are sited more discretely and therefore would not justify the proposal before me which would be visible in particular from the rear. The dormers at 14 Hummer Road and 17 Denham Road are visible from public points, but the presence of these dormers would not justify another substantial dormer. Moreover, I have not been provided with the full details of the circumstances that led to these developments being accepted. As such, I cannot conclude that the proposal would be comparable to these examples and so they would not justify the proposed development. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations 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.

P Terceiro

INSPECTOR

² LPA Ref RU.24/1668