



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/D/25/3366868

24 Meadow, Godalming, Surrey GU7 3HN

- 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 Matthew Thatcher against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is WA/2025/00575.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear first-floor extension with a solar flat roof, a ground-floor side extension and a pitched roof over the existing detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the rear and side extensions.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the existing garage and planning permission is granted for a pitched roof over the existing detached garage at 24 Meadow, Godalming, Surrey GU7 3HN, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2 The alterations to the garage shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: MR/04 and MR/06.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal includes extensions to the house and alterations to the roof of the garage. The Council have raised no objections in relation to the alterations to the garage. Consequently, in my decision, I have focused on the proposed extensions.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No.24 is a semi-detached property of a traditional form with a hipped roof. The entrance and principal elevation are to the side. Extending off this elevation, a single-storey extension is proposed to the rear section, which would integrate with the existing porch. To the rear, the first extension, together with a small ground infill element, would correspond with the existing depth of the building. Both elements would be visible from the road due to the width of the plot and open aspect to the side.

6. Whilst the single-storey extension would have a shallow pitched roof, it has a blank façade facing forward, and the rear addition would have a flat roof. Given the design and form of these extensions, they would be notable additions and would detract from the character and form of the existing property.
7. The flat roof design is contrary to the Council's Residential Extensions, Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD), which advises that all two-storey extensions should have fully pitched roofs to match the existing house. It would also create an odd juxtaposition with the neighbour, where the other half of the rear single-storey pitched roof projection would remain. The flat roof is designed to accommodate solar panels that would project at an angle. While supporting energy efficiency, the existing property has panels on the existing roof plane, which have a less pronounced protrusion.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to No.20, which is a similar property and has a two-storey projection to the rear. That extension continues the pitched roof form, and the Council also advise that the depth of the projection is more limited and is part of the same alteration to the other half of the semi, resulting in a symmetrical form. It is therefore not directly comparable, and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits.
9. The extensions would therefore fail to positively integrate with the host property and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the development would be contrary to policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018¹ and policy DM4 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023², which require development to be of high-quality design, to respond to local character and take into account existing architectural composition, rooflines, scale, form and appearance. There would also be conflict with the SPD in terms of the design.

Other Matters

10. The Council have not found any other harm, and there is support for the proposal from the neighbour. However, compliance with other aspects, such as amenity, is a neutral factor and does not outweigh the conflict with the development plan.
11. The addition of a shallow-pitched roof to the garage would not alter the parking provision and would be a visual enhancement. As the garage is a separate building, the proposed alteration is severable from the extensions to the house and under section 79 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 I have expressed powers to split a decision. In line with statutory requirements, conditions are required in relation to the commencement of development and the plans for certainty.
12. The appellant has also raised concerns in relation to the Council's site visit and the lack of opportunity for amendments. The Council's procedures and their handling of the application are separate matters outside the remit of this appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in relation to the extensions but be allowed in respect of the roof to the garage.

¹ Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites February 2018

² Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies March 2023

G Ellis

INSPECTOR