



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/25/3369023

Arcandy, Westwood Lane, Normandy GU3 2JG

- 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 Chris Ellam against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/00050.
 - The development proposed is demolition of rear garden room, kitchen and first floor bedroom with en-suite. Erection of rear ground floor kitchen, new front porch and first floor extension with alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Revised plans (03A and 04A) were received during the course of the application to amend the form and height of the roof. I understand that further revised plans were submitted (03B and 04B) but these were not taken into account by the Council in its determination of the application. Whilst the reasons for this are not clear to me, my decision is necessarily based on the plans as determined by the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area, and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbours at Sonnleiter, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with accommodation in the roof space, on the north-east side of Westwood Lane and within a predominantly residential area. Although there is a variety of single storey and two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings in the vicinity on both sides of the road, the property is one of four detached bungalows with hipped roofs that step up the hill from north-west to south east. A number of these bungalows have been extended and altered and three of the four bungalows have accommodation in the roof space

with front facing dormers but they retain a similar scale and appearance in the street scene.

5. The proposal seeks to replace two existing rear extensions with a new rear extension and change the form of the roof to introduce more accommodation at first floor level. The eaves height would be increased from approximately 2.4 metres to 4.3 metres whilst the ridge height would be retained at 6.12 metres, but the roof form would be altered from a fully hipped to a crown roof within a shallower hipped roof. Two dormers would be introduced both to the front and rear roof slopes. A front porch would also be added together with fenestration changes.
6. The proposal would raise the height of the elevations to accommodate additional first floor accommodation. Although no higher than the existing ridge height to the hipped roof, the roof form would be completely changed and would introduce a shallow hipped roof with central crown roof. The roof form in terms of its shape and crown roof would appear out of proportion with the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the property as extended would appear unbalanced with a large expanse of blank façade at first floor level and poorly proportioned dormers in the shallow roof space. The increased height of the eaves level together with the proposed form of the roof would result in a much bulkier form of development that would be jarring in relation to the form of the neighbouring properties.
7. As a result, the design of the property would appear visually incongruous and contrived and would appear discordant in relation to the properties on either side. I have taken into account the variety of properties in the wider street scene, including different roof forms, but I consider that the proposal would appear visually over prominent in the street scene as a result of its proposed design and roof form, including in relation to the scale and form of the immediately adjoining properties.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not respect but would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the street scene. This would conflict with Policies H4 and D4 of Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023 (LPDMP), Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019 (LP: SandS), the Residential Extensions and Alterations Guide SPD (SPD) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. The Appellant has drawn my attention to other developments and extensions that have been permitted in the local area. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits but in so far as the information has been provided to me, I have taken these other examples into account. The principle of extending and altering the property is not at issue, but I do not consider that these other examples are comparable in terms of the design approach and the relationship with neighbouring properties and effect on the street scene. A high quality of design which respects the local context should be the aim of all those involved in the design process and for the reasons set out above, I find that the scheme before me falls short of the high standards set out under the Framework and development plan policy.

Living Conditions

10. The neighbouring single storey property, Sonnleiter, to the immediate north-west of the appeal property sits at a lower level than the appeal property. There is an existing side facing window and obscure glazed door facing towards the common boundary, with a patio door and glazed conservatory to the rear closest to the boundary.
11. The internal layout is not known and therefore the use of the room served by the side facing window and the glazed door is not known, nor whether the windows at the rear serve the same room. The Council advises that historically the side facing window served a kitchen and the Appellant has referred to the kitchen and living/dining space of the property, although there is no information to confirm the current use of the room served by the side facing window and door, and whether or not they serve a habitable room.
12. Notwithstanding the gap between the properties, it is my view that the increase in the eaves height from 2.4 metres to 4.3metres would result in an overbearing outlook for occupiers of that room where the principal outlook would be directly onto the flank wall of increased height.
13. There is no technical information before me to assess the potential effect on light to the room with the side facing window. However, taking into account the orientation of the appeal property in relation to the neighbouring property as well as the difference in levels together with the proposed increase in height of the side elevation and notwithstanding the gap between properties, I am concerned that there would be a material reduction in light to that room as a result of the proposal.
14. Given my findings on the effect of the proposal in terms of outlook and light, in the absence of further information regarding the layout of the house and internal rooms and taking a precautionary view, I cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of the neighbours at Sonnleiter. Such harm would conflict with Policies H4 and D5 of the LPDMP, Policy D1 of the LP: SandS, the SPD and paragraph 135 of the Framework, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design with respects the amenities of existing and future occupiers.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR