



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/25/3368991

Montclair, Norrels Ride, East Horsley, Surrey KT24 5EH

- 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 Graham Barry against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/P/01698.
 - The development proposed is replacement first floor accommodation over existing retained ground floor area.
-

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 host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Norrels Ride is part of a residential area of private roads. The properties vary in style, but they are traditional in form, and the area has a verdant and suburban character. The appeal property is one of a group of more recent additions, although the detached houses reflect the materials and form of the local vernacular.
4. The East Horsley Design Code, as part of the Neighbourhood Plan¹, advocates that design is in keeping with the established character of East Horsley and with the style of properties surrounding the development.
5. Montclair has an attached garage with a hipped roof to the side that extends up to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property, Rowans. It has accommodation within the roof, served by a pitched-roof dormer window to the front. While maintaining the same footprint, the proposal would alter the roofscape, creating a mansard-style roof with a flat top. It would not add significant bulk, but the steep pitch and profile would be at odds with the hipped form of the host property, and it would visually reduce the gap to the neighbouring property. The zinc cladding and the scale and detailing of the windows further accentuate the contrasting form.
6. On its own, the structure is well-designed and proportioned, and I accept that contemporary extensions can sit alongside more traditional forms. However,

¹ East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2033

despite being set below the ridge line of the host property, the extension would, through its form and detailing, be a dominant and noticeable addition. There is a diverse palette of materials in the area, but located directly between the multi-buff brick and red tile hanging of the host property, and the red brick and flint of the neighbouring property, the proposed development would be an incongruous feature and would fail to harmonise with its setting.

7. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene, conflicting with policies H4 and D4 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies, and policy D1 of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2015 – 2034). These promote high-quality design in keeping with the character of the area, ensuring that development respects the existing property and street in terms of scale, design, and appearance. This is also echoed in Policy EH-H7(a) of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan (2017-2033), the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2018), and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR