



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/25/3373858

Brook Cottage, Pine Walk, East Horsley KT24 5AG

- 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 Mrs A Oakenfull against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/00808.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension, a part two storey part single storey side extension, front extensions, roof enlargement and alterations to include an increase in ridge height and the enlargement of the first floor, changes to fenestration to include the insertion of rooflights, landscaping changes, including a new vehicular access, and the erection of a car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the council's decision notice, as it more accurately and comprehensively describes the details and extent of the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including whether Brook Cottage constitutes a non-designated heritage asset and, if so, whether there would be harm.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. Brook Cottage is a detached house located within an area of private roads with a verdant and suburban character. The houses are primarily on large plots, set back from the road, and organically positioned, often at an angle to it. They are individual in form and exhibit a range of architectural details and materials, yet they share a homogeneous Arts and Crafts style. This is influenced by the development of properties in the area by Frank Chown. Chown design features, including eyebrow dormers, exposed timber, decorative brick plinths, prominent gables, and chimneys, are found on the appeal property and other properties within the vicinity.
5. Brook Cottage is positioned to the left-hand side of its plot and set at a slight angle. Both neighbouring properties are positioned closest to, and in close proximity to,

the boundary with the appeal property. The proposal would add extensions to both sides of the existing house with a large, new wing added to the northwest, aligned with the plot. This would significantly increase the front elevation and result in built form extending across the majority of the width of the plot.

6. The proposed side projections would be set down, although this is achieved by the height of the main house being raised. The change in form would significantly alter the low-profile appearance of the existing house, with the first floor in the roofspace served by eyebrow windows.
7. The materials would be reflective of the existing property; however, the exposed timber, gable projection, eyebrow windows and the proportions and style of the existing fenestration and the chimney would be lost. The proposed design incorporates architectural features and changes to the alignment to break up the façade, although these do not respond to the appearance of the existing property or the prominent Chown features. In my view, the incorporation of design elements, such as the slightly raised eaves over the full first-floor windows, appears to be a token feature rather than reflecting the existing stylistic language or, conversely, introducing a modern element.
8. The proposed alterations, which also include a detached carport to the front, would substantially increase the size of the property. While the scale of the resultant property can be accommodated within the plot, and it is evident that other properties in the area have accommodated sizable extensions, in combination, the extent, scale, height and form of the extensions would consume the existing property and result in a loss of space within its setting. Together with the changes to the appearance and proposed detailing, the proposal would significantly diminish the Chown style and the property's architectural integrity.

Heritage

9. The main parties advise that the property was built in 1954. The Council does not claim that Brook Cottage is an original Chown House, but, by virtue of its Chown-style aesthetic and as a demonstration of local building techniques and craftsmanship, they consider it a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).
10. The appellant disagrees with that position and the supporting heritage information prepared by Bidwells submitted in response to the Conservation Officer's comments, sets out the background to the development of the area and the Chown aesthetic. The property was built sometime after Frank Chown's death, and the architect's identity is unknown. The report acknowledges that Brook Cottage has a number of Chown features, but attributes this to the general Arts and Crafts movement in the area at the time and the restrictive covenants.
11. The Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) indicates that there are a number of processes through which NDHAs may be identified through various plans and appraisals, and that, irrespective of how they are identified, decisions to identify NDHAs should be based on sound evidence. It also advises that information, including the criteria used for selection is available to the public and that non-designated assets are clearly identified as such. Whilst they may also be identified as part of the decision-making process, the PPG refers to archaeological investigations as an example in that regard.

12. The East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2033 (EHNP) refers to heritage assets within the area, including a Conservation Area, and a large number of listed buildings and locally listed buildings. It specifically notes the architect Frank Chown and the distinctive Arts and Crafts homes, and that some of them are locally listed. I have not been provided with specific details, but the appeal property is not among them.
13. Brook Cottage is an attractive property which exhibits Chown characteristics. Whilst the property has previously been extended, the overall design aesthetic remains and positively contributes to the character of the area. There are, however, many other properties in the locality with similar attributes. The Council highlights particular features of the property, including some internal elements such as the fireplace and the timber staircase, although no evidence has been provided of any particular noteworthy value in these elements. While I recognise that the architect is not the only consideration and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits, the appellant also references developments to a number of original Chown properties which were not identified as NDHAs.
14. There is no indication that Brook Cottage is a particularly rare or important example of the Arts and Crafts style, and whilst it does have architectural and artistic interest, to me, this is as part of the area as a whole, the history of how the area evolved and the cohesion of the design aesthetic. As such, from the information before me, including Historic England's advisory local listing criteria, and bearing in mind the PPG's advice that only a minority of properties have enough heritage significance to merit identification as a non-designated asset, I do not find that Brook Cottage falls within this category.
15. Notwithstanding this, and while I accept that there is no policy requirement to preserve particular features of non-heritage assets, policy at both a local and national level seeks to ensure that development responds to local distinctiveness.
16. Policy EH-H7 of the EHNP requires that designs are in keeping with the established character and with the style of properties surrounding the development, and the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2018) advises that extensions should be well balanced in relation to the existing house and maintain the character of the area. It also advises that architectural detailing of the existing property should be repeated.
17. Therefore, irrespective of my finding in relation to the NDHAs status of Brook Cottage, the scale, design, and proportions of the proposed alterations would fail to respect the existing property, lack subservience, and diminish its original appearance with a loss of prominent architectural features. The form, as a result of the proposed development, would also disrupt the established pattern of development and would be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area.
18. Overall, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H4 and D4 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies, and to policy D1 of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites. These promote high-quality design in keeping with the character of the area, ensuring that development respects the existing property and street scene in terms of scale, design, and appearance. This is also echoed in Policy EH-H7(a) of the EHNP, the

Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which support high-quality design.

19. Given my findings, there would be no conflict with Local Plan policies D3 and D23 and the Framework (paragraph 216) relating to the effect of development on non-designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

20. There is support for the proposed development from third parties, and it would provide enhanced accommodation, including energy efficiencies. I accept that there is a capacity for change with opportunities to extend and refurbish the property, and I also understand the appellant's frustration with what they consider to be inconsistencies in the Council's approach to alterations to other properties in the vicinity and identification of NDHAs. I have, however, considered the proposal on its own merit, and these matters do not alter my findings against the development plan.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR