



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3371181

18 Groveside, Great Bookham, Surrey KT23 4LD

- 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 Ms Annabel Grieve and Mr Heshan Priyatilake against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref is MO/2025/0714/PLAH.
 - The development proposed is 'demolition of detached garage and part demolition of chalet bungalow, construction of new first floor under raised roof with front, side and rear two storey extensions and rear single storey extension and alteration to front drive'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of detached garage and part demolition of chalet bungalow, construction of new first floor under raised roof with front, side and rear two storey extensions and rear single storey extension and alteration to front drive at 18 Groveside, Great Bookham, Surrey KT23 4LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MO/2025/0714/PLAH, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos. 1177-01-01 Rev A; 1177-01-02 Rev A; 1177-14-10 Rev A, 1177-14-11 Rev A; 1177-14-12 Rev A; 1177-14-13 Rev A; 1177-14-15 Rev A; 1177-14-16 Rev A; and 1177-14-21 Rev A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials annotated on plan no. 1177-14-15 Rev A and the material compositions depicted on this drawing and drawing nos. 1177-14-16 Rev A and 1177-14-21 Rev A.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have used the description of development on the planning application form. In the Council's decision notice, reference has been made to 'erection of a carport / store'. However, the plans indicate that the carport / store is an existing structure, and I observed this on my site visit. Whether or not this building requires planning

permission would be a separate matter for the appellant to address with the Council.

4. The Council's decision notice also indicates that there are concerns that the amount of proposed development exceeds what is acceptable under a householder planning application. The Council accepted and validated the application and dealt with it as a householder planning application. Accordingly, having issued a decision, the appellant has exercised their right of appeal against the Council's refusal. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is situated within a residential area. The Mole Valley District Council Built Up Areas Character Appraisal Bookham and Fetcham (2010) indicates that Groveside is located within the 'South and West Bookham' area where amongst other things there are contrasting house styles that on the whole coexist in a harmonious manner. It also notes that dwellings tend to be one or two storeys high, external materials vary widely, roofs are almost universally pitched and there are often wide streets and grass verges which add a sense of space. This reflects my own observations of Groveside with the chalet bungalow on the appeal site and the two-storey dwellings either side all responding to the street's linear development pattern but differing in design. Overall, whilst there is no locally distinct design, there is visual cohesion on Groveside in terms of the maximum scale of buildings, the prevailing traditional aesthetic including pitched roof forms and the spacious character.
7. The extensions would be substantial. Even so, this would not appear incongruous as there are other large dwellings on Groveside. Indeed, the resultant two-storey scale would be consistent with the immediate neighbouring dwellings. Its complementary hipped roof form would suitably respond to the area's prevailing pitched roof character, with the varied ridge line also helping to breaking up the dwelling's mass. The red brick, flint and red/brown tiles proposed would repeat materials used elsewhere in the locality. The development would also sit comfortably within the substantial plot owing to its position set in from the side boundaries together with the alignment of the front and rear elevations which would suitably reflect the development pattern on Groveside.
8. The proposed development would therefore have a cohesive appearance that would respond well to the site specific context. Consequently, any variance from the guidance in The Mole Valley Design Guidance for House Extensions and Outbuildings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2025) would not be harmful in this particular instance.
9. The proposed development would therefore have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would accord with the requirements of policies EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (2024) and BKEN2 of the Bookham Neighbourhood Development Plan (2015) for development to be of high-quality design, to make a positive contribution, complement and respect the character of the area, to respond to the prevailing pattern of development, to be of

an appropriate scale, height, massing, proportion and form, and to use good quality materials that complement the existing palette of materials used within the local surroundings.

Other Matters

10. Interested parties have referred to two copper beech trees to the front of the appeal dwelling within the appeal site. It has been requested that a condition is imposed requiring their ongoing maintenance as well as placing them under a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). However, the proposal does not indicate an intention to remove these trees. A condition requiring the ongoing maintenance of the trees would not pass the tests required by The National Planning Policy Framework. This is because such a condition is not necessary to make the development acceptable and would not be specifically relevant to the development being permitted. Moreover, whether or not these trees should be protected under a TPO is not a matter for assessment under this appeal.

Conditions

11. As well as the standard time limit for commencement of the development, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the external materials to be as indicated on the approved drawings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR