
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2026

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/D/25/3375935

5 Priors Mead, Great Bookham, Surrey KT23 4DA

- 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 Derek Barham against the decision of Mole Valley District Council.
 - The application Ref is MO/2025/02166.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey side, front and rear extensions; erection of part single, part double storey extensions; installation of Velux rooflights in front elevation of roof slope; alterations to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing single storey side, front and rear extensions; erection of part single, part double storey extensions, installation of Velux rooflights in front elevation of roof slope; alterations to front elevation at 5 Priors Mead, Great Bookham, Surrey KT23 4DA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref MO/2025/02166, 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 BJ/23/31/06 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, BJ/23/31/07 Proposed First Floor Plan, BJ/23/31/08 Proposed Roof Plan, BJ/23/31/9 Proposed Front and Rear Elevations, BJ/23/31/10 Proposed Site Elevations, Location Plan, Block Plan and 45 Degree Line.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows on the flank elevations serving bathrooms and ensembles have been fitted with obscured glazing in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Derek Barham against Mole Valley District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey dwelling located in a residential cul-de-sac. There is a spacious and open character to the cul-de-sac with properties set within large plots with front gardens and driveways. While the spacing of properties is broadly consistent, the appeal property is sited a greater distance from the neighbouring 7 Priors Mead than is commonplace in the cul-de-sac.
5. The surrounding properties are of a scale and character broadly consistent with the appeal property, however many have been altered and extended which has resulted in the properties differing in their appearances. I observed on site that although the appearance of individual dwellings has changed and separation distances between some properties have been reduced as a result of the alterations undertaken, the alterations do not detract from the spacious and open character of the cul-de-sac.
6. The appeal proposal includes extensions to the front, sides and rear of the existing property. Collectively, the single and 2-storey extensions would substantially increase the size of the property. However, the extensions would reflect and respond to the shape, form and character of the existing property, using the same materials and complementing the design features of the existing building.
7. The 2-storey rear extension would be set down from the main ridge height and would be of relatively modest depth. Given this, it would not appear unduly large or result in the property appearing overly cramped in its plot. Moreover, given the siting of the extension at the rear of the property, its visibility would be limited such that it would not erode the overall character or appearance of the dwelling.
8. The proposed development would result in built form extending closer to the side boundaries of the plot. I acknowledge that the distance between the extended property and the south-east boundary of the plot would be less than the distance recommended by the Council's Extending Your House: Design Guidance for House Extensions and Outbuildings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2025) between extensions and plot boundaries. Nevertheless, given the generous separation between the appeal property and No 7, I am satisfied that the lesser distance would not result in a cramped appearance or erode the spacious character of the area.
9. The two-storey element to the north-west of the property would extend relatively close to the shared boundary with 3 Priors Mead, albeit it would not be as close as the existing garage. Moreover, built form at No 3 is set back from the shared boundary which enables appropriate spacing to be retained between the properties. Consequently, this element would not result in a cramped appearance either.
10. From the plans before me and my observations on site, the proposed development would result in a property of comparable size to many of the altered dwellings in the cul-de-sac. In this regard, it would not appear unduly large, prominent or incongruous in the street scene.
11. Furthermore, I observed on site that the siting of the extended dwelling would be consistent with many of the dwellings in the cul-de-sac with regard to proximity to plot boundaries and neighbouring properties.

12. Taking account of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As such, the proposal accords with the relevant provisions of Policy EN4 of the Mole Valley Local Plan (2020-2039) and Policies BKEN2 and BKH2 of the Bookham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015-2026. Among other matters, these policies seek development which is of high-quality design, responds to and integrates with the local surroundings and landscape context and respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including in respect of gaps between buildings.

Conditions

13. In assessing the need for conditions, I have had regard to the policy requirements contained in the development plan and the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
14. To meet legislative requirements, I have imposed a condition to address the period for commencement. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans is also necessary for reasons of certainty.
15. A condition requiring the materials to match those of the existing property is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.
16. A further condition requiring obscure glazing on the bathroom and ensuite windows on the flank elevation of the property is necessary in the interests of maintaining the living conditions of future occupiers.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the proposed development complies with the development plan as a whole. As there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR