
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025 by F Bradford BA (Hons) MRTPI

Decision by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/25/3370320

72 West Grove, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 5PB

- 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 Hannah Lyons against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0158.
 - The development proposed is described as a “single storey side extension to semi-detached house”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 72 West Grove, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 5PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0158, 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 Refs AL/1541/1 (Location Plan and Proposed Site Plan) and AL/1541/1 (Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

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. The description of development within the banner heading is taken from the application form. However, this has been amended in the decision above for clarity, to exclude elements that are not in themselves development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the proposed development’s effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. West Grove is characterised by mainly detached and semi-detached dwellings, of varied but traditional design. There is a legible sense of uniformity within the urban form, achieved through moderately generous plot sizes and the setting back of

dwelling from the highway, which creates a distinct, primary building line along West Grove. Mayfield Road is perpendicular to West Grove and is characterised primarily by single storey dwellings to its northern edge which, in themselves, form a coherent primary building line.

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, with its principal elevation facing onto West Grove and the side facing on Mayfield Road. The front of the house is strongly aligned with the West Grove primary building line. As a corner plot, it is somewhat wider than most nearby, with the host dwelling set within an L-shaped garden.
7. In this context, the side elevation of the appeal dwelling is clearly distinguishable as a secondary building line, distinct from the primary building line of Mayfield Road. This differentiation is reinforced by the relatively large gap between the appeal dwelling and the house at 2 Mayfield Road, and by the contrasting scales of dwellings in the two roads. Overall, there is a clear visual separation between the primary building lines in each street, which contributes to the character of the area.
8. The proposed development would introduce a single-storey side extension, which would be clearly subservient in scale to the host dwelling and set back from the primary building line on West Grove. Despite its siting on a corner plot, the width of the extension means that it would also be set suitably back from the edge of the site at Mayfield Road. Consequently, in combination with its modest height, external materials that match those of the host dwelling, and partial screening by the boundary fence, the proposed development would not appear obtrusive from either street. This is notwithstanding the smaller scale of the side extension opposite at No 74.
9. Furthermore, the proposed configuration would be consistent with guidance in the Elmbridge Design Code (the SPD), which sets out that primary building lines are defined by the external wall of the main building in relation to the street, whilst the secondary building line relates to single storey projections that have a more subtle effect on the character of the street. For the reasons given, the proposed development would read as a secondary building line. It would therefore respect the primary building line in both roads and the contribution of this street layout to the character of the area.
10. The Council has drawn my attention to a previously refused planning application for a side extension at the appeal site. I do not have all the details of that scheme before me, but I understand its dimensions were deeper and wider than those of the appeal proposal, so it had a larger footprint and less discrete profile than the current scheme. Furthermore, I understand the decision in that case predated the policy context and design guidance that now apply. I therefore give only limited weight to that earlier decision as a material consideration in this case.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 or Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan 2015. Among other things, these Policies aim to ensure that development integrates sensitively with the locally distinctive townscape and preserves or enhances the character of the area, including with regard to prevailing building patterns and the character of the host building.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and simplicity. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I recommend a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty.
13. A condition securing matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR