



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> March 2026

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/W/25/3376199**

**1 and 2 Burley Orchard Stables, Burley Orchard, Staines Lane, Chertsey, Surrey KT16 8PS**

- 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 F Riddiford against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is RU.25/0978.
  - The development proposed is front porch infill resulting in the re-siting of the existing front door from No.1 into No.2 and associated internal alterations to form a single dwellinghouse.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The site address on the application form, appeal form and the decision notice differ from each other. The application form cites the address as '2 Burley Orchard Stables, Burley Orchard, Staines Lane, Chertsey, Surrey KT16 8PS', the appeal form cites the address as '1 & 2 The Stables, Burley Orchard, Staines Lane, Chertsey, Surrey, KT16 8PS' and the decision notice cites the address as '1 and 2 Burley Orchard Stables, Burley Orchard, Staines Lane, Chertsey, Surrey, KT16 8PS'. From my site visit and consideration of the appeal description, I consider the correct address to be that as set out in the Council decision notice and have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The proposed external alterations to the dwellings were approved in 2017<sup>1</sup>, but were not implemented and this permission has now expired. This appeal is for identical external alterations as previously approved, alongside the amalgamation of 1 and 2 Burley Orchard Stables into a single four- bedroom dwelling. The amalgamation of the dwellings was removed from consideration of the original application in 2017 prior to determination. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed external alterations in this appeal and I have no reason to take a different view.

### Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the provision of residential accommodation in the Borough.

---

<sup>1</sup> RU.17/1516

## Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within the urban area and is formed of a two-storey terrace containing three dwellings which were converted from a former barn during the 1980s. Unit 1 is a three-bedroom dwelling and units 2 and 3 are each one-bedroom units. The terrace is within a shared courtyard area. The site is within Chertsey Conservation Area (CCA) and within Flood Zone 2. To the east of the application site lies a listed building, Burley Orchard.
6. Policy SL21 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (RLP) states development proposals should result in no net loss of existing dwellings, unless a loss can be justified by:
  - Retention of the residential use would be undesirable due to proven environmental considerations or would prevent the delivery of essential infrastructure projects identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan; or
  - The development proposal would provide a social, community or cultural service or facility which cannot be located within an existing non-residential use.
7. It is noted there would be no loss of residential floorspace and that the site would remain in residential use if the proposal were to be allowed and that the proposal would provide high quality accommodation for a larger household. However, there would still be the loss of a residential unit as a result of the proposal. The justification for the proposal put forward by the appellant relates to the desire for multigenerational living and the proposal would enable an elderly relative of the appellant to have private ground floor sleeping accommodation and support from the wider family. The appellant also points towards wider economic benefits of the proposal by reducing reliance on social services if an elderly family member were to be integrated into the family home.
8. The appellant has undertaken their own assessment of the local housing market which they claim highlights an abundance of one-bedroom properties on the market for sale and for rent compared to the number of larger family homes. This assessment however is just a snapshot in time and has not been independently verified therefore it carries limited weight in my assessment.
9. I note reference to the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), highlighting that smaller one-bedroom units are already relatively plentiful in the borough while larger family homes remain in short supply. However, the SPD relates to affordable housing which is entirely separate to open market housing and therefore I give limited weight to this document.
10. Whilst I note the desire of the appellant for multigenerational living, I have not been provided with substantive evidence that this could not be achieved with either the elderly relative living in one of the accessible ground floor reception rooms of the larger dwelling, or, given the proximity of the properties to each other, that the elderly relative could not be looked after without the amalgamation of the dwellings.
11. Whilst the proposals could be reversed should the need for a larger family home no longer be required, the proposals are fundamentally for the benefit of the

appellant and the aforementioned public benefits such as the reduced reliance on social services have not been quantified and therefore I give them limited weight.

12. Runnymede Borough Council do not have a 5 year housing land supply (2.89 years) and there is an identified need for housing in the Borough where housing land is in limited supply due to significant constraints. Any loss of residential accommodation would therefore have an impact on housing stock, however small. The existing dwellings also provide residential accommodation in an accessible location.
13. To conclude, the proposal would result in the loss of one dwelling and I have not been provided with substantive evidence that justifies the loss. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and there is an identified need for housing in the Borough. The benefits of the proposal are predominantly personal to the appellant and their family and whilst I have taken these benefits into account they do not outweigh the loss of housing, given the identified need. Given the above, the proposal would be contrary to policy SL21 of the RLP which has a presumption against the loss of existing residential units.

### **Other Matters**

14. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
15. S66(1) of the Act requires that for development which affects a listed building, special regard is had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
16. Burley Orchard is a Grade II listed building with notable iron-work features inside and outside the property. The property is in a gothic revival style over two storeys with an attic. The building is constructed of brick with stone dressings and a slate roof. Gables on the property have carved barge boards. The north-east face has an extensive ornamental conservatory with glazing bars and small panes.
17. The appeal site is located within CCA and is part of three former stable properties that are red brick with hung tiled first floors, with gabled and pitched roofs with bargeboards and decorative ridge tiles. The property was formerly the stable to Burley Orchard but is not treated as a locally listed building, but is highlighted as a positive building in the CCA. The appeal site faces towards Burley Orchard.
18. The special interest of the CCA is derived from the town's historic development in relation to the Abbey and subsequent evolution into a thriving market and coaching town.
19. The external alterations to the property would be proportionate in scale to the existing property and the materials proposed would match those on the existing dwelling. The existing internal layout does not have historic significance as it was a former stable building that was subdivided.
20. The appeal site faces towards but is heavily separated from Burley Orchard by a heavy tree belt limiting intervisibility between the properties. The property is also secluded within the CCA due to the street layout and tree belt and is only visible from very limited public vantage points.

21. Runnymede Historic Environment Team have raised no objection to the proposal and I have no reason to take a different view. The setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CCA would be preserved by the proposals and I find no conflict with the statutory presumption under s66(1) and s72(1) of the Act.

### **Conclusion**

22. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*C Coles*

INSPECTOR