



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 April 2026

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/Q3630/D/25/3376485

83 London Street, Chertsey, Surrey KT16 8AN

- 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 John Lewthwaite against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.25/1206.
 - The development proposed is 'partial demolition of rear stores/WC and construction of a single storey rear extension, internal alterations and repair of rear first floor brickwork/external paint'.
-

Appeal B Ref: 6002097

83 London Street, Chertsey, Surrey KT16 8AN

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant Listed Building Consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Lewthwaite against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.25/1228.
 - The works proposed are "partial demolition of rear stores/WC and construction of a single storey rear extension, internal alterations and repair of rear first floor brickwork/external paint".
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal building is located within the Chertsey Conservation Area, and is part of a Grade II listed building '83-89 London Street'. In determining the appeals, I have therefore been mindful of the statutory requirements placed on decision makers by sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the LBCA Act').

Main Issues

4. The main issues in both appeals are:
 - i) the effect of the proposal on the special interest of the Grade II listed building, 83-89 London Street; and
 - ii) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Chertsey Conservation Area.

Reasons

Listed Building

5. The listed building comprises a terrace of four two-storey dwellings. Nos 85 and 87 to the centre date to around 1830-1840. The pair have a rendered exterior, and include sash windows, a parapet which conceals the roof from the street and raised entrances with wooden porches which are set to either side of an advanced central section with a moulded cornice. Nos 83 and 89 date to the early 19th century and differ in design to Nos 85-87 and one another. No 83 has a brick exterior and includes sash windows, a central entrance with a doorcase including doric columns and a moulded entablature which is set between projecting splay bay windows, and a shallow hipped slate roof. No 89 has a parapet to the roof, albeit lower than Nos 85-87, and includes sash windows, a splay bay window to the ground floor and a flat canopy with iron brackets over the entrance. Despite the differences in the form, proportions and detailed designs, the detailing of the dwellings which is typical of the period provides for a degree of cohesion and the list entry notes that the listed building is an interesting urban climax at the end of the street.
6. The rear elevations of the building are not mentioned in the list description. However, the description is primarily for identification purposes and does not provide an exhaustive or complete description of special interest. In this case, I saw assorted single-storey projections to the rear of the listed building. These include at the appeal dwelling where there is a fairly deep red brick projection along the boundary with 81 London Street, a separate shallow projection adjacent to the boundary with No 85, beyond which is a flat roof pergola which the appellant suggests is temporary, and a small porch. No 85 also includes an attached projection which connects to a deep outbuilding along the boundary with the appeal site. Despite the presence of these alterations however, vertically-proportioned sash windows are typical and provide some visual cohesion and while it varies between the individual dwellings, architectural detailing is generally more muted than that facing the street reflecting the hierarchy of the building's elevations.
7. Given the above, I find the special interest of the listed building, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily associated with its architectural quality and composition, most prominently but not exclusively to the street elevations, as a group of 19th century dwellings which are of varied designs but which share some similarities in features and architectural language.
8. The proposed extension would replace the rear porch and red brick projection, although the parapet wall along the boundary with No 81 would be retained. The Council has not suggested that the removal of the existing projections would harm the special interest of the listed building and I have no firm reason to take a different view. Indeed, I saw that the materials and form of the red brick projection including the monopitch roof and the canopy section are somewhat uncharacteristic against the appeal dwelling and I consider its removal could offer an opportunity for visual enhancement to the listed building.
9. The extension in combination with the projection adjacent to No 85 which is to be retained would span the full width of the historic ground-floor rear elevation. It would also sit higher than the majority of the projection and the porch which are to be replaced. However, the existing rear projections and porch have significantly altered the appearance of the rear elevation of the host dwelling, and their varied

forms and styles currently disrupt and limit opportunity to appreciate the historic simplicity of the ground floor level. There may be no formal record of consents for these projections, but the appellant's evidence includes historic plans and documents which appear to indicate that structures were present prior to the Second World War. Based on my observations of the structures currently on site and the evidence before me, I see no reason to doubt that these features are of some age and that they would pre-date the listing of the building in 1972.

10. I accept that there would be a greater degree of concealment of the dwelling's rear elevation, including the position of the existing ground floor sash, but the brick finish would remain apparent at the upper level and the overall extent of historic features that would no longer be appreciable relative to the existing situation would be very limited. The extension would also be clearly legible as a modern addition and while there would be a change to the ground floor level of the appeal dwelling, it would not disrupt any uniform arrangement across the rear of the listed building.
11. In addition, the proposal includes the formation of an opening in place of the ground floor sash window, blocking up of the adjacent textured-glass window and the insertion of an internal partition wall. However, alterations to historic fabric and layout would be minimal, particularly in the context of the listed building as a whole and would not in my view compromise or detract from the integrity or legibility of the building to any significant degree.
12. Given these factors, I find that the loss of fabric and concealment of the ground-floor rear elevation of the appeal dwelling would, in principle, cause very limited harm to the special interest of the listed building as a whole. Furthermore, the proposal includes the restoration of brickwork to the first floor level which I saw was in noticeably poor condition. This would offer a visual enhancement which I consider would balance the harm. The appellant also indicates that they would be agreeable to conditions requiring rainwater goods to be of traditional materials which I agree with the Council would be consistent with the fabric and architectural integrity of the building.
13. However, while the overall scale of the extension would be generally subordinate to the host dwelling, it would include a very large roof lantern. This would project above the cill level of the first-floor window above the extension, and the submitted plans further indicate that it would sit directly in front of part of the cill. Although predominantly glazed, I consider that its height and scale would still be dominant and the juxtaposition with the historic rear elevation would be visually jarring. The width of the extension means that it would also overlap the shallower rear projection adjacent to No 85. This overlap and the resulting junction of its roof parapet onto the monopitch form would be visually awkward and the relationship would exacerbate the incongruous and unsympathetic nature of the extension against the composition of the building.
14. Taken in isolation, the extension may have a more cohesive form and appearance than the projection and rear porch which would be replaced. Nevertheless, it would be taller than the majority of the form of these structures and much greater overall bulk and scale so that the visual impact and dominance of the unsympathetic addition would be increased overall. In my assessment and even setting aside the overlap of the existing projection, the extension would be a discordant addition to the rear of the appeal dwelling and the proposal would detract from the architectural quality and integrity of the appeal dwelling and listed building as a

whole. It would not therefore comply with the Runnymede Design Supplementary Planning Document 2021 which includes requirements for extensions to respect and enhance the character of the original building and harmonise with it.

15. The appellant indicates that the dwelling formerly had a conservatory, but that this was destroyed in the war. It is not therefore an existing feature of the listed building, and from the details provided it is unclear that it was in any event of comparable form and design to the appeal proposal. Furthermore, neither the former conservatory or alterations to other parts of the listed building offer a compelling justification to allow further unsympathetic alterations that would not relate well to the architecture and form of the listed building.
16. Views of the extension from the surrounding area would be limited, but listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained. Given the above, I find that the proposal taken as a whole would not preserve the listed building and there would be harm to its special interest and significance.
17. Having regard to the scale of the proposal and how it would affect the building, harm to the significance of the listed building would be 'less than substantial' in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), and at a low level. Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use. I return to this matter in my planning balance below.

Conservation Area

18. The Chertsey CA is focused around the junction of Guildford Street, London Street and Windsor Street. It includes a mix of commercial uses, dwellings and open spaces including those on the remains of the former Chertsey Abbey. The Chertsey Conservation Area Appraisal 2020 ('the CAA') notes that the special interest of the CA is derived from the town's historic development in relation to the Abbey and subsequent evolution into a thriving market and coaching town. Insofar as it relates to these appeals, I consider the quality of the many historic buildings which vary in scale, architecture and use and the layout of development which reflects the evolution of the town over time to contribute to the character and appearance and thus the significance of the CA.
19. The CAA notes that houses on London Street are generally groups of terraced cottages, each with its own character but with consistent features which provide some harmony to the street scene. As part of a listed building which reflects these broad characteristics and which provides a visual focus at the end of the street, I find that the appeal building makes a positive contribution to the character, appearance and significance of the CA.
20. While I have found that the design of the extension would be unsympathetic against the listed building, the proposal would not be readily apparent from either London Street or Willow Walk which runs to the rear of the appeal site. There could be some views from nearby properties, but these would be very limited given the scale of the proposal and its position between existing rear projections. Even where there could be views, I consider having regard to the surrounding development, including the neighbouring rear additions of significant height and depth at No 85, that the proposal would not stand out as a conspicuous element in the area.

21. Notwithstanding the harm that I have identified to the listed building, I find for these reasons that the proposal would not have any meaningful effect on how the CA is experienced and I am satisfied that the contribution that the site makes to the character, appearance and significance of the CA as a whole would be preserved.
22. Accordingly, I conclude that there would not be harm to the Chertsey CA. In this respect, I find no conflict with Policies EE1, EE3 or EE5 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (adopted 2020) insofar as they include requirements broadly seeking development which responds to historic character and which conserves and enhances the significance and value of heritage assets including conservation areas.

Planning Balance

23. Although I have found that the character, appearance and significance of the Chertsey CA would be preserved, the proposal would cause harm to the special interest and significance of the host listed building.
24. The Framework advises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. The harm that the proposal would cause to the listed building would be 'less than substantial' and at a low level within this range. Nevertheless, the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and the harm attracts considerable importance and weight.
25. The proposal would provide additional and enhanced living accommodation for occupiers of the dwelling, but there is no firm evidence to suggest that the continued viable use of the appeal property as a dwelling is dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence. Accordingly, this would essentially comprise a private rather than a public benefit.
26. Moreover, there is no firm evidence before me to show that improvements to provide a modern and accessible ground floor layout would be dependent on an extension of the design proposed which I have found would be unsympathetic. Even if I were satisfied that there would be justification for alterations to the ground floor of the dwelling, I am not therefore satisfied that harm to the listed building has been minimised.
27. The repairs to brickwork to the rear of the appeal dwelling would offer some visual enhancement, but this would be modest. While I have found it would balance the very limited harm arising from the loss of historic fabric and concealment of the ground floor rear elevation, I find that it would be notably outweighed by the adverse effects of the discordant design of the extension.
28. In this context, I find that the public benefits of the proposal would be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the listed building, and a clear and convincing justification for the proposal has not been demonstrated.
29. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building 83-89 London Street. There is no clear and convincing justification for the harm that the proposal would cause to the significance of the listed building and the proposal would fail to satisfy the

requirements of the LBCA Act and the Framework. Although not determinative in the case of Appeal B, there would also be conflict with Policies EE1, EE3 and EE4 of the Local Plan insofar as they broadly seek development which conserves and enhances the significance and value of heritage assets including listed buildings and which does not adversely affect a listed building or its setting including by virtue of design or scale.

30. The Appeal A proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached.

Conclusion

31. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR