



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2009

by **Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Decision date:  
24 August 2009

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/E/09/2099848

### 1a Winchester Street, Salisbury, SP1 1HB.

- 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 Wigmore Retail LLP against the decision of Wiltshire Council (formerly Salisbury District Council).
- The application Ref. S/2008/1981/LBW, dated 19 November 2008, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2009.
- The works proposed are described as "alteration to the shopfront to Queen Street to form a new entrance door".

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/A/09/2099846

### 1a Winchester Street, Salisbury, SP1 1HB.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Wigmore Retail LLP against the decision of Wiltshire Council (formerly Salisbury District Council).
- The application Ref. S/2008/2121/FULL, dated 19 November 2009, was refused by the Council by notice dated 10 February 2009.
- The development proposed is described as "alterations to the shopfront to Queen Street to form a new entrance door".

---

## Decision

1. I dismiss these appeals.

## Procedural Matters

2. The original planning application was determined by Salisbury District Council which has now been subsumed into Wiltshire Council. The application was considered on the basis of the policies saved in the Salisbury District Council Local Plan (LP). As these remain the most up-to-date policies I shall consider this appeal against them.

## Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposed works on the special architectural or historic interest of the building, listed grade II, and thereby the character or appearance of the conservation area in which it is located.
-

## Reasons

4. The building the subject of these appeals is a mid 18 century building, listed grade II, sitting in a prominent corner location at the junction of Queen Street and Winchester Street in the Salisbury Conservation Area. The building known as Cross Keys House is a striking building with a strong vertical emphasis. This is characterised by a steeply pitched roof, projecting gables and vertical stone tracery with expressed timber framing over. It is its rich and strongly articulated architectural detailing that, I consider, defines this building's special architectural and historic interest.
5. There are two stone bays facing Queen Street, one to either side of a projecting stone porch with the original main doors set into it. That to the south, which is wider, extends over two floors and at some time in the past has been altered by the introduction of a pair of double doors, with a fascia sign over, at pavement level. That to the north is narrower and only single storey but sits under a projecting panelled timber gable projection. The stone jambs, cill, head and grid-tracery which form the window remain unaltered.
6. The appellant proposes the removal of the three window panes and attendant stone framing from the front of the bay along with part of the stone cill, brickwork under and stone/brick skirting detail and the insertion of a pair of doors and sign over, similar to the alteration already carried out to the southern bay. The existing street name board would then be repositioned at first floor level.
7. I observed that while the new doors to the southern bay were located so that a glass panel was retained either side, this would not be the case here. Accordingly, the window cill and stone dressing to the skirting would appear as though it had simply been cut through, as illustrated on the application drawings. The works of alteration and the insertion of the doors would therefore have a greater detrimental impact on the detailing of the original window than the earlier work to the southern bay. Due to this bay being smaller, the works of alteration would also, in my opinion, have a disproportionate impact on it. Further, the proposed works would lead to a significant loss of historic fabric.
8. In my opinion the introduction of a further pair of doors here with a sign set in a spandrel panel over would significantly harm the architectural integrity of the original façade. Furthermore, it would detract from it by imposing a further prominent entrance way that would compete visually with the original main entrance doors in the porch, thereby diminishing their original design/functional importance.
9. I appreciate that the authenticity and integrity of the original building has to some extent been compromised by earlier and more substantive alterations. Nevertheless that is no reason to allow a further alteration to an original part of the building that would in my opinion be harmful.
10. I appreciate that the proposed alterations would enhance, albeit to a relatively limited extent, the visible presence of the shop on to Market Square and I am sympathetic to this. Nevertheless, in my experience, while this may have some benefit many shops and outlets are not necessarily solely reliant on a

visual presence to run a successful viable business. The appellant has submitted evidence on the trading history of this unit. However, this has not been balanced by evidence in respect of the other premises in Winchester Street or Queen Street. Consequently I can afford it little weight. Accordingly, while mindful of the evidence provided on this matter I do not consider that, in this case, this consideration outweighs the harm that I have identified.

11. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed works would seriously detract from the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and therefore the proposed alterations would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would thus conflict with the purposes of saved LP Policies CN3, CN8 and G2.
12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should not succeed.

*Philip Willmer*

INSPECTOR