



# Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 February 2010

by **Jennifer Armstrong JP BA FRTPi**

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:**  
**10 February 2010**

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/E/09/2111056

### 61 The Borough, Downton, Salisbury, SP5 3LX

- 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 Darren Poole against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The application ref. S/2009/797/LBC, dated 29 May 2009, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2009.
- The works proposed are demolition of single storey section of cottage and construction of two storey extension on part of single storey section and internal alterations to thatched cottage.

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/A/09/2110230

### 61 The Borough, Downton, Salisbury, SP5 3LX

- 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 Mr Darren Poole against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The application ref. S/2009/768/FULL, dated 29 May 2009, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2009.
- The development proposed is demolition of single storey section of cottage and construction of two storey extension on part of single storey section and internal alterations to thatched cottage.

---

## Decisions

1. I dismiss the appeals.

## Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeals were lodged planning permission and listed building consent have been granted for demolition of the rear single storey parts of the cottage and extension to it (refs. S/2009/1273/FULL and S/2009/1274/LBC). I understand that the approved plans differ from those before me in that, although the extension would be the same length, the end 3m of it would be single storey rather than two storey. The demolition of the rear buildings has already taken place.

## Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
-

## Reasons

4. No. 61 is half of a pair of semi-detached Grade II listed cottages fronting the main village street. They are small in scale and timber framed with brick infilling and a thatched roof. In the light of the recent decisions mentioned above it seems to me that the only matter now at issue is the impact of the scale of the proposed rear extension on the cottage and its setting. In terms of its size, position and appearance, the proposal mirrors the addition to no. 59 which I understand was built following the granting of planning permission and listed building consent in 2002, prior to the adoption of the current Local Plan.
5. Whereas the side elevation of no. 59 is partly obscured, no. 61 has a stream running along the east boundary of its garden, resulting in a gap in the otherwise built up frontage. One result of this gap is that the extension proposed at no. 61 - some 8m long and therefore longer than the width of the dwelling - would be more visible from the public highway than that at no. 59. In my opinion, a two storey extension of this length and in this position would appear out of proportion with the scale and dimensions of the cottage. It would not therefore accord with Local Plan policy CN3 which, in line with advice in Planning Policy Guidance 15, requires that the scale of new development does not dominate a listed building. And because of the views into the site from the street I find that the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan (2003) Conservation Area policies CN8 and CN11 which seek to ensure that the form and scale of new development is appropriate to its setting and that views from the Conservation Area are safeguarded.
6. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and that the appeals should therefore be dismissed.

*J. Armstrong*

INSPECTOR