Planning Inspectorate

3D Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 44 45931
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: West1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Development Services
Wiltshire Council
Development Services
County Hall
Trowbridge
BA14 8JF

Your Ref: PL/2023/07727
Our Ref: APP/Y3940/W/24/3356285

14 November 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Twelve Fifteen Heritage Homes Ltd
Site Address: Beehive Cottage, Portway, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP4 6BL

Outcome

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

Thank you for your cooperation and patience while we reviewed your case and all relevant documentation.

What Next?

Please note that the Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome of the attached decision as only the High Court can quash this decision. The Planning Inspectorate is not the administrative body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadline for challenging a decision or a copy of the form for lodging a challenge, please get in touch with the administrative court on 02079476655.

Support

If you have any questions about how we handled the appeal(s), please use our customer contact form / https://contact-us.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/hc/en-gb/requests/new , or call us on 0303 444 5000. Our customer service phone line is open between 09:00 and 16:00, Monday through Friday (closed on weekends and public holidays).

If you do not have Internet access, please write to the customer quality team at the address above.

Feedback

We are committed to improving the quality of our service and experience for our customers.

Please take a few minutes to give your feedback via the short survey. As stated in our customer charter, we will learn from our mistakes and work to improve how we do things.

Your feedback makes us better / https://forms.office.com/e/nLDD4REWgf

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Jasmine Rogers
Jasmine Rogers

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notices

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is - https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate

Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/24/3356285
Beehive Cottage, Portway, Old Sarum, Wiltshire SP4 6BL

- 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 1215 Heritage Homes Ltd against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The application Ref is PL/2023/07727.
- The development proposed is the erection of a new dwelling, landscaping and associated works.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a new dwelling, landscaping and associated works at Beehive Cottage, Portway, Old Sarum, Wiltshire SP4 6BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2023/07727, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

2. Whilst work has commenced on the new Wiltshire Local Plan, no policies within the emerging plan have been put forward as relevant to this case. Consequently, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the Wiltshire Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

3. As the appeal site includes a listed building I have had regard to section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).

4. The appeal site lies within the catchment of the River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a European designated site afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2007, as amended (the Habitat Regulations). Whilst not indicated as a reason for refusal, it is incumbent upon me as the competent authority to consider whether the proposal would be likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of the SAC. As the main parties have addressed this situation during the appeal, neither party would be prejudiced by this matter being dealt with as a main issue.

5. Consequently, the main issues are:
   - whether the location of the site is suitable for the proposal, having regard to the local development strategy;
   - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
   - whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building known as Beehive Cottage[1] (the Cottage) or its setting or any of the features of special

[1] Listing Entry Number: 1023822, date first listed 20 June 1979

architectural or historic interest that it possesses; and whether it would preserve the setting of the Old Sarum Scheduled Monument[2] (Old Sarum SM);
- whether future occupiers of the proposal would be likely to experience acceptable living conditions, with particular reference to privacy and the quantum of outdoor space; and
- whether the proposal would be likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of the SAC.

Reasons

Location

6. As the appeal site is located outside a defined settlement boundary, for the purposes of the Core Strategy it is located within the countryside where development is strictly controlled. No other policies within the Core Strategy support the provision of a new open market dwelling on the site.

7. Whilst another Inspector[3] concluded that the physical context of the site could not be satisfactorily described as being open countryside, this decision was made within the context of a different planning regime, being taken prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy and the publication of the Framework.

8. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal site is not suitable for the proposal, having regard to the local development strategy and conflicts with policies CP1 and CP2 of the Core Strategy. In combination, these policies set out the hierarchical approach to the delivery of development, including housing, across Wiltshire which aims, among other things, to reduce the need to travel whilst supporting existing local services and facilities.

Character and appearance

9. The appeal site comprises the Cottage and its garden, together with an area of part scrub, part loose hardstanding. The latter area also accommodates the vehicular access to the Cottage and, at the time of my site visit, was separated from the Cottage's garden by a tall close boarded wooden fence. Aside from the yew tree[4] located close to the hedge and the hedgerows to the remaining three sides of the currently undeveloped part of the site, no other landscape features are present. The condition of this part of the site is largely unkempt/derelict, with weeds and grass growing through the loose stones.

10. In addition to its partially neglected condition, the character of the site is also heavily influenced by the highly engineered A345/Portway roundabout where four roads converge, and its associated infrastructure, including the bus laybys, signage, crossing islands and footpaths/cycleways. The roundabout also serves the Beehive Park and Ride facility. Just outside its eastern boundary, a wide footpath/cycleway lined by hedgerows, separates the site from agricultural fields. Therefore, as highlighted in the previous appeal, the influence the surrounding countryside may once have had on the character of the site has been significantly eroded and it is now contained within artificial, rather than natural, features.

[2] Listing Entry Number 1015675, date first listed 7 August 1916 and amended 3 July 1997
[3] Appeal ref: APP/T3915/A/08/2088072, dated 21 April 2009
[4] Subject to Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 193, dated 2 February 1995

11. Given the dominance of the aforementioned highways infrastructure, the introduction of additional built form on the undeveloped part of the site would not be a discordant feature within this context and, due to its containment, would not intrude upon the wider countryside setting. Furthermore, the intensified residential use of the site would lead to an enhancement in its condition and therefore a positive effect on its character and appearance.

12. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord with the Framework's requirement that development should be sympathetic to the local built form and landscape character while not preventing appropriate innovation and change.

Heritage

Beehive Cottage

13. Beehive Cottage is a Grade II listed building which formerly functioned as a toll house associated with two historical turnpike roads, including the Salisbury-Amesbury toll road. Currently in residential use, the two-storey building is constructed from brick with large areas of the external walls comprising knapped flint. The gable end facing southwards has a cream-coloured render. All three sections of its pitched roofscape are finished with slate tiles. While the historic windows and doorways have been replaced, their triangular headed casements remain.

14. Therefore, the special interest of the Cottage comprises its former use as a toll house and its relationship to the historic routes, together with its architectural features and use of materials. As highlighted above, the character of the appeal site has been eroded and the once isolated toll house is now appreciated in the same context as the adjacent highways works. Despite the reduction in intervisibility between the site and the Park and Ride facility in comparison due to the growth of the trees alongside the roundabout, the influence of roadside signage, lighting and bus laybys dominates the street scene. Nonetheless, the relationship of the former toll house to the historic routes continues to be discernible due to the close siting of the dwelling to the A345, particularly when viewed from the south.

15. The proposal comprises the erection of a new dwelling adjacent to the Cottage, on a part of the site which currently detracts from its setting. It would comprise the same footprint, bulk and massing as the previously approved appeal scheme, with its sole use for residential accommodation being the only point of difference. The retention of the yew tree on the site would also assist in separating the existing and proposed built form and the height of the new dwelling would be lower than that of the listed building and sited back from the A345. On this basis, despite the contemporary design and use of modern materials within the proposed dwelling, it would not detract from or harm the setting of this heritage asset.

Old Sarum Scheduled Monument

16. As a Scheduled Monument, the Old Sarum SM is a designated heritage asset which is, by definition, of national importance. The Framework recognises that Scheduled Monuments are assets of the highest significance and requires great weight to be given to their conservation.

17. Located on higher ground to the southwest of the appeal site, the Old Sarum SM comprises an Iron Age hillfort, likely to have been constructed between the sixth century BC and the mid first century AD. It is encompassed by multiple concentric defensive ramparts (multivallate), having been refortified and modified in later periods, including the construction of a royal motte and bailey castle following the Norman conquest in 1066. Remains of the medieval town previously located within the ramparts have also been discovered, along with those of a cathedral and a bishop's palace. The significance of the Old Sarum SM, insofar as is relevant to the appeal scheme, relates to its prominent, strategic and elevated position close to several Roman roads, its royal connections, historical use and later adaptions plus its archaeological potential that assists in understanding the Iron Age period.

18. Although the distance between the appeal site and the monument is significant, the cream rendered gable end of the Cottage remains identifiable against the backdrop of the tall, dark and mature trees associated with the nearby roundabout. However, the proposed dwelling would be predominately screened by the Cottage in the views from the Old Sarum SM given its siting behind and with a lower roof height than the existing dwelling. The existing yew tree on the site would also assist in screening and softening the proposed built form. Therefore, I conclude that the introduction of an additional dwelling on the site would not harm the setting of the Old Sarum SM.

Other Heritage Matters

19. Although not located within the Stratford Sub Castle Conservation Area (SSCCA), its boundary follows the edge of the field on the opposite side of the A345 from the site. The Old Sarum Airfield Conservation Area (OSACA) is also located nearby, beyond the agricultural field to the east. Neither conservation area is included on the decision notice as a reason for refusal despite the Officer's Report indicating that the proposal would harm the setting of the OSACA. Nevertheless, I have taken account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of the SSCCA and the OSACA, including any contribution made by their settings, as required by the Framework.

20. The SSCCA encompasses the Old Sarum SM and the settlement of Stratford sub-Castle, with the area closest to the site comprising the agricultural field that slopes down from the Old Sarum SM to the A345/Portway roundabout. Therefore, when occupied, the elevated siting of the hill fort would have permitted long distance views across the sloping topography enabling anyone approaching to be seen and preparations made for their arrival depending upon whether they were friend or foe. The significance of this part of the SSCCA therefore, is derived from its relationship with the Old Sarum SM and the views allowed from the former hillfort across the currently undeveloped landscape. Given my conclusions on the effect of the proposal on the Old Sarum SM, I similarly conclude that the proposal would preserve the contribution the setting of the SSCCA makes to its significance.

21. The significance of the OSACA relates to its aviation use which was first established during the First World War. The grass airfield remains in operation, albeit primarily for small aircraft, training, parachuting and helicopter operations. Agricultural fields lie between the grassy airstrip and the appeal site, one of which forms part of the OSACA. Given this distant relationship between the OSACA and the appeal site, even if the proposed dwelling is visible from locations within the

conservation area, its open character would be retained and the setting of the OSACA would be preserved.

Heritage Conclusion

22. I conclude that the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building known as Beehive Cottage and its setting and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. It would also preserve the setting of the Old Sarum Scheduled Monument. The proposal, therefore, satisfies the requirements of the Act and the Framework's desirability to sustain and enhance the significance of a designated heritage asset. It also accords with Policy CP58 of the Core Strategy which requires development to protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance the historic environment, amongst other provisions.

Living conditions

23. The main living space of the proposed dwelling, comprising an open plan area which incorporates a kitchen, dining and lounge, would be served by windows directly adjacent to the driveway access to the Cottage. A window in this elevation is also provided for the 'snug.' However, as this route would only provide vehicular access to the Cottage, it would be used infrequently by vehicles and/or cyclists. Given there are alternative, more direct routes for pedestrians to get to the cottage, it is likely that fewer people than vehicles/cyclists would walk past these windows. Moreover, such a circumstance is no different to locations where properties are constructed immediately adjacent to a pavement or a carriageway. This arrangement would not, therefore, be detrimental to the privacy of future occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

24. The amount of private outdoor space, as set out in the guidance within the Wiltshire Design Guide 2024, indicates that an area equivalent to the footprint of the property it serves is required as a minimum for the appeal scheme. Based on the evidence before me, in excess of the equivalent area has been provided for the new dwelling. This excludes the land beneath the canopy of the yew tree.

25. Although not directly from the kitchen/dining/living space of the proposed dwelling, access to the private outdoor space is proposed via the utility room which is linked to the main open plan area by a small hallway. I see no reason to conclude that such an arrangement would be detrimental to the ability of future occupiers to access their private outdoor space or that the living conditions they would experience would be unacceptable due to this arrangement.

26. I conclude that future occupiers of the proposal would experience acceptable living conditions, with particular reference to privacy and the quantum of outdoor space. The proposal, therefore, accords with Policy CP57 of the Core Strategy insofar as it relates to ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity (living conditions) are achievable within the development itself. It also accords with the Framework's aim of achieving well-designed places through ensuring new development has a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Integrity of the River Avon SAC

27. The conservation interest of the SAC relates to its watercourses of plain to montane levels habitat type which support internationally important vegetation together with populations of protected invertebrate and fish species. The ongoing

protection and maintenance of these habitats and species is, consequently, the core conservation objective for the SAC. One of the main issues preventing this objective from being met relates to the increase in wastewater being discharged into the River Avon. This includes pollutants and nutrients such as nitrates and phosphates which affect water quality and can threaten the condition of these habitats and their ability to support the aforementioned protected species.

28. As the proposal comprises a new dwelling, it would result in an increase in the number of people staying overnight in the area, thereby leading to an increase in the amount of wastewater being discharged into the catchment of the River Avon. As such, it is likely that the proposal, taken both in isolation and cumulatively, would have a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC.

29. The evidence before me indicates that it is not possible to connect the site to a public sewer. The Cottage is currently served by a septic tank with a total annual phosphorous load confirmed on the nutrient calculator provided during the appeal. The proposal comprises the installation of a package treatment plant (PTP) which will serve both the new dwelling and, in respect of the Cottage, would replace the septic tank. As shown on the nutrient calculator, the installation of the PTP, secured by the use of a suitably worded condition, would result in an annual phosphorous load from two dwellings entering the SAC significantly below the current situation from one dwelling.

30. I conclude that, subject to the proposed mitigation, the proposal would not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC, in accordance with the Habitat Regulations and the Framework's approach to promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of designated habitats.

Other Matters

31. The proposal would provide social and economic benefits from the construction and occupation of a new dwelling, albeit at a small scale. Modest environmental benefits would also be derived from the scheme due to the reduction in phosphates reaching the River Avon SAC.

32. Reference is made to the proposal establishing a new and sustainable use for the listed building and securing a programme of repairs and enhancements that may otherwise prove difficult to secure. However, during my site visit I observed that the Cottage was in residential use and I have no substantive evidence before me to conclude that its continued occupation depends upon the proposal. Furthermore, although the existing building would benefit from some maintenance, such works do not form part of the appeal scheme.

33. The Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in accordance with the Framework. The Council's Housing Land Supply Statement, published June 2025, confirms the latest position to be 2.42 years. This represents a substantial shortfall. In such circumstances, paragraph 11d Framework specifies that permission for proposals should be granted unless:
    i. the policies therein that protect areas or assets of particular importance, including habitat sites and designated heritage assets, provide a strong reason for refusing it; or
    ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

34. Given my conclusions relating to the heritage assets and the SAC above, I have not found that there is a strong reason for refusing the proposal in this regard. Therefore, paragraph 11di does not apply.

35. In respect to paragraph 11dii, the proposal is contrary to the local development strategy and, as policies CP1 and CP2 of the Core Strategy reflect the Framework's approach to the use of strategic policies on the location of development, I attach moderate weight to this conflict.

36. Nonetheless, I have also concluded that the net gain of a single dwelling as a result of the proposal would be valuable in supporting the Framework's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing where there is a shortfall. Despite the scale of the proposal, given the size of the shortfall, it would make a modest, but nevertheless important contribution to the local housing supply. I therefore attach great weight to these benefits.

37. As the appeal site is small, the proposal can be constructed quickly whilst making an effective use of land, both characteristics which are supported by the Framework. The proposal would enhance the listed building and its setting by replacing the currently derelict condition of part of the site, along with improving the character and appearance of the area. I give these benefits modest weight. Moreover, through the installation of the PTP, the proposal would lead to the reduction of phosphates being discharged into the River Avon SAC. Due to the SAC's designated status, this improvement attracts significant weight.

38. Consequently, when assessed against the Framework as a whole, I conclude that the adverse impacts of granting permission for the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits that would be derived from it. Therefore, paragraph 11dii of the Framework applies and the granting of permission is supported.

Conditions

39. Aside from the standard time and plans conditions, I have imposed conditions relating to archaeological evaluation, investigation and safeguarding, and the protection of the yew tree on the site. These need to be pre-commencement conditions as they involve protected features of the site or the discovery of irreplaceable historic features.

40. To secure the reduction in phosphorous load from the proposal and the existing Cottage, I have imposed a condition requiring the removal of the existing septic tank on the site and the installation of the proposed PTP prior to the occupation of the new dwelling. To restrict the use of water, consumption limits per person have been conditioned.

41. In the interests of character and appearance, and the setting of the listed building, I have attached a condition which requires the external materials of the proposal to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council. A condition relating to the laying out of the proposed parking areas has also been attached in the interests of highways safety. As the site comprises a listed building and due to the constrained nature of new dwelling and garden space, permitted development rights comprises enlargements or extensions, as well as alterations/additions to the roof and the erection of any buildings or means of enclosure on the site.

Conclusion

42. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR

List of 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 nos:

PP-12447743v1	Location Plan
23/675/01 rev B	Site Plan
23/675/02 rev B	Floor Plans & Elevations

3) No development shall take place until:

(i) An archaeological field evaluation has been carried out in accordance with a specification and timetable that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and

(ii) Safeguarding measures to ensure the preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording identified in the archaeological field evaluation have been undertaken in accordance with a specification and timetable that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

No development shall take place other than in accordance with the approved archaeological field evaluation.

4) Notwithstanding the works set out in Condition 3), no development shall take place, including site clearance, the storage of materials or other preparatory work until a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

5) No development above ground level shall take place until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

6) Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, the existing septic tank serving Beehive Cottage shall be removed and the approved Package Treatment Plant (PTP) and drainage field shall be installed. The PTP and drainage field shall, thereafter, be maintained and operated in accordance with the specification and details hereby approved.

7) Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, the space shall be laid out within the site, in accordance with the Site Plan (dwg no: 23/675/01 rev B), for six cars to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. These spaces shall thereafter be kept available at all times for the parking of vehicles.

8) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development

permitted by virtue of Classes A, B, C or E of Part 1 or Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the Order shall be undertaken.

9) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the Building Regulations optional requirement of a water consumption rate of no more than 110 litres per person per day has been complied with.