

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

24 November 2025

Jocelyn Sage
Senior Conservation Officer
Wiltshire Council Conservation
(South/West)

Officer’s Name: Hayley Clark
Officer’s Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2025/08824
Change of use, removal of existing structures and construction of two dwellings with off-road parking
Burnout Bikes, The Headlands, Downton, Salisbury, SP5 3HH

Please find following comments in respect of the above application(s).

Recommendations:

☐	No comment
☐	Support in principle subject to amendments to the scheme (as set out below)
☐	Support subject to conditions (as set out below)
☒	Object (for reasons set out below)
☐	No objections

Scope of comments: the following comments relate to the built historic environment.

Policy:

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 also requires the Council to pay **special attention** to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of designated Conservation Areas.

The NPPF outlines government policy, including its policy in respect of the historic environment. Section 16 of the NPPF 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' sets out the Government's high-level policies concerning heritage and sustainable development. Paragraphs 214-16 of the NPPF require a balanced approach with any harm which would be caused being weighed against the potential public benefits which might be achieved. Paragraph 210 requires local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

National Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on interpreting the NPPF.

The Council’s Core Strategy Policy CP58 ‘Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment’ requires that “designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner appropriate to their significance.” It is also required that distinctive elements of Wiltshire’s historic environment, including non-designated heritage assets, which contribute to a sense of local character and identity will be conserved, and where possible enhanced.

Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy Policy CP57 'Ensuring high quality design and place shaping': A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complementary to the locality.

Site and assets considered:

The existing building is not listed nor considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. It would appear to be a 20th century single-storey structure, abutting a semi-detached pair of buildings (The Grey Cottage and The Cottage) which are attractive historic dwellings and could reasonably be considered NDHAs.

It is within the Downton Conservation Area, for which there is an adopted appraisal. In respect of 'The Headlands' character area, the document says:

- *'Linear development focused on the junction with The Borough*
- *2 storey, back of pavement development. The substantial Bull Inn; 2½ storey with small dormers (figure 1).*
- *Key grouping of The Bull Inn and Nos. 1-3 The Headlands around the junction with The Borough – prominent and distinctive porches producing a pleasing rhythm, which leads the eye along the terrace (figure 2).*
- *Brick, painted render, slate, tile and some thatch (but not dominant).*
- *Important local views into The Borough (figure 3) and long views along Salisbury Road enclosed by development on back of pavement.*
- *Stone number plaques, porches and prominent roofs with distinctive dormers cutting the eaves line'.*

The townscape map (snip to follow) identifies the shop as being 'neutral' (ie no highlighting) but the adjacent properties (ie to the left and right) as buildings which make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area ie coloured turquoise (the royal blue denotes buildings or structures which are listed).





Proposal:

Demolition of existing structure

I have no objection to its demolition on the basis that it does not make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area.

Erection of new house (two dwellings)

The proposed drawings show a rectangular building sitting hard back of the pavement. It is two-storey with a gable facing towards the road and a pitched roof.

The 'wideness' of the footprint means a relatively shallow roof which is at odds with historic buildings in the area. The proposed western elevation shows lining up with its lefthand side neighbours. Interestingly it appears to mirror Downs View although the proposed dwelling is significantly wider and the roof shallower, and bluntly, all the uglier for it. (Downs View has a different treatment on the ground floor as it is also part of a shop. This 'relieves' the elevation so that it is not predominantly brick).



An entirely misleading drawing as it doesn't show the features that elevate or enliven the row of buildings such as porches, the former shop element etc. It is also inaccurate in terms of details – in particular regarding the proportion of the windows on the existing terrace.

Also, Grey Cottage has projecting eaves. The proposed footprint shows only the proposed building, not the adjacent Grey Cottage. I would strongly recommend that a ground floor footprint for the proposed and The Grey Cottage is provided (with the telegraph pole shown too).

The proposed dwelling has a small pitched roof/dormer lining up with the roof of The Grey Cottage. For what purpose? Again, the proposed roofplan doesn't show how this impacts on the roof of The Grey Cottage. I recommend a fuller roofplan ie showing the adjacent roof of The Grey Cottage is provided.

Treatment of windows, doors, oriel windows, what the lintels are over the doors and windows, whether the garage will have doors or roller shutters, are all elements that impact on the look of a building and how it beds into the CA. We have little information so whilst the above might suggest it replicates details elsewhere in the conservation area, there is no information to corroborate this.

In conclusion, the desire to construct one unit with a simple roof structure has resulted in an ungainly building that does not reflect the traditional character of the area where units are generally smaller and have steeper pitched roofs. The inclusion of a garage within the body of the building is also uncharacteristic of the area where they are usually detached. The proposed windows are 'mean' resulting in a large unrelieved area of brick (no doubt stretcher bond).

In addition, there is a lack of information about features. I recommend that a materials/details palette, is at the very least provided. I also recommend that accurate existing drawings are supplied.

As it stands, I consider the proposal design would cause harm to the character of the CA and therefore would be contrary to section 72 of the NPPF as well as paragraph 219 of the NPPF.