

APPLICATION FOR HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING PERMISSION DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2025/08780
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
SITE ADDRESS:	8 Providence Lane, Corsham, SN13 9DJ
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Two storey extension to side of house
RECOMMENDATION:	That Planning Permission be REFUSED

PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension at 8 Providence Lane in Corsham. The application is submitted using Householder application forms. This application follows a previous submission (under reference PL/2025/07131) form precisely the same form of development. That previous application was refused on 31/10/25.

The proposal seeks the addition of a two-storey side extension, to help develop the property from a 2 to a 4 bedroomed dwelling. The existing single storey extension is a subservient addition, set back from the host dwelling, and currently houses the main entrance door, garage, utility room and WC. The proposed extension would enable the creation of a new hall way, sitting room, garden room and utility room to the ground floor, with stairs to the upper floor. The proposed first floor includes 2 new bedrooms (one with en suite), a bathroom and landing area. A bedroom will also feature a new balcony overlooking the rear garden. The proposed first floor built form means that there will be a slight wraparound element, given the position of the first floor bathroom across the rear elevation.



Existing Elevations



The existing dwelling features a hipped roof, whilst the existing single-storey side extension has a shallow pitched roof. The proposed extension introduces a two-storey form, with an exceptionally shallow fully hipped roof, with eaves which meet that of the main dwelling. Its footprint rivals (potentially exceeds) that of the original building and is stood off from it via a box valley. At the rear, part of the roof continues the pitched design, but a flat roof section is also present and visible between the box valley on the front elevation.

The proposed external materials comprise a lime and stone dust render finish to the elevations, natural slate tiles for the roof covering, and timber-framed windows and doors. With regards to fenestration, the proposal will also see an increase to the front, rear and side elevations, both at ground and first floor level, including a balcony to the first floor rear elevation which includes a glass balustrade. The front door to the property will also feature on the proposed extension, which will be somewhat more prominent than its existing arrangement, given that it is currently concealed within the existing single storey extension.

The overall height of the extension is proposed to measure approx. 6.4m, with the width measuring approx. 6m wide and 9.5m deep. To compare, the original front width of the dwelling is currently 7.9m whilst the depth of the two storey element is approx. 6.8m. It is proposed that the extension will still occupy the current position of the single storey addition and the proposed built line will not be brought any further forward than the existing extension built form, however the footprint will increase to both the side and rear elevations.

The new application has provided an updated block plan, suggesting that the grassed area adjacent to the existing single storey side extension would be used to accommodate off-roading parking for 3 vehicles. The same drawing points to an area of the site in front of the existing dwelling, with a label of "turning". However, no swept path has been provided and

the on-site situation of that labelled area consists of a low wall, with the plan not advising on whether it would remain or be removed.

SITE DESCRIPTION/CONTEXT

The application property is a Georgian era, two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse within the settlement boundary of Corsham. It is constructed from natural stone and render to the external walls, natural stone tiles to the roof with EPDM to flat roofs, and timber windows and doors. The property is located in a no-through lane off of Pickwick Road. The surrounding area is characterised by an array of dwelling types – immediately fronting and adjacent to the site are examples of detached bungalows as well as two storey dwellings - constructed from a variety of materials, with predominantly open frontages.



Whilst not listed, the property is present on C19th 1st Edition OS map, and is clearly of some history and character; retaining much of its original Georgian features such as the rubble stone exterior walls, stone slate roof, full height chimney, dressed stone window surrounds and quoins etc. Indeed, it would appear that the sliding sash windows are also multi-paned with timber construction, likely reflective of its original construction. The later single storey extension to the side and rear is clearly a later addition, but due to its scale and recess back from the road frontage, does little to dilute the otherwise historic appearance of the property. In some regards, the property could be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, but there are no local lists or reference to the property within the core strategy or neighbourhood plan, although the Corsham Design Guide recognises Providence Lane as being within 'Character Area 13 – Pickwick Road'.

The application site is not within either the Corsham or Pickwick Conservation Areas.

The application site is subject to the following planning policy constraints:

- Countryside Character Areas - Cotswolds
- Bath BoA Bat SAC GHS 4km Core Roost buffer - Box, The Grille
- Bath BoA Bat SAC GHS 4km SAC parcel buffer - Bath & Bradford on Avon Bats

PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal / Summary
N/93/00783/DOC - Approval of details reserved by a condition Decision - Approved Date: 17/6/1993 – DISCHARGE OF CONDITION NO 2 RELATING TO N/92/1723/F - DETAILS OF LANDSCAPING DETAILS OF LANDSCAPING
N/92/01723/FUL - Full planning permission Decision - Refused Date: 2/11/1992 – CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO DOMESTIC GARDEN AND ERECTION OF A 2 METRE HIGH FENCE USE AS GARDEN/ERECT FENCE
ENQ/2025/00804 - Pre-Application enquiry – Erection of a two storey extension to front of existing structure. Erection of a second storey extension over existing single storey at the front of the structure.
PL/2025/07131 – Planning application - Decision - Refuse Date: 31/10/2025 – Two Storey Extension to side of house (delegated report and decision notice appended to this report)

RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Wiltshire Core Strategy

- Core Policy 57: Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping
- Core Policy 50: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- Core Policy 61: Transport and New Development
- Core Policy 64: Demand Management

Corsham Neighbourhood Plan

- Policy CNP ED1: Proposals should take into account the Corsham Design Guide
- Policy CNP E2: Achievement of sustainable development
- Policy CNP HE1: Good quality design

Corsham Design Guide

Bat Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) Planning Guidance for Wiltshire (September 2015)

Corsham Batscape Strategy

Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 Car Parking Strategy

Wiltshire Design Guide

- Appendix D – Design Guidance for Householder extensions

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Section 2: Achieving sustainable development
- Section 12: Achieving well designed places
- Section 16:
 - Paragraph 210 - Sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and ensuring new development positively contributes to local character and distinctiveness.
 - Paragraph 216 – Balanced judgement when considering loss or harm to non-designated heritage asset

The Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide

ISSUES

- Design, character and appearance
- Amenity
- Parking and access
- Bath and Bradford on Avon Bat SAC

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Corsham Town Council: No objection, subject to materials:

Resolved: that no objection be raised, subject to the materials used being in keeping with the main dwelling and surrounding area.

Council Highways Officer: No comment

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by direct neighbour letter. One representation has been received in support, with another representation raising objections. The comments are summarised below:

- Concerns raised that the proposal does not match the style of the original Georgian building
- The appearance would be improved if the windows and roof pitch matched the original dwelling
- The neighbouring property next door has no objection to the proposal

ASSESSMENT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

In accordance with this statutory requirement, this application has been assessed against the relevant policies of the Development Plan, including the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) and, where applicable, any made Neighbourhood Plans.

Design, character and appearance

WCS Core Policy 57 requires development to respond positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, elevational design and materials, with particular regard required for the compatibility of the design with the host dwelling and its surroundings, together with the relationship to adjoining buildings and spaces.

Policy CNP ED1 of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals for new development should take into account the Corsham Design Guide. Policy CNP E2 states that all new development should seek to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, whilst policy CNP HE1 states that all new development within the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Area must demonstrate good quality design, which means responding to and integrating with local surroundings and landscape context as well as the existing built environment.

The Corsham Design Guide recognises Providence Lane as being located within 'Character Area 13 – Pickwick Road'. The Design Guide gives guidance for buildings and building details, specifically to retain the existing character of historic buildings and features, building heights of 2 or 2 ½ storey are favoured, materials that are in-keeping with the area (including local limestone and rubblestone, and dark grey, brown or red stone roofing materials) and windows and door designs of similar proportions to existing.

The Wiltshire Design Guide elaborates on WCS Core Policy 57 and requires consideration that should be given to the external appearance, design and materials used for development.

Section 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) relates to achieving sustainable development, whilst Section 12 relates to achieving well designed places. Section 16 provides guidance relating to all heritage assets, with paragraph 210 highlighting the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and ensuring new development positively contributes to local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 216 requires a balanced judgement when considering harm or loss to non-designated heritage assets

As referenced above, this application is identical to that refused planning permission under reference PL/2025/07131, dated 31/10/25 (appended to this report). Given the recency of the

earlier decision and no intervening change in circumstance on the ground or in policy, it remains the case that the scale and design of the proposal represents an overwhelming of the original building and unacceptable interference with the character and appearance of the original building (which is considered to hold historic and architectural value, contributing positively to the surrounding streetscape). The third-party representation which states that the proposed extension does not match the typical Georgian architecture and proportions of the existing building is an astute observation.

As per the previous decision, it continues to be considered that the proposed extensions do not respond positively to the built form of the existing dwelling. The configuration of the extension, combined with the repositioned front door, creates the appearance of a separate, “bolt-on” dwelling rather than a subordinate and cohesive addition to the main building. The incorporation of an extremely shallow hipped roof with a box-valley jars with the nicely proportioned original building, with the number, design and proportions of the windows (especially those in the side of the extension) and new door in the extension exacerbating the gulf in character. Overall, the design of the proposed extension is considered to be of a poor quality, when compared to the historic design, proportions and appearance of the original building.

Turning to the scale, mass and footprint of the extension, it is clear that it will rival, and perhaps exceed that of the original building. It is considered to be disproportionately large in relation to the original building which exacerbates the poor design referenced above. The scale of the extension is not materially diminished by its setting back from the road frontage and will detract from its character and setting in the wider street scene.

The drawings suggest a mix of Bath stone dust and lime render for all elevations. Whilst render can be used as a suitable approach for ancillary type additions to main buildings constructed of natural stone (historically, it being used as a covering for a “cheaper” stone or other material), in this case, the scale of the addition will rival and perhaps dominate that of the original building and therefore the recessive effect of such a contrasting material is lost. In fact, in this instance, the use of such a large amount of a different material exacerbates the harm caused to the original building by the disproportionate scale of the extension.

As was the case at the time of the earlier decision, it is again acknowledged that the building is in perhaps in need of repair and maintenance. However, there is no evidence to suggest that those repairs could not be undertaken without the need for such a harmful extension. Indeed, even if it were to be accepted that an edition were to be somehow necessary, the amount of available space on the plot suggests that an alternative scheme of better design and proportions, which is more respectful to the original building, could reasonably be arrived at.

Accordingly, it is again concluded that this form of development does not represent high-quality design, with its scale, character and external appearance causing an unacceptable impact upon the original building and wider street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, policies CNP ED1, CNP E2 and CNP HE1 of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan, the Corsham and Wiltshire Design Guides as well as paragraphs 131, 135, 137 and 139 to the NPPF.

Amenity

Core Policy 57 states that development should have regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings and uses, the impact on the amenities of existing occupants and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself. Section 12 of the NPPF also states that planning decisions should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

As before, the neighbours most sensitive to the development remain as 6 and 10 Providence Lane, to the NE and SW of the site respectively.

Number 10 is semi-detached to the application dwelling and is of the same architectural style and appearance, built from the same construction materials. Number 10 also appears to have a later single storey side addition, which is subservient to the dwelling given its height and scale, constructed from matching materials. No.10 also appears to occupy a more extensive original footprint than the application site. With the majority of the proposed extension positioned to the side elevation on the NE, it will remain largely concealed from number 10, although partial elements of the development to the rear of the property will be visible.

Number 6, located to the NE, benefits from direct views toward the host dwelling. At present, the separation distance to the boundary ensures that the existing single-storey extension does not adversely affect the residential amenity of Number 6, due to its modest height, scale, and massing. Additionally, the extension contains no fenestration facing the shared boundary. While the proposed development would still increase the footprint and the introduction of an additional storey would also result in greater bulk adjacent to Number 6. In addition, fenestration is proposed to both the ground and upper floors of the extension, which introduces an increase in potential for overlooking. It is acknowledged that the boundary with number 6 does currently benefit from a scattering of established trees and hedging which can somewhat help mitigate against potential overlooking and overbearing effected resulting from the proposed works, however the proposed side elevation will introduce a total of 5 windows to the side elevation (3 to the ground floor, 2 to the upper floor).

Additionally, further properties sensitive to the proposed works are 5 Providence and 16 Erneston Crescent, which both face on to the front elevation of the application dwelling. 5 Providence Lane is a detached bungalow set back from the road, yet its position has direct views toward the host dwelling, particularly the location of the proposed extension. While it is acknowledged that No. 5 is already located opposite two-storey properties, the part of the host dwelling currently within its direct line of sight is the single-storey extension. This existing arrangement helps to mitigate any sense of overbearing development as number 5 is positioned slightly off-set to the application dwelling. The proposed extension, however, introduces additional height and massing that could result in unacceptable impact towards both the visual and residential amenity of this property. The extension introduces additional fenestration to the front elevation – namely 2 windows and a door to the ground floor and 3 windows to the first floor – which would increase the aspect of overlooking to number 5 with direct views across to their property from an increased height at first floor level.

The principal elevation of No. 16 Erneston Crescent faces toward No. 10 Providence Lane, with the boundary between the two properties offering partial views of the host dwelling. While

the proposed extension introduces additional bulk, massing, and fenestration to the front elevation, the orientation and positioning of No. 16—set at a sufficient distance from the proposed development—help to mitigate potential impacts on residential amenity. Views of the extension will be possible from the garden and amenity areas of No. 16, but the separation and existing layout reduce the likelihood of significant visual intrusion.

The proposed extension remains unchanged from the previously refused scheme. As such, the concerns identified in the earlier decision regarding its adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties also remains unchanged. The scale, siting, and design are likely to result in an unacceptable level of overbearing given the significant additional bulk and massing to the existing building, coupled with the potential to dominate the outlook from neighbouring gardens and habitable rooms, which diminishes the sense of openness and privacy. Furthermore, the inclusion of new fenestration at upper levels will lead to increased overlooking, raising concerns about loss of privacy and impacts both the visual and residential amenity of the surrounding properties. Therefore, the proposal does not comply with WCS Core Policy 57 and Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide, as Officers conclude that an appropriate level of amenity cannot be achieved when considering the compatibility of the extension with the adjoining and neighbouring buildings.

Parking and access

Core Policy 57 (xiv) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy seeks to ensure that development must meet the requirements of Core Policy 61. This policy requires proposals to be capable of being served by safe access to the highway network. Core Policy 61 seeks to ensure compliance with parking standards set out in the Local Transport Plan, whilst Core Policy 64 relates to residential car parking standards and the provision of car parking associated with new residential development being based on minimum parking standards. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly Paragraph 115 and 116, requires that development proposals do not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

The existing building is currently a 2-bedroom property, with a small garage and space to park cars to the side. The submission remains substantively unchanged from the previously refused development, with an increase to a 4-bedroom dwelling as a result. In order to comply with the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 Car Parking Strategy, the proposal is required to demonstrate 3 no. off-street parking spaces to serve a 4-bedroom property, which is illustrated on the proposed block plan.

The updated block plan for this new application now illustrates that the grassed area adjacent to the existing single storey side extension would be used to accommodate off-roading parking for 3 vehicles. The same drawing points to an area of the site in front of the existing dwelling, with a label of “turning”. However, no swept path has been provided and the on-site situation of that labelled area consists of a low wall, with the plan not advising on whether it would remain or be removed.

As per the previously refused application, the Council’s Highway Engineer has not objected to the proposed proposals. However, the plans are considered to remain unclear as to the intentions of the low wall and, as a result, the amount of space available to park and turn cars

on the site also remains in doubt (the existence of the wall severely curtailing the amount of space available in the location of the labelled “turning” area). As before, surety in this instance is considered to be important given the narrowness of Providence Lane and the likely lack of manoeuvring space on the site, and it is not considered that the matter could be reasonably left to planning conditions since such an inability would go to the heart of the acceptability of the development proposed.

Whilst the updated block plan identifies parking on the site and “points” to “turning”, there is still considered to be insufficient information to demonstrate that the cars will be able to adequately park and manoeuvre, given the on-site situation. Therefore, the proposal is still considered to be detrimental to the interests of highway safety and sustainable transport and will not comply with WCS Core Policies CP57 and CP61, the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 Car Parking Strategy as well as paragraphs 115 and 116 to the NPPF.

Bath and Bradford on Avon Bat SAC

The wider landscape surrounding Box and Corsham is of international importance for bats. Locally, their habitat is protected through a Bat Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is focused around the Box mine complex, just outside of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan boundary. Although the application site sits outside the formal boundary of the SAC/SSSI, it is known that essential foraging and commuting routes supporting this SAC extend for several kilometres outside the SAC boundary, including the entire Corsham Neighbourhood Plan area. This Batscape Strategy sets out to influence and enhance the sustainable development of Box and Corsham through protecting important bat habitats within the designated Neighbourhood Plan area.

As previously mentioned, the application site is outside of the formal designations, but it is located within the buffer zone. However, upon visiting the site, the condition of the building, as well as the roof, was noted so as to ascertain whether there would be a likelihood of the presence of bats. Since the current condition is good, with no apparent damage or means of entry for bats to create a habitat within the roofspace of the property, Officers were satisfied that the proposal would not have any negative impact on the SAC. Furthermore, no external lighting is proposed as part of the scheme, thereby it is considered that the proposal will meet with the requirements of policy CP50 to the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the Bat Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) Planning Guidance for Wiltshire (September 2015) and relevant legislative duties.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Householder planning applications are exempt from the requirement to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain under Schedule 7A, Section 4(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as inserted by the Environment Act 2021.

CONCLUSION

The proposals have not meaningfully changed from that refused under PL/2025/07131. There has been no change in circumstance since that refusal.

The proposed development will result in unacceptable impacts on visual and residential amenity. The scale, design, proportions and materials of the proposed extension represent a poor form of development which will fail to harmonise with the historic existing building and its surroundings.

The proposed two-storey extension introduces significant additional bulk and massing to the existing building, which is likely to result in an overbearing presence when viewed from adjacent properties. The scale of the extension, particularly in close proximity to shared boundaries, has the potential to dominate the outlook from neighbouring gardens and habitable rooms, thereby diminishing the sense of openness and privacy. Furthermore, the inclusion of new fenestration at upper levels will lead to increased overlooking, raising concerns about loss of privacy and impacts to both the visual and residential amenity of the surrounding properties.

Notwithstanding the submission of an updated block plan, the application fails to adequately demonstrate that the site can provide the required car parking for a 4 bedroomed property, or that the proposal will not have any adverse impact on the current access arrangements. Due to the narrowness of the road and likely lack of off-street manoeuvring space, it is not considered reasonable to leave this matter to conditions.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing building is in need of repair and maintenance, such a need would not outweigh the harmful impacts identified, and there is no evidence to suggest that an alternative, more respectful form of development could not be arrived at.

Accordingly, and by reason of the identified harm, the proposed development is considered to conflict with the aims and objectives of Core Policies CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, policies CNP ED1, CNP E2 and CNP HE1 of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan, The Corsham and Wiltshire Design Guides, the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011- 2026 and sections 2, 12 and 16 of the NPPF

RECOMMENDATION: That Planning Permission be REFUSED.

1. By reason of its scale, design and external appearance, the proposed extension is considered to be a poor form of development and will result in a form of development that fails to respond positively to the character, context and distinctiveness of the original building and the wider street scene. As such, the proposal is contrary to Core Policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, policies CNP ED1, CNP E2 and CNP HE1 of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan, the Corsham and Wiltshire Design Guides as well as paragraphs 131, 135, 137 and 139 to the NPPF
2. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, design and would result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers through overlooking, loss of privacy and an overbearing effect. The development would fail to protect the reasonable living conditions of neighbouring properties and is therefore contrary to Core Policy 57 (vii) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015), the guidance

contained within Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide SPD, and paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires developments to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

3. The proposal contains insufficient information to adequately assess whether adequate off-street parking can be provided in a manner that will not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and avoid a severe residual cumulative impact on the highway network. For this reason, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Core Policies 57 (xiv), 61 and 64 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015), the minimum parking and standards set out in the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan, and paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF.

APPENDIX

PL/2025/07131 – Refusal of planning permission for the erection of a two storey extension to side of house at 8 Providence Lane, Corsham - delegated report and refusal notice, dated 31/10/25.