

From:

Sent: 09 February 2026 11:49

To: Ellis, Angela <Angela.Ellis@wiltshire.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: PL/2025/09700 - Elbow Cottage

Dear Angela,

Thank you so much for your patience with this application, my apologies that it has taken so long to get back to you . However, myself and the applicants have been giving very careful thought to the concerns you have raised about the proposals for Elbow Cottage and have spent a great deal of time reflecting on the designs. The applicants are very proud of their house and entirely align with your views on the need to preserve the characteristics that make it a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. In the light of this, we have made the following amendments to the design:

- The proposal for bifold doors and a porch on the front (west) elevation of the main house have been removed leaving the existing fenestration and stone canopies on this face unaltered. It is now proposed that an existing window on the south elevation will have its cill lowered to create a pair of doors.
- The alterations to the main roof of the annexe have been substantially revised (magenta line on the drawings shows the outline of the previous design), with the ridge line turned back to align with the roofs of the main house. In order to meet the original objective of raising the head height of the windows at first floor up to eye level, a split ridge has been introduced. This maintains the existing ridge height and also introduces a design detail with echoes of the double stacked roof of the main house. A chimney, which was part of the approved 1985 design for the annexe but was never built, has been added to the north elevation to further echo the composition.
- The ridge of the link infill's proposed new roof has been lowered by over 700mm. Although this will still be higher than the existing, it now creates a much more defined separation between the main house and the annexe, reinforcing its subservience. The dormer roof over the terrace doors has also been removed.
- The fenestration at the first floor of the annexe is now more conventional, with no gable glazing, leading to a less visually dominant facade that is much more compositionally subservient to the main house.
- Similar changes have also been made to the proposed front (west) extension to the annexe, with the amount of glazing reduced to give it a more measured and less dominant appearance.
- The proposal to relocate the arched rear window to the main house has been removed.

- A great deal of thought has gone into the pair of proposed rear (east) extensions. Although we understand your concerns, for the layout of the house to function effectively as a multi-generational residence, there is a necessity for both sides of the family to have access to their own ground floor WC and a utility room. This has been the subject of a lot of discussion and it stems from the need to maintain the flexibility should live-in care be required. Currently, the house has only a single ground floor WC and its two utility rooms are both sited in the annexe, which does not integrate with the primary family living spaces at the southern end of the main house. Given the significant change in levels at the back of the house, where a retaining wall and steeply sloping ground obscure a substantial portion of the rear elevation, we feel that these additions will have a very limited impact on the overall visual massing of the house when viewed from any public vantage points. I attach a photograph of the rear of the house, which hopefully shows the context more clearly.
- Myself and the applicants have also put considerable efforts into trying to find an alternative location for the proposed outbuilding and a number of options have been explored, however none have proved suitable. Due to the layout of the site, with the house at the far eastern boundary, the visible 'public' boundary to the west and site access from the north, locating the outbuilding any distance further into the site to the south would risk obscuring the view of the house from the canal, impacting on the openness of the garden and enlarging the footprint of vehicular movement. Therefore, the only realistic window for locating the outbuilding runs along the northern edge of the site. However, the presence of a substantial and important tree next to the site entrance immediately east of the existing outbuilding reduces this window and the only space left is the north east corner of the site. Due to the topography of the land and the large change in levels between the access track and the garden at this location, we have concluded that the impact of the earthworks and alteration that would be needed to site the outbuilding here would be unjustifiably detrimental. We therefore attach a revised proposal for the outbuilding constructed entirely in rubble stone, which we believe will be appropriate within the setting of the listed bridge and will hugely improve upon the status quo.

We feel that the exercise we have undertaken to revisit the proposals for Elbow Cottage has been very productive and we are grateful to have had the opportunity to make changes that we see as real improvements to the previous design. However, we do believe that the site context is crucial to so much of what is being proposed, from the subservience of the annexe, the way the house sits within the surrounding ground levels to the rear and the position of the outbuilding. We would therefore very much welcome a site visit if you are able, so that these aspects can be more fully appreciated.

In terms of the former northern extension, we have undertaken further investigations into the history of the property and now have a number of pieces of information to support our volume calculations. The first is an OS map published in 1970 clearly showing the outline of the northern extension. I have attached the relevant extract but you can download the full map here: <https://we.tl/t-XVggKfGZid> (it's rather a large file so couldn't be attached to the email). The next is a scanned copy of the sales particulars for the cottage from the 1970s, which include a photograph of the front of the house with the lean to extension to the north clearly visible. This also confirms our understanding of the substantial ridge height of the extension, which is further corroborated by markings that are still visible on the stonework where the structure was removed (photographs attached). These pieces of information clearly demonstrate that the extension was extant in 1948 and therefore constituted part of the 'original dwelling' for Green Belt volume purposes.

Although it predates 1948 and is therefore not technically relevant to the volume calculations, Bradford on Avon museum came across a very nice piece of written history about Elbow Cottage (attached), which reveals that, at least until the 1930s, the lean-to was used as a skittle alley! This goes some way to explaining its proportions!

Many thanks again for your help and patience with this application.

Regards

Alistair