

APPLICATION FOR HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING PERMISSION DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2026/00970
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
SITE ADDRESS:	PLANTS FARM, CHELWORTH ROAD, CRICKLADE, SWINDON, SN6 6HE
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Rebuild Barn and Make the Property a 2 Storey Building
RECOMMENDATION:	That Planning Permission be REFUSED

PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks planning permission for the demolition of a single-storey, elongated barn and storeroom adjoining the eastern side elevation of this single storey dwelling and the erection of a two-storey extension in the same location with a two-storey section over the eastern end of the original property.

This “L” shaped extension would have a footprint of approximately 15m by 6m where it projects forward of the original dwelling and an overall height of 6.2m. This two-storey element would then wrap round above the eastern end of the original property, with the ridge at that same height. Within the two storey element, wall dormer windows are proposed on all four roof slopes with a large, glazed full height, gable end detail on the eastern side elevation. A new main entrance door is proposed within the front elevation of the proposed two-storey section

Minor changes are proposed to the fenestration layout within the original property.

In terms of materials, the elevations would comprise natural rubblestone, aluminium fenestration and matching roof tiles.

Internally, on the ground floor, the extension would provide for a large, open plan kitchen, dining and living area with a utility room and toilet cubicle. One doorway would lead from the re-modelled hallway from the former kitchen. At first floor level within the new extension, three bedrooms are proposed, all with en-suite shower room and a new main bedroom suite is proposed within the enlarged section over the remodelled hallway.

SITE DESCRIPTION/CONTEXT

The application site comprises a single storey dwelling which has a simple plan form of interconnecting rooms at the eastern end and the three bedrooms formed from a small extension on the front elevation for one bedroom and a further extension to the rear for two further bedrooms. This simple cottage has rubblestone elevations with concrete roof tiles and timber fenestration.

The site is located on the northern side of Chelworth Road, Cricklade with one residential dwelling to the north-east. Directly to the west of the site, is the Chelworth Park industrial

estate. This estate also incorporates a large area of land and built form to the south of the site and which characterises this part of the rural landscape.

PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal / Summary
19/00663/FUL - Full planning permission Decision - Refused Date: 4/3/2019 – Erection of a detached residential dwelling
N/03/00254/EMIN - Hardstanding and works - Plants Farm , Chelworth Road, Cricklade, Swindon, SN6 6HE – Remove barn and rebuild 2 storey side extension.
PL/2025/06912 – Remove Barn and Rebuild 2 Storey Side Extension Refused: 19 November 2025

There is a significant level of planning history on both the application site and the wider industrial land. Those listed above are considered the most relevant to the determination of the current proposal.

RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Wiltshire Core Strategy:

- Core Policy 50: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- Core Policy 51: Landscape
- Core Policy 57: Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping
- Core Policy 61: Transport and New Development
- Core Policy 64: Demand Management

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan: Made March 2018

Wiltshire Design Guide

Appendix D – Design Guidance for Householder extensions

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Cricklade Town Council: Support

Archaeology: No Objection

Ecology: Comment

It is best for this application to be supported by a preliminary bat roost assessment report.

Although the building proposed for works doesn't sit within ideal bat habitat, the building construction and structure appears suitable to support roosting bats. Unless site photos or justification can be provided to negate the need for provision of more information about potential impact on roosting bats, this application should not yet be determined.

REPRESENTATIONS

No letters of representation were received in relation to the proposed development

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 and Impact upon the upon the character and context of the area

Core Policy 57 - Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping of the Wiltshire Core Strategy seeks to ensure that all new development is of high design quality, reflecting local context, character, and distinctiveness.

It is noted that the existing property is a single-storey property with a shallow, elongated plan form, with some existing extensions to the front and rear elevations. It must be also acknowledged that there is an existing projection forward of the front elevation of the property, which provides for ancillary storage, and which has a higher ridge height than the host dwelling by approximately 0.25m. However, this structure, together with the front projection on the western end of the front elevation and with the central, gable end, porch does provide for a relatively balanced design for this modest dwelling.

The current scheme has been submitted in direct response to the previous application, PL/2025/06912, which for was refused on two points. For clarity and openness, these reasons for refusal are copied below.

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, form, siting and design, would result in a form of development that fails to respond positively to the character, context and distinctiveness of the host dwelling and its setting. The proposal would appear visually incongruous, overly dominant and poorly proportioned and would result in a disproportionately large extension which would not respect the character and scale of*

the host property. It would appear tantamount to the size of a new dwelling and would not read as ancillary accommodation in relation to the main dwellinghouse.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Core Policy 57 (i and iii) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015), the design principles set out in Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide SPD, and paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which collectively seek to ensure high-quality design that respects local character and integrates appropriately with its surroundings.

2. *The proposed development fails to demonstrate that it would avoid harm to biodiversity interests and protected species that may be present on or near the site. In the absence of an appropriate survey to demonstrate lack of harm or any required mitigation, the local planning authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on biodiversity.*

As such, the development is contrary to Core Policy 50 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) and paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require that planning decisions protect, mitigate, and where possible enhance biodiversity.

The current design, albeit acknowledged has been reduced in overall height by 1m, is still considered to represent a disproportionately large addition to the dwelling, which would visually overwhelm the original property. Whilst the host property is not considered to represent a heritage asset or have particular architectural merit, this large addition neither respects the host property nor is considered to represent an innovative or high-quality design solution for the benefit of additional habitable accommodation. Similarly, in line with the preceding application, the increase in height of the extension, projecting forward of the host dwelling would result in a visually dominant addition.

It is acknowledged that this projection has been reduced from approximately 15m to approximately 9m, but the bulk and scale of this element has now been added to by a two storey element above the proposed entrance area.

Whilst the existing structure projects forward approximately 15m, that existing structure does represent a subservient addition and is viewed as an ancillary and visually subordinate addition.

As stressed within the report for the preceding application and specified now, the adopted Wiltshire Design Guide in Appendix D states that proposed extensions should respect the original building and that the design, whilst taking into account plot location and shape, recommends that household extensions could either replicate the style, form or rhythm of the original house or, by contrast, be designed with a modern aesthetic.

In this current submission, the overall finished design is considered to represent a scheme of two halves, with little correlation between the original bungalow and the new extension. Whilst matching materials may link the two sections, there is considered little more that results in a visually pleasing and cohesive scheme.

In this instance, the overall bulk, scale and height and window placement is still considered to result in an incongruous addition, which is exacerbated by the mismatched window layout and their respective heights across the original and proposed front elevations. Whilst the preceding application was considered industrial in its architectural style, the current proposal does represent more of a residential aesthetic.

The Design Guide, is very clear in that *“proposed extensions and alterations should not dominate the existing building: in other words they should be subservient and appear as additions in a supporting role”*

The Framework in Chapter 12 and when read as a whole, has key aims to ensure that development, whilst meeting the needs of present and future generations is well-designed and visually attractive as a result of good architecture. The scheme subject of this report is not considered to meet these local and national overarching policies.

As previously opined, whilst the site is directly adjacent to an industrial setting, this is not considered to outweigh the need for good design and visually pleasing architectural solutions to home extensions.

Having regard to the above, the proposal does not accord with the design principles set out in Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide or the guidance and provision of the Framework.

Amenity

Point vii of Core Policy 57 - Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping of the Wiltshire Core Strategy seeks to ensure that developments do not adversely affect neighbouring properties.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly Paragraph 135(f), stresses that planning decisions should ensure developments provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The proposed development has been assessed in terms of its potential impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to loss of light, overshadowing, loss of privacy, and overbearing effects.

Due to the location of the site and the proposed development, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to any significant harm or detrimental impact on the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers such that the proposal could be reasonably refused on this basis.

Highways Impact

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 64 seeks to ensure compliance with parking standards set out in the Local Transport Plan.

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.

Whilst the proposal would result in an uplift in the quantum of bedrooms from 3 to 6, there is an existing highway access point from the highway with sufficient frontage parking and turning for the size of the property.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Core Policies 57 (xiv), 61 and 64 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the NPPF, and the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan.

Ecological Impact

Core Policy 50 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, including through ensuring that development avoids harm to protected species and habitats.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in Paragraphs 193, requires that development minimises impacts on and provides net gains for biodiversity, including ensuring mitigation is secured where harm cannot be avoided.

The application site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory ecological designations, and the scale and nature of development is such that significant harm to biodiversity is unlikely.

However, the Council's Ecologist has requested that the existing barn may be suitable for supporting bat roosts and that unless there is appropriate justification to negate the need for more information about potential impact then determination should be delayed until such time as that appropriate information is received.

Notwithstanding this requirement, and as opined in preceding sections of this report, the overall design and architectural approach is not considered to be one that the LPA can support and it is not considered expedient to require the additional information in this instance.

This is the same position as the preceding application in terms of Reason for Refusal 2 (referenced above) and which the applicant has full knowledge. Nevertheless, this current application has not been supported by any form of survey or appraisal, with only a sentence in the Planning Statement stating that "should the local planning authority require ecological confirmation the application is willing to commission and submit a bat survey". As the current scheme is the same as the preceding proposal in terms of the demolition of the outbuildings, it would therefore follow that this is a requirement and leaves the LPA no alternative other than to apply the same condition to any future refusal.

The proposed development therefore fails to adequately demonstrate that it would avoid harm to biodiversity or deliver appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. As such, it does not comply with the requirements to conserve and enhance ecological networks and protected species and it is considered that the LPA has no alternative other than to add this same condition to any future refusal.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policy 50 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to protect and enhance the natural environment. The application must accordingly be refused on ecological grounds.

BNG

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.

Nevertheless, as required by the regulations, any approval must include an Informative reminding the applicants of the biodiversity net gain requirements.

Nevertheless,

Other issues

The proposed development would provide for additional habitable accommodation which includes a kitchen and dining area. Whilst this proposal now includes a common entrance door, there is limited interconnectivity shown on the proposed plans between the existing property and the proposed extension.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the submission is for a household extension, the quantum of development, as previously opined, is overly large in relation to the host dwelling on the site. As this could still be utilized as annexe accommodation, a relevant condition appended to any grant of permission is considered appropriate and necessary in this instance, should permission be granted.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development, by reason of the identified harm, is considered to conflict with the aims and objectives of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the relevant policies and guidance, and no overriding material considerations have been identified that would justify a departure from the development plan.

Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, form, siting and design, would result in a form of development that fails to respond positively to the character, context and distinctiveness of the host dwelling and its setting. The proposal would appear visually incongruous, overly dominant and poorly proportioned and would result in a disproportionately large extension which would not respect the character and scale of the host property. It would appear tantamount to the size of a new dwelling and will not read as ancillary accommodation in relation to the main dwellinghouse.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Core Policy 57 (i and iii) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015), the design principles set out in Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide SPD, and paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which collectively seek to ensure high-quality design that respects local character and integrates appropriately with its surroundings.

2. The proposed development fails to demonstrate that it would avoid harm to biodiversity interests and protected species that may be present on or near the site. In the absence of an appropriate survey to demonstrate lack of harm or any required mitigation, the local planning authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on biodiversity.

As such, the development is contrary to Core Policy 50 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) and paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require that planning decisions protect, mitigate, and where possible enhance biodiversity.