

MATHEWSON WATERS ARCHITECTS

The Old Surgery, Crowle Road
Lambourn, Berkshire, RG17 8NR

TELEPHONE: 01488 73131

E-MAIL:

enquiries@mw-architects.co.uk

WEB:

www.mw-architects.co.uk

**Proposed minor internal alterations at:
62 New Park Street, Devizes. SN10 1DP**

Heritage and design & access statement.



View of the front, (north-east) elevation as seen from New Park Street. (Google Streetview)

Introduction:

The subject of this application submission is 62 New Park Street, Devizes, which is grade-II listed.

The applicant, Mrs Jane Hogg has instructed Mathewson Waters Architects to prepare and submit this application seeking listed building permission for minor, (reversible) internal alterations within the rear bedroom at first floor and within the basement room.

The application property:

62 New Park Street is an early nineteenth century grade-II listed modest townhouse, which shares its listing with the neighbouring house at no.63.

The statutory listing description for 62 New Park Street is as follows:

Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II**

List Entry Number: **1251617**

Date first listed: **19-Sept-1972**

List Entry Name: **62 AND 63, NEW PARK STREET**

Statutory Address 1: **62 AND 63, NEW PARK STREET**

Location

Statutory Address: **62 AND 63, NEW PARK STREET**

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

District: **Wiltshire (Unitary Authority)**

Parish: **Devizes**

National Grid Reference: **SU 00514 61585**

Details

1. 1042 NEW PARK STREET (South West Side) Nos 62 and 63 SU 0061 3a/165

II GV

2. Symmetrical pair of houses flanking yard entry. Early C19 2 storeys red brick on stone plinth. Stone 1st floor sill course. Small stone cornice and blocking course. Hipped slate roofs. 2 windows each on 1st floor with addition of false window to No 63, recessed sashes, 4 panes wide and on ground floor one wider window off centre and recessed

door of 6 flush panels (2 glazed in door of No 62). Each with 2 pane rectangular fanlight.

Nos 62 to 67 (consec) form a group.

Listing NGR: SU0051461585

The application proposal:

The following are proposed as the application for listed building consent:

- A) Introduction of timber studwork partitions to provide a practical layout for the rear bedroom and its adjoining bathroom. The partitioning would provide wardrobe spaces, a dressing area and a more practical shower room space. The partitions are reversible and the works do not affect any historical fabric.
- B) An improvement to the staircase leading down to the basement room. The 'internal' side of the stairs as it leads into the basement room has a modern studwork partition which reduces the view of the room and cuts out precious natural light. The partition would be replaced with a traditional balustrade and handrail, and the underside of the stairs would be opened up to provide a low recess for an item of furniture.

Photographs:

Photographs of the areas affected by the application proposals are included in the table below:

	<i>View of the rear bedroom Looking towards the doorway through to the bathroom.</i> <i>The doorway will be retained and a stud partition for proposed cupboards would be introduced approximately where the brown wardrobe is standing.</i>
---	--

	<i>A view, (looking south-west) from the doorway through to the bathroom which would be subdivided into a dressing area and then the shower room beyond.</i> <i>The two existing windows will be retained.</i>
	<i>Another view of the existing bathroom, looking south-west.</i>
	<i>View of the existing staircase from within the basement looking south-west.</i> <i>The existing modern stud partition would be removed to enable the side of the staircase to become 'open' and to let more natural light into the room and improve its character and appearance.</i>

	<i>A view from within the basement looking north-west.</i> <i>The window would remain unchanged but the side of the stairs, (on the left of the view) would be opened up with traditional balusters and handrail introduced.</i>

Pre-application consultation:

In August 2025, an enquiry, (ENQ/2025/01050) was submitted to the council by Jane Hogg, in order to seek advice with regards to various minor repairs and improvements.

The council's conservation officer Fiona Webb provided e-mailed advice, the majority of which confirmed that certain repairs planned for the property would not require Listed Building Consent provided that matching materials and like-for-like works were employed.

Of relevance to this current application was the specific advice relating to the staircase, which at that time was to be temporarily removed to facilitate intended chemical damp-proofing of the basement walls. Fiona Webb advised.....

"...- this would require LBC; we would need drawings and a detailed specification for the works to the cellar, as well as a Design, Access & Heritage Statement. As discussed on site, I do not consider that the stairs need replacing however these are covered will carpet and have not been exposed for inspection. The room needs greater ventilation and the damp is being held back by the cement tanking rather than being allowed to breathe. "

Subsequent to that advice, it was decided not to undertake the chemical damp-proofing, but instead to open up the enclosed underside of the stairs and to re-plaster the walls with a lime-based renovation plaster and breathable paint.

Statutory Legislation and Guidance:

Historic buildings are protected by law and in planning policy. This report is intended to consider the impact that the application proposal would have on the heritage asset, i.e. 62 New Park Street.

Within this report there is a justification for the proposal according to the relevant legislation, planning policy and guidance.

The Council requires that a heritage statement is undertaken by a professional qualified in historic building conservation. I have more than 35 years experience in projects involving listed buildings and conservation areas. I am a registered architect and a partner in a Chartered firm of architects. I hold a Masters Degree in The Conservation of Historic Buildings.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is the legislative basis for decision-making on applications that relate to the historic environment. Sections 66 and 72 of the Act impose statutory duties upon local planning authorities which, with regard to listed buildings, require the planning authority to have '*special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*'.

In considering applications for planning permission, local authorities are also required to consider the policies on the historic environment set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. At the heart of the Framework is 'a presumption in favour of sustainable development' and there are also specific policies relating to the historic environment. The Framework states that heritage assets are 'an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations'.

The Framework requires that local planning authorities categorise harm as either 'substantial' or 'less than substantial'. Where a proposed development will lead to 'substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset', the Framework states that:

... local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and

- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

Where a development proposal will lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Framework states that:

...this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Assessment of Significance

The following sets out what I understand to be the significance of the heritage asset. These have been discussed in terms of Historic England's *Conversation Principles, Policies and Guidance* (2008). A heritage asset can have certain values that are part of its significance; these values are classed as: **Evidential, Historic, Aesthetic and Communal**, which can be briefly explained as follows:

Evidential value: Evidential value derives from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity:

Historical value: Historical value derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. It tends to be *illustrative* or *associative*:

Aesthetic value: This derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place. This can be the result of the conscious *design* of a place, including artistic endeavour. Equally, they can be the seemingly *fortuitous* outcome of the way in which a place has evolved and been used over time:

Communal value: The meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

The values of significance of the application building are briefly evidenced in the statutory list description. The building retains an important amount of historical fabric and architectural interest thereby giving it obvious **Evidential & Historical** values. None of the Evidential or Historical values would be affected or harmed in any way by the application proposal.

The architectural character of the building is reinforced by its formal arrangement along the road frontage in combination with no.63 and other townhouses in that part of New Park Street. This lends it **aesthetic** value. None of the aesthetic value would be harmed by the application proposal.

The building has **Communal** value derived from its contribution to the social and commercial history of Devizes and New Park Street in particular. The communal value of the building would be retained and with no harm caused by the application proposal.

Setting assessment:

Annex 2 of the NPPF defines the setting of a heritage asset as:

'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.'

The setting assessment is guided by *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3* (Historic England 2015b; revised 2017), which advocates a systematic and five-staged approach to the assessment of the effects of development.

- Step 1 to 'identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected'
- Step 2 requires assessment of 'the degree to which these settings and views make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated'
- Step 3 to 'assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on the significance or on the ability to appreciate it'
- Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm.
- Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

Potential harm to the significance and setting:

The proposed internal alterations are very minor in nature and are reversible. The elements of the application are generally out of view and it is reasonable therefore to assert that no harm to the setting and aspects of significance of 62 New Park Street would be caused by the implementation of the application proposal.

Justification for the Proposals:

I have considered the impacts on the heritage asset and have concluded that there would be no harm to the character and setting of the heritage asset; Also, the proposed modest internal alterations are reversible and cause no harm to the existing historical fabric.

Therefore, the improvements would help the applicant to gain enhanced amenity and enjoyment from the property without causing harm to either the fabric or setting of the listed building.

Howard Waters *(Architect)*

BA; B.Arch; MSc. (Conservation of Historic Buildings)

14th May 2026