

Mr S & Mrs D Gregory



18.03.2026

Development Management
Wiltshire Council
Monkton Park
Chippenham
SN15 1ER

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Objection to Planning Application PL/2026/01094

Site: The Stoneyard, Potley Lane, Corsham, SN13 9RX

Proposal: Variation of Condition 2 of N/92/00419/F – changes to design, finishes and associated plans

I am writing to **object** to the above application to vary Condition 2 relating to approved plans for the remaining building at The Stoneyard.

While the applicant argues that the changes are “modest” and reflect the built context, the proposal introduces **material differences** that would negatively impact the local environment, design quality, and amenity. After reviewing the submitted Planning Statement and associated documents, I wish to raise the following concerns:

1. Proposed exterior materials are inappropriate and diminish local character

The original permission specifies **Bathstone random coursed ashlar**, a material consistent with the character of the Corsham/Wiltshire area and the architectural language used historically on this site. The applicant now proposes a **Bathstone-coloured stucco render with block patterning and reconstructed Bathstone quoins**.

This is a **significant downgrade** in quality:

- Render cannot replicate the appearance, weathering, or durability of real Bathstone.
- The site, though commercial, still lies within a wider context where genuine stone buildings predominate.

- Allowing imitation materials risks setting a precedent for further erosion of local vernacular.

The justification given — that Bathstone is increasingly constrained — is not a valid planning reason to lower the design quality of an approved scheme.

2. Alterations to fenestration and built form meaningfully change the design

The revised plans simplify the form and fenestration, re-using a glazed ridge and altering window configurations.

These are **not minor alterations**:

- They alter the character and appearance of the building.
 - Reduced detailing and simplified elevations can create a more industrial, utilitarian façade that conflicts with the originally approved design intent.
 - These changes would not achieve the same visual mitigation previously deemed necessary under the 1992 and 2023 approvals.
-

3. Risk of increased visual impact and reduced environmental quality

The applicant claims the changes reduce “potential light/heat spillage,” but provides **no technical assessment**.

In reality, alterations to glazing and materials could:

- Increase reflectivity and glare due to render finishes.
- Reduce the building’s visual integration into its surroundings.
- Make the development more prominent from the lane and nearby public viewpoints.

Without proper evidence, this justification should be given little weight.

4. The proposed variation may constitute a more fundamental change

Although the Planning Statement cites Section 73 case law (e.g., *Vue Entertainment v City of York*), the combination of material changes, elevation redesigns, and altered finishes could amount to something **beyond a simple non-fundamental amendment**.

Given:

- The original design intent,

- The importance of Bathstone as a defining characteristic, and
- The cumulative effect of elevational and material changes,

it is reasonable to conclude that this variation **significantly alters** the approved development and should not be accepted under Section 73.

5. The proposal offers no public benefit to outweigh its harms

The applicant states the site is an established commercial yard, but this does not justify reducing design quality.

The variation:

- Does not improve the environment for local residents.
- Does not enhance sustainability, public amenity, or landscaping.
- Provides no justification beyond construction convenience and material availability.

Under Wiltshire design policies, proposals must respect local context and deliver high-quality development — this variation fails to do so.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposed variation to Condition 2 should be **refused**. The approved plans reflect a higher standard of design and material quality that is appropriate for this location. The applicant's proposed substitutions would **diminish local character, reduce design integrity, and risk setting an unacceptable precedent**.

I therefore respectfully request that Wiltshire Council **refuse** the application **PL/2026/01094**.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Yours faithfully,
Stuart Gregory