

View results

Respondent

739

Kevin Asplin

15:14

Time to complete

1. Application Ref: *

PL/2026/02482

2. Site Address: *

15 Water Street, Bulford, Salisbury, SP4 9DZ

3. Before making a request for a planning application to be referred to a Planning Committee Members are asked to discuss it with the case officer to ensure that they are aware of all of the relevant considerations and the likely recommendation. This should ensure that only those applications that need to, appear on agendas. (There have been cases where applications have appeared where the officer's recommendation is in line with the Members thoughts).

I have discussed this application with the case officer. *

☐ Yes

☒ No

4. I request this application to be called to committee if the recommendation is for:

☒ Approval

☐ Refusal

5. I request that the above mentioned planning application is considered at a meeting of the Planning Committee. I have indicated below the key issues which I consider justify the call in.

☒ Scale of development

☒ Visual impact upon the surrounding area

☒ Relationship to adjoining properties

☒ Design – bulk, height, general appearance

☐ Environmental/highway impact

☒ Car parking (use)

6. Other (please specify)

1. Heritage Impact on Listed Building and Conservation Area.

Pre-application feedback (ENQ/2025/00375) explicitly flagged that the original two-storey rear extension would cause "significant impact on the character and fabric of the building, specifically as the two-storey rear extension would impede on the rear thatched cat-slide roof." The Conservation Officer advised the catslide should remain undisturbed, with any link at ground floor level only, and a subservient scale".

- The current scheme still includes a first-floor element in the extension (accessed via a single-storey lead/glazed link), with rooflights and slate wrapping down the walls. This creates a 1.5-storey appearance from certain views, undermining the subservience argument.
- The Heritage Statement (by Elaine Milton) acknowledges some harm to the historic plan form (blocking a doorway) and the catslide roof (partially covered by the link). While it claims "less than substantial harm," this under-weights the impact on the thatched catslide – a key character feature noted in the listing description.
- NPPF para 212, Wiltshire Core Strategy CP58. Section 66/72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to preserving the building and its setting.

2. Flood Risk in Zone 3

- The site is in Flood Zone 3.
- Pre-app specifically required a detailed FRA.

3. Scale, Massing, and Design Not Subservient Enough

- Even after revisions (lowered ridge, single-storey link, rooflights only on first floor), the extension adds substantial footprint and volume to the rear.
- Local context shows extensions with slate wrapping and modern materials competes with rather than defers to the host thatched cottage.
- Materials (red brick, slate wrapping, black aluminium, lead) are high quality but create a stark contemporary contrast that may not respect the vernacular flint/brick/thatch character of Water Street. The contravenes NPPF para 139 (design), Wiltshire CP57 (high quality design).

4. Other Supporting Points

- Neighbour amenity: potential overlooking or enclosure from the extension. The extension being to the south of properties on Old Coach road it also takes out light from gardens to the north of it. There will also be a prolonged period of building disturbance including large amounts of earth removal, noise and general disturbance. Neighbours who have raised concerns have also claimed the car park shown on the map does not actually belong to the applicant.

7. Division Member: *

Cllr Kevin Asplin

8. Date: *

22/05/2026

