

From: casey flay [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 June 2026 19:10
To: Developmentmanagement <Developmentmanagement@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: PL/2026/02713 : Porton Baptist Chapel, High Street, Porton, Salisbury, SP4 0LH

Dear Amy Houldsworth,

I would just like to clarify some of the comments left on our change of use application for Porton Baptist Chapel.

I have already addressed a number of points raised by the Conservation Officer and have emailed him directly regarding those matters. However, I would also like to respond to the representation submitted by the occupiers of Eleys, as I believe some of the concerns raised do not accurately reflect the relationship between the proposed development and neighbouring properties.

The points raised in relation to the proposed alteration to the west elevation from Mr John Targett.

Firstly, the proposed Juliet balcony does not result in any direct overlooking of the objector's property. The orientation and position of the opening are such that views are directed away from their dwelling, and therefore we do not believe the proposal would lead to any material loss of privacy. Furthermore, the neighbouring property that is directly affected by the outlook from this elevation has been consulted and has raised no objection to the proposal.

Secondly, whilst the representation suggests that the replacement of the existing window with glazed doors and a Juliet balcony would be visually inappropriate, we consider the proposal to be a sympathetic alteration that forms part of the wider conversion of the building. The existing opening is not considered a significant historic feature, and the proposed design provides the necessary light, ventilation and functionality required for the intended use whilst remaining subordinate to the overall character of the chapel.

The comments also refer to the balcony as creating a substantial projection from the building. As shown within the submitted drawings, the proposal is for a Juliet balcony only, with no external platform or usable balcony space. The intervention remains modest in scale and does not materially alter the building's footprint.

We respectfully submit that the concerns raised regarding overlooking and loss of privacy are not supported by the actual relationship between the properties or the submitted plans. We therefore ask that the application continues to be assessed on its planning merits and against the relevant planning policies.

Should you require any further clarification, we would be pleased to provide it.

Kind regards,

Casey Flay