



Ms Hannah Brown
Development Services
Wiltshire Council
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
Wiltshire BA14 8JN

1 September 2026

Dear Ms Brown

11 High Street, Ramsbury - Planning Application Reference PL/2026/04987

We are writing to express our significant reservations about the above planning application, as it stands. We recognise fully that the house needs updating and are not against the principle of some redevelopment but the currently “proposed” development is:

- already happening on site, before planning and building control consents have been granted;
- out of keeping with the character of the existing house and the Conservation Area, including using inappropriate materials; and
- we believe that there are structural elements which have not been accurately shown on the application drawings (which, ultimately, is a Building Control matter but is of most urgent concern due to the potential consequences of unapproved and ill-advised structural alterations).

Planning Policy context

Our comments on the information in the planning application later on in this letter are set against the following key statements of Wiltshire’s planning policy.

Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) - Core Policy 57 (Ensuring high quality design and place shaping outcomes):

Core Policy 57 includes the following statements.

- *“Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complementary to the locality.”*
- Development must be shown to be: *“...relating positively to ... the existing pattern of development...”*.
- It needs to be:
 - *“... responding positively to the existing townscape... in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials, streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting”*
 - *“... sympathetic to and conserving historic buildings and historic landscapes”*
 - *“... having regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings”*.



Ramsbury Conservation Area Statement (2003):

The Statement shows that 11 High Street has been designated as a “Significant Unlisted Building” (and is one of the buildings on the cover photograph of this document, taken when the village butcher operated from there). It sets out the following required action by owners (page 16):

- *If considering changes to existing buildings look carefully and view the proposal in context taking into account the original design of the building and its setting. Where construction work is involved, take particular care in the choice of materials.*
- *If proposing alterations to doors and windows on traditional buildings consider first whether the existing can be retained. Where changes are essential copy original styles and details.*
- *Consider all extensions as complementary to the existing building and design in keeping.*

It includes the following: “To maintain the character of Ramsbury it will be important to ensure that building extensions are kept subservient to the principal building concerned, and that the form, scale and style of any new work is kept in context.” (page 18)

Timing of the planning application v. work on site

Development started on site around the end of July. From the WCC Planning Application Register, it would appear that the planning application for 11 High Street has been submitted in two phases:

- initially on 10 August (around a fortnight after work started on site) and
- 27th August, when all the plans and elevations were provided.

The seventeen day delay in submitting the plans hints that they were drawn after actual work had started on site.

At the date of writing, the old conservatory has already been demolished and work on the Ground Floor “Sun Room” is now well advanced. As far as we are aware, no work has started on the proposed first floor extension or loft dormer/creation of the extra bedroom.

Design and appearance

The “Sun Room”:

- The Design and Access Statement (DAS) draws attention to the old uPVC conservatory not being in keeping with the Conservation Area: we believe that the very much larger, larch-clad, boxy, flat-roofed “Sun Room” is also not in keeping. The larch-cladding and black aluminium glazing shown on the elevation drawing are most definitely neither true “heritage style”, nor in accordance with the local vernacular. It is totally contrary to the building styles in this Conservation Area.
- Details about the style of larch-cladding are not given in the application but the company currently onsite constructing this element is Cube Garden Rooms and their construction style can be seen on their website: <https://cubegardenrooms.co.uk> - every single example of their work shows vertical cladding, on very boxy buildings (eg, garden offices and gyms).
- Nowhere in the document does it state whether the cladding here will be horizontal or vertical. There is an image shown of horizontal larch cladding, but the photo was not

taken at the property, and therefore represents neither the existing wood cladding onsite nor the style to be used on the development. The DAS claims that the cladding will complement the existing timber garden buildings. However most of the garden buildings are brick, the short wood-clad section uses a horizontal style rather than the vertical. Wood cladding on residential buildings, whether horizontal or vertical, is vanishingly rare in this area.

- So, relating back to planning policy, the proposed extension is at odds with the local vernacular, and is not complementary in form, mass, scale, elevation design or materials. It also forms a substantial length on the east elevation (just under 50% of the full depth of the building). It is not “clearly subservient” to the main dwelling from this side, as claimed in the DAS.

The Single-Storey Rear Extension: The existing southerly single storey extension was built around 20 years ago and its westerly wall forms part of the boundary with our garden. It was built of brick and flint to blend very comfortably with the courses of brick and flint in the wall of the older building immediately to the north of it (shown in a later photo in this letter).

- The proposed first floor extension going on top of this brick and flint wall is also larch-clad and will be a discordant patch on an otherwise harmonious brick and flint west elevation. It will not be visually subordinate or sympathetic to the original building, as claimed in the DAS and will be clearly visible from a number of properties west along the High Street (well beyond the next door neighbours being consulted on this application, especially in winter when deciduous trees are leafless).
- The drawing for the south elevation shows “new aluminium heritage style doors” on this first floor extension. So presumably there will be a Juliet balcony or similar in front but it is not obviously shown on the drawing.
- We disagree that the doors and triangular panes above, as drawn, are genuinely heritage style.

The Loft Dormer Window:

- The proposed dormer window facing east is going to be flat-roofed, with modern square windows and also larch-clad. None of these characteristics enhance the Conservation Area or are in keeping with the existing building.
- The application claims that privacy for neighbours to the east will be maintained by using obscured glazing. This cannot be relied on as glazing is far too easily changed once the building work is complete and the Council is no longer monitoring it.
- In the DAS, the orientation of the photograph from the High Street and illustrative view of the building after development are both misleading. If the photographer had walked forward a couple of steps, that easterly-facing roof is much more visible (see photo below).



- Consequently the proposed new window, jutting out from the roofline, will be prominent too.

Structural considerations

We appreciate that structural considerations are strictly the concern of Building Control rather than Planning, but we believe that there are some urgent structural concerns with this development scheme, so we are mentioning them below, for them to be nipped in the bud. We have been in contact with Building Control with further details.

The kitchen and sun room: As drawn, the room described as the “kitchen” in the proposed ground floor plan has no external ventilation - this is nonsensical. This room was used as the kitchen by the previous owners, so it is correctly labelled on the existing ground floor plan. The proposals plan shows what was the old kitchen's east-facing external wall remains unchanged and therefore the windows open into the “sun room”.

In the new development, we believe that the old “kitchen” will be joined onto the “sun room” by removing, at least partially, this solid wall - but this is not shown at all in the plans. This is a load-bearing wall, and as our house immediately abuts 11 High Street, any structural failing there puts our home at risk. The west-facing wall of this room is quite severely bowed, has been tied in in the past and needs to be carefully considered when there are structural works being proposed.

The first floor extension: The proposed first floor plan correctly shows that the existing first floor southerly wall will be removed entirely to create an unimpeded clear space for a large, south facing bedroom. We understand that the new extension is going to be a lightweight timber-framed structure, as the foundations were only designed to carry a single storey building. There is no indication about how this end of the house, including the vulnerable-looking west wall mentioned above, is going to be supported, especially as an existing wall tie (shown on the right hand end of the two storey part of the building in the photo below, just to the left of the rainwater downpipe) is likely to need removing, due to its low position.





WCC's Building Control needs to be fully involved with this development to ensure that it is done safely. But as of the date of writing, no Building Control Application is showing on the online Planning and Building Control Public Register.

We believe that the current planning application, as it stands, should be refused. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you need to discuss any of these points.

Yours sincerely



pp Victoria Hellyer and William Charlwood