



23rd June 2026
Ref:1640-1.2-001

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT with HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT.

**HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION. CONSERVATION AREA.
DEMOLITION OF LEAN-TO. REPLACED WITH 2 STOREY EXTENSION BOAT HOUSE AND
TACKLE ROOM.**

THE FISHING LODGE, WEST WALK, THE CLOSE, SALISBURY, SP1 2EY.

ASA architects issue:	Rev	Date	Change	Initial
	A	8.7.26	Minor	AS

Applicant:

Mr Steve and Mrs Jenny Maton
Slinfold House
Laverstock Park
SP1 1QJ

Steve Maton [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

CONTENTS

1. Introduction & Use
2. Design Principle and Context
 - Amount
 - Layout
 - Scale
 - Landscaping
 - Appearance
3. Heritage Impact
4. Consultations. FRA

1. Introduction & Use

- 1.1 The application site is originally a division of an orchard associated with the historic 'Kings House' but no link in use or activity. Adjacent to the north is a landing for the river and positioning suggests a likely reason for location. The Fishing Lodge is a commercial use for waterside and leisure activity. There is no dwelling use.
- 1.2 Early C19th originated 'shed' style structure providing shelter and storage. No architectural value but materials and form as a 'whim' and symbolic presentation of slight theatrical nature, a bit of fun.
- 1.3 The proposal retains commercial waterside use and updates kitchen and toilet, improves circulation and adds a boat house reflecting original footprint.
- 1.4 The site context is mainly residential, typically apartments converted from 1952 education buildings, Listed Buildings beyond to the east including the Cathedral, the Close and a number of primary historic buildings of national importance within the conservation area. SSSI landscape to the west beyond the river.
- 1.5 The site is not safeguarded and not defined housing or strategic housing and not on a brown field register to obstruct development.
- 1.6 The site is not Heritage England Listed but does fall within policy considerations respecting town policy consideration and evolution. The building is not an Important local building but fronts the river. The extension replacement is not in the public realm.
- 1.7 The intention is to replace an existing extension with material and form respecting the river edge context and enhancing usability.

2. Design Principles and Concept

2.1 Amount

- 2.1.1 The existing site is 192 M.sq including building, access and garden areas.
- 2.1.2 The existing building is a gross internal area of 40 M.sq. Over a single storey and of which 3 M.sq as existing extension to be removed.
- 2.1.3 The proposal replaces the existing extension and adds a new 2 storey extension of 45 M.sq. An overall increase of 42M.sq. Site and building reorganisation considers disabled use.
- 2.1.4 Existing parking is 4 dedicated to the Fishing Lodge.
- 2.1.5 The site is in an area with policy guidance to consider. Key design principals are informed:
 - (i) The external appearance of the extension, scale, massing, size and materials are consistent with the character of their surroundings;
 - (ii) There is no significant adverse effect on the privacy or amenity of nearby residents;
 - (iii) The proposal would not cause the loss or prejudice the retention of any significant townscape or landscape feature.

2.2 Layout

- 2.2.1 The existing main building is substantially unchanged. An opening is formed in order to connect with the extension via the new stairwell at first floor, previous W.C location.
- 2.2.2 The proposal replaces the existing south lean-to with compliant construction with functional proportion for utility use, a disabled toilet, boat house and tackle room in loft.
- 2.2.3 Existing entrance is maintained and a new access is formed in addition for disabled access at the FRA recommended floor level. The layout at original ground level is office, fly workshop and library.
- 2.2.4 External area maintain levels to ensure clear space about any building structure as path or patio with reclaimed material for any edging or garden edging. Disabled use.

2.3 Scale

- 2.3.1 The proposed extension has a respectful relationship with existing similar building forms nearby as well as respecting the greater historic environment. Proportions are generally respectful in terms of massing and relationship with existing structures.
- 2.3.2 The minimal intervention in massing, size and scale is therefore consistent with the character of the existing building and context and arguably an improvement of the existing extension replaced.

2.4 Landscaping

- 2.4.1 A principle is riverside and without change. The site perimeter north, east and south is dense hedge mainly indigenous species.
- 2.4.2 Access and parking is unchanged.

2.5 Appearance

- 2.5.1 The proposal is demonstrably an evolution of the existing building form. This is also respectfully followed with the use of materials. A consistency is retained in using the correct period style corrugated steel sheet, green material. The elevations are matching red stock brick up to FRA floor level, open to any potential flood with no volume impact.
- 2.5.2 The doors and window units will generally be ppc quality aluminium joinery frames with double glazing to meet at least 1.4 U-value.
- 2.5.3 Elevations generally Oak Shadow Gap horizontal cladding.
- 2.5.4 This use of materials is traditional, practical and fits the palette of local materials and is a common companion to the existing and redolent of a traditional method.

3.0 Heritage Impact See also separate Heritage Statement

- 3.1 There is defined historic landscape/townscape characterization and there is policy consideration to the site context which is recognised in the proposal. The site is in a conservation area and respect to the age of the property gives rise to an understanding of an informed approach.
- 3.2 The site is not Heritage England listed. Land packages defined prior to 1947.
- 3.3 The site within the defined urban landscape area is surrounded predominantly by a historic rural area beyond the river, urban fringe area to the east linking to Cathedral and surrounds. There are medieval points in the town and Cathedral but not near the site. The HE Grade 1 cathedral is some distance away. There are Grade 2 dwelling further to the west but not site visual. Grade 1 buildings not visual impact but include mainly public access, Medieval Hall, Kings House, Museums...
- 3.4 The parent structure is not of local importance but has a degree of visual value. The proposed replaced extension will protect and preserve the building, enhanced by sensitive materials and ensuring the form and appearance remaining an important feature.
- 3.5 It is not believed that the proposal affects any heritage asset. Scale and proportion has been referred to and the Cathedral or town centre is not in visual scope. The minimal fabric amendment will not affect any buildings neighbouring or other.
- 3.6 The original host building is assessed as constructed early C19th on a former garden/leisure site with typical accretion that the current extended portion represents now evolved with the replacement extension proposal.
- 3.7 The proposal is in a conservation area and it is worth noting:
National Planning Policy Framework: 16, Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. The proposal has no adverse impact within the defined planning zones and the domestic scale and use is not contrary to local or national policy. The existing site, is not a heritage asset. Nonetheless it is a site within a Conservation Area. *'206: Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas....., and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset or which better reveal its significance should be treated favourably.'*
- 3.8 In summary; sensitive repair, extension sympathetic and incorporation in the context and continued waterside use will ensure retention of the character.

4.0 Consultations

- 4.1 No independent consultations.
- 4.2 The site is within an Environment Agency flood zone and there is some risk of flooding by any assessment. No historic record and no requirement for a flood risk assessment directly affecting or damaging the existing building. Guidance follows a raised principle floor level to any new structure in this location and matching established raised level to previous element.
- 4.3 No local interest group or heritage concern has been approached prior to planning application other than response to policy and informal preference.
- 4.4 Ecology. PEA and bat emergence, report dated 2026. No significant comment.