

Agenda item

PL/2026/01373 - 95 High Street, Marlborough, SN8 1HD

- [Meeting of Eastern Area Planning Committee, Thursday 17 September 2026 3.00 pm \(Item 37.\)](#)

Retention of burgundy and pink striped painted front façade.

Minutes:

Public Participation

Cllr Jane Davies read a statement on behalf of Issy Wookey in support of the application.

Pippa Card, Senior Conservation/Planning Officer presented a report which outlined the retention of burgundy and pink striped painted front façade. Details were provided of the site and issues raised by the proposals, including the site and surroundings, relevant planning legislation, policies and guidance, summary of consultation responses, summary of representations, planning considerations, impact on designated heritage assets and conservation area, and planning balance.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views to the Committee as detailed above.

The Local Unitary Member, Cllr Jane Davies (Marlborough West) then spoke regarding the application. Cllr Davies raised the following points and outlined that she had a special interest in paint finish having ran a business which specialised in architectural paint analysis, with it stated that paint schemes were used to emphasise the purpose of a building. The example of the various decorative paint schemes used within in St Martin-in-the-Fields Church, London was cited. A further point was made about the commercial value of the property and how though it had been controversial at first, opinion had now settled with residents believing that the building was an asset for the High Street, bringing in money and trade. It was outlined that the paint scheme was not a permanent change to the building and was not doing any harm to the physical state of the building. A further point was made in relation to precedent with the previous permission granted for a building in Pewsey cited.

Members of the Committee had the opportunity to ask technical questions regarding the application. Details were sought on the harm being created with it clarified that though no physical harm had been created through the use of appropriate paint, the paint scheme broke up and distorted the visual detailing of the original architecture. A point was made about what an appropriate colour scheme would be, with it suggested that many other properties in Marlborough featured a variety of colours however these were in a solid scheme. A point was raised about the potential knock-on effect of letting a building have a stripey façade and how generally the Council aimed to be supportive of owners being expressive however this application had come about following an enforcement case and Historic England guidance. It was noted that the stripey pattern had been on the building since the start of the year and though 101 Marlborough High Street had a stripey theme on its external window blinds/awnings, this was not a listed building.

At the start of the debate a motion to ACCEPT the officer's recommendation was moved by Cllr Philip Whitehead and seconded by Cllr Maria Hoults.

During the debate, issues were raised such as the importance of adhering to building regulations, how in a climate where high streets were struggling it would be positive to support retailers and increase footfall, reference was also made to how the paint used had been breathable. Further points were made about how the Council had policies in place to protect Grade II Listed Buildings and that the impact on the conservation area needed to be considered and that though colour schemes were allowed, stripes were not permitted under policy and could affect the historical element of the High Street.

A point was made about precedent and that the Committee was required to deal with applications on their own individual circumstances, therefore the decision relating to the building in Pewsey was separate. It was acknowledged that there was however an element of precedent in that if the application was allowed to retain its stripey façade, this could lead to neighbouring properties adopting similar schemes against policy. A point was made about the unique nature of the High Street and how such a decision would have serious implications for the special architectural character and interest of the 18th Century building.

Further points were made that such a building might cause more attention to be drawn to it and that there didn't seem to be objections from local residents. Reference was also made to other buildings on the High Street which had different facades and schemes and that in some cases the schemes enhanced the history. The visual harm of the property was also questioned and that such a building should be celebrated, with the owners having taken care and thought to do this.

At the conclusion of the debate, it was,

Resolved:

That listed building consent be REFUSED for the following reason:

The retention of the painted striped colour scheme fails to preserve the special interest of the grade II listed building and its setting. The striped colour scheme is not considered an appropriate or traditional form of decoration for a principal elevation, causing visual harm to the special architectural character and historic interest of the 18th century façade.

The proposal causes harm to its significance as a designated heritage asset. In addition, the proposal also causes visual harm to the character and appearance of the Marlborough Conservation Area. In the absence of any reasonable justification to support the retained decoration scheme, or public benefits that would outweigh the visual harm, the proposal is contrary to the statutory duty under Section 16 and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026) Policies HE4(2), HE6(1,3,4) & HE9(1), and Wiltshire Council Core Strategy Policies 57 and 58.

The case should be referred to the Enforcement Team to seek the removal of the stripes, issuing a formal notice should an initial written request to paint out the stripes with an agreed colour scheme (or to return the elevation to the solid colour it was previously) not be adhered to.

Chairman called the meeting to a break at 4pm and resumed the meeting at 4.05pm.

Supporting documents:

- [PL.2026.01373 - 95 High St Marlborough - Report, item 37. PDF 532 KB](#)
- [PL.2026.01373 - Aerial Map, item 37. PDF 1024 KB](#)
- [PL.2026.01373 - Location Map, item 37. PDF 863 KB](#)