
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by David Walker MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/17/3179743

25 Churchfields Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP2 7NH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stares against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 17/02461/FUL, dated 9 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is cladding to gable end, lean-to roof to front elevation, and cladding to side of lean-to.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Salisbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is highly visible over a prominent gap in the streetscene. It is also closely associated with other nineteenth century individual and paired villas along the same side of the road. While some of these are in a poor state of repair it is apparent that traditional materials and good detailing predominate, including in joinery.
4. The UPVC cladding is already in situ and has evidently been installed to a good standard. However, it remains visibly plastic despite its dark colour and obscures much of the side of the building. My attention has been brought to other instances where UPVC materials and cladding have been used in the conservation area but no specific examples were provided. None were apparent at the time of my site inspection.
5. In a context where there is little evidence of other contemporary building materials the plastic cladding is clearly out of keeping with the historic character of the area. There is accordingly a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Salisbury Conservation Area. With reference to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework the amount of harm would be less than substantial harm, but would not be outweighed by any identifiable public benefits.
6. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Core Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015. These policies require a high standard of design

that draws on local context, is complimentary to the locality and protects the historic environment, which would not be met by the proposal.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR