



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/W/25/3365115

16 Huntingdon Street, Bradford-on-Avon, Wiltshire BA15 1RF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Richard Ford against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/11520.
 - The development proposed is described as: removal of existing porch and side extension and erection of two storey rear extension including associated minor internal alterations.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/25/3365118

16 Huntingdon Street, Bradford-on-Avon, Wiltshire BA15 1RF

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Richard Ford against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/11680.
 - The works proposed are described as: removal of existing porch and side extension and erection of two storey rear extension including associated minor internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard and paid special attention to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
4. The two appeals largely concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special interest of the Grade II listed building, Nos 16-20 (consecutive) Huntingdon Street (Nos 16-20) and the character and appearance of the Bradford-on-Avon Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

6. Nos 16-20 comprise a terrace of five two storey cottages dating back to the 17th century. The elevations are largely constructed from rubble stonework with some

stone-tiled and pantilled roofs. Some original windows still exist and comprise 2 and 3 casements with stone mullions. Whilst the terrace is 2 storeys in height, No 17 has a higher roof level with front and rear gables emanating from the roof plane.

7. The front elevation of the terrace is largely unaltered and despite No 17 projecting above the eaves and ridge line of the other cottages, the remainder of the terrace has a simple horizontal form and a coherent appearance. In contrast, the rear of the terrace has lost much of its uniformity, owing to an assortment of primarily two storey projecting gables and other minor modifications. In the case of the appeal building, No 16, it was extended at the rear through a single storey study/porch and two storey gable in circa 1987 and 2014, respectively. Although those additions have masked a large proportion of the original rubble wall at ground floor level, an appreciable portion remains at the first floor. Consequently, and together with the main roof of the cottage, the original silhouette of the dwelling can be understood and appreciated when viewed from the rear.
8. In large part, the significance and special interest of the listed building is derived, from its historic and architectural interests. Its historic interest primarily results from its age and illustration as a 17th century domestic terrace. While its architectural interests, mainly relates to its surviving historic fabric, and the attractive form and design of its frontage, as well as the contribution it makes to the wider townscape, as a group of listed buildings.
9. The modifications and additions at the rear have largely concealed the original outer rubble stone walls of the listed terrace. However, the remaining vestiges continue to be important as they provide an historical reference point and a legible perspective of the interface between the original building and the later additions. In doing so they provide an understanding of the evolution of the terrace.
10. Although the appeal building has undergone alterations in the past, primarily at the rear, its special interest and significance insofar as it relates to the appeals, is largely associated with its historic and architectural integrity, to which its surviving historic fabric and the legibility of its original walls and roof all contribute.
11. The appeal building is within the Bradford-on-Avon Conservation Area (CA). Insofar as it is relevant to the appeal, the significance of the conservation area, is largely derived from the historic layout of the town, and the collection and interrelationship of historic buildings and spaces that it contains. As an outlying part of the CA, situated close to the northern boundary, and occupying a small proportion of the street frontage where it faces Ashley Road, the original and unaltered parts of Nos 16-20's historic fabric give it legibility in the context of the CA. The listed building, which the appeal relates to, therefore makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole.

Appeal proposals and effects

12. The proposed two storey extension would project from the rear elevation of the appeal building and adjoin the existing rear gable addition, along its side. The proposal's roof line would rise above the eaves of the original dwelling and would be finished in clay tiles to match the existing. A dormer roof extension would project from the rear facing plane of the roof and along with the ground floor of the extension would be clad in horizontal timber weatherboards.

13. The proposed development and works would take place at the rear elevation of the listed terrace, where it faces Ashley Road. The appeal property has an open parking forecourt and access onto that highway, while the other properties in the terrace have low boundary walls with gated entrances. The appeal terrace is therefore highly visible from the road. In contrast, the front elevation of the terrace is more discreet. In this respect, the properties in the terrace are accessed off a short private lane, limiting public views from Huntingdon Street, which are somewhat angled and obscured partly by the boundary walls and vegetation enclosing the dwellings. Due to the proximity to Ashley Road, from where the properties in the terrace obtain primary access, the rear of the listed building has developed into the more public elevation.
14. The proposed rear extension would entirely conceal the existing rear rubble stone outer wall and in doing so would remove any visual understanding of the appearance and scale of that part of the listed terrace. Moreover, the extension's main roof would cut across the roof plane of No 16 and as a consequence would mask most of the original roof eaves, thus further eroding the layout of the original part of the listed building and what remains of its legibility. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposed timber clad dormer attempts to replicate the form and scale of those next door at No 17 Huntingdon Street, the extension as a whole would appear jammed into the space and discordant in the context of the simpler gable additions at the rear of the terrace. This awkward juxtaposition would be magnified by the use of timber cladding on the dormer addition and the ground floor elevation, which would be wholly out of keeping with the stone outer walls that characterise the rear of the terrace and many buildings along the street. The proposal would therefore detrimentally change the listed terrace's narrative and harmfully erode its special interest.
15. In the context of the CA, the loss of the listed terrace's historic fabric would be appreciable from Ashley Road, on which the listed building forms part of a frontage comprising several historic buildings. The further loss of part of the original 17th century outer wall of the terrace would undermine its heritage value and contribution it makes to the CA, as a whole.
16. The retention of most of the internal wall at the rear of the appeal dwelling is acknowledged. However, this does not overcome the harmful effect that the loss of the external part of the wall would endure when experienced from the property's driveway, Ashley Road and within the CA.
17. In support of the case, the appellants state that the use of timber is common on heritage assets, while examples have been referred to in the locality. Even if I were to find the use of timber cladding acceptable in this case, this does not alter my findings on the appearance and siting of the proposed extension. Moreover, it is not clear whether the examples cited of timber cladding elsewhere have received consent, and if so whether the policies and legislation they were determined against were consistent with this case. Accordingly, those other examples are not comparable to the appeals before me.
18. The alterations and the inclusion of later additions at the rear of the listed terrace are acknowledged, however, this is not sufficient justification for the further cumulative loss of the original historic fabric. Moreover, whilst the extensions at Nos 17 and 18 have masked the original rear walls of the terrace, I have no details of when those additions were approved, or whether they were assessed against

current legislation and policies relating to the protection of heritage assets. Therefore, those arguments do not weigh in favour of allowing the proposal.

19. The appellants contend that the appeal site can only be seen from within a very short stretch of Ashley Road, where it relates to the CA. It is also claimed that alterations at the rear of buildings are often negligible or cause little harm to the heritage asset. Notwithstanding my view that the proposal would face and be experienced from the more public Ashley Road, listed buildings (in respect of the S.20 works) are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained. Furthermore, even minor or little harm to a heritage asset carries considerable importance and weight.
20. It is acknowledged that houses are for living in and that the needs of the occupiers have changed. I am also aware of the Framework's support for the adaptation of homes to meet these changing requirements. Nonetheless, as designated heritage assets, listed buildings are an irreplaceable resource and the Framework is clear that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, which I have found not to be the case with the appeals before me.
21. Drawing all the above together, the proposed two storey rear extension would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, Nos 16-20. It would also harm the character and appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act.

Public benefits and balance

22. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework, (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting and that this should have clear and convincing justification.
23. With reference to Paragraphs 214 and 215 of the Framework, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the extent of the development and works, relative to the significance of the grade II listed building and the CA as designated heritage assets, the degree of harm in each instance is 'less than substantial' and moderate within that spectrum of harm, but nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 215 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.
24. The proposed extension would provide a further bedroom at the property, as well as a 'boot room', that would meet the appellants' current space requirements. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock. These public benefits are in line with the objectives of the Framework and carry minor weight in favour of the appeal.
25. As a small cottage, the appellants contend that space arrangements within No 16 are not conducive to their circumstances and to modern family life. However, no

substantive evidence has been presented which verifies that the optimum viable use of the property as a single-family dwelling would be jeopardised or would cease, or that its conservation as a designated heritage asset would be at risk, if the appeals were to fail and the proposal as submitted was not implemented.

26. Furthermore, whilst larger homes in the area might be financially out of reach, and the proposal, in the appellants' case represents a good viable use in the context of the current housing stock, this is unlikely to represent the only solution available to the appellants' and their space requirements.
27. In view of the above, clear and convincing justification has not been provided for the development and works which would compromise the building's conservation to an unacceptable degree and would not conserve it in a manner appropriate to its significance.
28. Overall, the minor weight that I ascribe to the public benefits which would accrue from the proposal is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight that I attach to the harm I have found.
29. Therefore, there would be insufficient public benefit to offset the identified harm and the development and works indicated do not accord with the Framework. I therefore conclude that the proposal fails to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed building at Nos 16-20, and would harm the wider character and appearance of the CA, which I am required to have special regard and pay special attention to by the Act. The proposal would also conflict with Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015. Together these require, amongst other things, that proposals conserve the significance of heritage assets and acknowledge features of importance.

Other Matters

30. The lack of any objections from neighbouring occupiers is noted, however the absence of these does not overcome my concerns and findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

31. **Appeal A:** The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
32. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

RE Jones

INSPECTOR