



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 26 November 2025

by **A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/W/25/3367420

3-5 New Street, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP1 2PH

- 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 Raymond Wicks against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/02822.
 - The development proposed is the division of the existing dwelling into its original.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/25/3367418

3-5 New Street, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP1 2PH

- 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 Raymond Wicks against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/08875.
 - The works proposed are to divide the existing dwelling into its original.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeals relate to the same scheme under different legislation. I have dealt with the appeals together in my reasoning.
3. The description of development entered on the application form for the planning permission refers to the division of the existing dwelling into its original. This is vague and assumes that how the building was originally divided is clear and agreed.
4. The existing building is already divided, with a rear wing that appears to function as an independent dwelling, although it is connected by an internal door to the rest of the dwelling, and this connection remains in the proposal. There is no evidence that a revised description was agreed between the appellant and Council, but the Council used the following description in its decision: the division of the existing dwelling into three separate dwellings. Given the uncertainty about whether the rear wing is currently independent and would be in the future, I suggest that the proposal is best understood as the division of the main part of the dwelling facing New Street into two separate dwellings. I have considered the appeals on this basis.
5. The description entered on the application form for listed building consent is also unclear, although reference is made to the related planning application. I have

therefore copied the description from the planning application in the banner heading for Appeal B above.

6. Since the Council made its decisions the Salisbury Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2038 (SNP) was made. The Council raised this in its statement, and the appellant had the opportunity to respond in his final comments. No further consultation on this change is therefore required, and I shall determine the appeals in accordance with the current development plan, which includes the SNP.

Main Issues

7. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal upon the significance of the grade II listed building known as 3 and 5 New Street¹, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Salisbury Conservation Area.
8. An additional main issue for Appeal A is whether the site is suitably located for the proposal with regard to the risk of flooding.

Reasons

Heritage

9. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) require the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Additionally, section 72 of the LBCA requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
10. The appeal building is a large dwelling that occupies a broad plot on New Street. Evidence suggests that it was built as two dwellings in 1837 and joined into one soon after – sometime between 1844-49. It now has the appearance of a single dwelling, with a main front door set into a lined surround with pilasters, a frieze and cornice that provides a strong definition to the centre of the elevation. The rest of the facade is arranged in a broadly symmetrical manner although the spacing between openings is not consistent and the first floor oriel window to one side is a significant intrusion into this arrangement. A small secondary door sits to one side of the front to provide separate access to the rear wing.
11. Despite this, the overall impression at the front is of a formal and ordered composition; and when re-ordered in the mid-19th century it was clearly arranged to appear as a single dwelling with a degree of status and prominence, rising considerably above the height of its neighbours. The appearance of the front would appear to date from this time, as there is no trace externally of the original second front entrance. Additional architectural interest is derived from the modest moulded eaves cornice and the uniform arrangement of traditionally detailed sash windows, including the top thirds of those on the second floor that include glazing bars. These modestly embellish the front elevation, and evidence suggests that they featured elsewhere originally.
12. Internally, the building is divided with a central hallway that provides access to four well-proportioned principal rooms to each corner, with a secondary extension at

¹ List Entry Number: 1258327

the rear. 19th century historic fabric is retained in numerous places, and includes staircases, doors, architraves, window linings, cornices, ceiling roses, chimney breasts and fireplaces; although it is noted that these features have not been retained consistently throughout the building and have been subject to replacement in certain areas.

13. At the rear, despite the incursion of the rear wing and single storey extension, the historic form of the building at first and second floor is readily appreciated. Some original joinery is retained and the matching pair of rearward hips reinforce a sense of the original order of the rear façade, which is emphasised by what appears to be a symmetrical placement of windows below the westerly hip. The fact that the best views of the rear of the building are achieved from its private rear garden is irrelevant, as an understanding of significance and how setting contributes to significance is not dependent on public accessibility.
14. Therefore, the significance of the building is derived from its consistent 19th century presentation that goes beyond its front façade; with a high level of authenticity resulting from retained historic fabric and materials, its plan form and a sense of its original appearance that is retained at the rear.
15. Whilst there is strong evidence that the appeal building was originally two dwellings, it was only used in this way for a relatively short period and physical evidence of its former subdivision is limited. The appellant suggests that the significance of this period should be elevated because of the association with a significant person. Whilst this is a relevant point and this association adds to the building's significance, greater significance would appear to be found in the way the building presents now, as a single dwelling, as a result of its ordered front façade and its consistent mid-19th century detailing.
16. The list description refers to its group value. It stands in the core of the city and in line with several historic buildings, to form an attractive and densely developed historic street. It faces a large multi storey carpark. Although the façade of the car park is largely inactive and its unglazed openings have a poor appearance, effort has been made to create a street facing façade that respects the rhythm and scale of adjacent buildings, disguising its function as a modern carpark with partial success. On this basis I find that it is a neutral component of the appeal building's setting that neither enhances or harms its significance. Most buildings nearby face the street directly and there are limited gaps in the streetscene. As a result, the appeal building has a mature and densely developed historic context, that contributes to its significance.
17. I note the appellant's comments regarding what he believes to be local characteristics that make a negative contribution to the significance of the listed building. I have already mentioned the carpark. Of other matters mentioned the most relevant appears to no. 1 New Street². I cannot agree that this listed building is a negative component of the building's setting. Although its street facing façade is peppered with signs, they have a consistent appearance, are largely at a low level, and relate comfortably to the building's commercial function.
18. The appeal building stands within the Salisbury Conservation Area (SCA). This covers an extensive and varied area. The extract of the Council's appraisal included within its officer report suggests that the building is part of a positive

² List Entry Number 1258311

frontage, which I was able to verify on site. The variation in scale of buildings along this side of New Street and the high survival of historic buildings form a street frontage that has high townscape value and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the SCA.

19. A thick spine wall extends through the building on all floors, to the west of the hallway. There is some evidence that a staircase may have existed on the west side of the wall. This would have served the separate dwelling that seems likely to have existed on this side of the thick wall. It is reasonable to conclude that this thick wall represents the original division of the street facing dwellings and reinstating a separation here is logical. However, there are several resulting consequences that mean it would not be a straightforward intervention.
20. A new doorway would need to be inserted in the front elevation. Although it is reasonable to assume that a second doorway existed originally, there is no evidence of its former position, and it appears likely that the front of the building was re-ordered at the time that it became a single dwelling.
21. The new door would sit alongside the existing front door, which is the primary focus of the building's front façade, and is a high quality component with its surrounding detail. The drawings suggest a more modest door. This is an approach that has some merit, as it would not necessarily compete with the existing door and could appear as a secondary element. However, a second door in this position would appear cumbersome and muddled as it would look out of place and would harm the sense of order currently achieved across the front five bays.
22. Whereas the existing access door to the rear wing is pushed up against one side of the façade and to the side of the five principal bays, the proposed door would be inserted in the main area of the façade. It would significantly erode the broadly symmetrical appearance of the building's front. Its secondary appearance would not make sense in the context of the existing elevation where it is logical that the centre of the five bays is defined by a well-appointed door.
23. The insertion of the door would result in the loss of historic fabric. This includes the existing window, the internal timber panel which extends to the ground floor and other parts of the lining on the basis that the opening would be narrowed. The window lining and panel would appear to be part of the mid-19th interior and is a detail that is repeated below the ground floor windows along the front elevation and therefore has some significance.
24. The reduced width would mean that the existing lintel would become redundant where it extends beyond the edge of the new door, and a narrow area of brickwork would need to be made up to fill the gap. This arrangement would look poor and would be likely to leave some scarring to the front elevation.
25. For these reasons the insertion of the door would cause considerable harm to the building's significance. It would also result in some harm to the streetscene. However, in the context of the scale of the SCA, the level of harm would be low.
26. Openings within the thick spine wall would be blocked to separate the dwellings. These are well detailed mid-19th century doors with architraves. The plans suggest that the openings would be blocked flush, with no apparent consideration given to

retaining fabric or evidence of the former openings in accordance with good conservation practice.

27. There is some evidence of a former partition in the ground floor room in the northwest corner. However, the plaster finish is historic and consistent across this wall. If the partition formed one side of a former hallway it would be reasonable to expect the section of wall where the hallway would have been to have a different appearance to the section of wall adjacent to the chimney breast. It would thus be more likely that the partition divided the room rather than separated it from a second hallway.
28. Similarly, the new hallway and lobby would be inserted into a room with an attractive historic cornice. In some areas new partitions would meet this detail and there is nothing to suggest the approach that would be taken in terms of whether partitions would cut in or be scribed around, and in other areas it would be lost entirely.
29. There are references before me to a concealed arch on the first floor that may have related to a landing, and I saw the outline of this and the remnant section at my site visit. I am however not convinced that this must have related to a hallway; it could have provided a connection between two rooms. Furthermore, despite the fact it is clearly an interesting feature, the plans do not show that it would be reinstated or better revealed.
30. The plans include a new en-suite to be inserted into the southeast bedroom. This is shown on the existing plans but was not in place at the time of my visit so I will treat it as part of the proposal. This is a well-proportioned room. The en-suite would sit awkwardly in the corner of the room in a manner that would harm its proportions, and there is nothing on the drawings to show how it would intersect with the existing cornices. Additionally, the far corner of the room would be made darker, which would be a downgrading of the quality of this part of the interior.
31. The rear extension would extend the existing hipped roof and be of the same height as the existing building. It would fail to be subservient or present itself as an addition to the building in a manner that would allow the original form and appearance to still be appreciated. As a result, the original form of the building at the rear would be significantly obscured, and certainly not restored as is suggested by the appellant. Additionally, historic windows would be removed, and the rear rooms in this part of the building would become dark and rely on borrowed light from the extension, adding to the harm to the quality of the building's interior.
32. The Council refers to the impact of the rearward extension on the neighbouring listed building to the west, which is also listed³. There would be a small physical impact as the extension would require a modest adjustment of the short length of its eaves, where it extends towards the appeal building. It is however likely that this could be addressed in a straightforward matter if the appeals are allowed, and details of the abutment could be secured through a condition.
33. The length by which the extension would extend beyond the rear gable of the neighbouring building would be modest, and I note that the neighbouring plot is wider at the rear than it is at the front. For these reasons I am satisfied that the

³ List Entry Number 1258328, 7 New Street

extension would not harmfully enclose the space around this neighbouring building.

34. The appellant has provided examples of many other proposals that the Council accepted, which he suggests present similar heritage issues. Consistency in decision making is indeed important. However, there will often be a different set of considerations that will result in different outcomes. This is particularly so for historic assets where the level of significance can vary between assets that initially appear to be similar.
35. By comparison, although the scheme at No. 82 St Ann Street⁴ includes a new entrance door to the front, it is situated to the side in a secondary extension and has not disrupted the order and symmetry of the front façade. At 4 New Street⁵, the scheme appears to have resulted in little change to the building's front, and 61-63 New Street⁶ appears to have presented itself much more clearly as a pair of dwellings. These buildings and others mentioned have different plan forms and levels of significance internally and it is therefore difficult or not appropriate to make a direct comparison with the appeal building and proposal.
36. I have found that the proposal would harm the significance of the listed building and fail to preserve the character or appearance of the SCA. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) the harms would be less than substantial. The extent of harm from each intervention would vary from low for more modest changes such as those that would impact the quality of the interior space, through to a medium level of harm for the change to the front façade and rear elevation. The harm would be of considerable importance and weight, and Paragraph 215 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
37. The appellant suggests that the building is too large to serve as a single family dwelling in this city centre location. It is large and may be over-sized or unpractical for most households. However, there is nothing before me to suggest that it has been considered carefully in the context of the local housing market or local demand, or that consideration has been given to marketing it as a single dwelling to see what interest is generated.
38. The appellant suggests that refusing the scheme will most likely result in a conversion to a house of multiple occupation, likely resulting in a greater level of subdivision and harm to the future conservation of the building. However, and in terms of the clear and convincing justification required by Paragraph 213 of the Framework, there is nothing to show that alternative ways of subdividing the building have been carefully considered. It is reasonable to expect that the practicalities of alternative options as well as the level of heritage harm associated with alternative subdivision schemes has been evaluated so that the best option can be pursued. I therefore give this matter little weight.
39. The proposal would deliver at least one additional dwelling. This is in the context of Government priorities to significantly increase the delivery of new homes in response to the UK's housing crisis, and the Council's lack of a five-year supply of housing. The building is situated in an accessible location, with easy access to a

⁴ List Entry Number: 1273228

⁵ List Entry Number: 1366014

⁶ List Entry Number: 1273457

wide range of local services and facilities, and additional benefits would arise from increased spending and the economic investments during the construction phase. However, the weight I give to this as a public benefit is limited by the fact that it would only deliver one additional dwelling and the construction work is limited as the proposal is for a conversion rather than new build.

40. It is suggested that the rear extension would secure improvements to the building that include internalising a damaged area of brickwork, the removal of modern French doors, and the internalising of existing soil vent pipes. Whilst I accept that these would all be improvements, they are modest benefits that would be entirely outweighed by the considerable impact that would arise from the rear extension.
41. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. The public benefits carry limited weight, and they are not sufficient to outweigh the level of harm identified.
42. In summary, the proposal would harm the significance of the listed building and would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the SCA. In reaching this position I have had regard to the requirements of the LBCA. The proposal would fail to accord with Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015 (WCS), which together seek to ensure that proposals protect and conserve the historic environment, and advice in the Design and Advertising Guide of the SNP relating to extensions to listed buildings.

Flooding

43. The proposal is for an additional dwelling in flood zone 2. The Council is of the view that a sequential test is necessary. The Framework states that the aim of the sequential test is to steer development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Paragraph 176 of the Framework states that applications for some minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the sequential test. Although the development includes an extension, the footprint of the building would not be changed. I am therefore satisfied that for the purposes of considering this matter the proposal should be viewed as a change of use.
44. Additionally, Paragraph 175 states that a sequential test would not be necessary in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source. The submitted site-specific flood risk assessment (SSFRA) suggests that this would be the case.
45. The Planning Practice Guidance⁷ states that a change in use may involve an increase in flood risk if the vulnerability of the development is changed. In this case, the existing use is residential. However, it goes on to say that a change of use within the same vulnerability classification can also increase the vulnerability of the development.
46. The appellant suggests that the vulnerability would not increase as there would be no overall increase in the number of bedrooms once the building is divided. This is a rather simplistic conclusion. It assumes that the existing building would be occupied by a large household that would fill all its nine bedrooms, which is unlikely. By comparison, the proposal would provide two generously sized

⁷ Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 7-014-20220825

dwellings with 4/5 and 3/4 bedrooms respectively. Both could be comfortably occupied by a larger household or family. This would increase the number of people residing at the site and would thus increase the vulnerability of the development.

47. Therefore, the SSFRA does not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the proposal's impact with regard to flood risk, and as a result it is not possible for me to conclude that the site is suitably located for the proposal with regard to the risk of flooding. The proposal would fail to accord with Policy 67 of the WCS which seeks to ensure the submission of sufficient evidence to assess flood risk.

Other Matters

48. Paragraph 11 d) of the Framework would ordinarily be engaged as the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. An exception to this is provided where policies in the Framework that protect assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the proposal. Footnote 7 establishes that this includes designated heritage assets. I have found that the proposal would harm the special interest of the listed building and fail to preserve the character or appearance of the SCA. It would therefore not accord with the Framework and Paragraph 11 d) would not be engaged.
49. The site falls within the catchment of the River Avon Special Area of Conservation and the zone of influence for the New Forest internationally protected sites. The Council suggests that mitigation to address both impacts could be dealt with by condition if the appeals are allowed. As I am dismissing the appeals for other reasons the impacts would not occur, and this is not therefore something that I need to consider further.
50. The appellant is of the view that the Council's decisions were contrary to its pre-application advice and refers to the different positions taken by different Council officers when the applications were being assessed. He questions various processes and approaches taken, and statements made by the Council; whether these are factually correct and whether its behaviour accorded with Paragraph 39 of the Framework. It is however necessary for me to determine the appeals by making an impartial assessment of the proposal's merits, and the matters raised regarding the Council's conduct are not relevant to my determination of the appeals.

Conclusion

51. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, that outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeals should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR