
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 11 November 2013

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 December 2013

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/A/13/2201527
12-14 Salt Lane, Salisbury SP1 1EE

- 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 A Catterall of Reflect Contractors against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref S/2013/0046, dated 9 January 2013, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2013.
 - The development proposed is creation of 6 dwellings with parking/carport, involving demolition works to existing buildings with the retention in part of 1 steam laundry building including retention of facade facing Salt Lane.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/E/13/2201528
12-14 Salt Lane, Salisbury SP1 1EE

- The appeal is made under sections 20 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant conservation area consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Catterall of Reflect Contractors against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref S/2013/0047, dated 9 January 2013, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2013.
 - Proposed demolition of the industrial warehouse to rear and the part demolition of the steam laundry building including the retention of its northern facade.
-

Applications for Costs

1. Applications for costs were made by Mr A Catterall of Reflect Contractors against Wiltshire Council. These applications are the subject of separate decisions.

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/A/13/2201527

2. The appeal is dismissed

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/E/13/2201528

3. The appeal is dismissed.
-

Procedural Matters

4. The Conservation Area (CA) consent application (Appeal B) uses the same description of development as the planning application (Appeal A). However, as the CA consent application is solely for works of demolition to facilitate the appeal site's redevelopment, the Council's description for this application more accurately reflects the nature of the works falling within the ambit of Appeal B. I have therefore adopted the Council's description of the works, with some refinement, for the description of the proposed works for Appeal B.
5. As the works of demolition proposed under the CA consent application are intrinsically linked to the scheme subject to Appeal A, I have considered the merits of both appeals concurrently as they relate to the same redevelopment scheme.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the appearance of the frontage building and whether this addition would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Salisbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises 12 to 14 Salt Lane and is occupied by a two storey, flat roofed, frontage building with central archway and a part single and part two storey workshop and store building to the rear with a courtyard area separating these buildings.
8. The frontage building is Edwardian and the detailing of the front facade includes: a full width ceramic tiled fascia advertising the 'Salisbury Steam Laundry Ltd'; stone or stone effect window heads; and perforated ornamental concrete balustrading, at parapet level, across the whole width of the front elevation, with shorter side returns. The frontage building is currently part occupied at ground floor level by office premises, the other half of the ground floor area being vacant, while the first floor is occupied as two flats. At the time of my site visit the courtyard area, which also extends to the west (side) of the warehouse building was in part being used for car parking.
9. The appeal site is situated on the southern side of Salt Lane and is bounded to the east by a two storey terrace of houses at Nos 16 to 22 and to the west by the Salvation Army Kingdom Hall, which wraps itself around the rear of No 12 and is single storey in height where it adjoins No 12. The appeal site is bounded to the rear by the comparatively recent St Edmund's Gate development. Directly opposite Nos 12 and 14 there is an extensive surface level public car park.
10. The appeal site is situated within the Salisbury CA and this part of the city is known as The Eastern Chequers, one of the Chequers that make up the city's medieval street pattern. The immediate area comprises a mixture of residential and commercial premises of varying heights, designs and dates. One of the features of this part of the CA, which particularly struck me at roof level, is the pleasant eclectic mix of gabled, hipped and mansard/gambrel roofs, which to my eye creates a very interesting roofscape.

11. The appeal scheme would involve the part demolition of the frontage building, with, amongst other things, its roof being removed, together with the substantive removal of the warehouse building to the rear. The scheme proposed under Appeal A would involve the provision of six dwellings. The frontage building would be extended by the introduction of a mansard roof of a gambrel form, clad in natural slate, set back from the parapet edge, creating a third floor of accommodation. The other proposed works to the frontage building would include the replacement of the shopfronts with domestic scale windows, in keeping with the building's original pattern of fenestration. The extended building would be occupied by two houses and a maisonette. The rear building would be replaced by a block significantly taller than the existing structure. This replacement building would occupy virtually the full width of the site and would accommodate a terrace of three houses, with accommodation on four floors. This terrace would be of contemporary design and take the form of a mews style development.
12. I am mindful of the scheme subject to Appeal A being a revised proposal that sought to overcome objections raised by the Council when it refused permission for application S/2012/1228. That application proposed a scheme of redevelopment similar in scale to that before me, but included different roof designs for the frontage building and the terrace to the rear.
13. The Council's Conservation officer objects to the introduction of a mansard roof in this part of the CA. However, given the varied roofscape, both in terms of height and form, found in Salt Lane and surrounding streets and the other recent developments I observed within the vicinity of the appeal site and as referred to by the appellant, I do not find that a mansard roof of itself would be out of place with the appearance of this part of the CA. Indeed, I appreciate that streetscenes often evolve over time and the variation of roof forms I observed is an indication of such evolution occurring within this part of the city centre. However, I am concerned by the implications of adding a roof extension, given the frontage building's appearance within the streetscene and its significance to this part of the CA.
14. The roof level balustrades are very much a quirky, but distinguishing, feature of the frontage building, adding to its undoubted, verging on dominant, presence within this part of Salt Lane. During my site visit I observed no other roof level balustrades, making those at the appeal site unique to this part of the CA. The introduction of a mansard roof would markedly change the appearance of this building at roof level, altering its proportions and diminishing the strength of balustrades as a distinguishing feature and thus harming the building's significance within the streetscene and consequently the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
15. The appellant has sought to demonstrate that from street level, standing directly opposite the frontage building, there would be no meaningful line of sight for the mansard sitting behind the front balustrading. I accept that from this position this would likely be the case and that the roof height would be below the 12.2 metre threshold identified in Core Policy 8 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy (the Core Strategy). However, there would be lines of sight for the roof addition from further afield within the public car park, although these might be affected at street level if this parking area was to be redeveloped. However, having regard to the straight alignment of Salt Lane,

the proposed roof extension would be readily visible behind the balustrading from the east or west, particularly the latter, given the lower height of the Salvation Army premises. From these eastern and western viewpoints I therefore find that the proposed roof extension would detract from the frontage building's simple but distinctive roof form, resulting in harm being caused to the appearance of the frontage building and the CA within which it is situated.

16. While the appellant proposes to undertake works to the frontage building's front elevation to reverse some previous unsympathetic alterations, I do not find these works to be of sufficient benefit to outweigh the harm to the appearance of both this building and the wider CA that I have identified.
17. I note that the Council raises no objection to the mews terrace to the rear of the appeal site and I similarly find that its siting, scale, design and appearance would be acceptable having regard to its relationship with neighbouring properties and position within the Conservation Area. Given the mixed use character of the CA, the appeal scheme would help to preserve its character.
18. I therefore conclude that while the mews terrace would be an acceptable development, the proposed roof extension to the frontage building would detract from its appearance with the result that the proposed scheme would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This is harm that could not be overcome by the imposition of reasonable conditions were I minded to allow the appeals.
19. Given the nature of the harm that I have identified the scheme subject to Appeal A would be in conflict with the objectives of policies D1, D3 and CN8 of the Salisbury District Local Plan 2004 (the Local Plan), which amongst other things require new development, including that involving extensions, to be respectful of its context, including the appearance of roofscapes and the building in question; and in CAs to preserve or enhance the character of the designated area.
20. As Appeal A is not to be allowed, it follows that the demolition works subject to Appeal B would be contrary to the provisions of policy CN9 of the Local Plan because planning permission would not exist for the site's redevelopment.
21. While I have concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the CA, the designated area is extensive and the appeal development would only affect a small part of it. Accordingly the harm caused to the CA's significance as a heritage asset would be 'less than substantial' as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 132 to 134. Nevertheless the scale of public benefit, including the provision of additional housing within the Council's area, would be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the CA that I have identified such as to warrant allowing these appeals under the provisions of the Framework. In this respect the appellant's evidence does not indicate that the appeal scheme would be the only means of securing the optimum viable use for the site.

Conclusions

22. I have had regard to the submissions made by all interested parties, including the references to other developments on other sites made by the appellant. However, these matters do not affect my conclusion on the main issue raised by this appeal and its particular site specific considerations. For the reasons given above I conclude the appeals A and B should both be dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR

If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer

Services Department:

Telephone: 0870 333 1181

Fax: 01793 414926

Textphone: 0800 015 0516

E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk