

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Refusal of Full Planning Permission
Application Reference Number: PL/2025/03165
Decision Date: 24/09/2025

Applicant:	McCARTHY AND STONE RETIREMENT LIFESTYLES LTD SOUTHERN HOUSE , EMBANKMENT WAY, RINGWOOD, HAMPSHIRE, BH24 1EU
Particulars of Development:	Erection of retirement apartments (Category II type) with communal facilities, car parking and substation to serve the development. (demolition of police station)
At:	Former Police Station, Georges Lane, Marlborough, SN8 4DB

In accordance with paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), this planning application has been processed in a proactive way. However, due to technical objections or the proposal's failure to comply with the development plan and/or the NPPF as a matter of principle, the local planning authority has had no alternative other than to refuse planning permission.

In pursuance of their powers under the above Act, the Council hereby **REFUSE TO GRANT PERMISSION** for the development referred to in the above application and plans submitted by you, for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reason

- 1 The proposal fails to achieve a high standard of design and would result in a development that is out of character with the surrounding area, contrary to Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the Wiltshire Design Guide, and paragraphs 129 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

REASON: Core Policy 57 requires new development to respond positively to the existing townscape and local context, ensuring high-quality design that respects local character. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure developments are sympathetic to local character and history, while

paragraph 129 requires local planning authorities to ensure that developments are visually attractive and function well. The proposal fails to meet these requirements, resulting in harm to the established character and appearance of the area.

Refusal Reason

- 2** Core Policy 57(vii) expects new development to have regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings and uses, the impact on the amenities of existing occupants, and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself, including the consideration of privacy, overshadowing, vibration, and pollution (e.g. light intrusion, noise, smoke, fumes, effluent, waste or litter). The applicant has failed to provide sufficient information for the LPA to be satisfied that a reasonable level of amenity can be achieved for the future occupiers of the proposed development as a consequence of noise and lighting.

REASON: The proposal lacks sufficient information for the LPA to be satisfied that an appropriate level of amenity can be achieved and thus fails to comply with Core Policy 57(vii) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Refusal Reason

- 3** The development, by reason of its height, bulk and design, would harm the setting of nearby listed buildings and the Marlborough Conservation Area, contrary to Core Policy 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and paragraph 208 of the NPPF.

REASON: Core Policy 58 seeks to protect, conserve, and where possible enhance the historic environment. Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 place a statutory duty on decision-makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings and the character or appearance of conservation areas. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF requires great weight to be given to the conservation of heritage assets. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets, which is not outweighed by public benefits.

Refusal Reason

- 4** The proposal provides insufficient on-site parking, resulting in highway safety issues and conflict with Core Policies 60 and 61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

REASON: Core Policy 60 promotes the safe and efficient movement of people and goods, while Core Policy 61 requires new development to be capable of being served by safe access to the highway network. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The lack of adequate parking provision is likely to result in on-street parking and associated highway safety concerns.

Refusal Reason

- 5** The proposal does not provide for the delivery of the necessary infrastructure (e.g. affordable housing, recreation and open space, and public right of way improvements) required to mitigate the direct impacts of the development and therefore fails to comply with Core Policy 3 (Infrastructure Requirements), Core Policy 43 (Providing affordable homes), Core Policy 52 (Green Infrastructure) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, Saved Policy HC34 of the Kennet Local Plan (provision of Public Open Space), Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

REASON: The absence of a completed legal agreement means the proposal fails to secure these necessary contributions to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

INFORMATIVE:

This reason for refusal may be addressed by the completion of a legal agreement (a 'S106 agreement'), in the event of an appeal.

Nic Thomas - Director of Planning, Economy and Regeneration

NOTES

1. **Appeals.** If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the local planning authority to refuse permission, they may appeal to the Secretary of State for the Environment in accordance with Section 78(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 within six months of the date of this decision. (Information and forms relating to the appeals process can be found at the Planning Portal - [Appeal a planning decision: Overview - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/appeal-a-planning-decision-overview)).