Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

14 December 2023

Officer's Name: Joe Richardson
Officer's Title: Senior Planning Officer

Jocelyn Sage
Senior Conservation Officer
Wiltshire Council Conservation (South and West - part)

Application No: **PL/2023/10016**

Variety Barn, Hindon Lane, Tisbury, Wiltshire, SP3 6QQ

Demolition of existing barn and erection of dwelling, reuse of existing stone, landscaping and ecology enhancements, solar array, field shelter and associated works

Please find following comments in respect of the above application(s).

Recommendations:

	No comment
	Support in principle subject to amendments to the scheme (as set out below)
	Support subject to conditions (as set out below)
	Object (for reasons set out below)
x	No objection

Scope of comments: the following comments relate to the built historic environment.

Policy: From the point of view of the historic environment the main statutory tests are set out within the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Sections 16 (LBC) and 66 (PP) require that **special regard** be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 also requires the Council to pay **special attention** to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of designated Conservation Areas.

The NPPF outlines government policy, including its policy in respect of the historic environment. Section 16 of the NPPF 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' sets out the Government's high-level policies concerning heritage and sustainable development. Paragraphs 201-3 of the NPPF require a balanced approach with any harm which would be caused being weighed against the potential public benefits which might be achieved. Paragraph 197 requires local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

National Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on interpreting the NPPF.

The Council's Core Strategy Policy CP58 'Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment' requires that "designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a

manner appropriate to their significance." It is also required that distinctive elements of Wiltshire's historic environment, including non-designated heritage assets, which contribute to a sense of local character and identity will be conserved, and where possible enhanced.

The Council's Core Strategy CP 57: Ensuring high quality design requires a high quality of design in all new developments. Proposals are required to "demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to the character of Wiltshire through (amongst other things) "enhancing local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the natural and historic environment, relating positively to its landscape setting and the existing pattern of development" and "responding positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials, streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting."

Site and assets considered:

Variety Barn is an unlisted barn outside the Tisbury conservation area.

I consider the building to be a NDHA of some limited interest, evidencing former farming practices and the rural agricultural character of this part of Tisbury.

Proposal:

The demolition of the existing barn and its replacement with a new building in a L-shaped arrangement, incorporating the stonework from the demolished barn in one of the new build elements.

The proposed structure, which would have a larger extension than that approved, would reflect more closely the proportions of the existing barn.

Planning History

We have already approved a scheme that converts and extends the existing building. However, the current application is for the demolition of the building and replacement with a new dwelling.

The proposals were the subject of a pre-application discussion. Unsurprisingly I reiterated my position that I consider the building to be a non-designated heritage asset and that I would regret its demolition.

The current application is supported by a Heritage Impact Assessment (dated September 2023). The report is comprehensive.

Issues: Loss of a undesignated structure of some heritage interest.

Information considered/provided: Paragraph 194 requires that applicants describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. In this particular case, as noted, previously, the application is supported by a heritage assessment of the interest of the building.

However, paragraph 195 also provides for the local planning authority to make its own assessment of impact and the following heritage recommendations are offered on this basis.

Assessment:

The author of the heritage report at 4.7 says:

'The existing barn has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset by the local planning authority. However, as discussed within the proceeding section, the heritage values of the barn are limited, and it is

questionable whether the building merits this identification given that it is of particularly standard form and no longer forms part of an 'outfarm' (all associated buildings have been demolished). However, it is acknowledged that through its material palette and agricultural character it reflects the local vernacular and the period'.

I would not disagree with their conclusion of its limited interest.

Summary & conclusion:

As such, I note paragraph 203 of the NPPF which requires a 'balanced judgement' in regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Unlike designated heritage assets, there is no requirement that the works provide a public benefit if they result in harm, rather that we carefully consider the benefits and significance. Given its limited significance (the barn) and given the proposed design with its broken up massing and lower overall height, **I withdraw my objection**.