

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

18 August 2025

Fiona Webb
Senior Conservation Officer (Consultant)
Wiltshire Council Conservation (Central)

Officer's Name: Joe Leesam
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2025/05178
**Erection of detached car port, following removal of existing.
Installation of 2 no. air source heat pumps.
Manor Farm, 17 The Street, Chirton, Wilts, SN10 3QS**

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)
☐	No objections

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. Section 66 requires that **special regard** be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing 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 214-216 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 210 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."

Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy Policy CP57 'Ensuring high quality design and place shaping': A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complementary to the locality.

Historic England Advice Note 2 – Making changes to Heritage Assets illustrates the application of policies set out in the NPPF in determining applications for PP and LBC.

Site and assets considered: Manor Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building, an associated barn enclosing the west side of the courtyard is a Grade II listed building, and associated stables and barn enclosing the north side of the courtyard is also a Grade II listed building. Other structures within the farmstead grouping are considered curtilage listed, such as the front brick boundary wall and associated walling in the courtyard and the single storey shelter shed associated with the front boundary wall. The farmstead is located within Chirton Conservation Area.

Proposal: The proposal seeks the erection of a detached car port, following the removal of the existing and the installation of 2 no. air source heat pumps.

Relevant planning history: PL/2024/05971 - Erection of detached cart shed, following removal (refused); PL/2025/05865 - Erection of 1 no. detached dwelling, conversion of existing barn into single dwelling, and sub-division & extension of 'Owls Barn' to create two separate dwellings; with associated parking, turning, landscaping, private amenity space & access arrangements. Removal of existing structures/walls – (under consideration); ENQ/2024/01285 - Erection of 4no. detached dwellings, conversion of existing barn into single dwelling, sub-division and extension of Owls Barn (Grade II Listed Building) to create 2no. separate dwellings, with associated parking, turning, landscaping, private amenity space and access arrangements. Modification of existing buildings to form garaging. Removal of existing buildings/structures and diversion of existing public footpath; 16/08431/LBC - Repairs and restoration of existing Listed Barn (approved); 14/10460/LBC and 14/10413/FUL - Alterations and refurbishment of existing farmhouse and detached garage. (approved); PL/2024/03109 and PL/2024/03109 - Demolition of existing single storey extension to south elevation. Erection of two-storey extension to west elevation (approved); K/31933/L - Alterations and provision of roof lights to form room in in roof space. (refused); K/15593/L - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO CONVERT EXISTING STABLE TO DWELLING (approved); E/09/0572/FUL - Demolition of rear single storey extension and construction of rear two storey extension. (approved); K/14034 - CONVERSION OF FARM BUILDINGS TO HOUSE WITH ATTACHED WORKSHOP FOR LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USE. (approved); E/09/1169/CAC - Demolition of coal shed and open fronted shed, retention of back wall. (approved); PL/2022/06448 and PL/2022/06860 - Conversion of part of Owls Barn to provide additional residential accommodation to be used in conjunction with the main house; associated works including replacement windows to existing barn and replacement means of enclosure (approved); K/31933/L - Alterations and provision of roof lights to form room in in roof space. (appeal dismissed).

Issues: impact on the setting of listed buildings, impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Information considered/provided: Paragraph 207 of the NPPF requires that applicants describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. This should include sufficient information to provide a clear understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting and the potential impact of any proposals on that significance. In this case, the applications are accompanied by a “Heritage Statement” which provides sufficient information to understand the impact of the proposals and is proportionate to their scope. The requirements of the NPPF are therefore met in this respect.

However, paragraph 208 of the NPPF also provides for the local planning authority to make its own assessment of impact and the following heritage recommendations are offered on this basis.

Significance of assets and contribution of setting: The NPPF defines significance as the “value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be **archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic**. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.” Historic England assesses significance in a similar manner, referring to evidential, historic, aesthetic and communal values of a place.

In this case the significance of the building lies largely with its historic fabric and architecture - its form, layout and architectural expression/detailing and use of high-quality design materials which have significant aesthetic and architectural interest and which contribute to the character of the conservation area.

Assessment: Manor Farm is a Grade II listed building located within Chirton Conservation Area.

The proposal is to demolish the existing single-storey timber garage that is located a short distance to the south east of Manor Farmhouse. The garage is of no particular architectural merit, and is of modern construction. It is proposed to erect a single storey cart shed and store, as a replacement to the existing garage. The principal element comprising an open-fronted, single-bay garage would measure 7m by 4m in ground-plan, with the attached store measuring 4m by 3m. The building would be an L shaped plan with a hipped roof, the widest elevation would face the street scene and would be on a narrow area of garden to the rear of the listed building. The eastern roadside elevation of the garage elements would be open-sides, with both sides of the entrance supported by timber posts mounted on staddle-stones. The adjoining east elevation of the store section would not feature any openings on this side.

The garage element of the building would be black-painted timber cladding, and would be mounted on a low brick plinth. The adjoining store section would be constructed of solid brickwork masonry.

Firstly, the applicant is carrying out extensive landscaping works at the property none of which appear to any permission or consent. These works include the rebuilding of the front boundary wall along the street and introduction of brick piers, creation of a wider drive way to the proposed car port, removal of trees, removal of garden area and creation of a drive way and hardstanding to the east side of the house, terracing, changes in level and subdividing garden walls and steps in the rear garden, erection of a green house etc. A number of these unauthorised works are linked to this application.

In principle there is no objection to covered parking on site subject to a sensitively designed sympathetic scheme in keeping with the heritage assets.

The cartshed would be subservient to the main house, being single storey with a lower ridge height than the existing main house. However, the building would be in line with the building line of the listed building and the neighbouring property and would infill the narrow garden area to the rear of the listed building which historically has always been open. This would create a terracing effect with the neighbouring property and the listed building and would also wrap around the curtilage listed outbuilding with an awkward narrow gap.

As such I consider that the terracing effect of building form would be detrimental to the setting of the listed building and the conservation area since the farmhouse has always maintained its garden area with its primary relationship with the enclosed farmstead grouping to its front elevation.

There would also be some limited harm to the conservation area through the partial demolition of the front boundary wall and the loss of the trees which contribute to the garden setting.

In principle there is no objection to the creation of a cartshed on site for parking. However, the applicant already has historic buildings in their ownership which could be repaired and re-used for this purpose. For example, the existing cartshed to the front elevation of the listed building could be sensitively repaired and used for parking/storage for the main house. This is the conservation preference since this would give an active use for a heritage asset and ensure its repair and longevity as a traditional outbuilding as part of the historic farmstead.

This would also have the benefit of screening parked cars and would not require additional hardstanding in the setting of the listed building and the conservation area and could allow the boundary wall along the street of the site to be re-instated.

As such at the current time, in conservation terms the new build cart shed has not been fully justified in favour of the heritage assets.

Summary & conclusion: The NPPF confirms that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). It makes clear that any harm to a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification.

The proposals will result in harm to the setting of the listed due to the terracing effect of built form in its immediate proximity, loss of garden setting, loss of trees and loss of enclosure of the brick boundary wall. This would also have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposals are considered as causing 'less than substantial harm' for the purposes of interpreting the NPPF, Indeed, the wording of the NPPF and the 'special regard' by Sections 16 and 66 and the 'special attention' by section 72 of the Act requires that any level harm caused should be taken seriously.

Whilst paragraph 215 allows that a level of harm may be offset by public benefits, which could include conservation benefits, in this case no benefits are being provided and the proposals are articulated as being primarily for the convenience of the occupants i.e. a private benefit. As a

result, the proposals fail to meet with the requirements of current conservation legislation, policy or guidance and I therefore recommend refusal.