

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

19 September 2025

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

Officer's Name: David Cox
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2025/05057
**Two storey & single storey rear extension and new vehicle access.
Braybrook, The Green, Marston, Devizes, SN10 5SW**

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

Recommendations:

☒	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 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: The site is an unlisted building located in Marston Conservation. The building is adjacent to a chapel which is a non designated heritage asset (NDHA) and a significant unlisted building.

Proposal: The proposal seeks a two storey & single storey rear extension and new vehicle access.

Relevant planning history: PL/2024/08409 - Two Storey Extension (withdrawn)

Issues: impact on the setting of neighbouring NDHA, 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, whilst the applications are accompanied by a "Design & Access Statement" the document provides limited information about the building and fails to provide any objective assessment of the fabric affected, its date or significance or of the impact of the proposals and, as a result, it fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF.

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.

Assessment: The property is an unlisted building located in Marston Conservation Area.

The proposal seeks a large two storey extension and single storey extension at the rear of the building and new vehicular access.

The extension has been improved in design from the previous submission, moved further away from the chapel and the ridge height reduced.

The size however would double that of the existing dwelling and whilst the two storey element is a traditional form, the single storey addition is boxy and unconvincing as an architectural addition to a traditional cottage, spanning the width of the two gable ends of the two storey extension.

In conservation areas or where proposal affect the setting of building which are heritage assets, flat roofs are rarely acceptable unless of a contemporary design, or where the roof has been

specifically designed to be a flat roof, such as a green roof. In this case a more contemporary single storey design may result in a more sensitive design. Alternatively, the single storey extension could be smaller mono pitched roof to give a more traditional form.

With the proposed access road the form is acceptable however it would be an improved design if the bridge had a traditional coping such as a half round brick or saddle back. Also if this were constructed of a traditional brick bond. It is also noted that a tarmac entrance surface is proposed, I would have thought that with any non-permeable surfacing, that you would need to show the relevant drainage to take the surface water run off, hence stone setts or self draining pavements may be a better surface. Gravel may also not be appropriate over the bridge area.

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.

As such amendments are requested.