

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

25 November 2025

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

Officer's Name: Brook Bishop
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2025/09193 and PL/2025/09026
Erection of single-storey rear extension. Minor internal alterations.
The Old Farmhouse, 9 Mill Lane, Poulshot, Devizes, SN10 1SA

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 16 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: The Old Farmhouse, is a Grade II listed building located within Townsend. The property lies on the north side of Mill Lane within the Poulshot Conservation Area.

Proposal: The proposal seeks the erection of a single-storey rear extension, together with internal alterations.

Relevant planning history: K/79/0103 - Extension to dwelling (approved); K/30209/L and 19/09389/LBC - The demolition of rear porch, minor internal works, new 2 storey rear extension, minor flood prevention and works to garden (approved); K/30217 - A rear extension and associated works (approved); 19/09113/FUL - Proposed Two Storey Rear Extension and Demolition of Garage and Construction of Replacement (approved); ENQ/2025/00764 - Erection of single-storey rear extension.

Issues: impact on the listed building, impact on the conservation area.

Information considered/provided: Paragraph 207 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 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. The list entry provides an indication as to the reason why the building was selected for designation, stating that the building was 'Included for interior features'.

Assessment: The property is a Grade II listed building located in Poulshot Conservation Area.

The Old Farmhouse was added to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest at Grade II in 1987. The building is described in the List as: *House, C16 raised in late C18 or early C19 and refenestrated in C20. Roughcast over brick with Bridgwater tile roof, hipped to west and one stack on north roof slope. Two storeys, 3- window range entirely of C20 timber windows. Centre door. Lean-to on west end. Interior: ground floor left room has heavy chamfered beams to 4-panel compartmental ceiling and exceptionally large unmoulded stone depressed-arched fireplace. Chamfered beam in ground floor right room. C18 or early C19 roof trusses. Included for interior features.*

The proposal seeks to construct a single storey extension to the rear of The Old Farmhouse within the angle between the rear elevation and the modern two-storey rear extension. The proposed addition would have rendered walls to match the existing building within the south-east elevation double doors with fixed glazed lights either side. There would be a flat roof light to the roof concealed by a parapet. The extension would be open to the present kitchen within the existing modern extension, and the window to the rear wall of the dining room would be enlarged to form a door.

The original house had a linear form but has been substantially extended with the single storey side additions and the large two storey rear extension. The exterior of the house is rendered brick and the windows are 20th century casements. The list description refers to the 16th century origins of the house and the roof trusses, chamfered beams and the stone fireplace are highlighted as features of interest.

The original house has already been substantially extended with the single storey side additions and the large two storey rear extension. The owners were informed in 2019 at the time of their last application for an extension, that 'the property is getting to the point where the extensions are on the verge of dominating the original house'. In this regard, I concur with this comment and consider that due to the cumulative effect of extensions that the building has reached its optimal size without having a harmful effect on the significance of the designated heritage asset. However, since the previously approved extension in 2019 was not implemented and these permissions have now expired, in conservation terms the principle of a new extension may be considered acceptable if well designed. But, I would be unwilling to accept both a new extension and that which has lapsed for the reason stated above.

In regard to the proposed extension, whilst it is modest single storey subservient structure, I do have concerns regarding its boxy design on the appearance of the listed building. The proposed flat roof would be an alien to the vernacular appearance of the property. I also have concerns regarding the extension masking the original form of the listed building and consider that it could have a lighter weight appearance, to still enable the host building still to be read.

Regarding the impact of the proposed extension on the conservation area, whilst the proposal would not be visible from the front of the house or from the public realm, the flat roof would appear out of keeping with the host building. On this matter, I do disagree with the Heritage Statement since there is a requirement for proposals to preserve or enhance the conservation area, and this applies whether or not the proposal is in public view or not.

Regarding the opening of the flank wall of the kitchen extension, this relates to modern fabric of no significance. The only area of change relating to the historic element of the house is the change of a window to a door. The impact would be a relatively small area of most likely 18th century brickwork which is not considered to represent a harmful change to the interest of the building through loss of historic fabric. The window is also modern and of no significance.

The minor internal alterations primarily relate to the modern extension or modern fabric in the central bay where there has been substantial change leaving this area with little heritage significance. The changes to this area will not harm the importance of plan form.

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 design amendments are requested for the proposed extension.