

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

12 December 2025

Andrew Minting
Senior Conservation Officer
Wiltshire Council Conservation (South)

Officer's Name: Daniel Jacobs
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2025/09043 (LBC) & PL/2025/08883(FUL)

Site Address Brackenbury House, Shrewton SP3 4HQ

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

Recommendations:

☐	No comment
☐	Support in principle
☐	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 Buildings 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.

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 212-5 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 to 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.

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.

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.

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:

Brackenbury House is a grade II listed building, listed in 1985 (as The Warren). Although in the parish of Orcheston, it is within the built-up area of Shrewton on Elston Lane, some distance from the principal settlements of Orcheston parish. Its location is directly opposite the lane to Shrewton House, and dates from the C17. The house has a relatively formal, if not symmetrical, frontage, with stone and flint chequerwork, while to the rear is an attached substantial c1900 house ('not of special interest').



(Google 2023)

To the west of the main block lies a C19 extension that appears now to be divided between the two attached dwellings, with a further early C20 outbuilding linked at its western end.

I last visited the property in 2014, at which point the 'porch' to the C19 extension was rendered (with concrete block quoins), but it has since been vertically clad with timber. The gabled porch visible in 2023 above has since been altered to a flat roof, as it had been until some time after 2014. A dormer window as also been replaced. None of these works has had consent and the glazing arrangement of the dormer windows should be reconsidered.

Planning History

None found.

Proposal

The proposal is for partial demolition of the buildings to the west of the original house, and erection of a flat-roofed structure with a 14m timber-clad front elevation set forward of the C19 structure.

Assessment

The attached outbuildings are of some historic interest and the application provides no useful heritage assessment, despite the expectations of the NPPF para 207, and critically, no investigation or assessment of their fabric or evolution. It is not sufficient to say they're not original and imply that they are therefore of no interest. The absence of a measured survey and a roof plan is a further notable hindrance as there are oddities about the existing roofs that are not discernible in the application, and I suspect the western additions do not lie square with the front elevation of the house. There are no plans at all of the core of the house, making it impossible to consider the circulation and layout of the building. The existing porch and wc are tacked onto the south front of the C19 outbuilding, but the minimal depth of this building (barely more than 1m) means it has little prominence and the pitched slate roof can still be fully appreciated, while the porch and wc are read as a slightly questionable C20 intervention.

The proposed design creates a long flat-roofed box that sits nearly flush with the front of the house, and incorporates large glazed doors and a large window with uncharacteristic horizontal emphasis. I consider this a wholly inappropriate form that does not preserve the character or appearance of the listed building. Nothing has been put forward to justify this harm, and while it falls within the 'less than substantial' range, as do many schemes, there are no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.

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.

I consider that further extension of the property as proposed would cause harm to the character and significance of the listed building, contrary to the aims of sections 16 and 66 of the PLBCA Act 1990, the NPPF and CP58.