

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

17 December 2025

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

Officer's Name: Jane Sanger
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2025/08090
Proposed single storey rear extension.
Rose Cottage, Stanton St Bernard, Marlborough, SN8 4LP

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 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.

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." 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.

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 property is a Non Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) and is a detached thatched cottage. The property affects the setting of numerous listed buildings in the immediate locality.

Proposal: The proposal seeks a proposed single storey rear extension

Relevant planning history: PL/2023/01630 - Replacement of existing single storey extension to front facade, extension of 2-storey side extension with replacement roof, dormer window and in-roof photovoltaic panels, together with internal layout alterations external landscaping, replacement garden shed, relocation of oil tank and provision of new external oil-fired boiler. (approved).

Issues: impact on the significance of the NDHA, impact on the setting of neighbouring listed buildings.

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 application is not accompanied by a "Heritage Statement" and as such the application fails to provide any objective assessment of the fabric affected, its date or significance or of the impact of the proposals on the setting of designated heritage assets 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.

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 vernacular architecture - its form, layout and architectural expression/detailing. The side of the building has, however, been compromised by extension and alteration during the modern period and is of lesser interest.

Assessment: This is my second consultation response and follows on from amended drawings being submitted.

The property is a detached thatched cottage positioned gable on to The Street. The property is considered a Non Designated Heritage Asset in NPPF terms and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the village. The property affects the setting of numerous listed buildings in the immediate locality.

The proposal seeks a flat roof extension in order to create a shower room and an extension to the dining room. The location of the proposed extension has now been amended and is shown on the western side elevation.

In principle there is no conservation objection to a small extension, subject to a sympathetic design to the host building.

This amended scheme is considered a less prominent location and would be better read as part of the modern element of the building. Given the planning history, the more discrete location, and that the extension would be off set from the non-designated heritage asset, it is considered that this would have a neutral impact on the significance of the original cottage.

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 impact of the proposals on heritage assets will be neutral and the requirements of current conservation legislation, policy or guidance are considered to be met and there is therefore no objection to the approval of the application.