

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

28 January 2026

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

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

Application No: PL/2026/00322 and PL/2026/00472
**Retrospective application for replacement of fence.
60 The Green, Poulshot, Devizes, SN10 1RT**

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.

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

Proposal: the proposal seeks retrospective permission for a replacement of fence.

Relevant planning history: PL/2025/05916 - TG1 3 Crack Willows - Pollard to 2.5m above ground (approved).

Issues: impact on the setting of a 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, whilst the applications are accompanied by a "Design, Access and Heritage Statement" the document provides limited information about the building and fails to provide any objective assessment of the impact of the proposal and, as a result, it fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF.

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.

Assessment: This proposal affects the setting of a Grade II listed building located in Poulshot Conservation Area.

This application seeks retrospective consent for the erection of a replacement timber boundary fence.

The very location of this attractive cottage within the Conservation Area makes any development here extremely limited. The Green lies to the southeast. The south gable end is particularly prominent being on a corner and facing the junction where Drewitts Lane meets The Street. The site is extremely visible from the west, southwest, south and southeast – a number of listed and significant unlisted buildings also look upon it.

Very little information has been supplied with this application and from the one small photo provided that shows a remnant area of low-level timber fencing, this is an inadequate justification for this retrospective application.

The current proposal is considered excessively tall and has a fortress like suburban appearance on the boundary of this attractive vernacular cottage. As such I am unconvinced that a development of this nature could be seen to preserve or enhance the charming character and qualities of this listed cottage and its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

If greater evidence can be provided that there was a former close boarded fence in this location, I may be willing to accept a single height panelled fence of significantly lower height.

However, if more evidence can not be provided, I consider that the most appropriate form of boundary treatment for the heritage assets would be a timber post and rail fence with a traditional mix of hedging and shrub planting to soften the boundary.

I should also add that Listed Building Consent is not needed for this proposal unless the boundary treatment is physically fixed to the listed building.

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 further justification is required together with an amended proposal.