

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

30th March 2026

Helen Garside
Principal Conservation Officer
Wiltshire Council Conservation (Central)

Officer's Name: Maryrose Scott
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2026/00389
Replacement of fence and removal of conifer
22 Cholderton, Salisbury

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

Recommendations:

☐	No 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.

National Policy and guidance: 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 (PP) requires that **special regard** be given to the desirability of preserving (n.b. the words 'or enhancing' intended to be added in due course under the Regeneration and Levelling Up Act 2023 but not yet enacted) 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 214-16 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.

Local Policy: 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.

Proposal: the application proposes the felling of a conifer in the front garden and the erection of a new boundary fence.

Relevant planning history:

Issues: impact on the listed building, impact on the setting of neighbouring listed buildings, 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 "Design and Heritage Statement" which describes the significance of the asset and contribution made by its setting and 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.

Significance of assets and contribution of setting (as appropriate): 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.

The interest may be architectural, or historic as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 S 1.

The house is an early nineteenth century cottage, one of a row constructed in brick with a tiled roof and blue, vitrified, brick dressings. To the rear, a row of outbuildings of similar date are an attractive feature. The end terrace in question has been substantially altered by the addition of an early twentieth century single bay addition in contrasting style and form, inspired by the Arts and Crafts movement, and the replacement of the earlier small paned windows. Further alteration takes the form of front and rear lean-to porch additions and a 1970s garden room. The various additions are not of significant quality in themselves and, although the C20 extension has some interest as evidence of a wealthy period for the estate and in reflecting a growing national interest in design, they do not form part of the special interest of the building.

The remaining special interest of the building lies largely with its contribution to the interest of the row and with the use of typical vernacular materials and form in the original cottage and outbuilding, which contribute to an attractive frontage and to the cumulative interest of the group. The group as a whole, with their outbuildings, make a significant contribution to the wider village setting.

Assessment: the conifer which is proposed to be felled is a non-native species which dominates the front of both properties, blocks light from the windows and does not make any positive contribution to the setting of the buildings. Its presence almost certainly prevents the growth of more appropriate species in this location and there is no objection to its removal.

Following removal of the tree, the application proposes the removal of the remnants of the current post and rail fencing which was installed in the 1970s and which has an unacceptable modern suburban character, with traditional picket fencing. A short section of solid fencing at a higher level adjacent to the house has been amended to match the remainder of the fence in a 'hit-and-miss' picket style and is therefore visually

permeable. The historic photo which has been submitted, which dates from the mid-1950s, indicates that boundaries to the terrace were historically picket fencing and, whilst at that time they appear to have been painted white, the current natural finish is in character with the other boundaries in place and will re-establish a sense of uniformity across the terrace. The modest level of higher fence is less traditional and will cause a small level of visual harm. However, it is accepted that it will provide the sense of enclosure and privacy which will be lost via the felling of the tree. It is also the case that the reinstatement of a coherent and appropriate boundary in good condition around the garden, which is in character with those to the neighbouring properties will provide some heritage benefit via a modest enhancement to the setting of the terrace overall.

I would suggest that a condition be added to require the completion of the whole of the fence approved rather than simply the higher section, to ensure that the heritage benefits which are described above are secured.

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.

In this case, the proposals will result in a small level of harm to the building via the proposal for the erection of a short length of higher than characteristic fencing immediately adjacent to the house. However, the remainder of the fence is appropriate in character and height and the proposals involve only a small section at the higher level which is in a similar design and also visually permeable. Whilst they could therefore be considered as causing 'less than substantial harm' for the purposes of interpreting the NPPF, this would be at a low level. It is also the case that the proposals will result in appropriate off-setting heritage benefits by virtue of the proposed investment in the repair of the boundary treatment and re-introduction of a more traditional design which relates to the other properties in the terrace

The impact of the proposals on heritage assets overall will therefore be neutral. On this basis no specific justification is required however it is considered the works will assist in securing the future use of a heritage asset in good condition, in support of its long-term conservation. The requirements of current conservation legislation, policy or guidance are considered to be met and there is therefore no objection to the application.