

PL/2026/00069 LBC PL/2025/09872

Site: The Latches, The Street, Oaksey

Proposal: Replacement of windows, new dormer, changed first floor layout with AC units, replacement flooring. Outbuilding extension, replacement smaller oil tank, new cycle storage with gate.

Recommendations:

☒	Comments
☐	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.

Scope of comments: the following comments relate to the built historic environment.

Site Description: Latches dates from the 15th century with 17th century alterations. It is simple and modest cottage, single storey with attic, constructed in coursed rubble stone walling gabled stone slate roof with a west end stone stack. It has a 19th century small single storey side extension to the west gable end in matching material to the main house.

Latches is in the historic core of the linear village of Oaksey along the Street and west of the junction with Minety Lane and Wheatsheaf Lane to the Wheatsheaf Public House. It is sited between the All-Saints Church to the east and Primary School to the west. It is set back 15 m to the south of the lane and has a significant part of the established village historic core The established character of the Conservation Areas is of detached dwellings within their own garden areas.

Heritage Assets:

Latches Oaksey grade II

All Saints Church grade I

Oaksey Conservation Area.

Relevant planning History: ENQ/2023/00902 Demolition of Side Extension to Allow for New Extension, Minor Adjustments to Internal Layout, Upgrade Windows Throughout in Matching Steel and Timber Casements, Addition of a Dormer on Rear Roof Pitch. Conversion and Extension of Outbuilding into Office

The Proposal: The application is for replacement of windows, new dormer, changed first floor layout with AC units, replacement flooring. Outbuilding extension, replacement smaller oil tank, new cycle storage with gate.

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. 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.

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.

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 213-15 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.

Paragraph 219. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas, andwithin the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

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.

Historic England Advice Note 3 – Setting of Heritage Assets

Issues: Impact on the listed building, impact on the setting of neighbouring listed buildings, impact on the Conservation Area and design and materials.

Significance of assets and contribution of setting:

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 NPPF defines significance as the “value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be, **architectural**, 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.

A comprehensive Heritage Statement was submitted as part of the application as required under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 194.

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, **architectural**, 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 cottage is evident in the vernacular architecture. Its form, layout, materials, outbuildings and architectural expression/detailing which have significant aesthetic and architectural interest. The cottage makes a positive contribution to the Oaksey Conservation Area and setting of the neighbouring Church of All Saints grade I.

Assessment:

Most of these proposals were considered previously under a pre application Ref. ENQ/2023/00902. However, the previous proposal for the demolition of the existing probably 19th century side extension has been removed from this application.

Dormer

The proposals as revised include for a new dormer to the rear roof slope (south). At pre application it was advised that ‘The proposed roof dormer is a harmful addition to an unaltered and unbroken rear roof, and it would be inserted into an attic room that already enjoys natural light from a gable window.’

Following further review of the Heritage Statement and onsite assessment it is apparent that the unbroken rear roof slope does have significance including the visual appearance from wider views and forms an harmonious and well-balanced, modest cottage balanced with the front elevation and there is little or no justification of need for a new dormer as there is an existing gable side window overlooking the Church yard next door.

On the other side of the considerations the dormer is proposed to be less conspicuous and significant rear elevation where Historic England guidance on Dormer Windows and Insulation suggest dormer windows can be very prominent and significant features and their proportion and external detailing are significant and should respond to local design detail for dormer windows. It is also established in guidance on extensions that the rear of a building is the best location for additions and extensions.

In addition the roof structure and cladding date from the second half of the 20th century possibly the 1970’s although it is recognised that the roof pitch and traditional stone tiles have assisted in retaining the significance of the cottage and its external appearance.

The formation of the proposed new dormer window with a hipped gable roof dormer with stone tiles and lead cheeks with traditional timber casement windows will not involve any loss of historic fabric and is well proportioned and relatively discreetly located on the lower part of the rear slope. To the right hand of the cross gable roof feature.

On balance therefore it is considered that the dormer as proposed would be acceptable addition to the rear roof slope.

Full details of the new dormer construction and timber casement windows including sections needs to be provided at a scale of 1:10.

Replacement Windows

In respect to the other proposals. The existing windows are identified in a window schedule on elevation drawings. They are stone mullion style with early metal frame casement windows with original window furniture to the kitchen (W.0.0.1) and utility front windows (W.0.03) on the ground floor which are of high significance.

The rest are later early 20th century Crittall style casements set in the stone mullions except for a first floor timber casement to the gable in the front elevation.

In addition to the kitchen rear elevation there is a modern large window opening adjoining the timber boarded kitchen door with four timber casement window in series, with storm profiles. These are early 21st century and of no significance. It is understood the opening was rebuilt when the windows were installed when the current owner brought the property to resolve a former lean-to extension built by the former owner without consent.

The proposal is to replace the Crittall windows with a modern metal frame version with single horizontal glazing bar and slim double glazing.

The four storm profile casement windows (W.0.05) to the rear elevation are also proposed to be replaced with traditional timber flush fitting casement windows with slim double-glazed units. The applicant also wishes to slightly lower this series of casement windows to level the cill with the other rear windows on the rear elevation (W.0.04).

A windows schedule that identifies the windows to be replaced is provide. The replacement windows are in accordance with Historic England guidance *Historic England's publication 'Traditional Windows – Their Care, Repair and Upgrading (2017)'* which encourages the retention of windows that contribute to the significance of listed buildings but sets also out their approach to the alteration/replacement of windows where this is acceptable in principle on P62 it advises

'Where historic windows have been replaced with ones whose design does not follow historic patterns, these are unlikely to contribute to the significance of listed buildings. Replacing such windows with new windows of a sympathetic historic pattern, whether single-glazed or incorporating slim-profile double-glazing, may cause no additional harm. It also provides an opportunity to enhance the significance of the building, which is the desired outcome under national policy'.

Historic England Advice Note 18: Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency, provides advice in support of consistent decision making on approaches to improve the energy efficiency and support carbon reduction of historic buildings, whilst conserving their significance

It is considered that the proposed windows to be retained are (W.0.01) and utility front windows (W.0.03). However, on the proposed elevations drawing 22010-732 it also identifies W.0.01 in the front kitchen window for replacement this needs to be corrected on this plan prior to any consent.

Once this correction to the plan is received the other windows to the property can be replaced as they follow the guidance.

Doors

The proposals include the replacement of both external entrance doors. Both are modern timber doors and of no significance. The replacements are a new Front door to the side porch in a traditional form with timber plank front in a shallow arched style frame to the existing opening.

The replacement kitchen door is currently a stable style door and will be replaced on a like for like basis. Details are provided for both new doors and are considered acceptable.

Demolition of Partition and Alteration to Plan Form.

In respect to the internal alterations to partition and plan form. The ground floor partition between living room and kitchen reflects the original room plan subdivision and the partition supports the beams on the subdivision between the two rooms, the kitchen beams and floor joists to the Living room integral with the significant chamfered and stopped beam to the living room.

The removal of the partition and pier between the kitchen and living room should be retained as its loss would be harmful to the existing plan form and the integrity of the beams and floor joists. Whilst it is understood that the structure is modern block work it is on the original alignment and it preserves the associated historic fabric.

This part of the proposal is harmful to significance and contrary to national and local plans policy and needs to be removed from the proposal plans.

The existing first-floor plan form of two bedrooms separated by a bathroom is created through modern partitions and has no significance. It is proposed to alter these to move the bathroom to the landing as a smaller shower room and have two larger bedrooms with new internal doors.

In addition, the first floor of the cottage is understood to suffer from poor thermal performance cold in winter and over hot in summer. The applicant wishes to address this by incorporating Air conditioning units to purpose built cupboards in the first-floor bedrooms.

The alterations to plan form and fabric on the first floor are considered neutral impact on significance and acceptable subject to detail of the new internal doors to be requested with the other amendments at this time rather than at condition.

Outbuilding

The 19th century outbuilding appears to be a former piggery and is located to the south west corner of the rear garden. It is a simple modest outbuilding used as a garden store that incorporates the lower part of the boundary garden wall as its west back wall and has a pitched stone tile roof.

The existing building has limited eaves height about 1.5m and there is some bulging of existing walls due to the limited foundation and undermining by the roots of the adjacent cherry tree and the timber sections set within the wall. In addition, the adjoining boundary wall is dry stone and appears to be in danger of collapse.

The applicant on site suggested the building was to be demolished and rebuilt. The application details to the contrary advise that south wall with the access door are demolished and a new

parallel building erected on a raft slab creating a double pitch roof with central valley in stone and stone tiles and the front door relocated to the gable end.

The structural engineers indicate that the conversion of the outbuilding to an office will require the demolition of the south wall with existing door and the raising of the walls to provide sufficient headroom. The suggested raising of walls does not appear in the application drawings.

The architectural approach to double the size of the existing outbuilding with a parallel pitch roof and a new central valley gutter appears reasonable. However, the existing building has substantial structural issues and the proposed new buildings internal ceiling height under the valley gutter is 1.5 making the internal use of the new office room difficult.

While there is scope for enlarging the existing shed it is apparent that the existing building and adjoining boundary walls needs some substantial structural work and rebuilding and removal of the cherry tree undermining the walls.

I suggest this proposal be reviewed as the current proposals is confused and appears to create an unusable internal space.

It might be a new building reusing all the existing material and of its own design that has the same floor area as the proposal be put forward. This should also include the rebuilding of the dry stone boundary wall as part of the works and as a further Conservation benefit to support the taking down and rebuilding of the existing store building.

The demolition of the existing structure and building a new outbuilding may be the only way to achieve an appropriate remedy and while this needs specific justification for its demolition as the former piggery which is curtilage listed and of significance for its historic and architectural interest. In addition, any new building will need to show how it would reuse all the existing stone and stone tiles.

Garden Structures

Behind the existing dry stone garden boundary wall in front of the building there is an area screened by existing Yew hedge and willow screen fence that is used for bin storage, heating oil tank and bike storage. It is proposed to add Bike storage anchors and Condensing Unit for the Air Conditioning units in the bedrooms to this area.

It is considered that this area is already well screened and the minor additional structures will have a neutral visual impact and will be low in noise.

Summary: 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 following additional amended details and drawings are required:

- **The proposed roof dormer window is considered on balance to be acceptable subject to receiving as part of the application rather than by full details of the new dormer construction including and timber casement windows to show, at a scale of not less than 1:10 details, elevations and horizontal/vertical dormer frame sections and window heads, sills and lintels to be provided at a scale of 1:10.**

- The removal of the ground floor partition between kitchen and living room is harmful to plan form and existing fabric significance and needs to be removed from the proposal plans.
- The proposed elevations drawing Ref. 22010-732 identifies W.0.01 in the front kitchen window for replacement. This window is significant and is not to be replaced. This drawing needs amendment accordingly prior to any consent.
- The Outbuilding proposals include partial demolition and create a poor and unworkable internal space in the extended building while not resolving significant structural issues with the existing building and associated dry stone walls. I suggest this proposal be removed from the application or reviewed and amended. Any revised proposal would need to be justified for any demolition – including reference to structural issues and show reuse of all stone and stone tiles on site.
- The alterations to plan form and fabric on the first floor are considered to have a neutral impact on significance subject to detail of the new internal bedroom doors to be requested with the other amendments at this time rather than at condition.