

PLANNING RESPONSE NOTE

Application Reference(s): PL/2025/09978 and PL/2026/00220

Proposal: Demolition of existing single-storey rear lean-to extension and erection of single-storey oak-framed extension, together with internal alterations.

Site Address: Cobblers Cottage, 35 Farm Lane, Great Bedwyn, Marlborough, SN8 3LU

Date: 27th March 2026

1. Introduction

This document has been prepared in response to the Planning Officer's observations and comments, received via email on Friday 6th March 2026, in relation to the above applications.

The following sections address each point raised and are supported by additional drawings, photographic information, and commentary prepared with contributions from PKA Architects, Planning Heritage, and the applicants.

2. Extension – Roof Junction with Thatched Roof

Observation/Comment:

Concern raised regarding the lack of clarity on how the extension roof will interface with the existing thatched roof, particularly in relation to the eaves line and prevention of water build-up.

Response:

A new sectional drawing has been prepared (section C-C) to illustrate the proposed junction between the extension roof and the existing thatched roof.

It should be noted that the thatched eaves along the western elevation of the historic core has already been compromised by the existing single-storey lean-to roof serving the utility/pantry.

The proposed mansard roof of the new extension will fall to a concealed flat roof with a hidden gutter. The historic thatch at eaves level will be reinstated, with the flat roof set below the thatch to prevent water retention and associated deterioration.

The design approach seeks to:

- Minimise disruption to the existing thatched eaves line
- Maintain the visual integrity of the historic roof form
- Ensure appropriate drainage to prevent standing water and avoid any risk of accelerated deterioration to the thatch

Supporting Information:

- Drawing Ref: 2136_PL_005 Additional Details

3. Extension – Roof Lantern Design

Observation/Comment:

Concerns raised regarding the prominence of the proposed roof lantern, with a preference for a more discreet solution.

Response:

The proposed design has been reviewed in light of this comment.

A revised, more discreet roof lantern is now proposed to reduce its visual impact. Whilst retaining a traditional pyramidal form, in keeping with the character of the existing cottage and the architectural language of the extension, the design has been refined to incorporate slim, minimalist aluminium profiles and larger, cleaner panes of glazing.

This approach allows for the continued maximisation of natural light into the proposed dining area, while presenting a simpler and less visually intrusive appearance.

The intent is to ensure the roof lantern remains sympathetic to the character and setting of the host building.

Supporting Information:

- Visuals: Please see the below precedent image of the suggested rooflight.
- Drawing Ref: 2136_PL_001 Proposed Site Plan Floor Plans Elevations Sections_RevA



Figure 1 – Slimline Roof Lantern. Source: Roofmaker, Slimline Roof Lantern, Roofmaker.co.uk, accessed 24 March 2026.

4. Staircase – Relationship to Existing Structure

Observation/Comment:

Request for an elevation/section showing the staircase, its impact on the window, and its relationship with the spine beam.

Response:

Further section and elevational drawings have been prepared (section D-D and East Elevation), alongside additional notation on the already submitted proposed design drawings, to illustrate:

- The position of the staircase relative to the existing window
- The relationship between the landing and the spine beam

The staircase has been carefully designed to avoid conflict with the existing ground floor hall window. The submitted drawings demonstrate that the staircase will not sit in front of, or obstruct, the window.

The staircase will not impact the existing spine beam, as illustrated by the proposed ground floor plan and section B-B.

Supporting Information:

- Drawing Ref: 2136_PL_005 Additional Details

5. Staircase – Impact on Existing Fabric

Observation/Comment:

Clarification requested on the extent of historic fabric affected by the staircase installation.

Response:

An assessment of the existing first floor structure has been undertaken following localised lifting of floorboards.

The existing first-floor structure has been subject to significant alteration, most likely during works undertaken in the 1980s. Evidence on site indicates that the spine beam is not original and has been modified, with a reused timber post and a cut beam end visible, although the exact method of connection remains unclear.

The floor construction above shows clear signs of disturbance and reconfiguration. The presence of double boarding suggests that earlier floorboards were retained but overlaid, likely due to their poor condition (e.g. unevenness, missing sections), with the additional layer also providing lateral strengthening. The upper layer of boards runs beneath existing partitions and door frames, indicating that the current room layout dates from this later phase of alteration. It is therefore reasonable to assume that much of the associated structural work, including joists, may also have been replaced or substantially altered. The ceiling below being formed in plasterboard further supports this conclusion.

While the precise relationship between the existing joists and spine beam cannot be fully verified without further opening up, the available evidence demonstrates that the area has already been extensively compromised and does not represent intact or highly significant historic fabric.

The proposed staircase works would be carried out sensitively, with any surviving historic floorboards carefully lifted and, where feasible, reused, either reinstated around the new opening or relocated to areas such as over the redundant stair void.

In heritage terms, the level of harm arising from the proposal is considered to be minimal, localised, and reversible, affecting fabric that is already altered and of limited significance. This must be weighed against the clear and substantial benefits of the scheme, including the removal of an inappropriate late 20th-century staircase, the reinstatement of a more historically appropriate plan form at both ground and first floor levels, and the securing of the building's optimum viable use.

In line with national policy, including the requirement to balance less than substantial harm against public benefits, the proposals deliver a net positive outcome. These benefits include the long-term conservation of the listed building through sensitive investment, enhancement of its historic character, and a broader contribution to the vitality and viability of the surrounding area.

Supporting Information:

- Photograph(s): Please see below for a photograph locally lifting floorboards from the first floor.



6. Ground Floor Doorway and Fireplace Relationship

Observation/Comment:

Concern regarding proximity of proposed doorway to a blocked fireplace and the need to preserve this historic feature.

Response:

A much altered and damaged former fireplace is present in the location of the proposed doorway. The fireplace was unknown and had been blocked and filled in the 1980s. No surround or formal opening remains other than a crude brick arch. Opening-up works revealed the flue connected to the stack above and which extends above the thatch. The reopened fireplace has been damaged by the removal of the surrounds, grate and hearth and the flue has also been compromised by the hacking out of fabric. No evidence survives of its original appearance or detailing.

The proposed work to form a doorway through the wall at this point, would result in the removal of the fireplace however, the significance of this could be preserved through a building record as it serves no purpose and should the plans be revised to form a door way to the side of it, this would only serve to compromise the beam and floor structure above, whilst creating a below standard doorway. In tandem with that compromised position, the fireplace would remain blocked up and covered over, negating any relevance or visible evidence of this feature.

In this regard, the significance of the former fireplace is firstly, to confirm that the room was heated (contrary to the list description which states the unheated left hand room was later divided into 2 rooms), however, that significance is not that it proves there was not any form of heating for the room but that it provides evidential value, albeit its historic significance is minimal as a direct result of the damage it has sustained in the past and it no longer retains evidence of its historic dimensions or appearance, bearing in mind that the now visible arch would have been plastered over and not exposed. As such, the evidential evidence is of interest, but it is not critical to the understanding of the building. The condition of the flue is such that it should be refilled and covered over, which in effect would not add or contribute to the aesthetic values. It is recognised that the virtue of age does not constitute heritage value and this is a case in point, whereby it (the remains of the fireplace) is accepted to be an interesting (re)discovery, what has been found simply demonstrates the room was heated. As a feature it has been compromised by damage caused by its removal and as such its heritage significance is minimal.

By recording what has been uncovered will preserve the evidence that there was a fireplace as will the stack above, whilst its retention will serve no purpose other than preserving a feature that itself will be recovered and hidden away once again.

In effect, its removal would have a minor impact on an asset's significance. The loss of a much-altered fireplace would potentially have a noticeable impact but one that does not fundamentally change the ability to appreciate the significance of the building as a whole.

Supporting Information:

- Photograph(s): Please see below for additional photographs further exposing the fabric of the existing fireplace





7. Bedroom 3 – ‘Bed Nook’ and Existing Cupboard Door

Observation/Comment:

Retention of the existing cupboard door and latch mechanism is encouraged.

Response:

The design has been revised to omit the previously proposed bed nook.

This amendment allows for the retention of the existing cupboard door and its latch mechanism, preserving this characterful feature as part of the historic fabric of the building.

Please see revised proposed design drawings.

Supporting Information:

- Drawing Ref: 2136_PL_001 Proposed Site Plan Floor Plans Elevations Sections_RevA