

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

7 April 2026

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

Officer's Name: Victoria Blackmore
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2026/01021 and PL/2026/00859
**Demolition of existing single storey rear lean-to extension and replacement with a new single storey extension. Inclusion of a first floor WC with conservation roof light and like-for-like refurbishment of existing main roof (front and rear).
42 Shurnhold, Melksham, SN12 8DG**

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 test is set out within the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Section 16 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."

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. The property also affects the setting of another listed building in the locality.

Proposal: The proposal seeks the demolition of an existing single storey rear lean-to extension and its replacement with a new single storey extension. Inclusion of a first floor WC with conservation roof light and like-for-like refurbishment of existing main roof (front and rear).

Relevant planning history: None

Issues: impact on the listed building, impact on the setting of neighbouring listed building.

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 Access Statement" which 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.

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 vernacular materials which have significant aesthetic and architectural interest.

Assessment: Nos 40 and 42 Bath Road are a semi detached pair of Grade II listed buildings. The cottages are built from locally quarried rubblestone with dressed stone surrounds to doors and windows, cyma-moulded mullions and a stone-tiled roof with coped verges and saddle stones.

The pair has a pleasing symmetry: with a central doorway under a flat hood on brackets flanked by mullioned windows, and four small hipped dormers punctuate the roofline.

The proposal seeks the demolition of an existing single storey rear lean-to extension and its replacement with a new single storey extension. Inclusion of a first floor WC with conservation roof light and like-for-like refurbishment of existing main roof (front and rear).

Historic England's list entry mentions that extensions dating from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries exist to the rear of the pair of cottages.

The extension at the rear of No.42 includes a kitchen, utility and bathroom. This extension is a simple mono pitched lightweight structure but lacks a damp-proof course or solid floor and is suffering from rising damp and structural decay.

The adjoining cottage at No. 40 has a two-storey and single-storey rear extensions and has two white-rendered gables linked by a flat roof and an additional lean-to at ground floor. The two storey extensions pre-date 1994 and the small conservatory is approved in planning ref: W/94/00163/LBC.

Taking each point in turn below:

- i) Proposed extension – there is no objection to the removal of the existing extension, however any replacement needs to be in keeping with the simple modest nature of the existing cottage and also needs to be subservient in form. The size of the proposed extension is excessive and would not represent a subservient form; indeed this would be more than 100% increase in size of the original ground floor of the host cottage. I am also concerned at the bulbous nature of the extension and how this would detract from the simple linear form of the cottage. For any extension to be successful this would need to be drastically reduced in size and be far more subservient and simpler in its form and appearance. The extensive area of flat roof is also not supported as this would be alien to the character of the cottage. This rather grandiose nature of the conservatory is also considered out of keeping together with the lack of a holistic design (particularly to the north elevation which is half glazed and half render).
- ii) First floor WC with conservation roof light – No details have been provided as to age or condition of the building fabric that would need to be cut through or removed for the WC. Also, no details have been given for alterations to the roof structure and whether any rafter would need to be cut through or whether the roof light would sit snugly between rafters. In addition, no details have been given for services, pipe runs, S&V pipe or extractors etc.
- iii) Like-for-like refurbishment of existing main roof (front and rear) – I would expect to see a condition statement of the existing roof outlining any defects. In addition, a detailed specification of works would be needed to understand the level of intervention proposed and the likely level of replacement building fabric.

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 amendments and further information is required.