

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

8 April 2026

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

Officer's Name: Jane Sanger
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2026/02030
Change of use of land to residential use, use of stables as ancillary domestic storage and erection of garden building (retrospective)
Land Rear of Marshfield, 85 High Street, Great Cheverell, SN10 5XR

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 host property is a curtilage listed building located in Great Cheverell Conservation Area. The land subject of this application affects the setting of the conservation area and the setting of two listed buildings.

Proposal: The proposal seeks change of use of land to residential use, use of stables as ancillary domestic storage and erection of a garden building (retrospective).

Relevant planning history: K/43686 - Change of use of land from agricultural to use as garden. (refused and Appeal Dismissed).

Issues: 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, whilst the application is accompanied by a "Planning Statement" the document provides limited information about the impact of the proposal on the setting of the conservation area and fails to provide any objective assessment of the impact of formal domestication of the proposed garden area in wider views or on the skyline of the village, 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 site lies with its historic pastoral origins and its value as surrounding open countryside to the historic village and conservation area. The landscape surrounding the village is of the highest quality and forms part of the Pewsey Landscape Character Area. The approach to the village from the north is notable with buildings in the conservation area crowing the skyline. The unspoilt countryside of the hillside below the ridge is an important feature and the backdrop to the setting of the conservation area.

Assessment: The proposal seeks change of use of an area of open countryside to garden, including use of an existing stables as ancillary domestic storage and the erection of garden building (retrospective).

The application site occupies an elevated position in relation to Baptist Cottage and Great Cheverell Conservation Area and forms part of the setting of these designated heritage assets.

Historically the site was open pasture land and adjoined the core of the village as shown in the extract from the 3rd Edition OS Map below:



In conservation terms, looking at the information submitted, there is insufficient justification for the level of impact as set out in the Planning Statement that accompanies this application.

Given the planning history of this site and the previous appeal that was dismissed for the same proposal, far greater supporting information needs to be submitted analysing the landscape visual impact of this proposal. This needs to be submitted to give greater certainty as to the level of visual encroachment that a domestic garden area would have on the setting of the heritage assets in both skyline and hillside.

In policy terms, at a local level CP57, CP58 as well as CP51 are all relevant considerations. As such can the Landscape Team also be consulted on this development proposal.

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 information is required to demonstrate the level of visual impact of this proposal and its impact on designated heritage assets including the approach to the village. This also needs to set out how this development proposal has overcome issues which were raised in the previous appeal which was dismissed for the same use.