

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

20 April 2026

Jocelyn Sage
Senior Conservation Officer
Wiltshire Council Conservation
(South/West)

Officer's Name: Daniel Jacobs
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2026/01935 PP and 01937 LBC

The Old Vicarage, Lower Road, Charlton All Saints, Salisbury, SP5 4HQ
Construction of single storey extension to west elevation to provide shower room facilities, forming external doorway in place of window in north elevation, removal of free standing wall adjacent east elevation

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

Summary

The house has recently been bought. The new owners are clearly wanting to undertake a lot of works, unfortunately, judging from a recent application I have dealt with, and in considering this application, without a proper understanding of the significance of this listed building. The agent would be advised to commission an independent heritage consultant to undertake an assessment and advise on proposed works. Their potted history of the evolution of the building is inadequate and not an assessment of significance, nor a heritage impact assessment. The lack of photos (why ever not?) and full plans (we only have partial proposed floorplans) is not helpful either.

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. Sections 16 (LBC) and 66 (PP) require 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 214-16 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.

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.

The following points are taken from the Historic England document "The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 3" (HE GPA3) that are considered to be particularly relevant:

HE GPA3 Part 1:

"The NPPF makes it clear that the setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset."

"The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. ...views of or from an asset will play an important part..."

"While setting can be mapped in the context of an individual application or proposal, it cannot be definitively and permanently described for all time as a spatially bounded area or as lying within a set distance of a heritage asset. This is because the surroundings of a heritage asset will change over time."

"The importance lies in what the setting contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or to the ability to appreciate that significance."

Site and assets considered:

'Vicarage. 1860-62 by William Butterfield. Flemish bond brick with courses of vitrified headers and some lozenge diapering, tiled roof, brick stacks with tumbling-in of offsets. 2-span roof. 2-storey, 2-window. Planked door with ornamental strap hinges in pointed doorway and hipped porch to left, single casement and segmental-headed 12-pane sash to right. First floor has single casement to left and 12-pane sash to right, the range to left has half-hipped gable. Right return has three segmental-headed 12-pane sashes to ground floor and one sash with gable to first floor. Left return has three 12-pane sashes and one planked door, first floor with 2-light and single casement and one large cross window lighting the stairs. Steeply-pitched roof with large brick stacks at different angles. Interior has 4-panelled doors and internal shutters to windows.'

The list description is not meant as a catalogue of all that is of significance in relation to a listed building, it is a means to identify a listed building. This is why paragraph X of the NPPF (and we have had this particular paragraph since 2012) says:

'In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting'.

Charlton All Saints is not a conservation area.

Proposal:

A single-storey extension (to form a shower room) to the existing 'office' against its west elevation. The extension to the existing storey proposes a stepped down ridge, and timber boarding.

Demolition of the section of wall;

Alterations to the existing office room (to convert to a bedroom).

Relevant planning history:

PL/2026/00289

'To form an opening in internal wall between kitchen and dining room insert lining with architraves'.

Issues: impact on the significance of the 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 application is supported by the agent's own assessment of the interest of the building which is inadequate.

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 (but not exclusively) the significance of the building lies largely with its

- Architecture ;
- Association with a significant Victorian architect;
- Historic fabric. Of particular interest is the use of decorative brickwork and the quality of the red brick work;
- Its floorplan (and this issue cropped up in respect of the previous application, not appreciated by the agent);
- That it is set within generous wrap-around gardens denoting the relative high-status of the house;
- Its contribution to the historic development of Charlton All Saints;
- Its former association with the church (by another well-known Victorian architect).

In relation to the current application, the single-storey red brick building is of some interest (historic, social, evidential) indicating a former ancillary sty/stable etc. The truncated wall is potentially too of interest. The conservatory is not considered to be of special interest and indeed, arguably detracts from the interest of the listed building given its scale and design.

Assessment:

The drawings (proposed ground floor) are only partial ground floor plans. This is unhelpful and should be rectified.

The drawings are at an insufficient scale to assess the impact of the proposed alterations, I suggest larger scaled drawings are obtained.

There are no photos, and no elevations so one is unable to assess the impact of the shower room extension on the side of the house.

The drawings indicate boarding. The house and outbuilding are in red brick. Timber boarding in this location would not be appropriate.

Why does the wall need to be demolished? There is no justification for this and it is loss of historic fabric (evidential value).

The drawing doesn't show a conservation rooflight (they have glazing bars/mullions) even though it says 'conservation pati? [stet] rooflight. I suggest they provide upfront details of the rooflight for approval.

I consider that the proposals, as presented, would fail to preserve the setting of this listed building and would entail the loss of historic fabric which has not been justified.

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.

The proposals will result in some harm to the building via the loss of historic fabric (wall and new openings) and character and via change to its layout and original external form. The proposals involve only part of the building and could therefore be considered as causing 'less than substantial harm' for the purposes of interpreting the NPPF.

Whilst paragraph 215 allows that a level of harm may be offset by public benefits, which could include conservation benefits, in this case no objective justification has been provided for the works and the proposals are articulated as being primarily for the convenience of the occupants i.e. a private benefit. As a result, the proposals fail to meet with the requirements of current conservation legislation, policy or guidance and I therefore recommend refusal.