

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

6 May 2026

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

Officer's Name: Angela Ellis
Officer's Title: Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2026/01029 and PL/2026/00858
Retrospective Application for replacement/ modified/new/windows and doors, internal works to include new partitions, staircase, recovering of roof surfaces and associated works
Penleigh Farm, Fairwood Road, Dilton Marsh, Westbury, BA13 4EB

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 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 other listed buildings in the locality.

Proposal: The proposal seeks retrospective consent for replacement/ modified/new windows and doors, internal works to include new partitions, staircase, recovering of roof surfaces and associated works.

Relevant planning history: 14/05406/LBC and 14/05352/FUL - Extension of existing farmhouse into adjoining stable building and internal alterations relating to the use of the building as a family dwelling (approved).

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

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, Access and Heritage 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 quality design and materials which have significant aesthetic and architectural interest.

Assessment: This is my second consultation response and follows on from additional supporting information being submitted including photographs showing the dilapidated condition of the building at the time of purchase.

Penleigh Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building that sits within a group of farm buildings on the east side of Fairwood Road.

The earliest part of the building dates back to the early seventeenth century with additions added in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. The building has an 'L' shape configuration and is generally constructed in red brick with the earliest roofs and the roofs in Bridgewater tiles on the later roofs being slate.

Attached to the main dwelling is single storey stable block which extends to the west. Being made of similar materials but of a far simpler construction, this would have been used for the housing of animals. Connected to this range is a further structure of earlier, stone construction which was likely a stable with hayloft over.

It is known that the house was in the same family for many years and was taken on by a younger generation around 2013, who were keen to undertake the necessary repair works and develop the property. They proposed a range of changes to alter some elements of the layout so as to make the house work as a modern family dwelling. This included the conversion of the existing adjoined stable building. Following the consent for these alterations, there is little evidence that any of the proposed works were carried out. The result being that the building continued to degrade to the point of sale in December 2025, when the now owners already had commenced works.

The 2014 consents allowed a number of internal and external alterations to the listed building, including the replacement of the main staircase, relocation of the internal wall in the hall, alterations to window openings and the insertion of a new window in the east elevation.

Whilst the alteration proposed in this application are not identical to those previously consented in 2014 (e.g. changes to window openings, new window inserted, alterations to the configuration of internal walls), they represent similar alterations that have previously been consented and are therefore considered acceptable.

The works have been carried out to a high standard and whilst carried out without consent represent a significant improvement to the living standard and condition of the property.

The wholesale loss of the original suspended timber floor and below structure and its replacement with modern timbers and a new T&G chipboard deck is however not entirely justified in the information submitted.

I also remain concern that the roofing works have not been satisfactorily justified or set out in the submitted plans and information. In the case of the roof structure, plans will be required showing the roof form and the works carried out, also supported by detailed photographs (before and afterwards) and structural engineers report. Access to this part of the building was not forthcoming during the site inspection.

The replacement rear door on the building is also not an accurate replacement of the original and the design is considered out of keeping for the period of the building.

At the time of my site visit, a new patio was being laid to the rear of the building again without planning permission, also a high picket fence had been erected without planning permission. I would suggest that details of all external landscaping works should form part of the current application.

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 a far greater level of information and supporting justification is required to be submitted, In addition, drawings are required showing full details of the roof works (replacement timber, metal supports etc) and installation of new services serving the listed building.