

Our ref: 25/436/lr

12th August 2026

Development Management
Wiltshire Council
PO Box 2281
Salisbury SP2 2HX

LUKE ROSE

A R C H I T E C T

Beck Cottage, Abbots Ann, Hampshire SP11 7NW
tel: +44 (0)1264 710163 email: info@lukerose.co.uk
www.lukerose.co.uk

Dear Sirs,

Barn at Shalbourne Manor, Kingston Road, Shalbourne SN8 3QD – Alterations, refurbishment, new extension and external landscaping

Please find attached a planning application for the above proposal which was considered under pre-application ENQ/2025/01869, where the following comments were noted:

1. Comment page 1, para 3: The proposals are *'acceptable in principle.'*
2. Comment page 4, para 1: *'detailed elevation drawings were not provided for all external alterations.'* Response: Included in this application with careful consideration of the detailing of new openings noted in page 4, para 4.
3. Comment page 4, para 2: the Ancillary building's *'the use of vertical timber cladding contrasts with the barn's horizontal weatherboarding'* and *'the siting of the detached ancillary structure appears incongruous when read against the established historic layout of the former farmstead, where buildings traditionally formed a coherent courtyard-based composition.'* Response: The Ancillary building has been removed from this application.
4. Comment page 5, para 3: *'any future applicant to engage the services of an archaeological contractor to produce the heritage statement...it is possible that the results of the statement may require a Strip, Map and Record archaeological excavation of the ancillary building footprint and areas of landscaping prior to any construction phase.'* Response: The Ancillary building has been removed from this application therefore the comment is no longer applicable however a Heritage Statement is provided in this application and has dealt with the historic significance and archaeological interest of the site.
5. Comment page 5, para 4: *'full residential conversion of an historic barn represents a highly interventionist form of development and is generally a last-resort option; an options appraisal should be undertaken to evidence that residential use is the optimum viable use in heritage terms.'* Response: Industrial, commercial or tourist uses have no similar relevance locally and would conflict with the residential character of the neighbourhood and could be an equally interventionist form of development; as page 6 para 3 notes *'The continuation of residential use, whether ancillary or as a separate dwelling, would not introduce activities or intensities of occupation that would be unusual or incompatible within this established domestic context.'*
6. Comment page 5, para 4: *'internal subdivision and proposed mezzanine, which interrupts the bay rhythm and detracts from the barn's internal character, while further clarity is required on flooring, insulation and the handling of the building fabric'* through the structural report. Response: Internal subdivision has been reduced, and the proposed mezzanine has been reduced to the central section of bay 5 and bay 6 aligning with the bay subdivision. The drawings and documents included in this application details flooring, insulation and structural envelope.
7. Comment page 5, para 5: *'The insertion of a wood-burning stove is explicitly not supported, particularly given the associated fire risk to the thatched roof.'* Response: This has been omitted from the proposal.
8. Comment page 5, para 5: *'the external treatment of the garage conversion risks appearing overtly residential and should more clearly reference the historic open-fronted shelter shed previously occupying the footprint.'* Response: The proposed garage block has been replaced with a

building of traditional vernacular form reflecting the historical footprint as proposed by the Conservation Officer at the pre-planning site meeting 18:02:26.

9. Comment page 6, para 2: *'The orientation of the Manor provides some potential for mutual overlooking of the proposed domestic garden associated with the barn.....Further clarification of boundary treatments in the interest of improve neighbour amenity would be welcomed at full planning stage.'* Response: The boundary treatment has been enhanced and details provided on the drawings included in this application.
10. Comment page 6, para 7: *'further emergence and/or re-entry surveys during the optimal survey season will be required to robustly establish bat activity and identify key flight lines. The site also contains a pond, creating potential for impacts on Great Crested Newts, and the applicant may wish to consider the Natural England District Level Licensing Scheme.'* Response: A complete Ecology statement is included in this application. The development site has been reduced to include the barn and immediate landscaping. No external works are proposed to the wider landscape.
11. Comment page 7, para 2: *'Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements apply, and the scheme will need to deliver the statutory 10% net gain, supported by a UKHab baseline and metric calculation.'* Response: This is a self-build development, and the development site is under 0.2ha and therefore biodiversity net gain does not apply.
12. Comment page 8, para 4: *'The proposed development would be liable for CIL where the sum equates to £70 per square metre of floor space created.'* Response: The proposed is self-build housing for personal residence and is therefore exempt from CIL.

Heritage, Ecology and Arboriculture statements support this Full Planning Application. Access remains unchanged from the existing.

I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully

Luke Rose

BA(Hons) Dip Arch RIBA

Cc. Mrs Donna Scott – Client