

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

26th August 2026

Officer's Name: Alex Marsh
Officer's Title: Senior Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2026/07461 LBC and 2026/01411 Householder
Description of Works: Take down and rebuild defective masonry and roof of rear extension. Re-build to modern standards. Replace inappropriate metal window with hardwood windows similar to adjacent windows of main house. Re-site west wall to connect end of south wall with north wall (Retrospective)
Address: Bradfield Manor, Hullavington, Chippenham, SN14 6EU

Please find following comments in respect of the above application(s).

Recommendations:

☐	Support requires amendments to the scheme (as set out below)
☐	Support subject to conditions (as set out below)
☐	Object (for reasons set out below)
☒	Comments

Scope of comments: the following comments relate to the built historic environment.

National Policy and guidance: 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 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 (August 2026) sets out Government planning policy for England. Chapter 20, *Conserving and enhancing the historic environment*, recognises heritage assets as an irreplaceable resource. Heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, with harm avoided unless there is a clear and convincing justification. Decision-makers are required to apply a balanced approach, giving substantial weight to the conservation of heritage assets and weighing any harm to significance against the public benefits of the proposal.

Chapter 5 of the NPPF sets out policies for “Meeting the challenge of climate change” and gives substantial weight to the benefits of improving the energy efficiency of existing buildings and/or drawing energy from

district heat networks, renewable and low carbon sources (including through the installation of heat pumps and solar panels where these do not already benefit from permitted development rights).

National Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on interpreting the NPPF.

Historic England's Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (2008) provides policy and guidance for the "sustainable management of the historic environment". Additional guidance on the application of policies set out in the NPPF is contained within their publications:

- Historic Environment Good Practice Planning Advice Note 2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (2015)
- Historic Environment Good Practice Planning Advice Note 3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets 2nd edition (2017)
- Historic England Advice Note 2 – Making changes to Heritage Assets (2025)
- Historic England Advice Note 18 – Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency (2026)

Local Policy: 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." It is also required that distinctive elements of Wiltshire's historic environment, including non-designated heritage assets, which contribute to a sense of local character and identity will be conserved, and where possible enhanced.

The Council's Core Strategy CP 57: Ensuring high quality design requires a high quality of design in all new developments. Proposals are required to "demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to the character of Wiltshire through (amongst other things) "enhancing local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the natural and historic environment, relating positively to its landscape setting and the existing pattern of development" and "responding positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials, streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting."

Heritage Assets:

Bradfield Manor Hullavington grade I

Barn in Courtyard Bradfield Manor Hullavington grade II

Barn to East Bradfield Manor Hullavington grade II

Barn to South West Bradfield Manor Hullavington grade II

Site Description: Bradfield Manor Farmhouse is a former medieval hall now a Farmhouse. Earliest parts are 15th century and reduced in size in 1670 when west range and gatehouse were demolished. East block added in the early 17th century, and the Hall was subdivided in the late 17th century. Further adaption of Hall and north wing were added in the 19th century.

The Manor original hall and 17th century block to the north east corner and further wing to rear form a u-shaped plan. The walls are coursed rubble with ashlar flush with rusticated quoins and copings. There are ashlar buttresses to hall stone dressings. The roofs are stone slate.

Bradfield Manor is located about 500 m north of the village of Hullavington and 100 m north of the West Coast mainline railway and 1.5 km south east of Norton village on the lane between the two villages.

Proposal: Take down and rebuild defective masonry and roof of rear extension. Re-build to modern standards. Replace inappropriate metal window with hardwood windows like adjacent windows of main house. Re-site west wall to connect end of south wall with north wall (Retrospective)

Relevant planning history:

N/A

Issues: Impact on the fabric of the heritage asset, design, and materials.

Information considered/provided: Policy HE5 of the NPPF requires applicants to assess the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, including the contribution made by their setting, and to identify the likely effects of the development on that significance. Sufficient information should be provided to enable a clear understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposal upon it.

Decision-makers must be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals and in this case the applications are accompanied by a "Design 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.

Decision-makers must be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals. In this case, although the application is accompanied by a *Design, Access and Heritage Statement*, the document provides limited information about the building and fails to include an objective assessment of the affected fabric, its date, significance, or the impact of the proposed works. Consequently, it does not meet the requirements of the NPPF. The following heritage recommendations are therefore made on the basis of the local planning authority's own assessment of the significance of the heritage asset and the impact of the proposals.

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.

The interest of a building may be architectural, or historic as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 S 1.

In this case the significance of Bradfield Manor comes from the house and associated separately listed barns, its age and rarity, vernacular architecture, its form, layout and architectural expression/detailing and use of high-quality design materials which have a recognised high significant aesthetic and architectural interest through the listing grade I

Assessment:

Policy HE4 requires that heritage assets be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance and harm avoided unless this has a clear and convincing justification.

Policies HE6 (designated assets) of the NPPF require a balanced approach with substantial weight given to the asset's conservation and harm caused being weighed against the potential public benefits which might be achieved.

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, **architectural**, 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.

The original west wing of Bradfield Manor was demolished along with the gate house in the late 17th century dates. The current North West wing to the rear was added in the 19th century and by 1990, was functioning as a working farmhouse while other parts of the building have fallen into disrepair. The west wing includes late 18th or early 19th c. stone mullioned windows.

The owners indicate the main house was in a poor condition in the 1990's and they have reinstated much of the earlier parts of the house since they took on the building.

A small rubble stone toilet extension was built in the 19th or early 20th century on to the rear of the 19th century north west wing backing onto a part retaining wall to the north and a raised section of garden wall to the south with access door to the garden.

A photograph of this 20th century addition is included in the application. While dating of solid rubble stone walling is difficult the use of Crittall windows would suggest that at least the last time it was built /altered was in the early 20th century.

The applicants indicated that the structure was detaching itself from the raised garden wall. The roof material was corrugated cement sheets in poor condition.

This application is retrospective for the taking down of the small toilet extension and rebuilding it with a slightly extended addition, using modern construction with a cavity wall and facing it with salvaged stone set in lime mortar from the former toilet block to form a toilet and cloak room of the garden.

A new external door to the south elevation was created reusing a salvaged oak plank door found in the barn on site. This opening provides access from the east wing of the manor to the internal courtyard.

A hardwood fixed casement window with single glazing bar between was also inserted to the right of the door in this renovated south wall, matching in casement windows in the adjacent wall of the west wing.

The north wall of the house and former toilet block extension backed onto the raised ground and was connected to the walled garden running to the west from the house.

A hardwood casement window with a single vertical glazing bar was inserted in the previously dilapidated north wall. This wall backs onto rising ground so that this window appears close to ground level externally. This bank has since the works been planted.

The corrugated sheet roof was replaced with a with new timber joists and boarding covered to create a flat roof with a waterproof sealed fibre-glass membrane.

The works were undertaken without Listed Building Consent and at the owner's risk and they should have had prior Listed Building Consent for these works.

However, in this instance they involve works to the lower significance 19th century northwest wing of Bradfield Manor onto a walled garden. The small stone and corrugated sheet roof toilet block and related sections of garden walling that were demolished were probably 19th or early 20th century construction.

The original addition was about 3.5 m x 5 m footprint and is replaced with a slightly larger extension about 5 m x 5 m, reusing as the outer stone face the rubble stone from the original building.

While there is a low level of harm from the loss of the original structure and garden wall, the replacement extension has a simple appearance with stone elevations and salvaged casement timber windows and oak timber door with oak timber lintel.

The new fibreglass clad flat roof is only partially visible and replaced a corrugated asbestos roof. The building accords to building regulations.

In the round the impact of the works is considered to have a neutral impact on the significance of the Listed Building and would if applied for have been approved. Therefore, I consider based on the evidence in the case a retrospective Listed Building Consent can be granted.

Summary & conclusion: The NPPF confirms that when considering the potential impact of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial 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 will be a matter of considerable importance and weight which requires clear and convincing justification.

The works were undertaken without Listed Building Consent and at the owner's risk and they should have had prior Listed Building Consent for these works.

However, in this instance they involve works to the lower significance 19th century northwest wing of Bradfield Manor onto a walled garden. The small stone and corrugated sheet roof toilet block and related sections of garden walling that were demolished were probably 19th or early 20th century construction.

The original addition was about 3.5 m x 5 m footprint and is replaced with a slightly larger extension about 5 m x 5 m, reusing as the outer stone face the rubble stone from the original building.

While there is a low level of harm from the loss of the original structure and garden wall, the replacement extension has a simple appearance with stone elevations and salvaged casement timber windows and oak timber door with oak timber lintel.

The new fibreglass clad flat roof is only partially visible and replaced a corrugated asbestos roof. The building accords to building regulations.

In the round the impact of the works is considered to have a neutral impact on the significance of the Listed Building and would if applied for have been approved. Therefore, I consider based on the evidence in the case a retrospective Listed Building Consent can be granted.