

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

21 September 2026

Janice Gooch
Senior Conservation Officer
Wiltshire Council Conservation (Central)

Officer's Name: Adrian Smith
Officer's Title: Level 2 Planning Officer

Application No: PL/2026/05744 & PL/2026/05185
Demolition of the existing 'condemned' garage and erection of a two storey four bay garage
The Manor House, Great Hinton, Trowbridge, BA14 6BZ

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

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 or 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.

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 relevant 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)

"The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 3" (HE GPA3) which notes that "The importance [of setting] lies in what the setting contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or to the ability to appreciate that significance."

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."

Proposal: The application is for retrospective consent for the rebuilding of the brick boundary wall which borders the road and public footpath.

Relevant planning history: NA

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

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 Heritage Statement and Design and Access Statement.

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 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 the building lies largely with its historic fabric and its polite architectural form, which have significant aesthetic and architectural interest.

The listing description identifies the Manor House as dating from the early C19, constructed of dressed limestone with a hipped Welsh slate roof. The Building Survey records the existing garage as being constructed of natural local rubble stone with dressed stone quoins and some brick detailing. Its traditional construction and materials suggest that it may be contemporary with the main house.

A review of the historic OS mapping shows a complex of ancillary buildings to the rear of the house, arranged around a courtyard. The principal pedestrian access appears to have been from the road, in approximately the location of the existing entrance, although the present metal fencing and gateway are relatively modern. Vehicular access is located to the side of the property and leads into the courtyard formed by the surviving and former outbuildings.

The historic OS mapping appears to indicate that these ancillary structures formed part of a small farmstead, including buildings identified as pigsties, with parts of the complex separated by a boundary wall. Historic mapping indicates that the outbuildings, with the exception of the structure now referred to as the garage, were lost sometime between the 3rd Edition OS mapping (1898–1939) and 1945.



1st Ed. OS map (1844-1888)



Andrews and Durys Map of Wiltshire 1773, showing no evidence of a previous house.

This raises the question of whether the surviving garage originally formed part of this historic complex of ancillary buildings. The evidence seen here would indicate that the structure would be deemed as curtilage listed. The fact that the structure appears to pre-date 1948 and historically stood within the same wider complex is relevant to this consideration.

It is also unclear when the property became known as 'Manor House', as this name does not appear to be identified on the historic OS mapping reviewed. Given its early C19 date, it is possible that the building was constructed as a country residence or gentleman's house, with associated agricultural buildings and grounds, rather than necessarily as a manor house associated with a historic manor or estate.

The 1st and 3rd Edition OS maps also appear to show that the site was with the same ownership with the neighbouring buildings, including Norton House (Grade II listed and dating from the C18) and the property now known as Watts Farm (Grade II listed farmhouse, dating from the mid-C18).

Neither the application site nor these adjoining properties are referenced in Pevsner's *The Buildings of England: Wiltshire*. The nearby buildings that are identified include No. 20, described as a 'Georgian brick building, formerly an inn, with a mansard-roofed addition constructed as a small woollen factory in 1816', together with the square timber-framed No. 23.

The Victoria County History (written 1965) provides a little more history to the village:

Great Hinton lies about a mile north of Steeple Ashton on a road which goes on to join the main road from Trowbridge to Devizes north of the village. It is built along two roads which divide at its south end and re-unite at the north end. Fore Street Farm is a timber-framed building with brick in-filling, probably of the early 17th century. Church Farm is a somewhat later building of stone rubble with a stone-tiled roof, and there are several 18th-century houses of brick with stone dressings. The New Inn is an early-19th-century building of brick, which has been licensed since at least 1842. (fn. 50) South-west of the village small groups of houses at Cold Harbour and Bleet both existed in 1773, (fn. 51) and were no doubt in origin groups of cottages built on the verges of the common. The population of Great Hinton tithing, later civil parish, rose from 174 in 1801 to 234 in 1831, and then gradually declined to 143 in 1951.

It recognises that parts of Semington and Great Hinton were sold in 1911 after it had initially been held by the Crown, who sold the Manor of Ashton to Edward Ditchfield and others in 1629. The manor house and farm, located in Steeple Ashton was sold separately to William Paulet (1551), who in 1601 sold it to John Greenhill. This manor house dates to 1647, and fronted in ashlar, identifies this as a higher status building, suitable to be a manor house.

Assessment: The application focuses on the two-bay building to the rear, which is formed of local stone, with large stone quoins, with some brick elements. The submitted information shows that this has some historic floor finishes (Building Survey page 6), which includes blocks. The proposed scheme looks to demolish the remains of this structure and replace with a two-storey, four-bay, timber framed/ clad garage, with dormer windows to the first floor.

Existing Structure

The submitted Building Survey identifies a number of reasons for the structure failing but has not included the consideration for the loss of the former supporting structures and elements. All of these elements are likely to have resulted in the movement of the walls.

The Building Survey concludes that:

Deflection to the lower purlins has caused a spliced joint to open up and further fracturing of the panels here has allowed water ingress. The roof to the garage certainly has very limited life and I would recommend this is replaced immediately. Some consideration should be given to providing more robust restraint to the external walls as part of any refurbishment programme. (last page)

This recognises that the roof covering has failed, and that there are concerns over the roof structure, but recommends that works are undertaken to repair the walls to support a new roof structure. Therefore, the significant aspect of the building (the walls) has the potential to be retained with some structural repair works undertaken. The roof covering and the roof structure are of limited significance, and therefore the principle of replacing these is considered acceptable.

The submitted application does not provide clear and convincing justification for the loss of the structure but provides evidence that the existing structure could be repaired and a new roof structure formed.

Proposed Design

The existing garage is a two-bay, single-storey structure constructed from high-quality traditional materials that complement the main house. Although it is of a deliberately lower-status construction, comprising rubble stone rather than the dressed limestone used for the principal dwelling, the use of dressed stone quoins provides a clear architectural relationship between the two buildings. This difference in construction and detailing contributes to an important historic hierarchy, whereby the garage is identifiable as an ancillary structure that remains visually and architecturally subordinate to the principal dwelling.

The proposed replacement garage would be timber-framed and timber-clad. Whilst timber can be an appropriate material for ancillary buildings, the proposal would result in the loss of the material and architectural relationship that currently exists between the garage and the historic dwelling. More significantly, the proposed material treatment needs to be considered alongside the substantial increase in the scale, height and architectural complexity of the replacement building.

The existing garage is single storey, although it is unclear whether it was historically taller and subsequently altered to form its present roof arrangement. It is considered likely that the building originally possessed a pitched roof, potentially finished in Welsh slate to correspond with the main house. Accordingly, there is no objection in principle to reinstating a more traditional pitched roof form. However, the proposed roof is not simply a change in form: its height and volume facilitate the creation of an additional storey and materially increase the mass and prominence of the building.

The replacement garage would extend to almost the full width of the principal elevation of the main house and would have a depth of approximately 6m. Its footprint would consequently be comparable with that of the original dwelling. The combination of its substantial footprint and approximately 5.5m overall height would result in an ancillary building of a scale that competes with, rather than defers to, the principal historic building. This would weaken the established architectural hierarchy between the main house and its ancillary structures, which contributes to an understanding and appreciation of the significance of the heritage asset.

The introduction of accommodation at first-floor level further contributes to this concern. Two dormer windows are proposed to each roof slope to provide light and ventilation to the upper floor. The scale of the roof, together with the number and prominence of the dormers, gives the building the appearance of a two-storey domestic building rather than a modest ancillary outbuilding. This domestication of the building would further dilute its subordinate character and increase its visual competition with the historic dwelling.

At ground-floor level, the proposed fully glazed bay and extensive use of bi-fold doors to both the front and side elevations would introduce a further domestic character. No justification has been provided for this degree of glazing. These features reinforce the impression of the building as additional residential accommodation rather than a traditionally ancillary garage or outbuilding and would therefore further undermine the distinction and hierarchy between principal and ancillary buildings within the site.

It is acknowledged that the existing garage originally formed part of a more extensive farmstead arrangement and that buildings historically occupied a greater proportion of the courtyard. However, the contribution made by setting is not limited to recreating the maximum historic extent of development. The loss of the former outbuildings in the early twentieth century has resulted in the principal dwelling experiencing a more open setting for a considerable period. That openness now allows the main house to retain a clear degree of visual prominence and provides separation between it and the surviving ancillary structure.

The historic existence of additional buildings within the courtyard therefore does not, in itself, justify development of the scale proposed. Rather, consideration must be given to the effect of the replacement building upon the significance of the heritage asset as it survives and is experienced today.

Overall, there is no objection in principle to the reintroduction of a pitched roof to the existing structure, and consideration of further development within the historic footprints to provide additional storage space, if this is required. The heritage concern arises from the cumulative effect of the proposed footprint, height, two-storey form, dormer windows, extensive glazing, domestic architectural treatment and the choice of the materials, together with the proposed loss of the curtilage listed structure. Collectively, these elements would produce a building of considerably greater scale and visual presence than the existing ancillary structure, and result in a loss of a listed building.

The proposal would consequently erode the established visual and architectural hierarchy of the site, diminish the prominence of the principal historic dwelling and encroach upon the relatively open character of its setting. The proposed building would therefore fail to read as a genuinely subservient ancillary structure and would instead compete with the host dwelling in terms of scale, massing and architectural presence, resulting in harm to the significance of the heritage asset through development within its setting.

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.

In this case, the proposals will result in the total loss of a curtilage listed building, and result in harm to the setting of the listed buildings through the development of a substantial outbuilding in an in-appropriate materials and design.

Policy HE6 allows for harm caused to be weighed against the public benefits resulting from the proposal. However, in this case it has not been demonstrated that the works will result in any public benefit which would outweigh the harm caused, or that suitable mitigation has been undertaken to reduce the harm, such as a sensitive design.

The proposals therefore conflict with the requirements of current conservation legislation, policy or guidance and the application is recommended for refusal.