

APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT OFFICER DELGATED REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2026/04817
APPLICATION TYPE:	Listed building consent (Alt/Ext)
SITE ADDRESS:	Building 66 (Guard and Firehouse), Buckley Barracks, Lower Stanton St Quintin, SN14 6BT
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Repair and refurbishment works to Guard and Firehouse.
RECOMMENDATION:	Approve with Conditions

SITE DESCRIPTION/CONTEXT

The application site comprises of a single-storey concrete frame, brick and Bath stone clad building known as Building 66 (Guard and Firehouse), which is a Grade II listed building, located within the Buckley Barracks, which lies on the edge of Lower Stanton St Quintin. The building is designated for its special architectural and/or historic interest under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The site lies within the draft Buckley Barracks Conservation Area (not adopted), and within the setting of a number of listed buildings, including the adjoining Main Gates, piers and railings, all of which are military building within the former Hullaington Airbase (now Buckley Barracks).

The building exhibits an ashlar stone clad building, with parapet detail, under a tiled roof with a mix of windows, and retains features of special interest that contribute to its heritage significance.

The list entry, for means of identification purposes only, provides the following description:

1384/0/10026 HULLAVINGTON BARRACKS 01-DEC-05 Building 66 (Guard and Firehouse)

GV II Guardhouse and fire-party quarters and garage. 1935 - 6. A Bulloch, architectural advisor to the Air Ministry's Directorate of Works and Buildings. Drawing No 4734/35. Bath stone ashlar on brickwork, plain tile roof covering.

PLAN: A rectangular single-storey block around a small central courtyard; an open arcade/verandah across the central section at the front. Principal offices to the front, with a later glazed lobby inserted to part of the arcade, cell, garage, offices and WCs to side and rear, slightly modified from original use.

EXTERIOR: A compact building with high-pitched hipped roofs behind parapets - the main front range behind the arcade has a higher ridge than the remainder, the slight wings stepped back behind the 5 arched bays on broad piers and responds to a high plinth. Simple capital and flush voussoirs with keystones; an arch returns at either end. Behind the arcade remain 3 of the original wooden 15-pane sashes, but the entrance modified, with a timber framed and glazed kiosk. To the left a high level grilled light, and on the

return high level lights, with a door at the far end. The right-hand end, also slightly set back, has a door to the front, and on the return a large casement, 3 smaller vertical lights, a door, and the wide vehicle doorway. The back has 3 central blind arches containing 12-pane sashes and to a lightly higher parapet, flanked by a 9 and 6-pane each side.

INTERIOR: Not inspected.

HISTORY: This building is one of a group of buildings at this nationally important site that are both substantially complete - with original windows and other fittings - and which display the successful fusion of functional and aesthetic requirements that distinguished the early phase of the post-1934 expansion of the RAF. As befits the first building seen by visitor and staff, the guardhouse is presented as a dignified structure with careful detailing and finish; in this case the open arcade, besides being functionally necessary, enhances the overall quality of the range.

Hullavington, which opened on June 6th 1937 as a Flying Training Station, is in every respect the key station most strongly representative of the improved architectural quality characteristic of the air bases developed under the post-1934 expansion of the RAF. Its position in the west of England with other training and maintenance bases also prompted its selection in 1938 as one of series of Aircraft Storage Units for the storage of vital reserves destined for the operational front-line. For further details on the site, see Buildings 59, 60 and 61 (The Officers' Mess).

PROPOSAL

The submitted Planning, Heritage, Design & Access Statement provides a clear list of proposed works:

- Partial dismantling and rebuilding of deteriorated Bath stone parapet walls, including repairs to copings and associated stonework.
- Renewal and relining of the concealed parapet gutter system, including regrading to eliminate standing water and improve drainage.
- Localised roof repairs, including stripping and relaying sections of roof covering, valley tiles and bonnet hip tiles.
- Repair and strengthening of the roof structure, including upgrading timber connections and undertaking local timber repairs where required.
- Dismantling and rebuilding of defective chimney stacks.
- Replacement of the deteriorated oriel window and timber infill panels with new timber boarding, studwork and flat window.
- Masonry crack repairs using HeliBar reinforcement and associated repointing works.
- Refurbishment of cast-iron rainwater goods, including replacement of damaged sections and renewal of broken gully kerbs.
- Redecoration of external joinery, rainwater goods and metalwork, together with repairs to fascia boards and timber detailing.
- Removal of barbed wire, redundant satellite dishes, obsolete fixings and other obsolete additions.
- Replacement of damaged internal and external ceilings and covings affected by water ingress, together with associated making-good works.
- Installation of new external LED lighting and reinstatement of services following

completion of repair works.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal / Summary
16/02973/PREAPP - Pre-Application enquiry Decision - Pre-App Response Date: 9/5/2016 – Alterations to Listed Building
20/08108/LBC - Listed building consent Decision - Approved Date: 18/2/2021 – Stone Repairs to Elevations & Parapets

RELEVANT LEGISLATION, POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Legislation

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 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 Policy and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) August 2026 sets out government policy, including in respect of the historic environment.

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.

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)
- *Traditional Windows: their care, repair and upgrading* (2017)

Historic England's publication '*Traditional Windows – Their Care, Repair and Upgrading* (2017)' encourages the retention of windows that contribute to the significance of listed buildings but sets

also out their approach to the alteration/replacement of windows where this is acceptable in principle:

1. Where historic windows, whether original or later insertions, make a positive contribution to the significance of a listed building they should be retained and repaired where possible. If beyond repair they should be replaced with accurate copies.
2. Where historic windows have already been replaced with windows whose design follows historic patterns, these usually make a positive contribution to the significance of listed buildings. When they do, they should therefore be retained and repaired where possible. If beyond repair they should be replaced with accurate copies.
3. Where historic windows or replacement windows of historic pattern survive without historic glass it may be possible to introduce slim-profile double-glazing without harming the significance of the listed building. There are compatibility issues to consider as the introduction of double-glazing can require the renewal of the window frame to accommodate thicker glazing, thereby harming significance. These issues are covered in Section 4 of this guidance.
4. Where historic windows have been replaced with ones whose design does not follow historic patterns, these are unlikely to contribute to the significance of listed buildings. Replacing such windows with new windows of a sympathetic historic pattern, whether single-glazed or incorporating slim-profile double-glazing, may cause no additional harm. It also provides an opportunity to enhance the significance of the building, which is the desired outcome under national policy.
5. Where a new window or re-glazing is agreed, the reflective properties of secondary and double-glazing as compared to modern, polished single-glazing, do not usually harm the significance of the building. But when new multi-paned windows are proposed, the desirability of reproducing broken reflections by individually glazing each pane should be considered. Where the aesthetic value of the building is high, then the impact on the whole of the relevant elevation should be considered, including the desirability of accurately matching other windows.

Wiltshire Core Strategy:

Whilst not directly relevant to listed building consent applications, the below policies give an indication of the Council's approach to development affecting heritage assets:

- Core Policy 57 '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.
- Core Policy 58 '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."

ISSUES

Impact upon the preservation of the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural and/or historic interest.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Stanton St Quitin Parish Council were consulted, and no response was received.

No other responses were received.

REPRESENTATIONS

In accordance with the requirements of Section 5(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990 (as amended) the application for listed building consent was publicised by way of:

- A site notice displayed near the site;
- An advertisement placed in the local press.

These methods were used to inform interested parties and to allow a statutory consultation period of **21 days** for representations to be submitted.

ASSESSMENT

In accordance with Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, special regard has been given to the significance of the listed building, including its architectural and historic interest, and the desirability of preserving both the building and its setting. Relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly Section 20: *Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment*, have also been taken into account. These policies require that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset must be clearly justified and weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

In order to be acceptable, the application needs to be assessed against the following criteria:

Information considered/submitted

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. In this case a detailed Planning, Heritage, Design & Access Statement was submitted that assessed the significance of the building, and an impact assessment of the proposed works. This was supported by a photographic record showing the roof, gutters and the visible roof structure.

Assessment of significance:

According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), significance is defined 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 further categorises significance into four key values:

- *Evidential* – the potential of the asset to yield evidence about past human activity.
- *Historic* – the ways in which the asset illustrates aspects of history.
- *Aesthetic* – the sensory and design qualities of the asset.
- *Communal* – the meanings and associations attached to the asset by people.

In this case the significance of the building lies largely with its clear design principles to form an earlier RAF building, using Bath Stone and concrete frame technology.

Impact of proposals on the significance and setting of the building/structure:

Understanding the impact of proposed works on a listed building requires a careful and proportionate assessment of how those changes affect the asset’s heritage significance and its setting. This includes both the physical alterations to the building itself and any changes to its spatial or visual relationship with surrounding structures or spaces.

The significance of a heritage asset is not static; it is shaped by its architectural, historic, and communal values, and by how these are experienced in context. Therefore, any intervention must be considered in light of the asset’s identified significance, with attention given to both potential harm and benefits. Benefits may include repairs that support the long-term conservation of the building, improved energy performance, or enhanced public access and understanding.

This assessment is grounded in the statutory duty under Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving the building and its features of special interest. It is also informed by national policy, particularly policies HE4-9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and relevant local heritage policies and guidance.

Roof & Parapet Works

From the information provided, the building has been suffering from water ingress as a result of the poor design and limited maintenance of the gutter, together with some movement within the structure. The proposed works involve relatively intrusive intervention, including the partial taking down of the parapet, reforming the parapet gutter and subsequently reinstating the parapet to match the existing detailing, with the existing stonework reused as far as practicable.

Parapets are particularly vulnerable elements of historic buildings due to their exposed nature. A lack of regular maintenance, particularly the clearing of gutters and hoppers, can result in water ingress which may not become apparent internally until deterioration is relatively advanced. In this instance, the problem appears to have been exacerbated by the insufficient fall and limited capacity of the gutter, allowing water to collect and potentially overspill the leadwork and penetrate the building fabric during periods of heavy rainfall. The proposed works seek to address these underlying defects whilst protecting the historic structure and securing its long-term conservation.

Due to the deterioration of some areas of stonework, a degree of replacement will be necessary to ensure the structural integrity of the parapet. Whilst this would result in a limited loss of historic fabric, the replacement would be restricted to stone that is no longer capable of satisfactory repair, with sound existing material retained and reused wherever possible. The limited loss of historic fabric is therefore considered justified by the need to make the structure sound, reinstate the architectural appearance of the parapet and prevent further deterioration of the building.

The long-term water ingress is also likely to have resulted in localised areas of decay, including the potential for wet rot within concealed roof timbers. Without removing the roof covering, it is not possible to fully ascertain the condition of these concealed elements or the precise extent of repairs that may be required. However, the submitted information identifies the areas considered most at risk and establishes appropriate guiding principles for carrying out the necessary repairs. Any intervention should follow a minimum-intervention approach, retaining sound historic fabric wherever practicable.

The overall works to the roof will require the partial removal of the existing roof covering. Its reinstatement will provide the opportunity to undertake associated localised repairs and maintenance works which, whilst not necessarily requiring listed building consent in their own right, will assist in ensuring that the roof is watertight and that the historic fabric is appropriately protected from further water ingress.

Overall, although the works involve some intervention into historic fabric, including a limited amount of replacement stonework, this is considered necessary to address identified defects and prevent continued deterioration. The proposals follow an appropriate conservation-led approach through the retention and reuse of existing fabric wherever practicable and the reinstatement of the parapet to its existing form and detailing. On this basis, the works would safeguard the architectural and historic interest of the listed building and support its long-term conservation.

Chimney Stacks

The chimney stacks have suffered from degradation, and the proposed works look to carefully take and rebuild with amended details that comply with modern standards. Whilst this is a slight amendment to the original construction detail, this change will not be visible but will ensure that the building is watertight in the future.

Rainwater Goods

The proposed works are to replace the missing or damaged sections to match existing and redecorate the existing cast iron RWG's. This will ensure that water is taken away from the building, as designed, and will protect the building in the future.

Replacement of the Oriel window

The oriel window is a later insertion and is considered to be of limited significance to the architectural and historic interest of the building. Whilst the retention and repair of existing fabric would normally be the preferred approach, the window has a number of failed elements which limit the viability of an effective and long-lasting repair. In this instance, it is therefore accepted that replacement represents a reasonable and proportionate approach, subject to the replacement window appropriately reflecting the character, proportions and detailing of the existing window.

Masonry Repair works

The building has suffered from some localised structural movement. The proposed works utilise an established method of repair, using Helibar reinforcement to 'stitch' the cracks and re-establish the structural integrity of the wall without the need for more extensive dismantling and rebuilding. This represents a proportionate and minimally invasive approach, limiting the loss or disturbance of historic fabric. The proposed works are therefore supported as they will address the identified structural issues and help secure the long-term stability and conservation of the building.

Remaining Works

The making good of the ceilings, the replacement of light fittings, and the redecoration are considered to be associated works following the water ingress or general maintenance works which do not require LBC.

Impact on Ecology

While Sections 16 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 do not explicitly reference protected species, Local Planning Authorities have a statutory duty to consider potential impacts on protected species when determining applications. This responsibility arises from broader environmental legislation and national planning policy and must be taken into account where relevant.

		Y / N / NA
(a)	Does the site or proposed development possess/impact on any of the features where protected species are likely to be present (assessed against Natural England's standing advice) and where species are likely to be found?	N
(b)	If yes, has a protected species survey been submitted?	Y
(c)	If yes, does the survey show a detailed consideration of ecological impacts, wildlife mitigation and the creation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife corridors to preserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the standing advice?	Y

Comments: The submitted report shows that the building is not used by bats or nesting birds, and that there is no requirement for further conditions.

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.

In this case, the impact of the proposals on heritage assets will be largely positive as it will ensure that the building is structurally sound and watertight and will have the capacity to cope with heavier rainfall due to global warming.

The requirements of current conservation legislation, policy or guidance are considered to be met, and the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Listed Building Consent be GRANTED, subject to the following conditions:

- *Timescale*
- *Drawings/ plans*
- *Rafter Repairs – confined to local identified*
- *Materials to match adjoining materials in form/ colour/ texture*