



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/25/3365947

Hazeland Mill, Hazeland, Bremhill, Calne, Wiltshire SN11 9LJ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Shaw against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/08251.
 - The works proposed are a single storey extension, internal alterations and refurbishment of the home/office storage building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Hazeland Mill is Grade II listed. In reaching my decision, I have considered the statutory duty under section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
3. The proposal involves alterations to an existing outbuilding sited to the side of the main house. It is common ground between the parties that the outbuilding is 'curtilage listed.' Having regard to section 1(5)(b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have treated the outbuilding 'as part of' the listed building.
4. A flood risk assessment submitted and a window styles and joinery details drawing has been submitted with the appeal. The additional submitted information does not include any alterations to the proposed scheme which interested parties of the opportunity may have wished to comment on.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. The appeal site forms part of the collection of former mill buildings at Hazeland Mill, Bremhill. The main mill, now a house, is a substantial early 18th-early 19th century rubble stone building with slate roof, two storey to the road side and three to the rear. The building was listed in 1987 and the listing description¹ notes that Hazeland Mill was part of the estates of Malmesbury Abbey, recorded as a grist

¹ List Entry Number: 1022431

and tucking mill in 1534. It was recorded in use as a cloth mill until approximately 1835 and as a grist mill until approximately 1965.

7. The single storey outbuilding which is subject of this appeal is a single-storey structure which the heritage statement indicates dates from the turn of the 20th century and was originally used as a service building to the main mill. It is built in coarsed ironstone rubble with brick detailing to the openings and slate hipped roof. The southern section comprises a double garage with timber doors, and the northern end of the building, which is not linked internally to the garages, is converted to office use with a toilet/kitchenette area. The outbuilding overlooks the weir pool and the river, and there is a parking area and beyond that, extensive gardens.
8. From the evidence before me, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be primarily associated with its architectural and historic interests, in it being an impressive example of a 18th century Mill with related outbuildings, and which is linked to the commercial and social history of Bremhill.
9. In so far as it relates to the appeals, important contributors in these regards include the main house's traditional construction and materials; surviving historic fabric; and legible retained functional architectural style.
10. In the context of the wider setting and scale of the main building, the outbuilding is of modest character and scale. It retains a discernible relationship with the main mill due to its simple design, retained matching traditional materials and proximity which allude to its previous use as a cart or vehicle shed.
11. The modest character of the outbuilding, combined with its visual, historic, physical and functional associations to the main building, mean that it contributes in a meaningful and positive way to the heritage interests of the 'listed building'. The building's curtilage/garden provides the primary surroundings within which the main house and associated outbuildings are experienced, and their hierarchy and relationship appreciated. Therefore, the listed building's immediate setting also, in part, supports its special interest and significance.
12. The proposed works involve the conversion of the entire outbuilding to form living accommodation, consisting of a living room and bedroom with utility space and shower room. This would entail forming a new opening between the living room and bedroom, insulating the garage openings which would form the bedroom wall, and inserting a new window opening in the south elevation to serve the bedroom. An existing door would also be replaced with a small window, and the garage door would be replaced with vertical cladding.
13. A kitchen/ dining room extension to the rear of the outbuilding would also be erected. The flat roofed extension, finished in render would be substantially glazed with crittal style windows and doors, with an additional glazed lantern on the roof.
14. The internal elements of the outbuilding have been greatly altered in its part residential conversion to an office space with a toilet/kitchenette area, and the garage area includes little fabric of historical note. As such, the internal alterations would not lead to the loss of any historic fabric.
15. The new extension would reflect the location of previous buildings. However, it would be a significant addition to the outbuilding, doubling its depth. Its flat roof

design, with uncharacteristic overhang would appear incongruous due to its uncomfortable contrast with the existing slate pitched roof, awkward height and ungainly connection to the existing roof above the existing eaves level.

16. There would be a clear distinction between the original and new building forms. However, the conspicuously contemporary design and amount of glazing, including the significant lantern, would completely alter the character of the existing building, resulting in a new domestic appearance that would have a challenging relationship with both the modest existing functional outbuilding and the main house. Overall, it would not integrate well into the site.
17. The visible and legible relationship, historic connection and understanding between the outbuilding and main house would be diminished. Whilst these harmful effects would not be visible from inside the main house nor the public domain, it would alter the authenticity of how the asset is experienced and lessen the positive contribution that the asset's immediate setting makes to its significance, as well as reduce the ability to appreciate that significance.
18. I conclude that the proposed works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, Hazeland Mill and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
19. Given the fairly localised nature of the works relative to the building, I find the harm to the heritage asset to be at a minor level of 'less than substantial', but nevertheless is of considerable importance and weight.
20. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the Equality Act) identifies that age and disability are relevant protected characteristics for the purposes of the Equality Act. The PSED sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. The appeal statement sets out that the appellant, who has worsening health concerns, seeks to secure consent for the extension of the outbuilding to provide ancillary accommodation for a couple who would provide carer responsibilities and general maintenance.
21. This would enable the appellants to continue to live in the main property, however, there is no compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that, particularly given the scale of the main property and wider site, that this is the only way to deliver the additional accommodation. I therefore give this benefit modest weight in my decision.
22. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock. Given the scale of the works, these benefits would each be small. Similarly, any benefit from biodiversity enhancement, given its scale, would also be small.
23. It is not demonstrated that preventing surface water run-off leaking into the eastern side of the building is dependent on the scheme before me. As such, this benefit carries little weight. Furthermore, no substantive evidence has been provided which verifies that the long-term viability of the outbuilding would be at risk if the appeal was to fail and the proposal, as submitted, was not implemented. There is

no substantive evidence before me that the works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the listed building.

24. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any harm amounts to less than substantial harm to significance. Overall, the weight I ascribe to the public benefits which would accrue from the proposal, is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm to significance I have found.
25. Consequently, the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage asset has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The works therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in section 16(2) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) insofar as these require high quality design that protects, conserves and where possible enhances the historic environment.

Other Matters

26. The pre-application advice² found no harm with the principle of the conversion of the outbuilding and suggested that a contemporary modest addition may be acceptable. Whilst this may be the case in principle, I have found harm with the detail of the proposal in front of me.

Conclusion

27. I have had due regard to the PSED, but the unacceptable effect of the proposal outweighs its benefits in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of age and disability and advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others.
28. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR

² Reference ENQ/2024/00015