



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 September 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/W/24/3355559

Mill Farm, Stanton St. Bernard, Marlborough Wiltshire SN8 4LT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Ginny Calkin against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The application Ref PL/2024/02781 was approved on 22 October 2024 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
- The development permitted is single storey extensions and the installation of two heritage conservation rooflights.
- The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: *The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:*
*Proposed Elevations *EXELEV-05 Rev C* (Received 21/10/2024)*
*Block Plan Proposed Block & Drainage Plan *ProBlk-03 Rev C* (Received 17/09/2024)*
*Proposed Ground Floor *ProGRO-03 Rev C* (Received 21/10/2024)*
Location Plan
- The reason given for the condition is: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/24/3355561

Mill Farm, Stanton St. Bernard, Marlborough, Wiltshire SN8 4LT

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against the grant of listed building consent subject to conditions.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Ginny Calkin against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- Listed building consent Ref PL/2024/02588 was granted subject to conditions.
- The works proposed are *Single storey extensions and the installation of two heritage conservation rooflights.*
- The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: *The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:*
Proposed Elevations EXELEV-05 Rev C (received 21/10/2024)
Block Plan Proposed Block & Drainage Plan ProBlk-03 Rev C (received 17/09/2024).
Proposed Ground Floor ProGRO-03 Rev C (received 21/10/2024)
Location Plan.
- The reason for the condition is: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. Whilst, as set out above, a plans condition is included on approval PL/2024/02588, the ability to attach a condition to seek adherence to approved plans applies to planning casework only through the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the ability to make a section 73 or 78 application to vary a plans

condition. There is no equivalent in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), wherein consent is granted for a specific works such that a fresh application should be sought for variations to listed building consent. I have taken into account representations received from both main parties on this matter.

4. Given that it is not possible to vary the plans of a consented listed building consent in this way, Appeal B is dismissed on these grounds and this decision focuses on Appeal A. Notwithstanding this, both appeals involve the same site and the same scheme.
5. It should be noted that the 'Finney' principles are not applicable with this type of appeal because it includes the powers for the Inspector to consider the matter afresh and 'deal with the application as if it has been made to them in the first instance'.
6. The applicant has confirmed that it is proposed to vary the plans approved under the above conditions. The plans proposed are as attached as an annex to the appeal statement (extracts of which are used within the appeal statement). These are drawings PROELEV-08 Rev. A and PROGRO-06 Rev. A, and it is these that I have considered for this appeal.
7. Mill Farmhouse is Grade II listed. In reaching my decision, I have considered the statutory duty under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
8. The Council have referred to Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) (CS) as being relevant to the proposals. The appellant has also referred to these, and as such there is no harm to natural justice in my considering the proposal against these policies.

Main Issue

9. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building, Mill Farmhouse or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

10. The application relates to Mill Farm in Stanton St Bernard, Marlborough. It is a two storey, detached property located in a secluded, rural location. Mill Farmhouse is a grade II listed property¹ originally a water mill and dwelling, now a two storey farmhouse. It dates to the late 17th Century, and is finished in brick on a stone plinth, with stone dressings and a thatched roof. The listing description sets out that the mill was rebuilt in the 19th Century and is of brick with a slate roof, with significant contemporary buildings added in late 20th Century, which extend to the rear.
11. These 20th Century additions are significant in scale and substantially increase the footprint of the property. Through the use of areas of flat roof and large expanses of glazing, they appear as clearly contemporary additions. However, given their simple reserved form, the use of appropriate materials and being clearly visually distinct from the historic core of the asset, they are largely sensitive to the

¹ List Entry Number: 1193907

building's historic aesthetics. This means the building's historic core remains legible. Nonetheless, given their scale, the form of the listed building has therefore been compromised.

12. Based on the evidence before me, I find that the special interest of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals, are its illustration and use of traditional methods of construction and materials; the primacy and legibility of its surviving historic core and plan-form; extant historic fabric; and key historic features and detailing.
13. The proposed works and development would result in a single storey extension to the northwest elevation, providing a boot room/laundry room in addition to a new sitting room to the annex on the northwest elevation with an enclosed canopy. The proposal would also increase the width of the existing kitchen on the southwest elevation and infill the existing overhang, add a rooflight to the southeast elevation and new front porch.
14. The proposal would extend the contemporary part of the building and so would not harm any historic fabric. Additionally, there are minor elements, such as the front porch to the southeast elevation of the modern extension and the moving of the northwest wall of the modern extension outwards to the edge of the existing roof, which would appear to be contained within the existing built form or overhang. As such, these elements would have a minimal effect on the footprint and appearance of the dwelling.
15. However, the extensions on the northwest elevation, the boot room/laundry room and sitting room additions, would result in a significant addition to the building, which would add a second gable. The resultant double gable would increase the scale, massing and prominence of this part of the property. Whilst not evident from the front of the property (southeast elevation) and located on what the appellant describes as redundant and rarely used space, it would be clear when viewed from the southwest, would draw the eye and visually compete with the surviving historic core of the building.
16. The subsequent scale and proportions of these combined additions would, whilst set at a lower overall height than the historic building and located within existing hardstanding, have a poor relationship with it and would visually overwhelm it. The double gable design would also result in a complicated form that would not be sensitive to the simple architectural form of the historic building.
17. In addition, whilst the vast majority of the floorspace of the dwelling is already contained within the modern additions, and further additions on this scale would further diminish the importance of the historic building and the hierarchy of spaces within it.
18. Moreover, the gable shown on the southwest (elevation 2) elevation of PROGRO-06 Rev A is not shown on the northwest (elevation 1). There is also no proposed drawing illustrating the additional proposed rooflight on the northwest elevation referenced in the appeal statement.
19. This gives rise to ambiguity and doubt regarding the dimensions and form of the gable, the effect on the existing roof and the location of the rooflight. This is highly

undesirable in general terms but especially given that the property is a Grade II listed building of national importance.

20. I conclude that the variation of condition 2 would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, Mill Farmhouse, and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
21. Given the existing extensions to the property, I find the harm to the heritage asset to be a minor level of 'less than substantial'.
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.
23. There is no substantive evidence before me that the continued viable use or the continuation of custodianship of the property is reliant on the proposal. This carries little weight in favour of the proposals, therefore.
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. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. On balance, in giving considerable importance and weight to the harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset, I find that this would not be outweighed by the public benefits that the proposal would generate.
25. Consequently, the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset in these appeals has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The proposed variation of condition 2 would not preserve the Grade II listed building Mill Farmhouse. The development therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in section 66(1) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with CS Policies 57 and 58 which, amongst other matters, require high quality design and the protection, conservation and where possible enhancement of the historic environment.

Other Matters

26. The appeal building is located within the North Wessex Downs National Landscape. The surrounding landscape is characterised by agricultural fields, bordered by hedgerows and scattered among clusters of mature trees, which collectively impart a sense of tranquillity and natural beauty. Several properties, like the appeal site, are present in the area, typically of considerable size and set within generous plots. These contribute to an overall sense of openness and spaciousness, reinforcing the area's rural character within the National Landscape.
27. The proposed extensions will be read in context with the host dwelling and as there will be no encroachment into the wider open countryside. The proposal would conserve and not therefore lead to any harm to the special qualities of the National Landscape.

Conclusion – both appeals

28. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR