

From: sean williams [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2026 16:50
To: Clements, Kate <Kate.Clements@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Third-Party comment -PL/2026/00043 - 27A Churchfields Road, Salisbury

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

PL/2026/00043 - 27A Churchfields Road, Salisbury, SP2 7NH.

Dear Kate,

The applicant wishes to respond to the third-party representation submitted by Linda Welsh and address the matters raised.

The representation refers to the need for planning permission for the decking structure. This is acknowledged, which is precisely why the current application has been submitted to regularise and retain the development.

In respect of the scale and height of the decking, the applicant relies on the submitted plans and supporting statement, which accurately depict the dimensions of the structure. The decking is read in the context of its garden setting and is a reasonable, proportionate and expected addition.

Concerns have been raised regarding the SSSI designation and potential ecological impacts. The applicant is mindful of the sensitivity of the river corridor and confirms that the proposal does not involve works within the river itself nor result in encroachment into protected habitats. While Biodiversity Net Gain requirements do not apply to householder development, the applicant remains committed to responsible stewardship of the riverbank and the proposal, limited to a deck and modest outbuilding, is not considered to result in material ecological harm.

In relation to the suggestion that the cabin could be enlarged in the future, no such works are proposed. Any future enlargement would require a separate planning application and would be assessed on its own planning merits against the relevant

development plan policies. This hypothetical scenario is therefore not material to the determination of the current application.

Reference is made to conditions attached to the original decision notice, although this application solely seeks permission for the retention of the existing structures as shown on the proposed plans.

With regard to the Conservation Area, the proposal is limited in scale, utilises materials appropriate to its riverside setting, and is sited at a low level relative to surrounding built form. As such, it is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in accordance with statutory duties under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

While the structure may be visible from certain points along the river, its visual impact is localised and transient, viewed against an established backdrop of riverside built development. It is not considered to result in demonstrable harm to the wider public enjoyment of the river corridor.

Finally, concerns regarding precedent are noted. However, it is well established that each planning application must be determined on its individual merits, having regard to site-specific circumstances and the development plan. Approval of this application would not set a precedent for unrelated or non-compliant development elsewhere.

Kind Regards Sean.

Sean Williams Planning Limited