

From: sean williams

Sent: 09 March 2026 15:08

To: Clements, Kate

Subject: Fw: PL/2026/00043 27A Churchfields Road, Salisbury, SP2 7NH

Dear Kate,

Thank you for the ecology consultation response in relation to the above application and opportunity to comment further.

I can confirm that no trees were removed to facilitate the development. The decking and outbuilding were specifically designed and positioned to avoid damage to adjacent trees and their root systems, and the works were undertaken without any disturbance to the riverbank itself.

In light of the above, there is no evidence that biodiversity has been harmed or that riverbank habitats have been affected by the development. Whilst we recognise that Wiltshire Core Policy 50 encourages biodiversity enhancement, the policy does not mandate the preparation of a detailed ecological scheme for minor householder proposals unless there is demonstrable ecological harm. Given the retrospective householder nature of the development and noting that mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements introduced do not apply in this instance, requiring the applicant to commission ecological input at this stage would appear disproportionate, particularly where no loss of trees, habitats or riverbank vegetation has occurred. It is also worth noting that similar outbuildings and garden decking could generally be constructed under permitted development rights without the need for planning consent or ecological enhancements.

Notwithstanding this position, and as a goodwill measure in support of biodiversity objectives, the applicant has identified locations for the installation of two bird nesting boxes and an insect hotel on the submitted plan. The applicant would be agreeable to a planning condition requiring these biodiversity enhancement measures to be installed within three months of the date of the decision notice and thereafter retained.

Given the domestic nature of the outbuilding and its location within a residential garden, a complete prohibition on lighting is in our opinion unreasonable. Should the Council consider lighting control necessary, the applicant would be agreeable to a condition restricting any future lighting to motion-activated lighting fitted with passive infrared (PIR) sensors, positioned downward and designed to minimise light spill beyond the site.

We trust that the above clarification and the proposed enhancement measures provide sufficient reassurance that the development would not give rise to harm to biodiversity

or the ecological network associated with the nearby River Avon Special Area of Conservation. We therefore respectfully request that the ecology holding objection is reconsidered in light of the above information.

Given the minor domestic scale of the development, the absence of habitat loss and the biodiversity enhancements proposed, it is considered that the application is capable of being determined with appropriate conditions if necessary.

Sean Williams Planning Limited