

Benchmark

Benchmark Development Planning Ltd
Chartered Town Planners & Development Advisers

Planning, Design and Access Statement (20/04/2026)

Gas Cottage, Home Farm, Humber Lane, Tidworth SP9 7BE

Householder Planning Application: Planning Portal ref: PP-14826585

“Demolition of existing lean-to, removal of mobile home, erection of a subservient extension to the dwelling linking to the existing outbuilding, formation of front courtyard, new gated access to retained rear walled garden, continued provision of 3 parking spaces, and associated hard and soft landscaping including new 120m native hedgerow planting.”

1. Site and Proposal

The application relates to an existing dwellinghouse and domestic curtilage at Humber Lane, Tidworth. The site lies outside the settlement boundary, but the proposal does **not** create a new dwelling or extend residential use into a materially different planning unit. It is a householder proposal for the major repair, essential rationalisation and sympathetic enlargement of an existing home. The submitted drawings show demolition of the poor-quality lean-to, removal of the mobile home, a linked extension to the existing dwelling and outbuilding, courtyard and garden works, parking retention and new native planting.

2. Planning Policy Context

The proposal falls to be assessed primarily against **Core Policy 57 (Ensuring high quality design and place shaping)** and **Core Policy 58 (Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment)** of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy. CP57 applies expressly to extensions and requires development to respond to local context and complement the locality. The Wiltshire Design Guide SPD provides further material guidance on those design expectations, including for householder development.

3. Design Principles

The scheme has been designed as a **subservient and legible extension** to the host dwelling. Ridge and eaves lines step appropriately, and the proposal uses matching or closely related materials so that the development reads as a coherent evolution of the existing property. The removal of the lean-to and mobile home will also improve the visual quality of the site. In design terms, the proposal preserves the farmstead

character of Home Farm while securing a more practical long-term residential layout, consistent with CP57.

4. Heritage

There is a separate Heritage Report by Forum Heritage. Forum consider the property to be a **non-designated heritage asset** and note its currently poor condition and the need for sensitive and viable long term restoration. The only viable proposal is residential use. The works do not entail demolition of the principal historic building; rather, they remove poor accretions and provide a coherent linked form that allows the asset to function effectively as a family home. Any heritage impact should therefore be assessed through the balanced judgment required for non-designated heritage assets, having regard to significance and the scale of any harm. In this case, the report By Forum Heritage supports this proposal because it will sustain and enhance the asset's ongoing use and secure visual and functional improvements.

5. Residential Amenity

The proposal will not give rise to material harm to neighbouring amenity. The nearest dwelling is more than 40 metres away, with intervening walls, fencing and trees. On that basis, no material loss of privacy, overbearing impact or unacceptable sense of enclosure is anticipated. The proposal remains well contained within the existing generous domestic curtilage, and parking provision is retained.

6. Landscape and Ecology

The proposal is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Phase 2 Bat and Reptile Survey. That report confirms common pipistrelle roosts within the retained two-storey dwelling and a low population of common lizard within parts of the garden.

The application has therefore identified the relevant ecological constraints at the outset.

As a result there are no proposed works that would affect the roof structure, tile verges, roof coverings or associated wall-cap/timber elements.

If – closer to implementation, it become clear there are additional works, then these would need to progress in accordance with the relevant planning permission and in due course, if approved, under the appropriate Natural England licensing regime and in accordance with the recommended bat mitigation strategy.

Landscaping and vegetation clearance within reptile-sensitive areas will be undertaken in accordance with the report's precautionary mitigation, including phased directional clearance, supervised destructive search where required, and retention and enhancement of the western habitat area.

Vegetation clearance will also avoid the bird nesting season unless a pre-commencement check confirms no active nests. External lighting will be designed to avoid harm to bat commuting and foraging activity.

In addition, the scheme includes meaningful soft landscaping and approximately 120 metres of new native hedgerow planting, together with ecological enhancements recommended in the report. Mandatory biodiversity net gain does not apply to this householder application.

7. Access

Existing vehicular access arrangements are retained and it is proposed to introduce a new gated connection to the retained rear walled garden. Three parking spaces continue to be provided on site. Safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular access will therefore remain available. Household black bin and other recycling bins are proposed for ease of access and safe turning for the 'bin-lorry'.

8. Conclusion

The proposal is a modestly expressed heritage-led package of householder repair, removal of poor-quality structures, extension and landscaping works that will secure the long-term use and improvement of this existing dwellinghouse and its setting.

It is policy-compliant in design terms, preserves the amenity of neighbours, and represents an appropriate and beneficial way to sustain a non-designated heritage asset.

Ecological constraints have been properly identified through the submitted survey work and can be addressed through the recommended mitigation, timing controls, lighting design and, if required, the appropriate protected species licensing regime.

Planning permission should therefore be granted.

Richard Greenwood BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

Director