

Planning Department
Wiltshire Council
Monkton Park Offices
Monkton Hill
Chippenham
Wiltshire
SN15 1ER

Edward Heron MRICS Limited
28 Christchurch Road
Ringwood
Hampshire
BH24 1DN

☎ 01962 398718

✉ contact@edwardheronmricts.com

19th May 2026

(Our ref: PC/26/101)

Application Ref: PL/2026/02323
Location: 14 Bishopdown Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP1 3DP
Proposal: Erection of brick summerhouse to rear of dwellinghouse.

Dear Daniel,

I write on behalf of our client, Ms Paula Elliott, in response to the representations received during the consultation period. The matters raised have been carefully reviewed; however, it is not considered that the concerns identified give rise to material planning harm that would justify refusal of the application.

The proposal relates to a modest, single-storey outbuilding of approximately 10m² located within the established residential curtilage. As set out within the submitted documentation, the building is incidental in scale and function, remaining subordinate to the host dwelling and consistent with the objectives of Core Policy 57 (Ensuring high quality design and place shaping) in achieving appropriate and well-considered design.

Concerns regarding the height and overall scale of the proposal are noted and appear to form the principal basis of objection. In this respect, it is important to consider the actual built form of the development in addition to how it may be perceived from neighbouring land. The proposed outbuilding is single-storey in nature, with its height defined by its roof form rather than the creation of the additional floorspace. Having regard to the size of the building and its domestic garden context, it is not considered excessive or out of keeping when compared to typical outbuildings found within residential curtilages.

It is acknowledged that variations in ground levels between properties may influence how the structure is experienced from adjoining gardens. However, such level differences are characteristic of the area and do not alter the actual scale of the development. These factors have been taken into account within both the submitted drawings and the shadow analysis, which has been prepared in accordance with BRE guidance. The assessment demonstrates that the proposal would not give rise to harmful impacts in terms of dominance, enclosure or loss of light, with only limited additional shadowing within adjoining gardens, well within accepted BRE standards for residential amenity. On this basis, and having regard to its siting, scale and separation from boundaries, the development is considered proportionate and would not result in an overbearing relationship with neighbouring properties.

In respect of the relationship to neighbouring boundaries, the application drawings accurately identify a substantial brick boundary wall. Any perceived discrepancy in height from adjoining land is attributable to localised level changes rather than any misrepresentation of the proposal. The structure is positioned entirely within the applicant's curtilage with a clear offset from the boundary, and it is not considered that the development would materially increase the sense of enclosure experienced by neighbouring occupiers.

Similarly, concerns regarding privacy and overlooking have been considered. The building is single-storey and does not incorporate openings that would give rise to views toward neighbouring properties. As such, there is no mechanism by which overlooking would occur. The introduction of built form in this location would also serve to interrupt existing open sightlines between gardens, thereby maintaining the general level of privacy currently experienced.

The inclusion of a chimney has also been raised. Chimneys and flues associated with domestic development are subject to control under Building Regulations, which require that they are designed and positioned to ensure the safe dispersion of emissions and to avoid impacts on nearby openings such as windows and doors. Any installation associated with the proposal would be required to comply with these standards.

In practice, chimneys serving domestic extensions or main dwellings are often located in closer proximity to neighbouring boundaries and windows than is the case here, yet are generally considered acceptable where they meet the relevant requirements. In this instance, the chimney relates to a small, incidental outbuilding within a rear garden setting, where separation distances are greater and the surrounding environment more open, with the flue situated approximately 20m from the nearest neighbouring dwelling. It is therefore not considered that the chimney would give rise to material harm in visual or amenity terms, and it would be read as a modest and proportionate element of the overall structure.

In design terms, the outbuilding is located within a private rear garden context, where public visibility is limited. The proposal is of a scale and form typical of domestic outbuildings and responds appropriately to its setting. The Wiltshire Design Guide supports development that reflects local character while allowing for variation where justified, and the proposal is considered to achieve this without detracting from the wider area.

Overall, the issues raised through the consultation process have been reviewed in detail and are either based on a misinterpretation of the proposal or are not supported by the technical evidence submitted. The development is modest in scale, well-contained within the site, and does not result in any demonstrable harm to neighbouring amenity or the character of the area. As such, it is considered to accord with the development plan and relevant material considerations.

In conclusion, it is not considered that there are defensible planning grounds upon which the application could reasonably be refused, and the Local Planning Authority is invited to grant planning permission.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Oxley', written in a cursive style.

David Oxley
Surveying Technician
Edward Heron MRICS Limited