

15th June 2026

Mr Daniel Jacobs
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

(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 further to your email of 27th May 2026 and submit revised plans (reference 26_J014/A102 Revision B) in response to the concerns identified.

The applicant notes your confirmation that no objection is raised to the principle of an outbuilding within the garden. The application therefore turns on matters of design, scale and impact, and the purpose of the revised submission is to address the specific concerns raised in that regard.

The applicant considers that the proposal, as originally submitted, was acceptable in planning terms and did not give rise to harm sufficient to justify refusal. Notwithstanding that position, the revised plans introduce amendments sought in order to engage positively with the Council's concerns and to assist in progressing the application.

In respect of scale and massing, the scheme has been amended to reduce the height of the building. This has been achieved through lowering ground levels rather than altering the form of the outbuilding. The revised drawings demonstrate a reduction of approximately 475mm to both eaves and ridge height, equating to an overall reduction of around 13%. This represents a material and measurable reduction in built form and directly responds to the concerns raised in relation to height. It is also relevant that the assessment of the proposal should be based on its acceptability in planning terms having regard to its specific context, rather than by reference to permitted development limitations which establish a separate and distinct fallback position. In this case, the proposal, as amended, is considered appropriate when assessed against the character of the site and its surroundings.

The effect of this amendment is to reduce the perceived bulk and visual presence of the building within the garden setting and when experienced from neighbouring properties. The outbuilding remains modest in scale and domestic in character. It is considered that, even in its originally proposed form, the building would not have given rise to unacceptable impacts when assessed against the normal expectations associated with development of this nature. The amendments now proposed reinforce that position and further limit any perceived effects.

In relation to neighbouring amenity, the revised height ensures a reduced sense of enclosure and visual prominence. Having regard to the siting of the outbuilding within the rear garden, its separation from neighbouring dwellings, and its domestic function, it is considered that the proposal does not give rise to unacceptable impacts in terms of outlook, dominance or overbearing effect. The relationship with surrounding properties remains typical of what might reasonably be expected within a residential context.

With respect to the proposed chimney and wood-burning stove, it is noted that the Council's Public Protection Officer has raised no objection. It should also be noted that the chimney height has been reduced commensurately by approximately 475mm as a result of the lowering of ground levels. The consultee advises that the flue should be installed in accordance with Approved Document J of the Building Regulations and designed to ensure appropriate dispersion. These matters fall within separate regulatory controls and, in the absence of any identified concern from the relevant specialist consultee, there is no evidential basis to conclude that this element of the proposal would give rise to harm in planning terms. It is therefore retained as part of the scheme.

The architectural approach has also been maintained. The incorporation of the reclaimed church doors forms a key part of the building's character and contributes positively to its appearance. The revised proposal demonstrates that it has been possible to respond to the concerns regarding height without undermining the integrity of the design. In this respect, the proposal continues to align with national policy objectives which seek to secure well-designed and visually attractive development.

The revised drawings also clarify that the reduction in building height is facilitated through minor excavation works and the introduction of a low-level retaining wall. These works are limited to the immediate footprint of the outbuilding and do not materially alter the wider landform of the site. They are proportionate in scale and directly related to reducing the overall height and impact of the building.

Taking all matters into account, the revised submission demonstrates a clear and proportionate response to the concerns raised. The amendments materially reduce the scale of the building, while the overall proposal continues to represent an appropriate form of development within a residential garden setting. No technical objections have been raised by consultees, and the scheme does not give rise to unacceptable impacts in respect of design or neighbouring amenity.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal accords with the relevant provisions of the development plan and national policy and that there are no sustainable planning reasons to withhold permission. The amendments now submitted further reinforce the acceptability of the scheme.

It is therefore respectfully requested that planning permission is granted.

Yours sincerely,



Edward J. Heron BSc MRAC MRICS
Managing Director

Enc.