

Planning Objection – PL/2026/03311 – Barringtons. Berwick St James, SP3 4TL

To: Development Management **Wiltshire Council**

Objector: Jane England

1. Introduction

I am the owner of the neighbouring property directly adjoining the application site. I wish to object to planning application **PL/2026/03311** on the grounds of harm to residential amenity, inappropriate boundary treatment, and adverse impact on rural landscape character. It is appreciated that the NPFF and Wiltshire Core Planning Strategy are primarily directed towards larger projects, the principles should apply to all proposed developments.

2. Building on the boundary line

The submitted drawings clearly show that the proposed extension will introduce a **solid built wall directly on the boundary line**, replacing the existing **green hedge** that currently forms a soft rural boundary between our properties.

The **Proposed Side Elevations** show the extension wall running **flush with the boundary**, with no fence, buffer, or landscaping indicated. The materials key confirms this will be a painted render wall with a UPVC glazed door almost on the boundary line with direct sight into my property. The plans suggest that the proposed new fence is lower than the height of the door.

There is currently sufficient room at the side of Barringtons for the owners to be able to repair and maintain their property without needing to access my property in order to do so. By **building on the boundary line** they will not be able to repair or maintain their property without accessing my property. This would be a significant adverse interference to my inclusive use of my property and would adversely impact my quiet enjoyment of my property.

The development represents a significant change from the existing situation, where the boundary is an **established natural hedge**, as shown in the **Existing Side Elevations (00-201)**, which runs all the way along the boundary down to the river.

3. Increased Massing and Height at the Boundary

The proposed elevations show a substantial increase in built form on the side facing my property. The extension introduces:

- A **flat roof section** (Material 4)
- A **solid rendered wall** replacing greenery

This creates an **overbearing and enclosing effect** not currently present and changes the character of these rural properties.

4. Roof Form Extending to Boundary

The **Proposed Roof Plan** shows the new roof structure extending right up to the boundary line. This confirms that the extension is not set back and will create a hard edge where a soft rural boundary currently exists.

5. Lack of drainage plan

The proposed room is said to be ‘Single Ply Membrane Flat Roof’ . A flat roof **always requires a drainage strategy** (falls, gutters, downpipes, outlets, or internal drainage). None of the documents show any drainage features:

- Roof falls (required for single-ply membrane roofs)
- Parapet gutters
- External downpipes
- Internal drainage outlets
- Discharge direction (towards my boundary or away from it)

A flat roof built **directly on the boundary** without a shown drainage strategy raises the following planning concerns:

a. Risk of water discharge onto my land

If the roof drains toward the boundary — even unintentionally — water could:

- Run off directly into my garden
- Saturate the ground near the boundary line
- Cause erosion or damp issues
- Increase runoff toward the River Till

This is a **material planning issue** because it affects neighbour amenity and environmental impact.

b. Maintenance access problem

If drainage outlets or gutters end up on the boundary side, the applicant would need access to my land to maintain them — which is not permitted without agreement. As the plans show the wall of the structure to be on the boundary line any guttering would then overhang my property which is not permitted.

Planning officers often require drainage to be shown precisely to avoid boundary disputes.

c. Non-compliance with building standards

Flat roofs must have:

- A minimum fall (usually 1:40)
- A defined drainage route
- Outlets sized for rainfall intensity

None of this is shown which is a significant omission.

The lack of drainage detail makes the application incomplete and contrary to **Wiltshire Core Strategy CP57**, which requires development to demonstrate high environmental and amenity standards.

6. Planning Grounds for Objection

Harm to Residential Amenity

The proposal will:

- Introduce a **dominant, overbearing wall** directly on the boundary
- Remove the existing hedge, which currently provides privacy and rural character whilst providing a habitat for wildlife (birds nest in the hedges)
- Increase overlooking and reduce the sense of openness
- Create a harsh, urbanised boundary treatment inappropriate for a rural setting

These impacts conflict with **Core Policy 57**, which requires development to respect neighbouring amenity and local character.

Inappropriate Development in a Rural Area

The properties sit in a rural landscape where boundaries are traditionally hedged. The proposed extension introduces:

- Urban materials (painted render, UPVC)
- A flat roof form
- A boundary-line wall replacing greenery

This is contrary to **NPPF 174**, which requires development to conserve rural character, and **CP51**, which protects landscape quality.

Impact on River Corridor

Both gardens run down to the River Till, which is part of the SSI and is an environmentally sensitive corridor. Hard-edged development close to boundaries can:

- Disrupt wildlife movement
- Increase runoff
- Reduce natural drainage
- Alter the visual approach to the river

The Council must consider ecological and landscape impacts in river-adjacent development.

Lack of Boundary Treatment Detail

The plans do not specify:

- How the boundary will be treated after hedge removal
- How the structure will be built without access to my land
- How the wall will be maintained without access to my land
- Any mitigation for privacy or amenity loss

This lack of detail is a legitimate planning concern.

Absence of Drainage Strategy for Flat Roof

This omission is significant because:

- The extension is built directly on the boundary.
- Any roof water discharge toward my property would cause harm to amenity.
- Maintenance of drainage elements would require access to my land.
- The site slopes toward the River Till, increasing environmental sensitivity.

7. Conclusion

For the reasons above, and based on the evidence in the submitted plans, I respectfully request that Wiltshire Council **refuse** planning application **PL/2026/03311** unless substantial amendments are made, including:

- A meaningful setback from the boundary sufficient to ensure the build/repair maintenance can be achieved without any requirement to access my land.
- Retention of the hedge or provision of a soft-landscaped boundary

- Measures to protect rural character and neighbour amenity
- Clear boundary-treatment and maintenance details
- A clear drainage strategy