

Applicant's Response to the Conservation Officer's Consultation Comments

A consolidated, evidence-led response to the revised conservation consultation

Planning application	PL/2026/01199
Site	Land South of Tudor Cottage, Park Lane, Cherhill, Wiltshire
Applicant	Robert Willis
Date	18 July 2026

1. Introduction

This document has been prepared in response to the Conservation Officer's consultation comments relating to Planning Application PL/2026/01199.

The applicant has carefully considered the conclusions reached within the consultation response. However, a number of the principal conclusions are not supported by the planning and heritage evidence now before the Local Planning Authority, do not fully reflect the material revisions made to the proposal and, in certain respects, do not accurately reflect the established character of Park Lane or the significance of the surrounding historic environment.

The proposal has evolved considerably through engagement with Wiltshire Council and its consultees. The revised scheme differs materially from both the earlier design and the original submission under the current application. The scale and massing have been reduced, the dwelling has been lowered within the site, the architectural form has been simplified, the landscape strategy has been strengthened and comprehensive heritage and technical evidence has been prepared.

This response should be read alongside the revised drawings, Design Addendum, standalone Heritage Statement and supporting technical reports. Those documents collectively form the evidence upon which the Local Planning Authority is invited to determine the application.

The purpose of this response is to address the principal conclusions reached by the Conservation Officer and explain why the submitted evidence does not support the recommendation that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to designated heritage assets or to the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area.

2. Previous Pre-Application References

The Conservation Officer's consultation response repeatedly relies upon advice said to have been provided during an earlier pre-application enquiry.

That pre-application enquiry was made by or on behalf of the previous landowner. It did not involve the present applicant, predates the applicant's ownership of the site and does not

relate to Planning Application PL/2026/01199. The applicant does not know what complete information accompanied it or the full nature and scope of the proposal considered.

The applicant has never been provided with the pre-application submission or the complete advice issued in response. A request for access to that material was made but refused. The applicant has therefore had no opportunity to examine the underlying proposal, verify the context in which the quoted observations were made, or respond meaningfully to the material now being relied upon within the Conservation Officer's assessment.

Relevant planning history may provide background context. However, undisclosed advice concerning the previous landowner's materially different proposal cannot properly be treated as advice given to the present applicant, as establishing fixed design requirements for the site, or as a substitute for a reasoned assessment of the current application.

Planning Application PL/2026/01199 must be determined on its own merits by reference to the current revised drawings, the Design Addendum, the standalone Heritage Statement and the complete body of supporting evidence before the Local Planning Authority.

If reliance is placed upon the earlier pre-application process, the Local Planning Authority must explain its relevance to the present proposal and identify the evidential basis upon which that reliance is placed. Repeatedly quoting isolated passages from material that has not been disclosed to the applicant does not demonstrate that the current revised scheme has been assessed fairly or on its own planning and heritage merits.

3. Design Quality and Local Vernacular

Conservation Officer's conclusion

The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposed dwelling is a generic house type which fails to demonstrate a meaningful understanding of the local vernacular, heritage context or distinctive character of Cherhill.

The planning and heritage evidence submitted in support of this application does not support that conclusion.

The proposed dwelling has not been selected from a standard catalogue design, nor has it been developed without regard to its surroundings. It has been specifically designed for this site following detailed consideration of the character of Park Lane, the Cherhill Conservation Area, nearby listed buildings, the surrounding landscape and the established pattern of development.

The proposed use of red brick, reclaimed clay double Roman roof tiles, painted timber windows and restrained architectural detailing has been a deliberate design response intended to reflect materials and building forms already established within Park Lane.

The consultation response concludes that the proposal fails to respond to the local vernacular. However, no comparative assessment has been undertaken between the proposed development and the existing built character of Park Lane to support that conclusion.

Park Lane is not characterised by a single architectural style, material palette or period of development. Rather, it has evolved over many centuries and comprises a diverse collection of historic buildings, traditional farmhouses, twentieth-century dwellings and more recent residential development.

- Old Bury Fields, constructed predominantly in red brick with a combination of natural slate and double Roman concrete roof tiles.
- 1 Park Lane, constructed in red brick.
- Phoenix Glow, constructed in red brick with second-hand clay roof tiles.
- Christmas Cottage, constructed in red brick.
- Crossways, approved under Planning Permission PL/2024/08976 in red brick with concrete roof tiles.
- Chalkstones, a Grade II listed building with an associated red-brick garage beneath a concrete tiled roof.
- Chestnut Cottage, a red-brick dwelling built on land that formerly formed part of the grounds of the Grade II listed Jugglers Cottage.
- Lower Farm, an eighteenth-century red-brick farmhouse.

These examples demonstrate that red brick forms an established component of the architectural character of Park Lane and that clay and concrete tiled roofs coexist successfully alongside designated heritage assets.

The revised proposal does not seek to replicate Tudor Cottage or create an artificial interpretation of historic architecture. Instead, it has been designed as a high-quality, sitespecific dwelling that responds positively to the established character, scale and material palette of Park Lane whilst remaining identifiable as a building of its own time.

Core Policy CP57 requires development to respond positively to local context through highquality design. It does not require architectural replication, nor does it prescribe a single vernacular style.

The applicant therefore considers that the revised proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of the local vernacular and heritage context. The evidence does not support the conclusion that the proposal represents a generic or uninformed design response.

4. Scale, Massing and Alleged Overdevelopment

Conservation Officer's conclusion

The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site and that the revisions fail to address the concerns regarding the scale, massing and overall form of the proposed dwelling.

The planning and heritage evidence before the Local Planning Authority does not support that conclusion.

The consultation response repeatedly describes the proposal as an 'overdevelopment' and, ultimately, a 'massive overdevelopment'. However, it provides no objective assessment of plot coverage, development density, site capacity, remaining open space or the relationship between the proposed built form and the dimensions of the site to demonstrate how that conclusion has been reached.

The revised proposal comprises one detached dwelling with a footprint of approximately 170 square metres within a site extending to approximately 3,358 square metres. The dwelling therefore occupies approximately 5.1% of the application site. Even allowing for the opensided carport, access and associated infrastructure, the substantial majority of the site remains free from built development and retains its spacious, landscaped character.

The retained site accommodates substantial native hedgerow planting, additional trees, wildflower meadow, a wildlife pond, biodiversity enhancements and sustainable drainage infrastructure. The development therefore preserves a generous landscape setting around the dwelling rather than creating a cramped or intensive form of development.

The assessment also fails to give proper weight to the complete design evolution that has taken place. Compared with the earlier design, the dwelling has been reduced:

- from approximately 20 metres to approximately 17 metres in length;
- from approximately 11 metres to approximately 9 metres in depth; and by approximately 1.5 metres in ridge height; and by being lowered approximately 450 mm into the site.

During the determination of Planning Application PL/2026/01199, further material revisions have included:

- removal of the detached triple garage and first-floor studio;
- replacement with a lighter, open-sided two-bay carport;
- reduction of first-floor and rear built form;
- expression of the sitting-room element as a single-storey form with a flat roof and roof lantern;
- simplification of the roof form and elevations;
- relocation of photovoltaic panels from the dwelling to the carport; and
- strengthening of the landscape strategy through native planting and biodiversity enhancements.

These changes are not 'very limited'. They materially reduce the quantity, height, massing and visual prominence of the development.

The proposed dwelling is approximately 17 metres long. The consultation response does not demonstrate, by reference to the established dimensions of development within Park Lane, that this length falls outside the prevailing pattern or scale of detached development.

Core Policy CP57 requires development to respond positively to local context through appropriate scale, massing and design quality. The proposal has evolved specifically in response to those considerations.

In the absence of any objective plot-coverage, density or spatial analysis demonstrating excessive development, the repeated description of this single dwelling as a 'massive overdevelopment' is not supported by the physical characteristics of the proposal or the submitted evidence.

5. Character and Appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area

Conservation Officer's conclusion

The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area and would erode its established spatial character.

The planning and heritage evidence before the Local Planning Authority does not support that conclusion.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

That statutory duty does not require new development to replicate historic buildings or prevent the introduction of carefully designed new architecture. The relevant statutory question is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The consultation response places considerable emphasis upon architectural preference but gives insufficient weight to the wider characteristics that define this part of the Conservation Area, including its mature landscape framework, generous plots, established boundary vegetation, varied architectural styles, historic buildings, later residential development and gradual transition towards the adjoining countryside.

The Conservation Officer relies upon the Cherhill Conservation Area Character Appraisal's recognition that many dwellings are set within large, publicly visible plots and that this contributes to the area's sense of space. The proposal responds directly to that characteristic. It provides one detached dwelling within a site of approximately 3,358 square metres, with the dwelling occupying approximately 5.1% of the site.

The revised proposal reinforces the spacious and landscaped character of the site through:

- a single detached dwelling within a generous plot;
- extensive native hedgerow planting;
- additional native tree planting;
- a wildlife pond;
- wildflower meadow;
- biodiversity enhancements;
- sustainable drainage features; and
- a gravel driveway with a cobbled entrance apron.

The substantial majority of the site remains free from built development and retains an open, landscaped setting around the proposed dwelling.

The consultation response does not explain how a single dwelling occupying approximately 5.1% of a generous landscaped plot would erode the spatial characteristic upon which it relies. Nor does it demonstrate how the proposal would materially diminish the ability to understand or appreciate the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposal is landscape-led and responds directly to the established pattern of detached dwellings within generous plots identified by the Conservation Officer and the Character Appraisal.

The applicant therefore considers that the revised proposal preserves the established character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area and accords with Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act and Core Policy CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

6. Wider Landscape and Elevated Views

Conservation Officer's conclusion

The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposal would appear visually prominent in longer views from the A4 and from elevated ground around the Lansdowne Monument.

The submitted planning and heritage evidence does not support the conclusion that the proposal would cause heritage harm within those wider views.

The applicant accepts that the site forms part of the wider village-edge landscape and that the proposed dwelling may be visible from certain locations. Visibility, however, does not itself establish harm to the character or appearance of a Conservation Area or to the significance of a heritage asset.

The relevant consideration is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area when experienced within those views. The consultation response identifies potential visibility but does not provide verified viewpoints, a comparative visual assessment or a reasoned explanation of how the revised proposal would diminish the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The wider settlement edge already contains historic buildings, twentieth-century housing, more recent residential development, agricultural buildings and mature vegetation. The proposed dwelling would therefore be experienced as part of an existing and varied pattern of development rather than as an isolated building within an otherwise undeveloped landscape.

The revised dwelling is one-and-a-half storeys, has been reduced in scale and massing, lowered approximately 450 mm into the landform and set well back from Park Lane. Its simplified form, restrained material palette and substantial spatial separation from surrounding buildings provide permanent controls upon its visual prominence.

The landscape strategy supplements those permanent design measures through retained vegetation, native hedgerow planting and additional native trees. The applicant's assessment does not rely upon future planting alone to make the development acceptable.

The consultation response does not demonstrate that the proposed dwelling would break the settlement form, dominate identified wider views or materially diminish the ability to appreciate the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area.

The applicant therefore considers that the revised proposal can be successfully assimilated into the established settlement edge without causing harm to the character or appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area.

7. Setting of Deep Thatch, Presently Known as Tudor Cottage (Grade II)

Conservation Officer's conclusion

The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposal would harm the setting of the Grade II listed building presently known as Tudor Cottage because intervisibility would remain between the listed building and the proposed dwelling.

The submitted planning and heritage evidence does not support that conclusion.

The relevant designated heritage asset is Deep Thatch, Park Lane, Grade II, National Heritage List entry 1022451, presently known as Tudor Cottage. That terminology is used throughout this section to avoid ambiguity.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the Local Planning Authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Neither Section 66 nor the National Planning Policy Framework establishes visibility or intervisibility, in isolation, as proof of harm. The relevant assessment must identify the

significance of the listed building, the contribution made by the application site to that significance and the effect of the proposed development upon the ability to understand and appreciate that significance.

The Conservation Officer identifies intervisibility but does not adequately explain how the revised proposal would diminish the architectural or historic interest of the listed building or the contribution made by its setting.

The proposed dwelling is approximately 48 metres from Tudor Cottage. The listed building occupies higher ground, and the relationship between the two properties is influenced by their substantial physical separation, changes in ground level, established boundary treatment, retained mature vegetation and proposed native planting.

These permanent spatial and topographical characteristics—not screening alone—ensure that the proposed dwelling remains physically and visually distinct from the listed building. The proposed planting strengthens that existing separation but is not relied upon as the sole means of avoiding heritage harm.

The proposal does not alter the fabric, architectural form or historic interest of the listed building. The application site is separately owned. Separate ownership is not relied upon as determinative of listed-building curtilage or heritage effect; the assessment instead considers the established historical, functional, spatial and visual relationship between the two land parcels.

The applicant therefore considers that the scale, siting, separation and landscape treatment of the revised proposal preserve the setting and significance of the listed building in accordance with Section 66(1) of the 1990 Act and Core Policy CP58.

7.1 Boundary Treatment and Intervisibility

The Conservation Officer describes the existing boundary fence as a 'crude' subdivision and recommends that it be removed because of its domestic appearance. Elsewhere, the consultation response relies substantially upon intervisibility between the proposed dwelling and Tudor Cottage as a reason for alleging harm to the setting of the listed building.

Those conclusions are not reconciled within the assessment.

The fence was not erected casually as part of the current development proposal. The registered transfer required a substantial close-boarded fence, no more than six feet high, to be erected and thereafter maintained along the boundaries marked A–B and B–C on the transfer plan. The fence therefore forms part of the established legal and physical separation between the two ownerships.

The applicant does not suggest that a private covenant determines the planning merits of the application. It does, however, provide essential factual context which is absent from the Conservation Officer's description of the land as having been 'crudely subdivided'.

The revised proposal retains the established boundary and strengthens it through native hedgerow planting. Together, these measures reduce visual permeability between the properties, soften the appearance of the boundary, reinforce the landscape framework and provide biodiversity enhancement.

As the native hedgerow matures, it will provide additional natural screening and further reduce the seasonal intervisibility identified by the Conservation Officer. Conversely, removing

the existing boundary would increase openness and visual connectivity between the application site and the listed building.

The recommendation to remove the boundary is therefore difficult to reconcile with the simultaneous reliance upon intervisibility as a principal source of alleged harm. The proposed native planting provides the coherent response: it retains the established legal boundary while softening its appearance and strengthening the landscape separation between the two properties.

7A. Existing Built Form Within the Application Site

The Conservation Officer's assessment gives insufficient weight to the existing built form already present within the application site.

The site is not an open or undeveloped parcel of land. It currently contains a substantial detached outbuilding comprising one open-fronted garage and two enclosed workshop or garage bays. The building measures approximately 11 metres in length, 6 metres in depth and approximately 4.2 metres in height. It is constructed in red brick beneath a clay double Roman tiled roof and forms part of the existing lawful physical baseline of the site.

The presence, scale, materials and established use of this building are material considerations when assessing the effect of the proposal upon the setting of Tudor Cottage and the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area.

The proposed development must therefore be assessed against the site as it lawfully exists, including its substantial existing building and domestic infrastructure. It should not be assessed as though built development were being introduced onto an otherwise open and undeveloped parcel of land.

The applicant considers that the existing lawful built form is an important component of the planning and heritage baseline and must be afforded appropriate weight in the assessment of the proposal.

8. Proposed Access and the Character of Park Lane

Conservation Officer's conclusion

The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposed vehicular access and associated visibility splays would harm the character of Park Lane and the Cherhill Conservation Area. He further states that any new dwelling would need to share the existing access serving Tudor Cottage.

The planning and heritage evidence before the Local Planning Authority does not support those conclusions.

The proposed access has been assessed by the Local Highway Authority, which has raised no objection subject to appropriate planning conditions. That response confirms that the proposed arrangement is acceptable in highway-safety and functional terms. The applicant does not suggest that the Highway Authority determines the heritage effects of the access; those effects must be assessed separately against the character and appearance of Park Lane and the Conservation Area.

The entrance has been specifically refined to respond to that context. Its width has been reduced to approximately 4.5 metres, the previously proposed tarmac apron has been replaced with traditional cobble setts, the internal driveway is gravel, and native hedgerow planting is proposed along the frontage. These measures limit engineering and avoid the appearance of an urban or suburban estate entrance.

The conclusion that an additional access would be inherently harmful does not reflect the established character of Park Lane. Within approximately 150 metres of the site, there are seven existing, approved and operational vehicular entrances serving dwellings and residential development. Separately, an existing agricultural field gateway serves the land approved for the proposed Village Hall. The approved Village Hall entrance has not yet been created or implemented.

The Wiltshire Council Final Decision Statement records that the Cherhill New Village Hall Community Right to Build Order was made on 5 April 2019 under Section 61E(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and that the Village Hall development was thereby granted planning permission. The approved but unimplemented Village Hall access is relied upon only as additional planning context and is not included among the seven existing operational entrances.

Those openings demonstrate that vehicular accesses already form part of the established street pattern. They do not establish that every additional access must be acceptable, but they demonstrate that a carefully designed single-dwelling entrance is not an unfamiliar feature within Park Lane.

8.1 Incorrect Account of the Existing Access

The Conservation Officer states that the existing access serving Tudor Cottage was created pursuant to planning permission N/08/02734 following approval to relocate an access approximately 15 metres north. That account is factually incorrect.

The approved 2008 drawing clearly distinguishes between:

- the original access, labelled 'existing vehicular access' on the existing site plan; and
- a proposed replacement entrance approximately 15 metres farther north on the proposed site plan.

Although permission was granted for that relocation, the approved proposal was never implemented. The access presently serving Tudor Cottage remains the original access shown on the 2008 existing site plan.

This factual position was expressly identified in the applicant's first response and supported by the approved drawing. Nevertheless, the revised consultation response repeats the same incorrect account without acknowledging or addressing the evidence provided.

8.2 Suggested Shared Access

The Conservation Officer further states that any new dwelling 'would need' to share the existing Tudor Cottage access. No policy requirement, comparative heritage assessment or reasoned justification is provided for that conclusion.

The consultation response does not demonstrate that sharing the existing access would better preserve the setting of the listed building or the character and appearance of the Conservation

Area. Nor does it assess the effect of introducing additional residential traffic through the established access arrangement associated with Tudor Cottage.

The relevant heritage question is whether the proposed access, as designed and landscaped, would cause harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The existence of an alternative access arrangement does not, without comparative assessment, establish that the submitted proposal is harmful.

The proposed access follows an established pattern of openings along Park Lane, is acceptable in highway-safety terms and incorporates materials and landscaping specifically selected to respond to its rural setting. The evidence therefore does not support the conclusion that it would cause unacceptable heritage harm or that shared access is the only acceptable planning solution.

9. Proposed Materials

Conservation Officer's conclusion

The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposed materials fail to respond appropriately to the historic environment and suggests that the palette should include thatch, lime render, chalk or local stone, with only limited use of brick.

The planning and heritage evidence does not support the conclusion that the proposed materials are inappropriate.

The revised palette comprises red brick, reclaimed clay double Roman roof tiles and painted timber windows. These are traditional, durable materials selected following consideration of the established built character of Park Lane.

Section 3 provides the detailed comparative evidence demonstrating that red brick and tiled roofs are recurring features within Park Lane, including on historic buildings, later dwellings and buildings situated close to Grade II listed assets. That locally grounded evidence supports the proposed material palette.

The consultation response does not identify any adopted policy requiring the use of thatch, lime render, chalk or local stone on this site. Nor does it explain why the proposed use of red brick, reclaimed clay tiles and painted timber windows would cause harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The applicant therefore considers that the proposed materials represent an informed and locally appropriate response to Park Lane and preserve the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area.

9.1 Suggested Architectural References and the Basis of the Design Objection

The Conservation Officer describes the proposed dwelling and carport in strongly dismissive terms, including 'uninspired', 'standard', 'off the shelf', 'poor quality' and having 'no architectural merit'. He then identifies a series of individual architect-designed houses elsewhere in Wiltshire as examples of the design direction that he considers should be pursued:

- Rammed Earth House — Tuckey Design Studio;
- Orchard House, Calne — Studio Octopi;

- Laurel House — Casa Architects; 7 Bolo Cottage — Chalk Architects; and 7 Upper Lawn, Tisbury — the Smithsons.

The applicant has considered those references. However, each represents an individual architectural response to a different site, landscape, development brief and historical context. None establishes the prevailing character or vernacular of Park Lane, and none has been demonstrated to share the particular spatial, architectural or heritage circumstances of the application site.

When the report is read as a whole, a substantial part of its negative assessment appears to arise from the fact that the submitted proposal differs markedly from the architectural direction and reference projects preferred by the Conservation Officer. The strongly dismissive descriptions applied to the proposal, when contrasted with the promotion of those alternative examples, indicate that this difference in architectural approach has carried significant weight in reaching the objection.

A professional preference for an alternative design may properly form part of design advice, but it is not, without a reasoned connection to heritage significance, evidence that the submitted proposal causes heritage harm. The assessment must distinguish between a design that the Conservation Officer would not favour and a design that fails the statutory and policy tests applicable to Deep Thatch, presently known as Tudor Cottage, and the Cherhill Conservation Area.

These projects do not form part of the adopted development plan, do not constitute adopted Wiltshire Council design guidance and do not impose a policy requirement for the application proposal to follow a particular architectural style. Their inclusion may illustrate the Conservation Officer's preferred approach to contemporary architecture, but preference for those examples cannot itself demonstrate that the submitted design would cause harm to the significance of the listed building or to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The repeated use of strongly subjective descriptions, when considered alongside the promotion of unrelated architectural reference projects, creates a legitimate concern that the assessment has placed disproportionate weight upon whether the proposal accords with a preferred design philosophy, rather than demonstrating through a clear heritage analysis why the particular scale, form, materials and siting of the revised proposal would cause harm.

The relevant statutory and policy question is not whether the Conservation Officer would have designed a different house, whether he considers another architectural approach more imaginative, or whether the proposal resembles the projects he has selected. The question is whether the submitted development, assessed objectively within its actual Park Lane and Cherhill context, preserves the setting and significance of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposed dwelling has been informed by the demonstrable built character of Park Lane: its varied architectural forms, historic and later development, red-brick buildings, tiled roofs, detached dwellings and generous landscaped plots. That locally grounded evidence is directly relevant to the application. The cited reference projects are not evidence of the prevailing Park Lane vernacular.

The Conservation Officer's report does not establish why departure from his selected architectural examples would result in heritage harm. Nor does it explain why the substantial design revisions, locally established materials, limited site coverage, separation from Tudor

Cottage and strengthened landscape framework fail to preserve the significance of the identified heritage assets.

The Conservation Officer's advice is a material professional consideration, but it is not determinative. The Local Planning Authority must reach its own reasoned judgement upon the complete revised proposal, the statutory duties, adopted policy and all the submitted evidence. The applicant respectfully requests that the strongly expressed architectural criticism and suggested reference projects are afforded weight only to the extent that they demonstrate identifiable harm to heritage significance, rather than a difference in architectural preference.

10. Standalone Heritage Statement and NPPF Paragraph 207

The Case Officer has raised concern that the original submission was not accompanied by a standalone Heritage Statement containing sufficient information about the significance of the affected heritage assets.

The applicant does not accept that the absence of a separately titled Heritage Statement necessarily established non-compliance with national policy, because relevant design, contextual and heritage information was already contained within the submitted application documents. Nevertheless, to remove any possible uncertainty and respond fully to the Case Officer's concern, a comprehensive standalone Heritage Statement now accompanies this response.

Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, including any contribution made by their settings, in a manner proportionate to the assets' importance and sufficient to understand the potential effect of the development. The accompanying Heritage Statement:

- identifies the designated heritage assets potentially affected;
- describes their architectural and historic significance;
- assesses the contribution made by their settings;
- explains the evolution of the design;
- evaluates the effect of the complete revised proposal;
- addresses the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area;
- applies the statutory duties under Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; and
- assesses the proposal against Core Policies CP57 and CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Local Planning Authority therefore has a proportionate and comprehensive assessment of heritage significance and potential effect before it.

Accordingly, any earlier concern regarding the form or extent of the submitted heritage information has now been fully addressed and cannot reasonably remain a basis for concluding that the application fails to satisfy paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. Compliance with Statutory Duties and Development Plan Policy

The revised proposal has been developed having full regard to the statutory duties imposed by Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Section 66(1) requires special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72(1) requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

The revised proposal responds to those duties through its restrained scale and massing, substantial separation from the listed building, lowered siting, strengthened landscape framework, locally informed materials and comprehensive heritage assessment.

The proposal has also been assessed against Core Policies CP57 and CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Core Policy CP57 seeks high-quality development that responds positively to local context through appropriate scale, design, landscape integration and a strong sense of place. Core Policy CP58 requires proposals affecting heritage assets to be informed by an understanding of their significance and to conserve that significance through an appropriate design response.

For the reasons set out in this response and the accompanying Heritage Statement, the applicant considers that the revised proposal satisfies the statutory duties and accords with both development plan policies.

12. Conclusion

The applicant has carefully considered the Conservation Officer's consultation response and the subsequent observations of the Case Officer.

The revised proposal has undergone substantial design evolution. Its scale, massing and visual prominence have been reduced; the detached triple garage and first-floor studio have been removed; first-floor and rear built form has been reduced; the dwelling has been lowered within the site; the material and landscape strategies have been strengthened; and comprehensive heritage and technical evidence has been prepared.

The proposal has been designed specifically for this site. It responds positively to the varied character of Park Lane, reflects the established pattern of detached dwellings within generous plots and uses materials demonstrably present within the immediate locality.

The dwelling occupies approximately 5.1% of the 3,358-square-metre site. Even allowing for the open-sided carport, access and associated infrastructure, the substantial majority of the site remains free from built development and retains a spacious landscape setting incorporating native hedgerows, additional tree planting, wildflower meadow, a wildlife pond and biodiversity enhancements.

The proposed access reflects an established pattern of vehicular openings along Park Lane. It has been designed using materials and landscaping appropriate to its rural setting, and the Local Highway Authority has raised no objection in highway-safety terms, subject to conditions.

The accompanying Heritage Statement provides the proportionate assessment required by paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It identifies the affected heritage assets, describes their significance and the contribution made by their settings, and assesses the effect of the complete revised proposal.

The Conservation Officer's objection relies upon a number of forcefully expressed conclusions, including that the proposal is 'uninspired', 'standard' and a 'massive overdevelopment'. However, those descriptions are not supported by an objective assessment of plot coverage, density or site capacity, a comparative analysis of the established Park Lane vernacular, or a reasoned explanation connecting the specific characteristics of the revised development to harm to heritage significance.

The assessment also repeats an incorrect account of the existing access despite the documentary evidence previously supplied, relies repeatedly upon undisclosed pre-application advice relating to the previous landowner's different proposal, and does not reconcile the proposed removal of the established boundary with its simultaneous reliance upon intervisibility as a source of alleged harm.

Having regard to the revised drawings, Design Addendum, standalone Heritage Statement, submitted technical evidence, Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the National Planning Policy Framework and Core Policies CP57 and CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the applicant considers that the evidence does not support the Conservation Officer's conclusion that the proposal would harm the setting or significance of the Grade II listed building or the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area.

The applicant respectfully requests that Planning Application PL/2026/01199 be determined on the basis of the revised proposal and the complete body of planning, heritage and technical evidence now before the Local Planning Authority.