

Submission of Final Technical Responses to Consultation Comments

Dear Jonathan,

Further to the outstanding consultation comments relating to drainage, ecology, heritage and conservation, please find attached the final technical information prepared by the respective specialist consultants in response to the matters raised during the consultation process.

The attached information has been reviewed and updated to provide a comprehensive technical response and includes the following documentation;

Drainage

The drainage submission comprises,

- Revised Drainage Strategy,
- Updated Drainage Layout Drawing,
- Soakaway Design Statement,
- Surface Water Drainage Maintenance Plan,
- Foul drainage design & Maintenance plan,
- Supporting technical response addressing the Drainage Engineer's consultation comments.

The revised drainage information confirms, amongst other matters, that,

- The proposed surface water drainage strategy is based upon infiltration in accordance with current national guidance and SuDS principles,
- The proposed soakaway has been repositioned to provide a minimum separation distance of 10 metres from the proposed dwelling,
- BRE365 infiltration testing is acknowledged as necessary to inform the final detailed design of the soakaway and is proposed to be secured by planning condition prior to the commencement of development,
- A long-term inspection, maintenance and management regime has been prepared to ensure the continued performance of the drainage system throughout the lifetime of the development,
- The strategy incorporates rainwater harvesting, exceedance routing and sustainable drainage principles to manage surface water effectively,
- Foul drainage is proposed to be managed by a package treatment plant discharging to a drainage field, with the foul and surface water systems remaining entirely separate,
- The proposals have been developed having regard to the site's favourable chalk geology and known infiltration characteristics, with the detailed soakaway design to be verified through BRE365 infiltration testing prior to commencement, if planning permission is granted.

Ecology

The ecological submission prepared by Ellendale Environmental Ltd comprises:

- Updated Ecological Report.
- Revised Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Version 1.1).
- Updated habitat baseline assessment.
- Revised habitat creation and enhancement proposals.
- Updated hedgerow calculations.
- Habitat trading summaries.
- Supporting biodiversity calculations.

The revised assessment demonstrates:

- An on-site area habitat biodiversity net gain of 23.35%.
- An on-site hedgerow biodiversity net gain of 6,397.73%.
- Compliance with the statutory biodiversity trading rules.
- No requirement for off-site biodiversity units or statutory biodiversity credits.

The ecological proposals include woodland enhancement, native hedgerow planting, replacement tree planting, wildflower grassland, a wildlife pond, bat and bird enhancement features together with long-term habitat management designed to deliver measurable biodiversity gains across the site.

Heritage

The heritage submission comprises:

- Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment.
- Assessment of the significance and setting of the Cherhill Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Tudor Cottage (listed as Deep Thatch).
- Assessment of the complete revised proposal against the relevant statutory duties, national planning policy and Wiltshire Core Policies 57 and 58.
- A clearly separated policy assessment should the Council reach a different conclusion on heritage harm.

The Heritage Statement demonstrates:

- The significance of the affected heritage assets and the contribution made by their settings have been expressly identified and assessed.
- The complete revised proposal preserves the setting and significance of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the Cherhill Conservation Area.
- The assessment takes account of separation, boundaries, vegetation, site levels, reduced scale and massing, revised materials and the established pattern of development.
- The primary conclusion is one of no heritage harm, with a precautionary policy assessment provided should the Council reach a different judgement.

Response to the Conservation Officer

The Applicant's Response to the Conservation Officer comprises:

- A detailed response to each principal matter raised, together with the complete design evolution and substantial revisions made during the application process.
- Objective evidence addressing scale, massing, site coverage, materials, access, boundaries, intervisibility, existing built form and the wider Park Lane and Cherhill context.
- Clarification of the Tudor Cottage access, the unimplemented Village Hall entrance and the established operational driveways along Park Lane.
- Assessment of the suggested architectural reference projects and the distinction between a preferred alternative approach and demonstrable heritage harm.

The response demonstrates:

- The proposal has been materially reduced and refined; its approximately 170m² footprint within the approximately 3,358m² site represents approximately 5.06% site coverage.
- The submitted design must be assessed objectively against heritage significance, the actual character of Park Lane and the applicable statutory and policy tests.
- The reference projects concern different sites and briefs, are not adopted policy and do not establish the prevailing Park Lane vernacular.
- A preference for a different architectural direction is not, without a reasoned connection to heritage significance, evidence of heritage harm.
- The submitted evidence does not support the conclusion that the revised proposal would harm Tudor Cottage or the Cherhill Conservation Area.

The enclosed information has been prepared to provide a complete and coordinated response to the outstanding drainage, ecology, heritage and conservation matters and to assist you and the respective consultees in concluding the assessment of the application on the basis of the complete revised proposal and supporting evidence.

Should any further clarification be required from either consultant, I will be pleased to arrange this without delay.

Thank you for your continued consideration of the application.

Kind regards,

Rob Willis. Simon Filipowicz
Applicant. Agent