

Land East of Blackmore Farm, Melksham

Response to Consultee Comments

edp9278_r011a

QA: RSk/ACr_FMi/NHa_150926

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Response to Consultee Comments has been produced by The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd (EDP) for Gleeson Land (hereafter referred to as 'the Applicant') in response to consultee comments received from Wiltshire County Council's (WCC) Principal Conservation Officer (PCO; 29 June 2026).
- 1.2 In these comments from the officer, effects on heritage assets are referenced which express concern in terms of changes to the setting of the Grade II listed building Blackmore House and their effect on the asset's significance.
- 1.3 The following paragraphs will therefore outline the officer's comments, consider those comments and then respond in terms of their accuracy and reasonableness; and reach conclusions in respect of the Proposed Development's conformity with the current planning policy framework.

2 GRADE II LISTED BUILDING BLACKMORE HOUSE

The Assessment of the Listed Building's Significance and the Contribution made by its Setting, Including the Land at the Site

- 2.1 In accordance with Policy HE5.1 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF, 2026) the Applicant has assessed the effect of the Proposed Development on the significance of the Grade II listed building Blackmore House. Whilst it references the previous edition of the NPPF, this assessment is set out in the *Archaeological and Heritage Assessment* (EDP, 2026, report reference: edp9278_r004) that was submitted with the planning application.
- 2.2 In accordance with the definition of significance given in Annex B: Glossary, of the NPPF, Blackmore House's significance is mainly derived from its historic interest and, to a lesser extent, its architectural interest.
- 2.3 Its historic interest reflects the illustration, in its physical form, of the Post Medieval agricultural history of the hinterland of Melksham, and its connections with the local and historic weaving industry. Its architectural interest is derived from the features which are characteristic of a plain farmhouse of the Post Medieval Wiltshire vernacular, with its window configuration (multi-pane sash windows) and style typical of the Georgian period in

which it was built. It has no distinctive 'polite' elevation designed to be seen on approach, as all its elevations are similar in their simple treatment.

- 2.4 In that regard, it is noted that the PCO does not raise any concerns about EDP's description of the asset, assessment of its significance or assessment of the contribution which its setting makes to that significance. Indeed, they conform that:

"...the significance of the building lies largely with its historic interest, including its fabric, its form, layout and vernacular design and materials and from the contribution it makes to the understanding and experience of the historic agricultural landscape surrounding Melksham".

- 2.5 In this regard it is reasonable to conclude that the PCO agrees with EDP's assertion that the majority of the significance of the asset is contained in its physical fabric and therefore that its setting contributes to its overall significance to a lesser degree.

- 2.6 The Applicant considers that the setting of the listed building does contribute to its significance. With reference to the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment report that was submitted with the outline planning application, the following aspects of its setting are considered to contribute positively but to varying degrees:

- The adjacent gardens to the north and east, which are closely associated with the farmhouse;
- The historic and modern outbuildings to the south-east, west and south-west, and modern farmhouse to the north-west, which are functionally associated with its historic use as a farmhouse and illustrate this former usage;
- The roadside to the immediate north (the A4102), as it provides the historic access to the farmhouse and is a location from which to view and experience the building; and
- The wider farmland, to the east, south-east and north-east (including parts of the site), which was historically associated with the house, although a functional association is no longer apparent as the house is now a private residence.

- 2.7 As the gardens, outbuildings and roadside would be wholly unaffected directly by the proposals, it is important to understand the degree to which the wider farmland, including that within the site, contributes to the listed building's significance.

- 2.8 Inasmuch as the definition of setting (NPPF, Annex B Glossary) is "*the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced*", the farmhouse can be experienced from and in conjunction with some of the farmland to the east and south-east. In such views (see Images EDP A1.2, A1.5 and A1.8 in the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment) the former farmhouse is seen from and across historically associated farmland, comprising grassed fields bounded by hedgerows with occasional mature trees. A similar experience is also achieved from the bridleway located to the east of the site, where the land rises slightly, allowing for a view across fields to the farmhouse.

- 2.9 As described in the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment, the experience of the farmhouse in these views is not only defined by a view across agricultural farmland but also includes various modern elements that are seen adjacent to, behind or in front of the listed building. These comprise the large, modern agricultural buildings to the south-west of the farmhouse, garden outbuildings to the south-east of the farmhouse, a line of electricity pylons and lines crossing the site from south to north, the rear of modern houses along Sandridge Common (the A4102) to the east of the farmhouse and further modern development within the wider landscape beyond the house to the north-west.
- 2.10 As such, the experience of the farmhouse in the views across the adjacent farmland to the east and south-east is of a historic farmhouse viewed across grassed fields, bounded by well-maintained hedgerows containing scattered mature trees. However, like most farmland its historic character has been degraded by modern development and intensification of farming practices and there is nothing particularly interesting or unusual about the farmland in and of itself, that increases its contribution to the significance of the listed building as part of its setting. As noted above, this experience is illustrated by Images EDP A1.2, A1.5 and A1.8 in the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment.
- 2.11 Furthermore, it is apparent that, with no aesthetic architectural features, the rear elevation of the building was not designed or intended to be a feature in views and indeed, historically, cartographic sources indicate that the building was adjacent to orchards which would have restricted any views toward it.
- 2.12 As such, the fields within the site to the east and south-east of the listed building, from where the farmhouse is experienced, do contribute to the significance of the building but this is simply because farmhouses are typically experienced adjacent to fields within a rural setting that reflects the character of the farmhouse's historic setting, rather than due to there being anything about these fields which elevates them above the ordinary, or due to any particularly prominent experience of the building in views across this land.
- 2.13 Consequently, it is assessed that the contribution to the asset's overall significance (such that the majority is contained within its physical fabric) is slightly muted and contributes to no more than a minor degree.
- 2.14 The PCO states that they agree with the Applicant's assessment in that *"the surrounding land which farms the site [presumably meaning the farmland within the site] has a historic and functional connection with the house that contributes to its significance and its understanding as a farmstead within the rural landscape"*.
- 2.15 However, whilst this statement does align with one aspect of the Applicant's assessment, the PCO does not describe or discuss the specific experience of the farmhouse from, or in conjunction with this land, and thus disregards the modern elements of the farmhouse's setting that detract from the historic agricultural character of the surrounding landscape when the asset is experienced from the east and south-east.
- 2.16 They do, note, within their assessment that *"there has been some erosion of the immediate setting of the house via the loss of much of the historic farmstead and by the construction of the adjacent bungalow, which is out of character"*, but they do not mention the wider erosion of its setting, such that the farmhouse is now experienced alongside the other

modern elements highlighted above, or how this process has changed the character of the views to it, across the adjacent fields.

- 2.17 The PCO does discuss how the development granted in outline for the adjacent site, known as Land at Blackmore Farm (reference: PL/2023/11188), will further change the setting of the Grade II listed farmhouse, such that, because that development will be situated across some of the farmland historically associated with the listed building, the remaining farmland to the east and south-east would increase in terms of its contribution to the significance of the farmhouse through it *“contributing to the understanding and experience of a farmstead set within its historic agricultural holding”*.
- 2.18 Whilst it is the case that the proposals under reference: PL/2023/11188 will result in the conversion of farmland to the south-west of the farmhouse into residential development, it is also apparent that the PL/2023/11188 scheme provides for the retention of green space to the south and south-east of the farmhouse, which would continue to allow a degree of openness to its setting and for the listed building to be experienced adjacent to grassed spaces and former farmland.
- 2.19 The farmland further to the south-west (which would be developed within that scheme) was historically functionally associated with the farmhouse but is of limited relevance to its experience, given that the listed building is screened from this land by the modern agricultural sheds to the south-west.
- 2.20 As such, the loss of this land to development is of limited relevance to the wider experience of the farmhouse within a landscape of grassed farmland, such that the land in the site is already (without the development of PL/2023/11188) one of the only areas of farmland to the south of the A4102 where a view to the farmhouse across and in conjunction with grassed farmland is still possible. As such, it does not contribute more to the significance of the farmhouse because of the development of PL/2023/11188, because the farmland land lost to that development is, for the most part, not land from where an experience of the farmhouse is readily available.
- 2.21 Nevertheless, it is the case that both developments will transform a swath of farmland to the south of the A4102 into a modern residential development and thus, even with regard given in both schemes for retaining an experience of the farmhouse, the character of the landscape will change. As such it is correct to assess an ‘in-combination’ cumulative effect from both schemes.
- 2.22 Finally, it is noteworthy that the PCO has not expressly specified the degree to which they consider the land to the east and south-east of the farmhouse (that is within the site) contributes to the significance of the listed building.
- 2.23 Instead, the PCO simply states that they think that it does make a contribution. Without clarification, this position can reasonably be assumed to be broadly equivalent to that of the Applicant, in that it is assessed that the land to the east and south-east of the farmhouse that is within the site does make a positive contribution to the significance of the farmhouse, but to a minor degree.

The Effect of the Proposed Development on the Setting and Significance of the Listed Building

- 2.24 The Applicant's assessment identifies the effects of the Proposed Development within the context of the approved housing development (reference: PL/2023/11188) that lies adjacent to the west and includes a piece of land that is also within the Proposed Development site. In this regard, the assessment takes account of the impacts caused to the significance of the listed building by the PL/2023/11188 development and the change to the asset's setting from the consented scheme, as well as what it means for the baseline position and for the assessment of effects from the Proposed Development. This approach accords with the in-combination effect discussed by the PCO in their response to the application.
- 2.25 The PCO makes a sweeping statement to describe the effect of the two proposals in combination, stating that *"the proposals would introduce a suburban form of development which is out of character with the existing agricultural landscape, over a very large area, and would result in the loss of a substantial part of the wider rural setting within which the listed farmhouse is experienced and a consequent diminution of its significance"*. This statement (which is repeated twice within the PCO's response) takes no account of the details of the proposals, the strategic locations of open space, the retention of hedgerows and mature trees and, consequently, the consideration for the provision of space and views that allows for a continued appreciation and experience of the listed building.
- 2.26 In this regard, reference is made to the statement in the NPPF at HE5.3 that, in making the assessment of effect on a heritage asset *"it is the effect on a heritage asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered"* and so, the assessment should focus not on the wider scale and extent of development, both within the site and in the site to the west, but on the finer and more detailed assessment of how exactly development would affect the experience of the listed building and how that change might affect its significance.
- 2.27 As described in the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment, the PL/2023/11188 development instigates consented measures to help preserve an experience of the listed building that is reminiscent of its historic agricultural setting, with views from the south retained across a grassed field, additional tree planting on boundaries to the south and east of the farmhouse and an area of orchards due east of the house, in a location previously characterised by orchards.
- 2.28 These provisions (with that planning application) were assessed to not entirely mitigate any impact upon the listed building's significance but rather to reduce the severity of that impact by retaining a degree of visibility and prominence at the building and referencing the former historic character of its setting.
- 2.29 The current proposals continue this theme, with a recognition of the harmful effect on the significance of the listed building from the development of agricultural land in its setting. Consequently, design measures have been implemented that are considered to not fully mitigate the effect but (instead) reduce its severity by retaining elements of the listed building's farmland setting and retaining an experience of it within views across the site,

thus respecting its primacy as the oldest built element in the vicinity and the character of its historic setting.

2.30 These provisions include:

- Retention of the orchards consented under PL/2023/11188 and retention of the fields east of the orchards as open grassed, public spaces containing sustainable drainage (SuDs) ponds;
- Retention of mature trees and hedgerows within and on the edge of these spaces and the planting of new trees and hedges;
- Open space linking into the East Green public park area; and
- Development in the north-east part of the site, which will be set against existing houses along Sandridge Common and will have an active frontage to the south, whereas at present the view comprises the rear elevations of houses.

2.31 These provisions allow for a degree of openness within the landscape to the east of the farmhouse, retaining views across to it from as far as the bridleway that lies adjacent to the site to the east. To reiterate, it is not the Applicant's position that this approach would retain or preserve the existing agricultural landscape of grassed fields; the character of this landscape would only be preserved in the form of the retained hedgerows and mature trees.

2.32 It is, rather, that the retention of views to the farmhouse across grassed spaces and over and adjacent to mature trees and hedgerows, would continue to allow it to be experienced in views across the site and ensure that the land adjacent to it to the east, in tandem with the preserved open space in the PL/2023/11188 site, retains a degree of openness in its setting and includes elements of the present agricultural landscape (trees and hedges) in order to reference its history as a farmhouse.

2.33 There is no suggestion that, overall, the Proposed Development would not be harmful to the significance of the listed building, as an area of adjacent farmland would be changed in character. All the same, the measures that are proposed in the illustrative masterplan would reduce the severity of this effect and, overall, the assessment concludes that there would be a low degree of 'less than substantial harm' to the Grade II listed building, and thus a greater degree of harm than the very low degree of harm assessed for PL/2023/11188 (which was deemed acceptable).

2.34 The concept of 'less than substantial harm' has been dropped from the heritage policies set out in the new NPPF and so the effect is considered to constitute a degree of 'harm' instead. With consideration of the factors addressed above, in relation to the contribution made to the significance of the listed building, from the land within the site that is in question, and given the design mitigation also discussed above, this effect is still nonetheless assessed as constituting just a low level of harm.

2.35 In combination, both harmful effects would occur and could collectively be seen to amount to a low/moderate degree of harm, but not 'substantial harm'.

- 2.36 Under Policy HE6.3, harm to a designated heritage asset is a matter of “*considerable importance and weight*” and, under Policy HE6.4 “*where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.*”
- 2.37 The PCO makes a number of comments regarding the effect of the Proposed Development on the significance of the listed building.
- 2.38 They comment on the provision of orchard planting and green space to the east of the farmhouse, noting that its situation between developed areas and the new entrance roads that run through it will mean that it has a “*very different character to the previous agricultural landscape and is unlikely to preserve the character of the farmstead’s historic setting*”.
- 2.39 It is fully acknowledged that the change will be to a different form of landscape, comprising open space within a housing development, and that it will not be an agricultural landscape, nor a replication of the farmhouse’s historic setting. This is not implied in the Applicant’s assessment.
- 2.40 The consented orchard will partially screen the farmhouse and will reference its historic setting, not recreate it. Indeed, the PCO’s comment implies again that the farmhouse is set within an unspoilt agricultural landscape that closely reflects its historic setting. However, this is not the case, as the fields in question contain modern pylons and lie immediately adjacent to modern housing along Sandridge Common and the modern agricultural buildings adjacent to the farm. As such, it is not a well-preserved historic landscape that is being changed.
- 2.41 The PCO mentions their previous advice in relation to an early iteration of the proposals for PL/2023/11188, such that the revised scheme for that site removed development from the land to the east of the farmhouse and that this constituted an improvement to that scheme regarding the effect on the significance of the listed building. They claim that the Proposed Development ‘reverses this view’ and imply a return to the original approach. It is contended that this is a misrepresentation of the Proposed Development because the submitted masterplan is notably different from the older iteration of the PL/2023/11188 scheme, with notably less housing proposed within the spaces to the east of the farmhouse and with a much greater provision of open space in this area. As such, to equate the two approaches is not correct or reasonable and again, does not pay heed to the details of the current proposed design.
- 2.42 In this regard the Proposed Development has carefully sited housing in the northern part of the site and further to the south-east of the farmhouse, in order to avoid imposing into the view towards the house from across the space to the east/south-east and from locations where the house is prominent, such as the bridleway to the east of the site.
- 2.43 Furthermore, the area in the northern part of the site where housing is proposed does not provide a visual experience of the farmhouse, due to the dense mature hedgerow that lies to the east of the house and the primacy of the adjacent houses on Sandridge Common within the view. As such, the development of this space would not result in the loss of any view in which the house is experienced and appreciated looking across grassed agricultural

land. In this way the proposed housing in this part of the site has been sited to minimise any impact upon the experience of the farmhouse, a nuance of the masterplan that is not commented on by the PCO.

- 2.44 Regardless, and as stated previously, the Applicant does assess harm to the significance of the farmhouse and to a greater level than that previously identified for the consented scheme PL/2023/11188, acknowledging that development to the east and south-east of the farmhouse as proposed would ultimately be more harmful than that from the site to the west, but taking account of the measures that are proposed to reduce that harm.
- 2.45 The PCO also comments on change to the experience of the proposed development in views to the farmhouse from along Sandridge Common (the A4102) to the north, stating that *“The impact of the development on the wider agricultural landscape which forms the setting of the farmstead would be particularly appreciated in approaching the site from the north along the main road, when the farm would become surrounded by and viewed against a new backdrop of suburban housing development in place of the current agricultural character of the landscape”*.
- 2.46 The potential for views of the farmhouse from this area to include proposed housing are assessed in the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment (paragraph 5.22). This analysis demonstrates that the farmhouse is not at present viewed against a backdrop of agricultural land from the adjacent roadside to the north. The fields to the south of the house are presently screened in views from the road by the hedgerows that define the house's gardens, its outbuilding to the south-east, the farmhouse itself and the modern barns and other buildings such as the adjacent modern cottage to the west and south-west (see **Images EDP 2.1** and **2.2** below).



Image EDP 2.1: View from Sandridge Common looking along the farm track towards the western corner of Blackmore House, illustrating how the hedgerow, house and outbuildings screen any views beyond towards farmland.



Image EDP 2.2: View from Sandridge Common looking along the garden access towards the eastern extent of Blackmore House, illustrating how the garden trees and boundaries, house and outbuildings screen any views beyond towards farmland.

- 2.47 From further east/north-east along Sandridge Common (A4102), the farmhouse is not seen due to the presence of the mature hedgerow that bounds its garden to the east, and the hedgerows and row of modern housing that lines the southern side of the road (see **Images EDP 2.3** and **2.4** below). More distant views towards the farmhouse are possible from the roadside as the road climbs Sandridge Hill to the north-east (i.e. PVP EDP 5 in the Landscape and Visual Assessment, report reference: edp9278_r001). However, the experience of the listed building is very limited from such locations, with the farmhouse appearing as a distant house situated adjacent to other buildings and it cannot be fully appreciated as a historic farmhouse. Thus, such views are of limited relevance to its significance.



Image EDP 2.3: View from Sandridge Common looking across a gate through a gap in the hedgerow towards the farmhouse, illustrating how views to it from the east are screened by a dense mature hedge, and thus at most, only comprise heavily filtered views in the winter months.



Image EDP 2.4: Image looking west along Sandridge Common, c.240m east of the farmhouse, illustrating how views towards the farmhouse and into the site more generally are screened by modern housing along the road.

- 2.48 None of the features of the farmhouse's immediate setting that are experienced in views to it from the roadside would be removed by the development proposals. In fact, the vegetation along the boundary to the east of the farmhouse would be strengthened by the adjacent orchard planting. The PL/2023/11188 proposal includes the retention of a grassed field to the immediate south/south-west of the farmhouse, and the provision of an area of open space populated by trees beyond this to the south. Furthermore, the Proposed Development envisages housing c.130m to the south-east of the farmhouse and c.140m to the east at its nearest points, with that to the south-east situated behind the farmhouse's garden outbuildings, two retained mature hedgerows and an area of open space containing proposed trees. Looking from the road into the site, the housing to the east is not only set well away from the farmhouse, well beyond its immediate setting and the extent of views to it from the roadside to the north of the farmhouse, but it is also situated behind the existing modern housing that lines Sandridge Common.
- 2.49 Given these factors which are clearly illustrated on the illustrative masterplan, it is evident that the farmhouse's immediate setting (as it is experienced from the roadside to the north) would be unchanged and the building would certainly not become "*surrounded by and viewed against a backdrop of suburban housing*". Given the factors set out above, it is clear that no new housing would be present in the background in views to the farmhouse from the roadside, and that the immediate surroundings of the building would retain their present character, reminiscent of a farmhouse with an agricultural history, that is still situated adjacent to related gardens and agricultural buildings, as well as more recent modern houses.

- 2.50 In this regard, the PCO's statement is incorrect and again, based on a misrepresentation of the proposals and their detailed and nuanced treatment of the listed building's setting that aims to mitigate harm as far as possible.
- 2.51 The PCO concludes their assessment by stating that, because of the lack of impact on the building's physical fabric, the Proposed Development would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the listed building. However, they do not quantify what degree of harm this would equate to. As noted above, the concept of 'less than substantial harm' is no longer applicable in the NPPF and so the PCO's assessment translates to a non-defined degree of 'harm' to the listed building.
- 2.52 This approach is not consistent with the *Planning Practice Guidance* (PPG) accompanying the NPPF, as it requires that "*Within each category of harm, the extent of the harm may vary and should be clearly articulated*". As such, without there being a quantification of the harm, it is hard to understand what precisely the PCO thinks the effect would be and how the case officer should attribute weight to it in completing the balancing exercise.
- 2.53 It is also noteworthy that the PCO's assessment of the degree of harm is likely to be close to that of the Applicant because, as previously stated, the Applicant assesses a low degree of harm to the significance of the listed building.
- 2.54 The PCO also makes a concluding statement that "*No heritage benefits are argued or will result from the proposals.*" Whilst they may be relatively minor, this statement ignores the proposals discussed in paragraphs 5.27 to 5.30 of the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment for themed play areas within the site that reference its history, with one in the south that references the Roman period archaeology found in that part of the site and one in the north (within sight of the Grade II listed farmhouse) referencing the Post Medieval/modern agricultural landscape.
- 2.55 Whilst it is not suggested that this provision would be such that it negates the harmful effect of the development, it is still arguably a very minor benefit such that it would allow the history of the landscape to be interpreted by the public as they use the site.
- 2.56 The opening up of the site to public use, whilst detrimental to the existing agricultural character of the landscape, does create an opportunity for education through reference to the history of the landscape. As such, it is disappointing that the PCO does not even mention this suggested provision or express any desire to enter into a constructive discussion about how it could look or how it could best illustrate the history of the historic environment in this location.
- 2.57 Likewise, whilst expressing the need for an in-combination approach with the PL/2023/11188 scheme in assessing harm to the significance of the listed building, the PCO does not acknowledge the information board that was proposed in a March 2024 response to their comments in relation to those proposals. Indeed, after asking for suggestions for heritage benefits for that scheme, the PCO did not discuss the proposed information board any further and neither was one requested within the planning conditions for that permission.

- 2.58 Yet again it is disappointing that the PCO, whilst keen to assess a lack of heritage benefit and to use this assessment as justification for their objection to the current proposals, does not acknowledge suggestions for heritage interpretation that are presented in good faith by the Applicant, nor enter into any discussion about how to best realise an approach for heritage interpretation at the site or, as demonstrated by the consent for PL/2023/11188, make any attempt to control such provision through a planning condition.
- 2.59 The 2026 NPPF puts further emphasis on recognising the positive effects that development can have on the significance of heritage assets (notably Policies HE5.2.a and HE6.2) and, whilst the potential at the site is limited, the proposed interpretation measures (in combination across both the site and PL/2023/11188) could potentially result in a very minor benefit to counterbalance the harm from the Proposed Development. Interpretation could serve to 'better reveal' the significance of the listed farmhouse and the site's archaeological resource to the public that would be using the housing and the landscape in which it is set.
- 2.60 The Applicant would welcome some positive engagement from the PCO on this approach, rather than the current dismissal of the proposals and statements that justify only a negative opinion of the Proposed Development, focusing only on harm.

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 In conclusion, it is evident that there is a degree of cohesion between the PCO's position regarding the effect of the Proposed Development on the significance of the Grade II listed building Blackmore House, and that of the Applicant.
- 3.2 Both positions assess a degree of harm and neither assesses 'substantial harm'. However, with the lack of clarification by the PCO, as to the degree of contribution made to the significance of the listed building by the land in the site, and the assessed harmful effect of the proposals, it is hard to be precise about where the differences in opinion as to the effects of the Proposed Development lie.
- 3.3 What is apparent is that the PCO has not fully represented the change to the asset's setting that would occur from the implementation of the Proposed Development, seeming to adopt a broad approach rather than acknowledging the precise nature of the listed building's current setting, the detail within the design and the measures that have been proposed to respect the setting of the listed building and minimise harm. Consequently, their assessment does not seem to fully consider the change that would occur to the setting of the listed building and how that would affect the experience of it within the landscape.
- 3.4 Furthermore, the PCO has placed emphasis on a lack of heritage benefits as a reasoning for their objection to the proposal, stating that:

"From the viewpoint of the built historic environment alone there are no heritage benefits which will outweigh the harm caused to the historic environment and I must therefore object to an application."

- 3.5 It is frustrating to read this statement because, as outlined above, suggestions have been made for interpretative measures both within the site and previously within the consented PL/2023/11188 site, that have been seemingly disregarded by the PCO.
- 3.6 To reiterate, in the spirit of the new NPPF and its policies, the Applicant would welcome a constructive discussion about what could be provided in the way of heritage interpretation at the site, that the PCO would consider to represent a heritage benefit.