

OBJECTION: Material Inaccuracies, Direct Document Contradictions, and Failure of Holiday Let Viability Assessment

As a full-time resident of the adjacent annex located immediately opposite the development site in Upper Woodford, I object to application **PL/2026/05064** on the grounds that the submitted Woolley & Wallis Viability Report (dated 15 July 2025) is factually incorrect, demonstrably cloned from an unrelated development file, and fails to provide a legitimate, site-specific assessment for The Old Forge, Upper Woodford.

The report is fundamentally compromised by the following fatal errors:

- **Direct Conflict with the Design Statement:** The Viability Report (Clause 2.3) bases its economic evaluation on a non-existent 'Garage connected to the North Elevation'. Conversely, the applicant's own Design Statement, submitted in support of the application, explicitly contradicts this, correctly identifying the structure as an *'existing pitched roof storage extension on the North side of the building [which] would be retained as a space... to act as a vital "lobby" entrance point to the property'*. The surveyor has financially evaluated a property profile that simply does not exist.
- **Severe Geographical Errors:** The report misidentifies the property's access constraints by referencing 'Chine Road' (Clause 2.1) and a 'small country lane' (Clause 2.2). Locally, Chine Road is an agricultural lane that branches off well past the Roman Bridge. The Old Forge sits directly on the prominent roadside of the C42 corridor.
- **Flawed Methodology (Clauses 1.2 & 1.3):** The report admits to relying heavily on 'desktop research' and was published nearly four months after the alleged site visit (21 March 2025). This lag explains the catastrophic mixing of data from a completely different property or template.
- **Inaccurate Structural Representation and Internal Document Contradictions:** The Viability Report (Clause 5.1) claims that *'a visual inspection presented that the building looks in good condition with no signs of structural damage'*, completely ignoring the highly visible, dilapidated state of the former smithy. This claim is completely exposed as false by the applicant's own submission documents. While the Planning Statement (Clause 2.4) falsely claims the structure is in a *'good structural condition'*, the Design Statement explicitly admits that the East wall is *'in poor condition having been covered in ivy for an extended period of time... and is likely to need rebuilding from the line of the plinth'*. The application's Materials subsection further confesses that a large section of this cob and flint East elevation is *'past repair'* and must be completely demolished and replaced with a modern timber-framed wall. Furthermore, Section 3.3 of the Planning

Statement uses highly ambiguous, non-committal language, stating that internal cob walls will be preserved '*wherever possible*'. This exposes a fatal lack of definitive structural oversight. The applicant has failed to commission a comprehensive structural survey by an accredited engineer specialising in historic cob and flint structures. Without a specialist survey, the phrase '*wherever possible*' serves as a convenient loophole to allow the wholesale demolition and modern reconstruction of the building's historic fabric post-permission under the guise of 'site necessity'. Because the true structural parameters of the building are entirely unknown and un-costed, the Viability Report's financial baseline is entirely fabricated and unauthentic to this specific site.

- **Fatal Impact on Financial Viability Modelling:** Because the Viability Report relies on a false premise that the building has no signs of structural damage, its financial costings are completely invalid. It entirely fails to factor in the highly specialised, prohibitive engineering costs required to safely dismantle and reconstruct a failed traditional cob wall on a historic flint base without collapsing the remainder of the structure. By masking the true, extensive structural degradation of the East elevation, the applicant has submitted a viability report built on completely fabricated financial parameters.

Conclusion

Because the underlying physical layout, asset profile, geography, and structural reality belong to a different property or a fictional narrative, the generic Airbnb statistics and viability graphs contained within this report hold zero validity for The Old Forge. The applicant cannot claim a building is structurally sound to pass conversion policy, while simultaneously admitting it is past repair to justify a modern rebuild of an entire elevation. The applicant has entirely failed to satisfy Wiltshire Council's strict viability testing required to permanently bypass holiday-occupancy restrictions in favour of full C3 residential use. This report is fundamentally flawed and must be entirely disregarded by the Planning Authority.