
Eastleigh Court and Former Eastleigh Court Stables

Planning Statement Addendum

Introduction

1. This Town Planning Statement Addendum is written on behalf of Kindred Living Project Ltd in support of an application for planning permission (Ref: PL/2026/01607) and Listed Building Consent (Ref PL/2026/01995) for the proposals at Eastleigh Court and the Former Eastleigh Court Stables.
2. Following the submission of these applications the Government has replaced the 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) with a new version that was published in August of this year. The new NPPF has introduced a revised structure and includes a new suite of decision-making policies.
3. The NPPF remains a material consideration in the determination of applications and now directs that Development Plan policies “which are materially inconsistent” with the new NPPF policies should be given “very limited weight”.
4. As a result, it is necessary to review the planning assessment set out in the submission documents and to provide additional assessment where there have been changes to the NPPF.
5. Attached at Appendix 1 is a table which identifies each of the documents that were submitted in support of these applications and identifies the relevant 2024 NPPF paragraphs that were included in the report assessments. Then the revised 2026 NPPF policies are identified along with commentary as to whether the changes necessitate further assessment. In a number of instances, while the format and wording of the text has been updated, the aims and objectives remain unchanged. Therefore, in these instances there is no requirement for amendments to the assessments in those reports. Where the changes do require further analysis details are set out below.

Assessment

Sustainable Development - Settlement Analysis

6. The submitted Planning Statement acknowledges that the Site lies outside the defined settlement boundary for Warminster and that Bishopstrow is not identified as either a Large or Small Village within the settlement hierarchy referenced in Core Policy 1. However, the statement states that the site is very close to Warminster which is identified as a Market Town in the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy, and benefits from proximity to shops, services, Warminster railway station and public-transport links.
7. The 2026 NPPF sets out a new policy for assessing the location of sustainable development. Policy S4 entitled the “Principle of development within settlements” sets out the following:

“1. Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

2. In applying policy S4, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include (but are not restricted to) situations where the development proposal would:

a. Have a substantial adverse impact in relation to:

i. The allocation or safeguarding of land or buildings for particular uses in the development plan, unless there is no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the allocated use, or there is evidence that the safeguarding is no longer appropriate; or

ii. The application of the policies in this Framework for existing

recreational land and facilities (HC7), Local Green Space (HC8), areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (N6), Protected Landscapes (N4) and development within residential curtilages (L2(1)(d)).

b. Involve the whole or partial loss of undeveloped land which is used for a cemetery or burial ground; or for water storage and/or flood risk management (unless suitable compensatory provision is made that does not increase the risk of flooding either on or off-site); or

c. Fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.”

8. In addition, the glossary defines a settlement as:

“Settlement: Includes cities, towns, villages and other predominantly built-up areas, including land which is allocated or has permission for development which will form part of the built-up area once the development is complete. This includes areas defined as a settlement in the development plan (whether using defined settlement boundaries or equivalent terms, or criteria for identifying settlement extents where boundaries have yet to be defined). Settlements do not include hamlets and scattered groups of houses located outside predominantly built-up areas, unless specifically defined as a settlement in the development plan. For the purpose of this Framework they also exclude villages which lie within and are defined as part of the Green Belt in the development plan.”

9. As set out in the definition of a settlement above, the NPPF is clear that it is no longer necessary for a Development Plan to define a settlement boundary in order for an area to be identified as a settlement for the purposes of Policy S4. Bishopstrow comprises a number of properties, including houses, the Bishopstrow Hotel and Bishopstrow School. It is also in close proximity to Warminster.
10. This assessment is supported by the recovered appeal decision relating to Land at Boreham Road, Warminster, BA12 9JP, (appeal reference APP/Y3940/W/16/3150774, dated 20 July 2017). The appeal concerned outline planning permission for up to 35 custom-build residential dwellings and was determined by the Secretary of State following an Inspector's report dated 14 September 2016.
11. The Inspector's decision contains repeated descriptions of Bishopstrow as a village and identifies its coherent physical form. The Inspector stated that **“Bishopstrow is a small and attractive village with pleasant cottages closely fronting the road.”**, stating that the village has a notably linear format. The Inspector also referred to the “main ribbon of housing in Bishopstrow” and identified the River Wylye and the open countryside beyond it as providing separation between the appeal site and Bishopstrow.
12. Although the appeal decision predates the August 2026 NPPF, it provides helpful context that Bishopstrow has previously been identified by an Inspector and the Secretary of State (who did not disagree with the Inspector) as a village and not a hamlet or a scattered group of houses. Therefore, Bishopstrow should be considered a settlement for the purposes of Policy S4 and this planning application should be approved on the basis that the proposals will deliver sustainable development that will provide a significant number of planning benefits as set out in Section 16 of the Planning Statement. In addition, that as outlined in Section 9 of the Planning Statement, the scheme has been carefully designed to ensure that there will not be adverse effects when assessed against the other NPPF policies.
13. As set out in Section 13 of the Planning Statement detailed consideration has been given to the potential impact of the scheme on residential amenity and a detailed Operational Management Statement is submitted in support of this application which sets out how the site will be managed during the operational phase.
14. In accordance with part 2 a) the scheme will not result in the change of use of allocated or safeguarded land or buildings for

particular uses in the Wiltshire Development Plan. In addition, the site does not fall within any of the designations set out in part 2 a. part ii) or part b. of the policy and therefore is acceptable. Finally, the proposals comply with the remaining national decision-making policies set out in the NPPF in accordance with part 2 c) of the policy.

15. In addition, Policy E4 continues to support the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings to provide for sustainable business growth in rural areas expressly stating that rural facilities that support leisure and tourism are also supported.
16. In conclusion, the introduction of Policy S4 provides in principle support for the proposals and sets out additional national planning policy support for the approval of these planning and listed building consent applications on the basis of the location of the site within a village. This will in turn facilitate the delivery of significant social, economic and environmental benefits. The proposal will secure the viable, long-term re-use of a vacant heritage asset; provide high-quality short-stay visitor accommodation; support the rural economy; create employment and generate expenditure within local businesses in accordance with the conclusions set out in the Planning Statement.
17. Therefore, in accordance with Policy S3 part 1 a) as the proposal is within a settlement, there is a presumption in favour of the grant of planning permission.

Heritage Considerations

18. The changes in the NPPF August 2026 introduce new heritage Policies HE4, HE5 and HE6 which condense and slightly reword the previous approach to development proposals that impact on heritage assets.
19. These changes do not require the reassessment of the significance of Eastleigh Court or the reassessment of the impact of the proposals on the heritage asset that is set out within Chapter 10 of the Planning Statement and the Heritage Impact Assessment ("HIA"). Read together, the policies place emphasis on identifying and understanding significance; securing development which preserves or enhances heritage assets and their settings, giving great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets as set out in the 2024 NPPF. The policies do not alter the statutory duties under sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Rather, they provide a clearer national policy framework through which the conclusions already reached in the Planning Statement and HIA should be considered.
20. The requirements of Policy HE4 and HE5 are met through the submitted HIA, which provides a detailed and proportionate assessment of the significance of Eastleigh Court. The significance of the landscape around the Court is also assessed along with the wider Bishopstrow Conservation Area. The assessment identifies the relevant designated heritage assets as the Grade II listed Eastleigh Court and the Bishopstrow Conservation Area. The requirement to consider the impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings is also identified.
21. The HIA explains that Eastleigh Court has experienced repeated alterations, additions, demolitions and changes of use during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The assessment identifies that the surviving significance derives particularly from the Court's remaining architectural quality, detailing, historic plan form, landscape setting and its legibility as a nineteenth-century gentleman's residence. The HIA also identifies less successful later interventions, including the existing flat-roofed extension, the erection of the former-garage and the utilitarian character of the northern parking area. This assessment of significance then directly informs the proposed conservation-led approach to the proposals, including the carefully considered internal interventions to the Court, including the removal of detracting fabric and repair works. The comprehensive landscape strategy is also discussed.
22. In accordance with part 1a) of Policy HE4, the proposals will secure a long-term viable use consistent with Eastleigh Court's conservation. Furthermore, as set out in part 1b) will minimise any harm to the significance of the Estate. In accordance with part 2 of Policy HE4, the HIA and Planning Statement set out the justification for the proposals in the context of the significant public benefits that would be delivered.
23. Policy HE5 amends the previously established approach to heritage harm, removing the term "less than substantial harm" and simply referring to harm or substantial harm. The approach taken to the assessment of level of harm and the policy requirements where harm is found, remains consistent with the approach set out in the 2024 NPPF, albeit written in a policy format.
24. The submitted assessment of significance set out in the HIA and Planning Statement remain consistent with the

requirements of Policy HE5.

25. In accordance with Policy HE6 the applications will secure the long-term conservation, enhancement and viable re-use of Eastleigh Court in a manner commensurate with its significance. As set out in Chapter 10 of the Planning Statement, the application will bring the Grade II listed building from an underused former office function into high-quality short-stay accommodation use, while restoring its residential character and allowing its principal rooms to be appreciated as reception rooms and bedrooms rather than institutional office space. This represents a use consistent with the building's historic function, scale and status, and will secure ongoing investment in its repair, maintenance and long-term custodianship.
26. In compliance with Policy HE6, the HIA confirms that the proposed internal alterations have been kept to the minimum necessary to facilitate the proposed use. The HIA identifies heritage benefits including:
- The removal of the modern kitchen from a principal ground-floor room and its reinstatement as a reception space;
 - The removal of the poor-quality 1990s single-storey extension and its replacement with a higher-quality and more sympathetic contemporary extension;
 - The replacement of the detracting former-garage lintel and window arrangement with a more appropriately proportioned and detailed opening;
 - The removal of the unsympathetic fire barrier at the head of the principal staircase, thereby reinstating its sense of space and grandeur;
 - The replacement of conspicuous modern rooflights with conservation-style rooflights, together with previously approved dormers better related to the building's architectural character; and
 - The retention, repair and incorporation of surviving historic features, including coving, fireplaces and ceiling decoration, within a high-quality refurbishment.
27. The proposed Pavilion and landscape works also comply with the conservation objectives reflected in HE5. The HIA concludes that the Pavilion is deliberately subservient to the Court, is positioned so as not to disrupt key views towards or from it, and is located in an area that has been substantially altered over time, close to the former orangery location. The HIA states that the Pavilion's low-key, single-storey form, materials palette, planting and hedge treatment are intended to enable it to read as a garden structure rather than compete with the listed building. The HIA concludes that the building will make a complementary contribution to the Court's setting and preserve its special interest in accordance with the 2026 NPPF.
28. The HIA and Planning Statement state that the landscape proposals will reunite the Court with the former Stable Block and wider grounds, reinstate the legibility of the former long drive as a pedestrian route. The HIA also outlines that the landscaping proposals will introduce substantial new planting, restore a more layered and picturesque parkland character, and re-establish more filtered or glimpsed views towards the house. The HIA concludes that this investment will enhance the setting of Eastleigh Court and, consequently, the character and appearance of the Bishopstrow Conservation Area.
29. As detailed above, the HIA identifies, that there will inevitably be a limited degree of intervention to historic plan form, principally to accommodate bathrooms, services and the operational requirements of a viable modern use. Under the 2024 NPPF the HIA identified that the proposals could result in less than substantial harm. Now that the "less than substantial harm" or "substantial harm" categories has been amended
30. , and replaced with the category of "harm" or "substantial harm" the proposals are considered to fall with the general category of harm and do not constitute substantial harm as previously concluded. As such, the HIA assessment and conclusions remain valid albeit with a change in naming. The HIA concludes that the proposals will enhance the special interest of Eastleigh Court, the setting of nearby listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Bishopstrow Conservation Area. In addition, as set out in the HIA and Planning Statement, the proposals will deliver a number of planning benefits that will outweigh the level of identified harm in accordance with Policy HE6 part 4. As such the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policies HE4, HE5 and HE6 and the assessments set out in the HIA and the Planning Statement are still valid.

Summary

31. The 2026 NPPF changes published following the submission of these applications for planning permission and listed building consent have been reviewed and where required, additional assessment has been provided. In response to the changes set out in respect of Policy S4, Bishopstrow should be considered a village and therefore planning permission should be granted on the basis that the public benefits derived from the scheme are not substantially outweighed by any adverse effects from the development.
32. In addition, for the reasons set out above, the findings of the HIA and planning statement in respect of the heritage assets are still applicable and the scheme is considered to be in compliance with the criteria set out in the 2026 NPPF.

Appendix 1

Eastleigh Court and Former Eastleigh Court Stables NPPF Update Review Summary Table

This table sets out the NPPF 2025 references within the submission documents and identifies the relevant revised plan making policies within the new August 2026 NPPF.

Please note that the adopted December 2024 NPPF was amended with subsequent corrections in February 2025 and so is referred to in the Planning Statement as the February 2025 version.

Submission Document	Page / section	NPPF 2024 with corrections in 2025	Summary of Commentary	NPPF 2026 Policy	Impact on Submission Documents	Notes
Town Planning Statement	p. 19 Para 5.1	Paragraphs 40 42 and 44	In accordance with NPPF Paragraphs 40, 42 and 44, along with Wiltshire's Statement of Community Involvement (2020), this application is submitted following pre-application engagement with Wiltshire Council and the local community.	DM1	No change to conclusions	Pre-application engagement continues to be promoted.
Town Planning Statement	p. 29 Para 7.10	Paragraph 49	In line with Paragraph 49 of the NPPF, Local Planning Authorities ('LPAs') may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given)	DM4	No change to conclusions	The Wiltshire emerging Local Plan was withdrawn following the submission of the application.
Town Planning Statement	p. 45 Para 8.63	Paragraph 11	The scheme complies with the Development Plan and is supported by the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development.	S3 and S4	See Planning Statement Addendum	Change to the presumption in favour of sustainable development into a location-led framework which directs development to settlements as defined in Policy S4
Town Planning Statement	p. 46, Paras 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4	Section 12, Paragraph 131,135	Section 12 of the NPPF stresses the fundamental importance of high-quality, beautiful design in the pursuit of delivering sustainable development. The Planning Statement sets out how the scheme will deliver a high-quality design that will function well and add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development. That the scheme is visually attractive, sympathetic to the local character and context, and will maintain a strong sense of place and distinctiveness.	DP3	No change to conclusions	Objectives retained as a decision-making policy. Planning Statement includes justification for high-quality design of the works proposed to the Court, Pavilion and landscape.
Town Planning Statement	p. 52, para 9.31 p.66 para 11.3	Paragraph 189	The proposals have been designed to work with the historical landscape and surrounding context to deliver a scheme that is appropriate to and enhances the setting of the Cranborne Chase and the West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	N4	No change to conclusions	Objectives relevant to scheme still apply.
Town Planning Statement	p. 53 to 54, para 10.5 p.55 para 10.9	Paragraphs 207 and 208	Paragraph 207 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. Paragraph 208 highlights the need to identify and assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by a proposal, so as to avoid or minimise conflict between heritage conservation and	HE5	See Planning Statement Addendum	Approach retained with reworded text.

			the proposed development.			
Town Planning Statement	p. 54, para 10.5; p. 62, para 10.42 p. 61 para 10.39	Paragraph 210	In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.	HE6	See Planning Statement Addendum	Approach retained with focus remaining on viable reuse, heritage repair and economic-benefit case.
Town Planning Statement	p. 54, para 10.5; p. 61, para 10.39	Paragraph 215	Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm shall be weighed against the public benefits, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.	HE6	See Planning Statement Addendum	Rewording from less than substantial harm to harm
Town Planning Statement	p. 54, para 10.6; pp. 43 to 45	Paragraph 8	The scheme complies with the Development Plan and is supported by the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development.	S3, S4 and E4	See Planning Statement Addendum for more details	Location and thematic decision-making tests are more explicit and allow for in principle support for development in villages defined as settlements.
Town Planning Statement	p. 76 para 12.3	Chapter 9	Requires transport to be considered from the earliest stages of the development proposals, proposals should be located in sustainable locations, consider trip generation and parking as well as providing travel plans where appropriate.	TR3 TR4 and TR 6	No change to conclusions	Continued focus on sustainable transport prioritising public transport with travel plans promoted. Changes do not impact the scheme assessment conclusions.
Town Planning Statement	p. 87 para 14.1	Paragraph 181	When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. An FRA was submitted.	F4 F7 and F8	See Technical Note Addendum on Flood Risk and Drainage	The principles remains but are reorganised. FRA conclusions on flood zone, layout and residual risk remain.
Town Planning Statement	p. 69, para 11.21	Section 15 and paragraph 187	Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.	N2 and N3	No change to conclusions	Substantively retained. Approach to mitigation, enhancements and biodiversity net gain remain where relevant to this scheme.
Ecological Impact Assessment	p. 40 to 42, para 6.3	Paragraph 162	Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating and drought from rising temperatures.	CC2 and CC3	No change to conclusions	Previous plan-making wording reorganised. CC3 provides the current decision-making context for resilience, drainage, green infrastructure and tree planting. BNG policy requirement remains at 10% and is exceeded by the scheme as per the submission.
Ecological Impact Assessment	p. 41, para 6.3.3	Paragraph 182	Applications which could affect drainage on or around the site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, and which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal.	F8 and CC3	No change to conclusions	Substantively retained. Relevant to drainage strategy. No impact on the findings of the submitted

						drainage strategy or Ecological Impact Assessment findings.
Ecological Impact Assessment	p. 41, para 6.3.4	Section 15 and paragraph 187	Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.	N2 and N3	No change to conclusions	Substantively retained. Relevant to mitigation, enhancements and biodiversity net gain. Scheme addresses these requirements in existing Ecological Impact Assessment.
Ecological Impact Assessment	p. 41 to 42, para 6.3.5 to 6.3.8	Paragraphs 192 to 195	Require schemes to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, identify and pursue opportunities for habitat creation and measurable biodiversity net gain, safeguard ecological networks and wildlife corridors, and support the recovery of protected or priority species.	N2 and N3	No change to conclusions	Current Framework separates habitats-site, designated-site and biodiversity policies. Apply specialist ecology evidence with statutory duties and current policies.
Energy and Sustainability Statement	p. 3 to 4; section 2 p 9 para 5.1 P12 para 5.3.6 P 17 para 5.5.3	No specific paragraph	NPPF requires the planning system to support the transition to net zero by 2050, reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, improve resilience to climate impacts and support renewable and low-carbon energy; it also requires climate-change mitigation and adaptation to be considered when preparing and assessing planning applications.	CC2 and CC3	No change to conclusions	The same approach and sentiments are taken forward with a focus on renewables, low carbon energy and electrical network infrastructure.
Flood Risk and Outline Drainage Strategy	p. 1, introduction	Paragraph 181	When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment.	F4 and F7	See Technical Note Addendum on Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy	Flood Risk and Outline Drainage Strategy was submitted with the application.
Flood Risk and Outline Drainage Strategy	p. 1, introduction	Paragraph 182	Applications which could affect drainage on or around the site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, and which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal.	F8	See Technical Note Addendum on Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy	Substantively retained. Current wording requires proportionate SuDS and encourages water-quality, biodiversity and amenity benefits.
Flood Risk and Outline Drainage Strategy	pp. 17 to 19, para 5	Annex 3; Sequential and Exception Tests	The NPPF requires that all development be sequential tested to steer new development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding, Flood Zone 1.	F7 Annex F	See Technical Note Addendum on Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy	See Technical Note
Heritage Impact Assessment	pp. 30 to 31, para 4.63 to 4.65	Paragraph 207	A description and analysis of the significance of the site and its heritage context is provided, as required by Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	HE5	See Planning Statement Addendum	Approach retained with reworded text.
Heritage Impact Assessment	p. 30, para 4.64	Paragraph 210	The proposals strike the right balance between sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and bringing the Court back into a viable use consistent with its conservation.	HE6	See Planning Statement Addendum	Approach retained with focus remaining on viable reuse, heritage repair and economic-benefit case.
Heritage Impact Assessment	pp. 30 to 31, para 4.65	Paragraphs 214 and 215	The proposed scheme complies with paragraph 214 of the NPPF; it does not lead to substantial harm to or the total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset. It also complies with Paragraph 215.	HE6	See Planning Statement Addendum	Approach retained with focus remaining on viable reuse, heritage repair and economic-benefit case.

Socio-economic Assessment	pp. 18 to 19, para 4.2 and 4.3	General themes with no specific policy references	The NPPF places significant weight on supporting economic growth, including in rural areas, recognising the importance of creating conditions in which businesses can adapt, expand and diversify in response to changing market conditions.	E4	No change to conclusions	Continues to support sustainable growth of businesses in rural areas both through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings with specific reference to supporting rural leisure and tourist facilities.
Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Archaeology Assessment	p. 3 Para 2.3	212	Heritage assets are defined in the NPPF glossary as any designated or undesignated element of the historic environment which is identified as being of such significance that it is a material consideration in the planning process. In determining applications which cause harm to heritage assets directly, or indirectly, through affecting a complementary setting, the NPPF recommends that 'great weight' be given to their conservation when reaching a planning decision.	HE6	No change to conclusions	The approach to archaeology remains consistent with the 2026 NPPF.
Archaeology Assessment	p. 5 para 2.4	213	It is noted that any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. It notes that 'substantial harm' to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including scheduled monuments, should be wholly exceptional (Paragraph 213). The paragraph also includes a footnote clarifying that non-scheduled archaeological sites which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.	HE6	No change to conclusions	The approach to archaeology remains consistent with the 2026 NPPF.
Archaeology Assessment	p. 5 para 2.5	215 and 216	Paragraph 215 clarifies that, where a development proposal will lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Paragraph 216 notes that effects on the significance of non-designated heritage assets, which includes most significant archaeological remains, require a '...balanced judgement....., having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'	HE6	No change to conclusions	The approach to archaeology remains consistent with the 2026 NPPF.
Archaeology Assessment	p. 3 para 2.6	218	Where heritage assets are to be lost, Paragraph 218 confirms that an appropriate record of the elements to be lost should be provided and both disseminated and archived by the developer.	HE6	No change to conclusions	The approach to archaeology remains consistent with the 2026 NPPF.
Phosphate Neutrality Statement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Operational	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Management Statement						
Planning Noise Assessment	p. 5 para 2.1	Paragraphs 187 and 198	Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on unacceptable noise pollution to minimise adverse noise effects from new development, avoid significant harm to health and quality of life, and protect valued tranquil areas.	N2 and N3	See Memo from Hepworth Acoustics	Consistent in approach towards noise with continued focus on protecting the amenity of existing and future occupiers.
Planning Noise Assessment	p. 11 para 6.1	General	The NPPF provides some general guidance to local authorities on taking noise into account in planning policies and decisions. This includes guidance that local authorities should 'aim to avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development'. However, there is no specific guidance on how to conduct an acoustic assessment or design criteria relevant to this development provided in the NPPF, nor British Standards.	P3 and P4	See Memo from Hepworth Acoustics	As above
Statement of Community Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Design and Access Statement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Draft Construction Management Plan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Transport Assessment	p. 7 and 8 para	Chapter 9 Para 109, 115, 116, 117 and 118	Requires transport to be considered from the earliest stages of the development proposals. That proposals should be located in sustainable locations, consider trip generation, highway safety, use of public transport and parking as well as providing travel plans where appropriate.	TR3 TR4 and TR 6	No change to conclusions	Continued focus on sustainable transport prioritising public transport with travel plans promoted. Changes do not impact the scheme assessment conclusions.
Transport Assessment	p. 7 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4	Page 5	Emphasis on sustainable development which is summarised as 'meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'	Para 15	Sustainable development is to be achieved through managing the use and development of land in the long-term public interest. This is a rewording with the same goal that does not impact on the conclusions of the assessment.	Strong emphasis on sustainable development is retained.
Transport Assessment	p.16 para 3.5.12	General	Statement that there are no specific recommended maximum cycle distances for access to services / leisure facilities stated within the NPPF.	N/A	N/A	There is still no prescribed maximum cycling distance to services and facilities.
Draft Travel Plan	p.11 para 2.3.12	General	Statement that there are no specific recommended maximum cycle distances for access to services / leisure facilities stated within the NPPF.	N/A	N/A	There is still no prescribed maximum cycling distance to services and facilities.
Landscape Statement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A