

Objections to Planning Application PL/2025/08109

1. Initial Comments

We are shocked and dismayed to receive notice of proposed further development of “garage/workshop/Office Building” at 8 Long Leaze, Nettleton (**PL/2025/08109**)

Approval of the erection of the new building was granted on 12 August 2022 (application reference PL2022/02008) **with conditions**.

Of the listed conditions, condition 6 and 8 are repeated here:-

*“Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended by any Order revoking or reenacting or amending that Order with or without modification), the garage(s) hereby permitted **shall not be converted to habitable accommodation**.”*

Condition 6, emphasis added.

“The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling, known as 8 Long Leaze, and it shall remain within the same planning unit as the main dwelling.

*REASON: The additional accommodation is sited in a position where the Local Planning Authority, having regard to the reasonable standards of residential amenity, access, and planning policies pertaining to the area, **would not permit a wholly separate dwelling**”.*

Condition 8, emphasis added

When this present application (PL2025/08109) was made, the “garage/workshop/Office Building” had NOT been completed. This can be seen from Fig. 8 which, despite trying to only show a clad gable end of the property, clearly shows the front elevation where cladding was not finished. No cladding has been applied to the rear of the building either.

Furthermore, the conditions set out in the original granted permission (PL2022/02008) have also not been completed. For example, condition 5 states that *“No later than one month after the first occupation of the development, the sole means of vehicular and pedestrian access to the development shall be as shown on the plans hereby approved”*. This has not happened.

In fact, the new ‘Application for Planning Permission’ dated 9 October 2025 (Portal ref: PP-14364137) asks the question “Is a new or altered vehicular access proposed to or from the public highway?” The Applicant’s have answer this as “NO”. However, the answer is “YES” as the condition of the original planning permission is that the access is “Stopped up” (see condition 5 of the granted planning permission) – so new access is needed: It is a complete change from the original granted permissions.

The proposal stated in the Design and Access Statement is “*Conversion of garage to Annex*”. This statement is completely misleading. The current building is **NOT** a garage and has **NEVER** been used as a garage, and quite possibly **could not** be used as a garage given a significant reduction of the doors compared to the approved plans.

Instead, work has already commenced to fit the interior for habitable accommodation contrary to the original planning permission granted. The ‘Application for Planning Permission’ (Portal ref: PP-14364137) dated 9 October 2025 asks the question “Has the work or change of use already started?”. The Applicant answers this question with “No”.

If this was true, why is a permanent staircase in line with the drawings submitted in the current application (see Fig. 7) already in situ and built prior to the exterior doors being completed?

2. Misleading and Major Discrepancies in the drawings

There are confusing, misleading and significant discrepancies in the elevation drawings between (i) the approved permission; (ii) the new application; (iii) the actual building as it currently stands.

2.1 The “front” elevation in the approved drawings (PL2022/02008 – 09 revision C dated July 22) is called “North-West elevation”. Picture copied below



2.2 The “front” elevation in the new application (PL2025/08109) (also copied below), is now referred to as a “South-West Elevation”. However, apart from the obvious discrepancy in which elevation we are referring to, it looks identical to the approved elevation from the original application (PL2022/02008).



2.3 The same elevation is now shown in the below photograph:



It is immediately apparent that the garage doors (and side window) are on a completely different scale to the ones shown in the original approved plans (PL2022/02008) and in the current application (PL2025/08109). The “workshop” door is also not per the plan.

Accordingly, the elevations represented in the current application are **NOT** representative of the actual current building proposed for conversion.

Surely, it is fundamental that any application for planning permission accurately reflects the structure of the building to be converted as it currently stands – not as it should have looked if the original approved plans had been followed. The present application (PL2025/08109) provides drawings that do not represent the current building. This is very misleading.

The height and width of the exterior garage doors is significantly reduced compared to the originally approved plans suggesting that the interior upper floor level has been lowered for the purpose of providing living accommodation and that conversion into living accommodation is already underway and was intended from the outset.

The original approved application (PL/2022/02008) stated that the building would be a garage with workshop and storage area. However, as mentioned above, during the construction of the building, the staircase (as shown in Fig. 7 of the present application) has been installed. This has made the space unsuitable to accommodate 2 cars despite this being stated in the original application as being the intended purpose.

Furthermore, the width of the garage doors (which are now inset and therefore with reduced opening, and nothing beyond 90°) appear unsuitable for car access. Accordingly, not only is the current building **NOT** being used as a garage, it **CANNOT** be used as such for the 2 cars as stated and was not built for that purpose.

It is clear that this new application for planning permission does not relate to any “conversion” or “change of use” as implied in the summary section of the application, but to a **CONTINUATION** of building works to provide a standalone residential property, contrary to the originally stipulated conditions and completely against the legitimate expectations of the neighbours.

3. Cited Precedents

The precedents cited in section 3.2 of the Design and Access statement are **NOT** relevant to the present case. Both relate to pre-existing structures that had been used for many years for their original purpose. Contrary to the current building, these cases relate to the conversion of one type of building to another type of building with a different purpose.

20/10457/FUL related to a garage that had been used as a garage for many years before the application for conversion to an annex was made.

PL2022/00187 relates to stables that were used as stables for many years before the application to demolish and change of use was made.

In contrast, the present application relates to a building that is **NOT** being used as a garage but one that is in the process of becoming a standalone residential property, contrary to the legitimate expectations of the neighbours and in breach of the conditions stipulated in the original granted permissions.

In sum, it is clear that this new application is **NOT** for “change of use” or, as put in the document title, “*a conversion of a garage to an annex*” - it is an application for retrospective consent for work that is already underway to build a stand-alone residential dwelling.

4. Reasons provided by the Applicant for the changes

We are strongly opposed to any change to the original granted planning permission, and in particular any change to the conditions stipulated therein. The reasons stated by the Applicant for this second request, while very sad, are not relevant to the merits of the application which we know will be considered by Wiltshire Council in line with the following;

- The visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area

- To ensure that adequate provision is maintained for parking in the interests of highway safety and amenity
- To safeguard the character and appearance of the area
- Having regard to the reasonable standards of residential amenity, access, and planning policies pertaining to the area.

The reason put forward by the Applicant in the current application is to provide living accommodation for “*end of life care for disabled relative*”. However, this provision could in fact be achieved by the Applicant’s present dwelling. For example, the Applicant recently (2023) extended the existing property to include a large garden room. This has similar floor space to the proposed bedroom in the plans and therefore could easily accommodate a medical bed and any equipment required. The room has immediate access to hard-standing outside through large glass doors. With a wheel-chair ramp in place this would provide easy access. The current dwelling also has a downstairs toilet and shower facilities (same as proposed in the new building). If a full-time, live-in carer was required, this could be temporarily provided for in the current upstairs four-bedroom, two-bathroom property.

This alternative solution is immediately available, would use existing utilities (drainage, water, heating etc) and does not require building a new residential property against the stated conditions in the original planning permissions.

5. Setting of a Precedent

As stated above, the original granted permissions (PL/2022/02008) stated that the building ***shall not be converted to habitable accommodation*** (see condition 6).

The only thing that has changed since that original application is that the new application states that the building will be for the purpose of accommodating “*end of life care for a disabled relative*”.

None of the reasons behind the original decision to not allow habitable accommodation have changed. Accordingly, if permissions were to be granted, this would be based **solely on the purpose stated in the new application**. One can immediately see the precedent this would set and how it could be open to abuse in the future.

Any application in the future for conversion of a shed/garage etc (brown field site) could be accompanied with the statement that the accommodation is for a sick/disabled relative. As there is no actual requirement that such a relative live in the intended property or indeed that this was ever the intention, it is a reason that could be easily cited in any application if it was felt it would help gain permission to build a residential dwelling.

Accordingly, while we are in no way questioning the legitimacy of the present application, one could see how such a precedent would be open to abuse.

We sympathise with the Applicant's stated reasons for the application. However, these reasons should not override the carefully considered decision in PL/2022/02008 which stated that the building ***shall not be converted to habitable accommodation*** (see condition 6).

In this case, as mentioned above, a suitable alternative solution already exists in the Applicant's current dwelling.

6. Specific Objections

Our objections to the subject building were submitted in response to the original application and copied again here (see ANNEX). However, we have also provided additional comments below for why we object to the building of a standalone residential dwelling.

6.1 Location

The current building is not positioned as reflected on the approved plans. The orientation and location of the proposed carparking (for "3+ cars") is close to the boundary of "Park View Cottage" leading to detriment and loss of amenity for both Park View and Codrington House as the access drive in the original application was to be closed.

6.2 Window looking into Codrington House

The current application proposes a new window on the South-West elevation which would look directly into bedrooms of Codrington House. We object to having a window so close overlooking our property.

6.3 Drainage and utilities

The current application states that foul sewage will be disposed of via "Mains sewer".

Nettleton is not on a Mains Sewer. Accordingly, this statement is misleading and needs to be clarified.

It is our understanding that Long Leaze has a community treatment plant which was designed for the original 8 properties and no more. The new proposed standalone residential building would constitute a 12.5% increase in the capacity required for the common treatment plant.

It is further our understanding that the Community treatment plant is owned and managed by "Green Square Housing Association." It needs to be clarified whether it is even possible for a new property to be included with respect to (i) permissions, (i) capacity of existing system, and (iii) connection means.

For example, are connection means already in situ within the existing building proposed for conversion?

6.4 Increase Traffic

In addition to the objections raised above relating to the position of the proposed carpark, we have serious concerns over yet another change to the proposed access for cars.

In the original application (PL/2022/02008), the new driveway (former application N/12/00519/FUL – 2012) was stated to be the only access to the property. The access to the original garage building (as part of a stated condition in the approval) was to be closed.

However, the new application states that “new or altered vehicular access proposed to or from the public highway” is NOT required. This again is misleading.

The opening and closing of different driveways, within increased numbers of cars, onto this quiet, single lane, village road – with lack of visibility either way – is contrary to highway safety.

The current proposal will lead to detriment and loss of amenity for both Park View and Codrington House, whereas the Applicant’s property significantly benefits as parking is moved to the side of their property.

ANNEX – Comments submitted against original application PL/2022/02008

I am writing to register my and my wife's objection to the main part ie the Garage/offices and workshop element of this planning application. We have no objection to the proposed replacement of the exiting conservatory with a slightly larger extension attached to the main house.

Grounds for objection

Damage to historical setting and listed buildings unique association.

Nettleton village is set within an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and this location uniquely has three linked Grade II listed buildings directly affected by the proposal. All three buildings Codrington House, Boxheart Cottage and Park View can clearly be seen together and in context from the road, maintaining an association that has stood for over 250 years as they all formed an original smallholding back in the 18th century. The introduction of a 6m high, 7m wide and 11m long 21st century building in the proposed location breaks that continuity and significantly reduces the historical value that such a rare surviving example of historically linked properties provides.

The heritage impact assessment submitted in the application does not accurately reflect the setting and the negative impacts the proposal would have on it and also does not acknowledge that the existing 2.1m high garages will be replaced by a 6m high 7m wide elevation. This will have a major negative impact on the views of the countryside towards Manor Farm currently enjoyed from the three bedrooms on that side of the first floor of Codrington house, views which have stood uninterrupted for nearly three centuries.
Scale of proposed building and building use

The proposed stand-alone building is not only extremely large given its main purpose as a two car garage (the largest of the buildings it is planned to replace) it is also out of proportion to the other 8 main dwellings on the Long Leaze estate with its footprint being in excess of 150% of the other 7 houses*. This makes it vastly out of proportion to the other modern buildings in the immediate vicinity.

There are also reasonable concerns that its design, scale and facilities are very similar to those of a house rather than a garage with work shed and office. The application form refers to foul sewage being disposed of via a septic tank so it is not unreasonable to question why toilet facilities would be required if it is not intended to become used for residential purposes at some point. Our concerns are validated by what occurred when a similar application in West Kington at Plough Cottage took place. The approved garage, office and storage stand alone building had the garage doors/bays replaced with windows, a bathroom and kitchen put into the upstairs office/storage area and became a separate residential annexe to the main dwelling. This all took place without prior planning permission being granted and if it had been contained within the original application would almost certainly have been refused. Notwithstanding the objections above, the plot of land in question could support a linear development of normal single storey low level roof height (3.5m max) alongside the field boundary. Within this a two car garage, office space and workshop could then be accommodated without the negative impacts associated with the current application. Such a

development would also address the grave concerns that the owners of Park View have with regards to the proximity of the planned scale and location of a 6m high, 11m deep building; which would effectively cut off the entire left-hand side of their property and loom over the three small windows that run down that side of their house.

*The footprint of the applicants own house No 8 Long Leaze estate (which has been extended) is only slightly larger than the footprint of the proposed garage replacement itself.