

Comments on application PL/2025/08109 by R and E Goodman, Park View

We believe this application should be refused. Our reasons are explained in the following comments.

Errors in the statements made in the application

“The garage has minimal impact on the setting of surrounding heritage assets.”

This is factually incorrect. The building has been erected in the wrong place, too close to our property, Park View (a Grade 2 listed building), and in contravention of the existing planning approval. The plans submitted with the original application already had greater than minimal impact on the setting of surrounding heritage assets and the incorrect and unapproved positioning of the new building has resulted in substantially increased intrusion and impact, including significant loss of natural light inside our property. (photo)



4.2 includes the conversion of a portion of the loft store space to carer accommodation, which includes a bedroom and bathroom.

The original 2022 planning approval stipulated: **“It is acknowledged that there is domestic storage included at first floor level, although this is entirely within the pitched roof structure and is not suitable for habitable accommodation.”**

It is clear that either the original permitted plans were followed in which case the current application is not possible without major internal alterations to the suspended floor height, or the permitted plans were not followed and are in breach of the planning approval conditions. It simply cannot be both!

“4.4 In respect to the neighbouring residents and the character of the area, the footprint, front and side elevations would remain unchanged...”

The bin storage enclosure shown on the plans constitutes a change in the footprint of the building. Whilst in principle this appears trivial, in trying to hide the bins from the applicant’s view, their position is in close proximity of our main residence, i.e. Because the applicants do not want to look at

their own bins, they intend to place them where we would. The building is already too close to our property and the proposed bin storage area will make it closer still.

“4.8 The access to the property will remain the same.”

This statement is factually incorrect. It will not remain the same because the original approval was given on the condition that the access was to be stopped up. This means a new request is required to use this access. Again, this is a breach of the conditions on which the original permission was granted by the authority. This is illustrated in the original planning approval documents: **“...the applicant proposes to close up the vehicle access for the existing garage building, further assisting in enclosing the building within the confines of the application site.”**

“4.9 The proposed parking arrangements have been illustrated on the plans, showing 3 parking places along with a turning area.”

This is of great concern to us. The indiscriminate use of construction machinery used over the past year has caused substantial damage to our boundary wall of a grade 2 listed building (photo). As far as we are aware this wall has survived intact for centuries but is now collapsing. The chosen position for car parking by the applicants will apply further ground loading next to the wall, which will accelerate the destruction of our wall. It is important to be aware that the ground level on 8 Long Leaze's side is approximately 0.3 meters higher than the external ground surface on Park View's side.



The original intention of the applicants was to erect the new building against this boundary wall, thereby entirely obscuring the rear ground floor windows of our property, cutting out much of the natural light entering those rooms. This intention was rightly refused. However the new application has vehicles parked immediately outside our rear windows on ground that is 0.5 metres higher than our internal floor level. Once again our right to light and privacy will be significantly diminished.

The original 2022 planning permission documents state:

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

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision is maintained for parking in the interests of highway safety and amenity.”

No highway safety and/or amenity changes have occurred during the period since the original planning permission was granted only three years ago. Therefore, this condition to the original planning permission stipulated by the planning authority remains entirely valid and should be enforced.

“6.1 Provides essential, life-enhancing accommodation for a terminally ill patient and visiting carers.”

If it is essential to move the person in question from their existing accommodation, they could and would better be housed within the main residence of 8 Long Leaze, which has been extended multiple times and readily exhibits sufficient space and amenities for this purpose.

“Has the work already started? Answer: No”

This answer is factually incorrect. The internal staircase has already been installed. The vehicle access has not been stopped up. The cladding on the entire north east elevation has not been fitted. (Photo taken on 11/11/25). It appears likely that other work has been carried out internally to create upstairs living space in contravention of the original planning permission and this is evidenced by the fact that the existing front elevation does not adhere to the original plans.



“Are there trees or hedges on the proposed development site? Answer: No”

This answer is factually incorrect. A hedgerow is present (continuous linear planting approx. 1.5 metres high along the entire length of Park View’s main residence) along the boundary between 8 Long Leaze and Park View (photo). This hedgerow allows the passage of natural light but affords us some privacy from the elevated land of 8 Long Leaze that is only three metres away from our ground floor windows.

This hedgerow is not shown on the plans for this application and it therefore appears that the applicant’s intention is to remove it as part of the development. This will increase the impact of the development on the setting of surrounding heritage assets, including the natural environment, as well as further diminishing our privacy.



“Please state how foul sewage is to be disposed of: Answer: Mains sewer”

There are no mains sewers in Nettleton.

“Are there any existing employees on the site or will the proposed development increase or decrease the number of employees? Answer: No”

This answer is likely incorrect. The application refers to full time carers, which are likely to be paid employees.

The original 2022 planning approval for this building stated:

“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.”

No relevant changes have occurred in respect of the reasonable standards of residential amenity, access, and planning policies pertaining to the area during the period since the original planning permission was granted by the authority only three years ago. Therefore, the above authoritative statement remains entirely valid and should be enforced.

Additional Points

1. It appears likely to us, and other residents of the village that the applicant’s intention was, from the first application, to build a house rather than just a double garage. Our opinions in respect of this matter are evidenced by:
 - The initial proposed positioning of the building (which was refused).
 - The 6 metre height of the building which, although barely within the legal maximum height defined as single storey, is far higher than would be required for a garage.
 - The concrete base was incorrectly positioned in 2023, allowing for pedestrian access to the rear of the building should doors in the rear elevation ever be fitted in the future.
 - The deviation from the approved front elevation drawing, with impractical shorter inset garage doors.
 - The installation of a permanent staircase rendering one of the garage spaces unusable.
 - The unfinished cladding on the rear of the building.
2. We would expect Wiltshire County Council to take appropriate enforcement action in respect of the breaches of the existing planning permission to build a garage, prior to considering the new application for change of use.
3. Should the new application be granted, we would consider seeking planning permission to build a two storey accommodation building within our grounds [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Our application would be almost identical to that of our neighbour, apart from the fact that our new building would not have the same privacy infringement concerns on neighbouring properties. We would also expect that, such a suspension of Wiltshire planning policy would lead to many other residents in the area doing the same.

In summary, it is our opinion that this application should be refused.

- It is not necessary; the applicants have an alternative and better solution available to them.
- The building is currently in breach of the 2022 planning approval conditions.
- The privacy of both Codrington House and Park View would be further compromised.
- Further damage would be inflicted on Park View’s boundary wall and our already low internal light levels would be further reduced.
- It fundamentally contradicts the intentions of the 2022 planning decision, expressly laid out in the approval documents.

