

Development Serviceseb
Wiltshire Council
developmentmanagement@wiltshire.gov.uk

December 2025

References:

- A. Planning Application PL/2025/08707 dated 12 Feb 26.
- B. Planning Application PL/2025/08707 dated 24 Nov 25.
- C. Planning Application PL/2021/04262.
- D. HBAS 18423/RJH dated 12 Feb 26.

Dear Sir/Madam

1. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I strongly object to the proposal contained in PL/2025/08707. This proposal is the third I have seen regarding Tisbury Motors. The first, Reference C, may have been considered favourably by the local authority¹, but it is clear that it received several negative comments regarding the design, building shape and layout and followed by an unsupportive Parish Council Meeting, the application was withdrawn by the client to avoid refusal. Whilst the updated plans to Reference A do address some of the comments raised in Reference B, reducing its footprint to some degree, its impact on its neighbours is still an issue. From my perspective this proposal does not address some key issues, and I wish to make a number of concise and straightforward comments and observations, the key point are:

- a. **Accuracy.** Reference A still proposes eight houses when it is clear from reference D that only seven houses are proposed.
- b. **Health and Safety.** The proposal still presents several dangers to current and future residents, construction workers and others.
 - i. Given the fact that the lane represents the only access route (vehicle and pedestrian, there is a requirement to maintain access, including the demolition and build phases, leaves residents and their properties at risk. Access for emergency services, council services, carers and residents is essential and must be maintained. Whilst the segment of the road is Private the residents have access rights. This is still not acknowledged in the documentation.
 - ii. The large Leylandii, which is in part supported by a wall which appears to have been removed in the plans, needs to be checked so that it does not fall, particularly

¹ It is not clear which local authority.

during demolition, construction and high winds. It is a danger to construction workers and residents alike and could block the lane stranding those above it.

- iii. The volume of traffic on the very narrow lane will still increase. There is no passing place and a blind corner: the latest plan does not address this issue. In addition, the inclusion of flowerbeds at the bottom of the lane will cause vehicles to reverse into the High Street and get in the way of emergency services.

c. **The application.**

- i. The private lane's reflects the garages use but does not reflect resident's usage.
- ii. The new plan has not been adjusted to regarding the direct and peripheral views over the site. The consultation has not taken this into account the Resident of Orchard Lea and, given the visual impact of the upper levels, should also include the residents of Weavers Road, Vicarage Cottage and Churchill Road, who all have an interest.
- iii. The new plan is more intrusive on residents' amenities, it is not less intrusive.
- iv. The amount of traffic will increase not decrease.
- v. There is no mention of the removal of the current car park wall.
- vi. The water run-off has not been adjusted to the new plan.
- vii. No consideration is given to the provision and space used by utilities and refuse receptacles, or their visual impact.

- d. **Overdevelopment.** The new plan is overcrowding the site. It's predecessor (Reference C), was less intrusive and had a suitable parking area, the one currently in use. The planned site is overcrowded in terms of: the size of the lane, the manoeuvre space associated with parking plan, the provision for sighting oil or gas supplies, water, sewerage and electricity.

2. **Detailed Comments.** My comments and observations expand on the key points noted above.

- a. **Understanding the Impact of The Works.** The private lane on the north side, which is owned by the garage, is a dead end and provides the only vehicular and pedestrian access to: Phoenix Cottage, Little Court, Lawn Cottage, Orchard Lea and Vale View, and parking for Cleveland House.

- i. It is unclear to me how a project of this scale can be managed effectively whilst maintaining that access on a very narrow lane given the requirements for demolition and build. I am concerned that both the demolition of the garage and construction of the proposed properties will disregard the access requirements of the households that are completely reliant for vehicular and pedestrian access, on the very narrow lane. There is no other way for the owners, emergency services (Health and Safety), carers, the postman, deliveries, friends etc, to access the properties at the top of the lane. The access to the properties above the site must be maintained 24/7.

- ii. Lawn Cottage is included in Para 3 which describes a group of houses and associated garages. The private lane's use is described as primarily servicing the parking area. I would disagree with this description. I personally use the lane on a

daily basis at least once by vehicle and, more than twice as a pedestrian. There are at least three deliveries to our house a week, Wiltshire Council uses the lane weekly, and the Post Office delivers Monday to Saturday. Assuming the 6 properties have similar requirements, this represents at least 136 two-way journeys.

- iii. The same Paragraph states that none of the properties have direct views over the site. Whilst this is true of the current construction and carpark it will not be true if the proposed construction is built with the middle and upper buildings having a significant negative visual impact, from both direct and peripheral perspectives, and will result in overlook, noise, disturbance and nuisance, and loss of privacy.
- iv. Para 5 describes the rear of the site and two blocks of houses (a semidetached pair and three cottages). The adjusted plan sees 4 housing, It asserts that this will remove an intrusive industrial business, which is arguable. The industrial business is a valued amenity and provides jobs for local people.
- v. Para 10. States that the amount of traffic will be reduced. Whilst I have only lived here for two years, I meet the 6 residents who use the lane and traffic associated with them (postman etc), more often than traffic related to the garage. The addition of another 4 household on the lane with an unrealisable 9 car parking spaces (as shown in the proposed upper block and middle block diagrams with only one visitor parking slot). The key points are as follows:

- 1. The adjusted plan now takes into account the width of the lane which is 3.28 and the recommended manoeuvring space at 6 meters – thank you.
- 2. The reduction to 1 visitor space for all 4 properties will be an inconvenience to the residents of the new properties and increase the number of cars parking on the high street which will replace the current ancillary parking problems that is mentioned.
- 3. The entrance to the current car park is regularly used as a passing bay. The absence of this will create a situation where vehicles will be required to reverse onto the high street and or use the limited space at the top of the lane which is already congested. This can be mitigated, to some extent, by the removal of the proposed flowerbed at the bottom of the lane.
- 4. A passing place should be enabled.

vi. Para 11.

- 1. The new houses at the top of the proposed development, behind the garage, remove an unoffensive gravel carpark and replace them with intrusive two story buildings which will destroy the main landscape features.
- 2. The road is not busy and reducing traffic movements will have a negative impact on local businesses who have not, as far as I know been consulted.
- 3. The proposal will increase traffic on the lane not reduce it.

b. The Conservation Area document describes the Tisbury motors site as at odds with the character of this part of the village. Whilst that may be argued, the site has been an important amenity dating back to 1886 and was a garage in the 1930s: it precedes the Methodist Chapel and the Victoria Hall. The closure of the garage will mean that local people, who use the garage's business will have to find resources elsewhere which will

have an environmental and financial impact on residents. The reduction in traffic may also have an effect on local businesses who have not, as far as I can see, been consulted. I should also add that the loss of the garage will reduce employment opportunities locally, the loss to garage is self-evident, but there may be a knock on effect to local businesses.

c. For Applications for listed Building Consent. This paragraph states that there are lower status listed houses to the north and south of the site, but there are no visual connections between them and the site. Whilst this statement may currently be true, it does not represent the visual connection once the build phase is complete. This raises the issue of other properties and their settings being impacted. The residents of Churchill Drive, Vicarage Cottage and Weaveland Road, should all be consulted before the deadline delayed to an appropriate time.

d. The Approach to Design of the Works.

i. The new houses to the rear of the site do not have 'cottage-like' facades that reflect the others in the locality of the site.

ii. The private gardens to the rear of the middle and upper blocks will be very small and given their location invisible: they should not be considered as enhancing the area as described later in the document.

e. Are any landscaping features (walls, hedges, fences,) being removed etc?

i. There is no mention of the removal of the very old wall, which is effectively a raised flowerbed, that currently divides the car park and the lane. I am uncertain as to why this has been omitted given the detail given about the Leylandii, which is embedded in it, but it is clear from the diagrams that the proposal necessitates the removal of these structures.

ii. I would suggest that the large Leylandii is inspected and if necessary, removed, it is a potential hazard: if it blew over it could trap all those above it.

iii. Given the size of the proposed gardens the potential for green surfaces, claimed as an advantage, is insignificant given the loss of greenery in the wall and the shaded gardens proposed.

f. Negative effects on amenity (neighbours and community).

i. Noise. The current garage operates during working hours and has a minimal effect on the properties at the top of the lane. The addition of 7 homes, an increase of 6, 4 of which are closer to other properties, will with associated traffic, considerably increase the noise and activity in the area, especially during evenings and Sundays when there is currently no activity.

ii. Disturbance and Nuisance. The current site only operates during working hours with little or no disruption to the lives of residents. The addition of 7 homes with personal and associated traffic will more than double the potential for disturbance and nuisance. This is likely to be at its worst during the demolition and construction phase. I reiterate that access is achieved up a single narrow lane is essential with no passing area.

iii. Overlooking & loss of privacy. The proposed buildings are over-bearing out-of-scale and out of character in terms of appearance with its neighbours. In addition, the top plot will overlook the front of my property causing a loss of privacy. The buildings

will reduce the amount of daylight in our property and reduce our view of the countryside.

iv. Negative Visual Impact. The negative visual impact of the development will affect our view but will also impact on many properties that have not been consulted: Churchill Road, Vicarage Cottage and Weaveland Road. Please note that I was told, when I purchased the property, that any planning permission to add another story to my bungalow, was very unlikely because it would inhibit the view from the houses above us on Churchill Road. Approval of this plan will set a precedent.

g. Over-development. The new plan is overcrowding the site. Its predecessor (reference C) was less intrusive and had a suitable parking area, the one currently in use. The site is overcrowded in terms of the size of the lane, a lack of visitor spaces, no provision of a layby, the siting of oil/gas/heat pumps and other associated utilities, which are not mentioned, and the access needs of all concerned. There is currently no provision for water, sewerage and electricity to either the middle or the top construction. Creating the capacity, if it is available, will entail groundworks which should not infringe on access requirements. I would suggest that these factors need to be included in the proposal before it is granted.



Lt Col (Retd) Rupert Forrest MBE