

FROM: Bruce Evans

TO: Adrian Smith (Case Officer)
CC: Lucy Rutter-Dowd
Wiltshire Council Planning Department

By Email
13 April 2026

Dear Mr. Smith,

REF: PL/2026/01813 – 45 High Street, Pewsey

I am writing as a nearby resident to provide a supplementary representation regarding the above application. Having reviewed all the recent public comments and the Highways Department's response, I wish to highlight several physical and procedural constraints that appear to remain unresolved.

1. Procedural Inconsistencies and Access Red Lines

The current 'Red Line' boundary presents a proposal with all the appearance of being completely self contained. However there are significant procedural anomalies with this.

A simple check of the relevant Land Registry Plans shows that the Red Line encroaches upon third-party land (the south-west 'blob' of land belonging to 4 King Alfred Close and potentially also to the Parish Council), but it fails to encompass the actual land required for access to the property from either the High Street (pedestrian) or Whatley Drive (vehicular). These two third-party access routes will sustain material change of use if the proposal goes ahead.

For an application to be valid, the Red Line must typically include the access to the public highway. Furthermore, the recent service of Certificate B on just two neighbours (8 April) along the access routes is insufficient. Mandatory notice must be served on all landowners within a Red Line encompassing all the affected landowners. For the application to be legally valid under Section 65 of the Act, this would include the Parish Council, the owner of 4 King Alfred Close, No 2 Whatley Drive and all the landowners south of Grove House along the footpath to the High Street too.

2. Evidence of Access Failure and Emergency Safety

The shared private driveway was originally designed to serve three residences, but finds itself currently serving five, one of which is now a high turnover commercial enterprise. Wiltshire planning application 14/01087/TCA helps to show how this intensification of use began.

Third-party representations (e.g., Spencer, 10-11 April) confirm that the property is already difficult for delivery drivers to locate. Of greater concern is the impact on emergency

services. Access relies on a short gravel-on-earth link between the shared private driveway and the property's gate over Pewsey Parish Council land.

I have observed that "overspill" parking already routinely occurs on this specific gravel link. When vehicles are stationary here—or when the designated parking area is occupied regularly by a large campervan—the narrow access is physically constricted. In my view, this creates a scenario where a 12.5-tonne fire tender would be unable to reach within the mandated 45m of the proposed residential unit (Building Regulations Approved Document B).

The intensification of the site for commercial use without a dedicated, clear turning head poses a genuine safety risk that has not been addressed in the submission.

3. Ambiguity of Guest Access and Safeguarding

The Airbnb listing markets a "magical wooded path" as a feature of the stay. While it is unclear if this refers to a route within the applicant's own grounds or the 1953 easement route through the private garden of Grove House, it is a matter of fact that the latter route is being made available to commercial guests.

I believe that utilising a private residential garden as a thoroughfare for high-turnover commercial visitors—regardless of how the route is marketed—creates an unavoidable conflict with the privacy and safeguarding of a neighbouring family home. This constitutes an "avoidable nuisance" and fails to promote the "safe and secure" environment mandated by NPPF Paragraph 135.

4. Capacity and Highways Standards

The Highways Officer's "No Objection" (8 April) assumes a three-bedroom site. However, the application Plans and the Design & Access Statement suggest a four-bedroom total site—one ground floor bedroom, bedrooms (plural) in the attic and one in the studio. Under Wiltshire's LTP3 standards, this requires a minimum of three to four car spaces.

In my opinion, the current provision is insufficient for a combined residential and commercial use. The frequent overflow onto shared driveways and the Parish Council's green space is clear evidence that the site does operate beyond its safe capacity. This represents an unauthorised intensification of use that places an undue burden on local infrastructure.

Conclusion and Duty of Care

Finally, I wish to highlight that the building in question—originally an extension—has, by the applicant's admission, been converted into an independent residential unit and has operated commercially for almost a decade without any formal scrutiny of its internal plans or construction standards by the Local Planning Authority or Building Control.

I do not believe a "desktop exercise" can realistically determine the safety or suitability of this structure for continual commercial use. Given the evidenced constraints regarding emergency vehicle access to the site, the lack of a compliant turning head, and the unresolved overspill parking on the access link, I consider that the proposal fails the fundamental test of "sustainable development." It also entails a "material change of use" to

land that is very specifically controlled by private easements and this use is therefore legally undeliverable.

I respectfully request that the LPA refuses the application or stays any determination until a full site inspection is conducted to verify that the development meets the safety and amenity requirements mandated for independent commercial holiday accommodation.

Yours sincerely,

Bruce Evans