



## **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

### **SECTION 78 APPEAL**

#### **STATEMENT OF CASE**

**Appeal Reference:** 6009637

**LPA Reference:** PL/2025/09732

**Site Address:** The Stables, Doctors Hill, Ashley, Box, SN13 8AT

**Appellant:** Ms Marilyn Harford

**Development Description:** Retrospective permission for Change of Use of part of an existing barn for residential purposes

**Procedure:** Written Representations

**Prepared by:** Lucie Turner

**Date:** 18 June 2026

In accordance with the requirements of the Planning Inspectorate [guidance](#) on the *use of artificial intelligence in casework evidence*, it is confirmed that this document was prepared with assistance from Microsoft Copilot. Copilot was solely used for proofreading purposes. All suggested amendments by Copilot were reviewed and verified by the author to ensure that the content is accurate and fully reflects the Council's intended position and professional assessment.

## **CONTENTS**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Site Description**
- 3. Planning History**
- 4. The Proposal**
- 5. Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance**
- 6. The Council's Case**
- 7. Comments on Appellants Statement of Case**
- 8. Planning Balance**
- 9. Summary and Conclusions**
- 10. Appendices**

## 1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Statement of Case is submitted on behalf of the Local Planning Authority in response to the appeal lodged by Ms Marilyn Harford against the decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for “Retrospective permission for Change of Use of part of an existing barn for residential purposes” at The Stables, Doctors Hill, Ashley, Box, SN13 8AT

1.2 The purpose of this statement is to set out the Council’s case and explain the reasons why planning permission was refused. The decision was issued on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2026 following consideration of all relevant material planning matters. The refusal was based on the following reasons:

**1      *Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt***

*The retrospective residential use of part of the barn, together with associated domestic paraphernalia including a summerhouse, outdoor seating, clothes airers, potted plants, delivery boxes, and private vehicles, constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The development has resulted in a material loss of openness and conflicts with the purposes of the Green Belt. Substantial weight is afforded to this harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Core Policies 1 and 2 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS).*

**2      *Lack of Essential Need/Conflict with saved Policy H4***

*The proposal is located in an open countryside location where new dwellings are only allowed based on established policy exemptions. The proposal does not involve a replacement dwelling and no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate that permanent residential accommodation is essential in connection with the employment needs of rural areas. The development is therefore contrary to paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved Policy H4 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan and Core Policies 1, 2, 11 and 48 of the WCS, which only permit new dwellings in the open countryside where an essential functional need is demonstrated.*

**3      *Harm to the Character and Appearance of the Area/Cotswolds National Landscape***

*The residential occupation of the barn and the proliferation of domestic paraphernalia has introduced visual clutter and incremental domestication into a previously rural site. The proposal fails to conserve or enhance the landscape character, scenic quality, and local distinctiveness of the Cotswolds National Landscape, contrary to Core Policies 51 and 57 of the WCS, the Wiltshire Design Guide SPD, and the Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan, and is inconsistent with Chapter 15 of the NPPF.*

**4      *Unsustainable Location***

*The site is remote from local services, public transport, and safe pedestrian or*

*cycle routes. Occupation of the dwelling would be reliant on the private car, contrary to the aims of Core Policies 60 and 61 of the WCS and Section 9 of the NPPF, which seek to reduce reliance on private vehicles and encourage sustainable transport alternatives.*

## **5 Occupant Amenity/Lack of Suitable Living Conditions**

*The barn has been partially converted to residential use without the submission of floor plans or details of internal layout. As such, it is uncertain whether the accommodation provides adequate living conditions for occupants. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policy 57 of the WCS, which requires high-quality and functional design.*

- 1.3 This statement has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Procedural Guide for Planning Appeals and complies with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and associated regulations. It provides a clear and robust justification for the Council's position, referencing relevant planning policy, guidance, and material considerations.

## **2.0 Site Description**

- 2.1 The LPA is not aware of any material changes to the site since the application was determined. Accordingly, the site description set out in the original Officer Report, already provided to the Planning Inspectorate, remains accurate and relevant for the purposes of this appeal.

## **3.0 Planning History**

- 3.1 There have been no changes to the planning history of the site since the application was determined. Therefore, the summary contained within the original Officer Report, already provided to the Planning Inspectorate, remains accurate and relevant for the purposes of this appeal.

## **4.0 The Proposal**

- 4.1 There have been no amendments to the proposed development since the application was determined. Accordingly, the description of the proposal set out in the original Officer Report, already provided to the Planning Inspectorate, remains accurate and relevant for the purposes of this appeal.
- 4.2 Additional information submitted as part of the appeal is addressed below where relevant.

## **5.0 Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance**

- 5.1 There have been no changes to the relevant national or local planning policies, nor to associated guidance, since the application was determined. All applicable policies and guidance are set out in the original Officer Report, which has already been provided to

the Planning Inspectorate. The Appeal Questionnaire sent to the Planning Inspectorate contains links to the relevant national and local planning policies.

## 6.0 The Council's Case

- 6.1 The Council relies entirely on the evidence and assessment contained within the original Officer Report, which has already been provided to the Planning Inspectorate. No additional points or further evidence are submitted. Accordingly, the Officer Report forms the Council's full case for the purposes of this appeal.

## 7.0 Comments on Appellants Statement of Case

- 7.1 The Council's assessment of the Appellant's Statement of Case is set out below. The original Officer Report remains the primary basis of the Council's position. Commentary is therefore limited to addressing matters raised in the appeal that introduce new information or materially differ from those previously considered

### 7.2.0 Refusal Reason 1- Inappropriate development in the Green Belt

- 7.2.1 The Appellant contends that the proposal does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, stating that *"the proposal constitutes the alteration of a building"* and should be considered under paragraph 154(c) of the Framework. This interpretation is not accepted. The proposal is not a physical extension or alteration of the building in planning terms, but rather a material change of use of part of the building to a residential use.
- 7.2.2 The introduction of a residential unit within a building previously restricted to equestrian purposes represents a fundamental change in the nature and function of the site. As such, the development must be assessed as a change of use, not as an alteration falling within the exceptions listed at paragraph 154. The proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 7.2.3 With regard to impact on openness, The Appellant further asserts that any impact on openness is *"de minimis"*, placing weight on the absence of new built form and the screening of the site. The Council does not agree with this assessment. Openness in the Green Belt is not solely a matter of built form or visibility from the public realm. It is well established that openness has both spatial and visual dimensions, and can also be affected by the nature and intensity of use of the land. In this case, the use of part of the barn for residential purposes has introduced a domestic character to the site, together with a range of associated paraphernalia.
- 7.2.4 The Appellant characterises the presence of domestic paraphernalia as limited and *de minimis*. The Council does not agree. In addition to the items identified in the Officer Report (outdoor seating, clothes airers, potted plants, post boxes, delivery boxes, and vehicles associated with residential occupation), the site has also been subject to a

separate application for the retention of a summerhouse (ref: PL/2025/09919), which was refused. The siting of a summerhouse, together with the range of domestic items present on site, has resulted in the creation of a domestic curtilage within a previously rural, equestrian site. This materially alters the character of the land and reduces its openness, even in the absence of additional built form to the stable building.

- 7.2.5 The suggestion that these impacts are negligible fails to recognise the cumulative effect of domestic activity and paraphernalia associated with a dwelling, which by their nature represent a permanent and ongoing change to the character and function of the site.
- 7.2.6 The Appellant places weight on the limited visibility of the site from the public realm. This is not determinative of the impact on the Green Belt. The essential characteristic of the Green Belt is openness, not visibility. While existing planting may limit public views, the presence of residential use and associated domestic features within the site nonetheless reduces openness in both spatial and functional terms. The harm therefore arises from the use and activity on the land, rather than solely from visual prominence.
- 7.2.7 The Appellant further argues that the proposal does not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. This is not accepted. In particular, the introduction of a residential use and associated domestic activity represents an encroachment into the countryside, which is one of the purposes of Green Belt designation. The change from a restricted equestrian use to a residential use, together with the associated domestication of the site, erodes the distinction between the countryside and built development and conflicts with the aim of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- 7.2.8 For the reasons set out above, the Council maintains that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The development results in a material loss of openness through the introduction of residential use and associated domestic paraphernalia, and conflicts with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Substantial weight should be afforded to this harm, in accordance with national policy.

### **7.3.0 Refusal reason 2: Lack of Essential Need/Conflict with Saved Policy H4**

- 7.3.1 The Appellant accepts that the proposal does not fall within the exceptions set out in saved Policy H4 but contends that the policy is overly restrictive and that the proposal should be supported on the basis of a specific need associated with horse welfare. The Council does not agree that the circumstances advanced justify a departure from the development plan.

- 7.3.2 The site lies outside any defined settlement boundary and the proposal introduces residential development in the open countryside. As set out in the Officer Report, such development is only supported where it meets specific policy exceptions. Saved Policy H4 and Core Policy 48 require that new residential development in the countryside is justified by an essential functional need associated with agriculture, forestry, or another rural enterprise. The Appellant acknowledges that the proposal does not relate to a “*business use*”, and therefore does not meet the requirements of these policies.
- 7.3.3 The Appellant relies on the need to provide on-site accommodation to support horse welfare, citing previous incidents involving animals requiring urgent attention. While the Council acknowledges the importance of appropriate animal husbandry, this does not in itself demonstrate an essential need for permanent or semi-permanent residential accommodation on site. Critically, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the presence of a full-time or even part-time residential unit is essential to the operation of the use. The submission does not include any functional assessment, professional veterinary evidence, or operational justification to demonstrate that the needs of the horses cannot reasonably be met without the provision of on-site residential accommodation.
- 7.3.4 The Council regularly considers proposals for rural worker dwellings, including temporary permissions, where a clear functional and financial need is demonstrated. In such cases, applicants are expected to provide robust supporting evidence, including details of the enterprise, operational requirements, and why on-site presence is essential. No comparable evidence has been submitted in this case. The justification provided is based on personal preference and anecdotal incidents rather than a structured and evidenced assessment of need. As such, the proposal does not meet the threshold required to justify a new dwelling in the open countryside.
- 7.3.5 The Appellant seeks to argue that the site is not “isolated” and therefore that national policy relating to isolated homes should not apply. This does not alter the policy position in this case. Regardless of whether the site is considered isolated in the context of paragraph 84 of the Framework, it remains outside any defined settlement boundary and is therefore subject to the countryside policies of the development plan. The proposal does not meet any of the relevant exceptions set out in Core Policy 48 or saved Policy H4, and the absence of isolation does not in itself justify residential development in this location.
- 7.3.6 The personal circumstances of the Appellant, including the desire to improve the welfare of horses on site, are acknowledged. However, national and local policy require that any such need must be demonstrated to be essential and supported by clear evidence. The information provided indicates that the site has previously operated as an equestrian facility without on-site residential accommodation, and no substantive evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that circumstances have changed to the extent that a residential presence is now essential. The justification therefore carries limited weight in the planning balance.

- 7.3.7 For the reasons set out above, the Council maintains that the proposal conflicts with the settlement strategy set out in Core Policies 1, 2 and 11 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and fails to meet the requirements of Core Policy 48 and saved Policy H4. The proposal has not demonstrated an essential functional need for residential development in this location, and the principle of development is not supported.

#### **7.4.0 Refusal Reason 3: Harm to the Character and Appearance of the Area / Cotswolds National Landscape**

- 7.4.1 The Appellant contends that the Council has overstated the degree of visual harm, asserting that the site is well screened from public viewpoints and that any domestic paraphernalia is limited and visually contained. The Council does not agree. The assessment of landscape and character impacts extends beyond public visibility and must consider the effect of the development on the character and quality of the site and its surroundings.
- 7.4.2 The Appellant places significant weight on the limited visibility of the site from the public realm. However, limited visibility does not equate to an absence of harm. The statutory duty and relevant policy framework require decision-makers to conserve and enhance the character and scenic quality of the Cotswolds National Landscape, not simply to assess whether development is readily visible from public viewpoints. In this case, the harm arises from the change in character of the site itself, rather than from its prominence in wider views.
- 7.4.3 The Appellant asserts that the degree of domestication has been overstated and that the domestic paraphernalia is limited and contained. This is not accepted. The Officer Report clearly identifies the presence of a range of domestic features, including outdoor seating, clothes airers, potted plants, vehicles and other items associated with residential occupation. These features, taken together, have resulted in a clear and identifiable shift from a rural equestrian use to a domestic character. The cumulative effect of these elements introduces visual clutter and erodes the simple, functional appearance expected of such a site.
- 7.4.4 The pattern of domestication is further evidenced by the introduction of a summerhouse within the site, which has been the subject of a separate application for retention (ref: PL/2025/09919) and subsequent refusal. The presence of the summerhouse, in combination with the domestic paraphernalia observed, demonstrates a deliberate and ongoing progression towards residential use of the site, rather than incidental or occasional activity. This reinforces the Council's position that the degree of change is material and cannot reasonably be described as de minimis.

- 7.4.5 The site lies within the Cotswolds National Landscape, where great weight must be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. The Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan also provides clear guidance that the introduction of domestic features and activity within equestrian or agricultural settings can harm character and tranquillity, particularly within enclosed valley landscapes. In this case, the introduction of residential use and associated paraphernalia detracts from the rural and undeveloped character of the site and is inconsistent with the objectives of conserving local distinctiveness and tranquillity. The Appellant suggests that the domestic items are located between existing built form and do not extend into the wider countryside. Even if spatially contained, this does not negate the impact on character. The introduction of domestic activity into a previously non-residential setting changes the functional and visual character of the space, creating a domestic curtilage where none previously existed. This represents a clear departure from the intended equestrian use and has a harmful effect on the character of the site and its contribution to the wider landscape.
- 7.4.6 For the reasons set out above, the Council maintains that the proposal fails to conserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area and the Cotswolds National Landscape. The cumulative impact of residential use and associated domestication has resulted in harm to the rural character, scenic quality and tranquillity of the site, contrary to Core Policies 51 and 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the relevant provisions of the Framework.

### **7.5.0 Refusal Reason Unsustainable location**

- 7.5.1 The Appellant contends that the site is not remote from services or public transport and further argues that the proposal would reduce vehicle movements by allowing the Appellant to remain on site when needed. The Council does not agree that these points overcome the locational concerns identified in the original Officer Report. As set out in the Officer Report, the site lies outside any defined settlement boundary and future occupiers would be reliant on the private car for day-to-day needs. While the Appellant refers to a footpath opposite the site and bus stops within the village, this does not alter the Council's position that the site does not provide safe and convenient access to services and facilities such that the residential use can reasonably be regarded as sustainable in transport terms.
- 7.5.2 The Council's Highways Officer did not object on highway safety or capacity grounds, but expressly identified concern in relation to the sustainability of the location for residential development because of the likely reliance on the private car. The Officer Report reflected that advice accurately. The issue is therefore not the adequacy of the access or parking provision, but the unsustainable nature of the location for a dwelling. The Appellant argues that the proposal may reduce some journeys associated with

attending to the horses. The Council acknowledges that this may be the Appellant's intention. However, this does not outweigh the fact that the proposal introduces a residential use in a location where occupiers would remain dependent on private vehicles. The suggested reduction in some existing trips does not alter the underlying policy concern that the site is not a suitable location for residential occupation.

- 7.5.3 For these reasons, the Council maintains that the proposal remains contrary to Core Policies 60 and 61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the relevant aims of the Framework in relation to sustainable transport. Whilst this reason should be viewed in the context of the appeal as a whole, the locational concerns identified in the Officer Report remain valid.

### **7.6.0 Refusal Reason Occupant Amenity / Lack of Suitable Living Conditions**

- 7.6.1 At application stage, no floor plans or details of the internal layout were provided. The Council was therefore justified in concluding, on the basis of the information before it at the time, that it had not been demonstrated that the accommodation would provide adequate living conditions for occupants. The Appellant has now submitted a floor plan as part of the appeal. That additional information was not before the Council when the application was determined and is therefore a new matter raised at appeal stage. The Council also notes that, without detailed assessment, it is not clear whether the accommodation would meet modern expectations for residential living standards; however, this is not determinative in this case.
- 7.6.2 Notwithstanding that additional information, the Council's position remains that the principal concerns in this appeal relate to the unacceptable principle of residential development in this location, the Green Belt harm arising from the change of use and associated domestication, and the harmful effects on the character of the site within the Cotswolds National Landscape.

### **7.7.0 Appellant's Suggested Temporary Permission**

The Council notes that the Appellant now suggests that a temporary three-year permission may be appropriate. This was not the development proposed or assessed at application stage and therefore represents a new matter raised at appeal stage.

In any event, the Council does not consider that the grant of a temporary permission would overcome the fundamental policy objections in this case. Even on a temporary basis, the proposal would introduce an unjustified residential use within the Green Belt and open countryside, together with the associated domestic activity and domestication identified in the Officer Report.

No substantive evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that a temporary residential presence is essential or that the harm identified would be mitigated or reversed after the suggested period. The Council therefore considers that a temporary permission would be inappropriate in this instance.

## **8.0 Planning Balance**

- 8.1 The Council relies on the planning balance assessment set out in the original Officer Report, which has already been provided to the Planning Inspectorate. No further commentary is offered, and the Officer Report forms the Council's position on this matter for the purposes of the appeal.

## **9.0 Summary and Conclusions**

- 9.1 In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the starting point for decision-making is the development plan. The Council has assessed the appeal proposal against the adopted development plan and all other material considerations.
- 9.2 The Council considers that the proposal is in clear conflict with Core Policies 1, 2, 11 and 48 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and saved Policy H4 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan. No essential functional need for residential accommodation has been demonstrated and the justification advanced is not supported by the level of evidence required to justify a dwelling in this location.
- 9.3 The Council has carefully considered the Appellant's Statement of Case and the additional information submitted at appeal stage. However, for the reasons set out in the original Officer Report and expanded upon above, the Council's position remains unchanged. The additional information provided in the Appellant's Statement of Case does not outweigh the significant and demonstrable harms identified. The proposal constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt. It results in harm to openness through the introduction of residential use and associated domestic paraphernalia, and conflicts with the fundamental aim of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Substantial weight must be afforded to this harm.
- 9.4 Furthermore, the introduction of residential use and associated domestication has resulted in harm to the character and appearance of the site within the Cotswolds National Landscape, failing to conserve or enhance its scenic quality, tranquillity and local distinctiveness.

- 9.5 The Council has considered the Appellant's suggestion that a temporary permission may be appropriate, together with the additional information submitted in respect of internal layout. These matters do not overcome the fundamental policy objections identified. Even on a temporary basis, the proposal would introduce an unjustified residential use into the Green Belt and open countryside, together with the associated harms identified above.
- 9.6 While the personal circumstances of the Appellant are acknowledged, including the care of horses on site, these considerations do not outweigh the substantial harm identified to the Green Belt, the conflict with the development plan, and the adverse effects on the character of the National Landscape.
- 9.7 The Council notes the current shortfall in housing land supply. However, the site lies within the Green Belt and the Cotswolds National Landscape, both of which are areas of particular importance under the Framework. The identified harm provides a clear reason for refusing the development under paragraph 11(d)(i) of the Framework and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is therefore not engaged. 9.4
- 9.8 For these reasons, the Council concludes that the appeal scheme does not accord with the development plan and does not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, the Council respectfully requests that the appeal be dismissed.

## **10. Appendices**

Appendix 1: Suggested planning conditions

Appendix 2: Wiltshire Council Highways Consultation Response

## **APPENDIX 1: SUGGESTED PLANNING CONDITIONS**

Without prejudice, should the Inspector be minded to allow the appeal, the Council requests that the following conditions be imposed to ensure the development is acceptable in planning terms and in accordance with paragraph 57 of the NPPF and relevant PPG advice on the use of planning conditions:

### **1. Standard time limit**

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

### **2. Plans**

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents:

Location plan received 23 December 2025

Site plan received 12 December 2025

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

### **3. Time limit (if temporary permission considered)**

The use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the residential use shall cease on or before [3 years from date of decision]. On or before that date all domestic paraphernalia associated with the residential use shall be removed and the building and land reverted to its former equestrian use.

REASON: In the interests of the openness of the Green Belt and the character of the countryside, in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CP1, CP2 and CP51 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

### **4. Occupancy restriction**

The residential accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied only by a person solely or mainly engaged in the keeping of horses at the site, or their dependants, and shall not be occupied as an independent dwelling.

REASON: To ensure the accommodation remains functionally linked to the equestrian use of the site and to avoid the creation of an unrestricted dwelling in the open countryside, contrary to Policies CP1, CP2 and CP48.

**5. Removal of domestic paraphernalia / restriction of curtilage**

Notwithstanding the details shown, no additional domestic paraphernalia, including but not limited to outdoor furniture, structures, storage, washing lines, or domestic items, shall be stationed, erected or placed on the land outside the building without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON To safeguard the openness of the Green Belt and the rural character of the site and to prevent further domestication.

**6. No external alterations / retention as existing building**

The building shall not be extended, altered externally, or otherwise modified to facilitate residential use without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To protect the openness of the Green Belt and the character of the building.

**7. Ancillary use only**

The residential use hereby permitted shall remain ancillary to the use of the site for private equestrian purposes and shall not be sold, leased, or occupied as a separate planning unit.

REASON: To prevent the creation of a separate dwelling in the open countryside contrary to development plan policy.

**8. External lighting restriction**

No external lighting shall be installed without prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To protect the character, tranquillity and dark skies of the Cotswolds National Landscape.

## APPENDIX 2 WILTSHIRE COUNCIL HIGHWAYS CONSULTATION RESPONSE

### **Highway Development Management Consultation Response**

**Planning Application Ref:** PL/2025/09767

**Site Address:** The Stables, Doctors Hill, Ashley, Box, SN13 8AT.

**Proposal:** Retrospective permission for Change of Use of part of an existing barn for residential purposes.

**Date of Consultation Response:** 22/01/2026

*I refer to the above consultation for planning advice dated 05/01/2026 with regard to Retrospective permission for Change of Use of part of an existing barn for residential purposes.*

*As this would lead to separate dwellings outside of identified development boundaries, the proposal would usually attract an adverse highway recommendation on sustainability grounds as follows:*

*The site is located outside of any settlement policy boundary, raising concerns with regards to the sustainability of the site for residential development due to the likely reliance upon the private car for any occupants and their visitors. This proposal is therefore, in my opinion, contrary to Core Policies 60 and 61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which aim to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car and encourage the use of sustainable transport alternatives. However, I shall be guided by you on this sustainability issue and wish to advise with regard to highways in the instance that you would be minded to permit a dwelling in this location.*

*The site is accessed from Doctors Hill, an unclassified section of public highway subject to a speed limit of 30mph, which immediately changes to 60mph to the south. The existing access serves the stables and would be suitable for residential access for the purpose of this retrospective proposal. It is not proposed to alter the access with the public highway.*

*It is indicated that a single vehicle parking space would be available for use in relation to the residential element, this would be in accordance with the minimum standards for residential development.*

*Other than the highlighted sustainability issue, the principle of a single residential unit ancillary to the equestrian use would not be considered detrimental in terms of capacity within the public highway. Therefore, it is considered that no highway objection be raised.*

*If you have any queries regarding the above advice, please contact:*

*HighwaysDevelopment@wiltshire.gov.uk*