

From: Simon Chambers <simon.chambers@lpctrull.com>

Sent: 22 June 2026 09:45

To: Wise, Isobella <Isobella.Wise@wiltshire.gov.uk>

Cc: Laura Bailes <[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: PL/2026/02956

Dear Isobella

Thank you for forwarding the highway consultation comments and further to which I hope the following helps to positively balance the assessment.

As you will be aware the recent refusal, effectively for the same dwelling on the existing yard was resisted on the sole basis that the land is believed to be beyond the scope of the current easement right. If that case is correct it follows that your highway's colleague is incorrect in the premise that the access from West Street is acceptable in principle to your Council. It is reasonable therefore to make a comparison between the modest change to the existing Seagry Road access and its unrestricted current context. Based on the refusal it follows that the access to the yard should be seen as necessarily entirely derived from the southern gate and track.

On balance, as your colleague says though this is a 'minor intensification', but perhaps even less than suggested, as the access serves a significant agricultural holding beyond my client's equestrian use-including the movement of large machinery and by definition the dwelling will substantially lessen the equestrian activities.

The NPPF at paragraph 116 provides very clear guidance in such circumstances and stipulates that development should only be refused on transport grounds if it causes unacceptable highway safety impacts or if the residual cumulative impacts on the road network are deemed "severe". This is an extremely high threshold and not typically associated with a 'minor' change as agreed.

Indeed, the conflict identified is said to be principally with the route of PROW GSOM7. Notwithstanding that the footpath route already crosses the land using the established point of access (shown in the photographs below-viewed from the road to the left and looking towards Seagry Road on the right-where the gate allows vehicles to pull clear of the highway to open the gate safely) the attached plan shows how the more defined new track will include gates to allow walkers (with dogs) to cross the track safely and without obstruction. Please substitute this plan as part of the application.



You will be aware that the TRICs data base indicates that a single dwelling, such as that proposed, which is sustainably located, notably with pedestrian access onto West Street would result in approximately no more than 6-7 daily vehicle movements. For convenience it is anticipated that the pedestrian gate will allow for deliveries and post etc which will actually ensure the average movement levels are suppressed, so this is very much a maximum average.

On this basis such modest vehicle movements cannot reasonably be considered to lead to a 'severe' impact to justify refusal on highway grounds.

As an established field access, with unrestricted comings and goings, currently including slow moving horseboxes and farm machinery, it is not designed to strict highway standards, and is of course typical of the area, where there is no known record of accidents. I have included photographs of the access within my supporting statement, and these are augmented below by specifically standing back from the carriageway and at driver's eye-level in the middle of the access. Interestingly, the locally managed hedgerows evident since the previous photographs were taken show a clear enhanced view, and which I hope can be agreed highlight its reasonable line of sight. It is not a concealed access. As requested though the approximate visibility splays are marked on the attached plan and it is acknowledged these are below the stated 215 m design standard, but it is not considered unsafe.





The redevelopment of the equestrian yard (considered to involve a couple of potential movements a day) and the minor increase of movements from Seagry Road do not justify the need for a speed check, but it is clear, as a matter of reasonable judgment that contextually speeds are well below the potential national speed limit.

As indicated there is a balance to be made, not least as the NPPF para 11 (d) tilted balance is triggered in support of such sustainable new village housing, arguably also reducing traffic through the village. The access is not inherently dangerous and the nature and alignment of the road (which is lightly trafficked) also naturally calms road speeds. The access arrangement is not the only one along this stretch of the road either

which ensures it is part of the established arrangement and not unique for other road users, who are therefore likely to be more aware of its possible use, albeit very infrequently through the day. This balance, in my view, is sufficient to agree the gateway is not dangerous and its use will not create a 'severe' level of harm, indeed contextually there is believed to be no harm as already established at this access, and along the road to the east.

I hope these brief comments address the key points arising from the consultations identified and demonstrate the PROW is unaffected and the minor change in the nature of the access use is not harmful when balanced against the previously agreed positive assessment of the site's redevelopment to accommodate a single new dwelling, boosting local housing supply.

Kind regards

Simon Chambers B.Sc (Hons) MA MRTPI

Director

Advanced Notice of leave

4th September

8th and 9th October

LPC (Trull) Ltd
Trull
Tetbury
Gloucestershire
GL8 8SQ

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]