

Application Number:	PL/2026/03351
Location:	The Old Rectory, Everleigh, Marlborough, SN8 3EY
Proposal:	Prior Approval, Part 3, Class Q - Change of use of agricultural barn into 4 dwellings including building works

[SN8 3EY - Google Maps](#)

[A342 - Google Maps](#)

Introduction and Proposal

I refer to the above application for prior approval to determine whether approval is required for the proposed change of use of an agricultural to four dwellings.

The proposal would create 4no. 2-bedroom maisonettes with two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling, accessed via an existing shared access serving the dwellings of Rectory Cottage and Rectory Bungalow and associated buildings. A separate access to The Old Rectory is noted as being located to the south-east of the shared access, which it shares with Sidbury House.

Scope of Assessment

Whilst the site is located within a rural area with limited access to services and public transport, sustainability is not a matter for consideration under this prior approval application.

The remit of Highways Development Management is limited to assessing whether the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or a severe residual cumulative impact on the highway network, having regard to the transport and highways considerations set out under Class Q.2(1)(a).

Access and Impact on the Highway Network

The application site is served via an existing access onto the A342, which is subject to a 50mph speed limit.

In accordance with DMRB guidance, visibility splays of approximately 2.4m by 160m would be required at this location. The available visibility at the access has been observed to fall materially below this standard and is therefore considered substandard in relation to the recorded vehicle speeds.

The Planning Statement asserts that the existing access arrangements are adequate and that the proposed development would not result in a significant increase in traffic movements.

However, no evidence has been submitted to quantify the level or nature of traffic associated with the existing lawful agricultural use of the building or wider holding, nor to demonstrate how this compares with the proposed residential use.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the access has historically accommodated agricultural vehicle movements, such movements are typically intermittent and irregular in nature. In contrast, the proposed residential use would be expected to generate a more frequent and regular pattern of trips throughout the day, including during peak commuting periods.

The change in the character and regularity of vehicular movements, particularly at peak periods, would result in a more consistent use of the access onto a high-speed road where visibility is substandard. In the absence of sufficient evidence to demonstrate otherwise, it cannot be concluded that this would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Internal Layout, Turning and Parking

The submitted details indicate that each dwelling would be served by two parking spaces, which accords with current parking standards.

The layout shows a 6m manoeuvring aisle to allow vehicles to turn within the site; however, it appears that this width relies in part on land outside of the application red line boundary. As such, it has not been demonstrated that adequate turning provision can be achieved within the site itself.

Summary and Recommendation

The proposed development would utilise an existing access onto the A342, which is substandard in terms of visibility for a road subject to a 50mph speed limit.

The proposed change of use is likely to result in a more regular and frequent pattern of vehicular movements, including during peak periods, compared to the existing agricultural use. This would intensify the use of a substandard access onto a high-speed road.

In the absence of robust information demonstrating the level of traffic associated with the lawful fall-back position, and a clear comparison with the proposed use, it has not been demonstrated that the development would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Furthermore, it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that adequate turning provision can be achieved within the application site.

On this basis, it is considered that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would comply with the requirements of Class Q.2(1)(a) in respect of transport and highways impacts.

A highway objection is therefore recommended.

Amanda Hall
Highways Development Management Engineer