

FURTHER STATEMENT

In respect of an appeal by Mr & Mrs W Sherred

against

The refusal of Householder Planning Permission by Wiltshire Council

for

detached double garage and studio

at

Vimy Ridge, London Road, Salisbury, SP4 6DU

LPA Reference PL/2026/01324

July 2026

1.0 TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH LPA APPEAL STATEMENT

1.1 2. Scope of the dispute.

We “expressly” applied for a new detached garage and studio. The only reference to “ancillary accommodation” in the Planning Statement was as an example of similar applications and approvals. Our only reference to “accommodation” was preceded by “studio” and we never used the phrase “annexe accommodation” within our original text. The application clearly sought approval for a new building within a residential curtilage that included a garage to accommodate car parking and a studio to accommodate personal use incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house.

3. Whether the proposal is ancillary accommodation

3.2 Functional independence

It doesn’t include cooking facilities or bedrooms but does include a sink which is usual in a studio for personal hygiene, washing paint brushes, rinsing car cloths etc. etc.

If the test is a building that “would operate independently” then any building over 37 sq.m floor area could qualify as a dwelling so most of the examples quoted for precedent would or could qualify.

4. Response to section 7 – influencing factors

This statement was included without any intent to be vexatious and we do not suggest that the Officer did anything but a professional assessment of the application.

4.2 “Essential need” and the officer`s reasoning

The LPA statement says the application is “not being assessed as a typical domestic outbuilding, but as a form of development that goes beyond what can reasonably be regarded as ancillary” ...” “capable of independent accommodation” due to “scale, layout, facilities and separation”

If this is the threshold please refer to LPA Section 5 in its entirety.

If these factors are considered fundamental at application stage because of how the “development could be occupied over its lifetime” and personal circumstances have no weight, we refer to application reference PL/2025/02747 erection of Dwelling and Annexe.

If the intent is to future proof development, then a new build annexe with two separate double bedrooms, bathroom, kitchen and living accommodation and 50m separation between host dwelling front door to front door, could be a prime target for use as a separate dwelling. The Council has already argued that the application type is not determinative it is “whether the development would function as ancillary accommodation or a separate dwelling unit.”

6. Other matters raised by the Appellant

6.1 Precedent

We do not accept the LPA rational for each example and happy to explain but for brevity we attach this as an Addendum

Apologies for the last planning reference S/2007/689 – this must be a typo, please ignore.

Application S/2010/1635 was refused but superseded by S/2011/0379

Suggested Conditions

The Appellant accepts the suggested Conditions

ADDENDUM

Refer to the list of applications in the LPA statement

- Neither does the appeal building and there is no Condition applied to say a kitchen cannot be fitted. How does the LPA know the occupier of the unit relies on the host dwelling for daily tasks?
- No further comment
- No further comment
- Playing with words.
- The building is well over 37 sq.m in floor area and the host dwelling and annexe could each have an independent access to the highway
- No further comment other than there has never been a car in the garage – not unusual of course. 3 cars can park on the drive.
- Doesn't say it cannot have them.
- As a separate building it is over 37 sq.m.
- No further comment
- Ditto
- Ditto
- Superseded by an approved application ref S/2011/0379 apologies for the confusion
- No further comment
- Typo - apologies I cannot find the correct reference.