

Design, Access and Planning Statement

Regularisation of Existing C3 Residential Use (Two-Bedroom Dwelling) – The Coach House, 489A Semington Road, Melksham, SN12 6DR

This Design, Access and Planning Statement summarises the planning history of The Coach House, and confirms that, at every stage of assessment, the building has been found to meet all relevant design, amenity, and highways criteria.

Garage and Office Permission (PL/2021/06824) – Officer Findings

The officer reports for **PL/2021/06824** (garage and office permission) demonstrate that the structure, as built, is acceptable in terms of **design, character, residential amenity**, and **highway safety**, with each matter explicitly addressed and satisfied.

Design & Character – Officer Findings

The original officer report confirms that the building is acceptable in design, scale, and character. In the **Design and Visual Impact** section, the officer states:

*“Officers have appraised the height and scale of the proposed building... and are satisfied that the development would be **subordinate to the host dwelling**... and **would not appear out of keeping** within the local area.”*

*“The use of sympathetic materials... would ensure the proposal would **integrate into the surrounding setting and existing street scene**.”*

*“It is considered that the proposed garage would... **constitute an acceptable addition** to the host dwelling... The development would therefore **comply with Policy CP57** of the WCS.”*

These findings confirm:

- **Design quality**
- **Character and appearance**
- **Compatibility with local context**
- **Compliance with CP57**

The building was therefore judged acceptable in form, massing, materials, and relationship to its surroundings.

Residential Amenity – Officer Findings

The officer also provides a full amenity assessment and concludes that the building causes **no unacceptable harm**:

*“Given the scale of the development proposal, it is considered that the proposed scheme **would not result in unacceptable loss of light, overlooking, overshadowing and would not have an overbearing impact** upon neighbouring properties.”*

*“Therefore, **no overlooking concerns are raised**.”*

*“Officers are satisfied that the effect of the development on the neighbouring property... **would be nominal and acceptable**.”*

These findings confirm that the building meets all amenity requirements relating to:

- **Light and overshadowing**
- **Privacy and overlooking**

- **Overbearing impact**

Highways – Officer Findings

The original report also confirms that the development does not give rise to highway safety concerns:

*“The proposal retains the existing access and **would not give rise to significant harm in terms of highway safety.**”*

*“The highways officer concluded... that the lack of parking provision would **not be so severe** to result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that the residual cumulative impact would **not be unacceptable.**”*

These findings confirm compliance with:

- **Highway safety**
- **Parking standards**
- **CP60, CP61, CP64**

Temporary Permission (PL/2024/09323) – Officer Findings

The officer’s delegated report for **PL/2024/09323** confirms that the temporary residential use of the building (as site manager accommodation) was acceptable in terms of **design, character, amenity,** and **highway safety**, subject only to the temporary nature of the permission. The following extracts demonstrate that the building, as converted, met all relevant criteria.

Design & Character – Officer Confirms Acceptability

The officer raises **no concerns** regarding the design or visual impact of the temporary conversion. The report states:

*“Given the limited works proposed to the existing building set within the built envelope of the application site, **officers raise no concerns in relation to the design and visual impact** of the proposal...”*

*“...the proposal... is deemed acceptable subject to the necessary conditions ensuring temporary use are imposed. The development would therefore **comply with Policy CP57** of the WCS.”*

These findings confirm:

- **Design acceptability**
- **No adverse visual impact**
- **Compliance with CP57**

The building remained visually appropriate, well integrated, and acceptable in character during temporary residential use.

Residential Amenity – Officer Confirms No Unacceptable Harm

The officer again concludes that the building causes **no unacceptable amenity impacts**, even when used as residential accommodation:

*“The temporary use of the building as a residential use **would not introduce any adverse overlooking** to any neighbouring occupiers.”*

*“The proposal would **not introduce any overbearing or overshadowing impacts.**”*

*“It is considered that the proposed development **would not result in unacceptable loss of light,***

overlooking, overshadowing and would not have an overbearing impact upon neighbouring properties.”

These findings confirm:

- **No overlooking harm**
- **No overshadowing harm**
- **No overbearing impact**
- **Amenity fully acceptable**

The building continued to meet all amenity standards during temporary occupation.

Highways – Officer Confirms No Significant Harm

The officer concludes that the temporary residential use does **not** give rise to highway safety concerns:

“The proposal retains the existing access and would not give rise to significant harm in terms of highway safety.”

“The highways officer... offered **no objection**... confirming that the parking arrangement addressed previous highway concerns.”

These findings confirm:

- **Highway safety acceptable**
- **Parking provision acceptable**
- **Compliance with CP60, CP61, CP64**

The temporary residential use did not create any new or unacceptable transport impacts.

Despite a full and detailed officer assessment, the issue of “overdevelopment” was not identified, raised, or considered at any stage when temporary non-ancillary C3 residential use was granted for the three-year period. This omission is significant, particularly as the physical circumstances of the site remain entirely unchanged.

Impey Case – Temporary → Permanent Use

The temporary C3 permission confirms that the residential use of The Coach House was considered acceptable for the period and purpose assessed. Under the High Court ruling in *Impey v Secretary of State* [1984], a temporary permission does not necessarily imply that a use is unacceptable in principle; rather, it may demonstrate that the use was considered acceptable subject to a time-limited condition. The Coach House has now operated as an independent C3 dwelling for over two years without identified adverse impacts, and the temporary permission remains a significant material consideration in the assessment of permanent C3 non-ancillary use.

Pre-Application Report (ENO/2025/01496) – Officer Findings

The pre-application report provides informal officer opinion only, but it remains a paid, formally issued document that the applicant is entitled to rely upon. Following the officer’s full review within the pre-application report, no new harm is identified in relation to the physical structure, its design, its amenity impacts, or its highway impacts. Instead, the officer’s concerns relate solely to policy matters, specifically the number of dwellings on the wider site and the concept of “overdevelopment.”

Where the report touches on technical matters (design, amenity, highways), the officer repeats the findings of the earlier permissions and confirms that the building’s existing impacts remain acceptable.

The relevant findings are set out below.

Design & Character – Officer’s Position

The pre-application report does **not** identify any new design harm arising from permanent C3 use. Instead, it repeats the earlier acceptance of the building’s design and focuses solely on the *policy* issue of “overdevelopment”.

The officer states:

*“Given the limited works proposed to the existing building... **officers raise no concerns in relation to the design and visual impact** of the proposal...” (from PL/2024/09323, expressly carried forward into the pre-app assessment)*

In the pre-app report, the only objection relates to **plot capacity**, not design:

*“If the garage building were to be converted to residential use... the application site... would accommodate 8 dwellings. Therefore... this would constitute **overdevelopment of the plot**, which would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.”*

This is a **policy-based conclusion**, not a design-based one. The officer does **not** identify any harm arising from:

- the building’s height
- its massing
- its materials
- its appearance
- its relationship to neighbouring buildings

All these matters were addressed and confirmed acceptable in PL/2021/06824 and PL/2024/09323

The officer’s assertion that converting the building “would” create eight dwellings is **misplaced**, as the building has **already been converted** and has **operated for over two years** as a **non-ancillary C3 dwelling** under **PL/2024/09323**. The Council has **already accepted** the residential use, **already assessed** it, and **already confirmed** that it causes **no harm**.

Residential Amenity – Officer Confirms No Harm

The pre-application report **explicitly re-uses** the amenity findings from the Temporary Permission, confirming that permanent residential use would not introduce any new amenity harm.

The officer states:

*“The existing windows overlook the applicant’s private parking area... **would not introduce any adverse overlooking** to any neighbouring occupiers.”*

*“The proposal would **not introduce any overbearing or overshadowing impacts**.”*

*“It is considered that the proposed development **would not result in unacceptable loss of light, overlooking, overshadowing and would not have an overbearing impact** upon neighbouring properties.”*

These are clear, repeated findings that:

- **Amenity impacts remain acceptable**
- **No new harm arises from permanent residential use**

The officer does **not** identify any amenity-based reason for refusal.

Highways – Officer Confirms No Harm in Principle

The pre-application report again confirms that highways impacts remain acceptable **in principle**, subject only to demonstrating parking layout at application stage.

The officer states:

*“The Local Authority Highways officer... **has raised no highway objection in principle** if the necessary parking spaces... can be demonstrated.”*

This mirrors the earlier findings in PL/2024/09323:

*“The proposal retains the existing access and **would not give rise to significant harm in terms of highway safety.**”*

The pre-app report does **not** identify any new highways harm arising from permanent C3 use.

It simply requires:

- a block plan
- demonstration of parking allocation
- confirmation of turning and access

All of which are normal validation requirements, however please note:

Turning Space Requirement Newly Introduced at Pre-Application Stage

At no stage during the earlier applications – **PL/2021/06824** (garage + office) or **PL/2024/09323** (temporary C3 non-ancillary use) – did the Council raise any concern regarding **turning space**, nor was any requirement made to demonstrate on-site turning, access geometry, or vehicle manoeuvring. Both permissions were granted with **no turning-related conditions**, and the temporary residential use therefore set a clear precedent that the building and its access arrangements were acceptable without the need for on-site turning provision.

The introduction of a turning-space requirement in the **pre-application report ENQ/2025/01496** is therefore **new** and does not reflect any previously adjudicated concern. The officer now states that a future application should demonstrate how vehicles would “access and egress the site” and whether “reduced turning area” would affect highway safety – a parameter that **did not form part of any earlier assessment**.

This new requirement is inconsistent with the Council’s own established position. In **the 2017 officer report (Ref: 17/04649/FUL)**, the Highways Officer explicitly confirmed that **many dwellings along Semington Road do not have turning areas** and routinely **reverse into or out of their driveways**. The report states:

“The Council’s Highways Officer has not objected to the proposal as many other dwellings don’t offer turning spaces and cars have to reverse onto the highway. As this is already an existing situation it is not considered that the cumulative residual effect of the development would cause severe harm to highway safety.”

This context is directly relevant because:

- **Semington Road functions as a local service road** following the introduction of the A350 Melksham Bypass many years ago, and its access pattern reflects this status.
- **Semington Road’s established pattern of access does not rely on on-site turning areas**, and most dwellings do not provide them.

- **Reversing manoeuvres are normal and accepted by the Highways Authority**, forming part of the long-established access behaviour along the road.
- **Paragraph 32 of the NPPF** confirms that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe – and the Highways Officer has explicitly stated that they are **not severe**.
- The **temporary C3 permission** already confirmed that the proposal would cause **no significant harm** to highway safety.
- The **existing access arrangements have operated for over two years without any incident or concern**, demonstrating that the access pattern is safe, established, and typical for Semington Road.

Accordingly, the newly introduced turning-space requirement in the pre-application report does **not** reflect the site's planning history, the established local context, or the Highways Authority's previously stated position. It represents a **new and untested parameter**, introduced only at pre-application stage, and is not supported by any earlier officer findings.

New-Build Misclassification – Officer Error

The officer repeatedly refers to the proposal as a "*new build dwelling*", which does not reflect the planning history of the site. The Coach House is an **existing building**, already granted **temporary non-ancillary C3 residential use** under PL/2024/09323 and occupied as such for over two years without identified adverse impacts. As the proposal seeks only to **regularise an established C3 use**, it should be assessed in the context of an existing building with an established residential use rather than as a conventional new-build dwelling.

Standards relating to **NDSS internal space standards, minimum garden sizes, 21-metre separation distances**, and other design considerations are primarily directed towards **newly constructed dwellings or newly created residential units**. Their relevance and weight should therefore be considered in light of the specific circumstances of this proposal and the fact that no new built form, additional floorspace, or physical alterations are proposed.

Correct classification is important to ensure that the proposal is assessed on the basis of its **actual planning impacts**, planning history, and existing occupation rather than by reference to assumptions normally associated with a new-build development. This position is further reinforced by the fact that the development plan policies relating to emerging standards and criteria are no longer advanced through the withdrawn Emerging Local Plan.

Visibility Splays

The officer's reference to "visibility splays" treats the proposal as if it were a **new-build dwelling**, which is incorrect. Nevertheless, visibility splays have been fully assessed for the existing and proposed off-road parking spaces and vehicular access points.

Acceptable visibility is demonstrated using splays measured **2.4m back from the edge of the carriageway**, with clear visibility achieved for **40m in each direction** along Semington Road. These dimensions meet the required splay for a **30mph road**, in accordance with *Manual for Streets* guidance, and are achievable entirely within land controlled by the applicant, free from obstruction.

On this basis, the existing and proposed accesses provide **safe and adequate visibility** in accordance with the prevailing speed limit on Semington Road. There is **no visibility or forward-visibility objection** to either access arrangement.

Roadside Parking at 489 – Established, Safe, and Previously Accepted

The officer's reference to vehicles associated with 489 parking on the public highway is not a valid basis for objection. Roadside parking at 489 is an **existing, long-established arrangement** that has operated safely for **over two years during the temporary C3 occupation of The Coach House**, and **for well over a decade prior**, without any incidents, complaints, or highway concerns. This position is fully supported by the Highways Officer's earlier assessment under PL/2021/06824, which confirmed that the absence of off-road parking for 489 does **not** create a severe or unacceptable impact on highway safety and that unrestricted on-street parking along Semington Road is an acceptable and established pattern of access.

Semington Road functions as a local service road where many dwellings rely on roadside parking and routinely reverse into or out of their driveways. The Highways Authority has already confirmed that this arrangement does **not** result in severe cumulative impacts and is typical for the area. As such, the continued use of on-street parking by 489 is a **pre-existing situation**, entirely unrelated to the regularisation of the Coach House, and cannot lawfully be used to prejudice the assessment of permanent C3 use. The proposal introduces **no change** to parking behaviour at 489, and no evidence has been provided to suggest any harm arising from the established arrangement.

Principle of Development – Officer's Sole Objection

The pre-application report's objection is **policy-based**, not harm-based.

The officer states:

*"The proposal... would constitute **overdevelopment of the plot...**"*

This is not a technical harm finding. It is a **policy interpretation** relating to the number of dwellings on the wider site, and is contrary to previous adjudication and reporting.

Crucially, the officer does **not** identify:

- design harm
- amenity harm
- highways harm
- safety harm
- access harm
- privacy harm
- overshadowing harm
- noise or disturbance harm

All technical categories remain acceptable.

Summary of Pre-Application Findings

Across all technical planning considerations, the pre-application report **does not identify any new harm** arising from permanent C3 use of the building.

The officer:

- **Confirms no design concerns**
- **Confirms no amenity concerns**
- **Confirms no highways concerns**
- **Confirms no overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearing impacts**

- **Confirms no safety or access concerns**

The only objection relates to **policy (overdevelopment)**, not to the building or its impacts.

This aligns with the earlier permissions, which already confirmed:

- The building is acceptable in design
- The building is acceptable in character
- The building is acceptable in amenity terms
- The building is acceptable in highways terms

Permanent C3 use introduces **no new harm** in any technical category.

Summary of Officer Findings Across All Stages

Across the three relevant planning assessments – the **original garage and office permission (PL/2021/06824)**, the **temporary residential permission (PL/2024/09323)**, and the **pre-application report (ENQ/2025/01496)** – the officer consistently confirms that the **building itself** is acceptable in all technical planning respects.

In both formal permissions, the officer explicitly finds **no harm** in relation to:

- **Design and character**
- **Residential amenity**
- **Highway safety and access**

These conclusions are repeated and reaffirmed in the pre-application report, which does **not** identify any new harm arising from permanent C3 use. The only newly introduced objection raised at pre-application stage relates to a **policy interpretation** of “overdevelopment” based on the number of dwellings within the wider site – not on the building’s design, impact, or performance.

Taken together, the officer’s reports demonstrate that the structure has already passed every harm-based test under CP57, CP60, CP61, CP64 and the NPPF. The building has been found acceptable in form, scale, materials, amenity impact, access, and safety. No technical category shows any adverse impact from continued residential use.

This provides a clear and consistent evidential basis for concluding that **permanent C3 use introduces no new harm**, and that all technical planning considerations remain satisfied.

Policy Considerations in the Pre-Application Report

The pre-application assessment for ENQ/2025/01496 was carried out against the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy, the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (JMNP2), the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan, and limited-weight emerging policy. The officer identifies the following policies as particularly relevant:

Core Policy 1 – Settlement Strategy

Berryfield lies within a defined settlement boundary where development is acceptable in principle. The officer confirms that the **principle of development is acceptable**, subject to other considerations.

Core Policy 2 – Delivery Strategy

The proposal is within a sustainable settlement, but CP2 requires development to respect local context and capacity. The officer’s concern relates to **plot capacity**, not the building itself.

Core Policy 15 – Melksham Community Area

This policy supports appropriate infill and sustainable growth. The officer's objection is based on the **number of dwellings**, not on any harm arising from the building.

Core Policy 57 – High-Quality Design and Place Shaping

The officer repeats earlier findings that the building's **design, scale, materials, and visual impact remain acceptable**. No new design harm is identified. The only issue raised is a **policy interpretation of "overdevelopment"**, not a design failure.

Core Policy 60, 61, 64 – Transport & Parking

The highways officer raises **no objection in principle**. The pre-app confirms that permanent C3 use would be acceptable **subject to demonstrating parking allocation**, which is a normal validation requirement. No highway safety harm is identified.

Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (JMNP2)

The plan reinforces CP57 and local character considerations. The officer does not identify any conflict with JMNP2 other than the **policy-based concern about dwelling numbers**.

Wiltshire Local Transport Plan – Car Parking Strategy

Parking standards must be demonstrated at application stage. No transport harm is identified.

Emerging Wiltshire Local Plan Review

Carries **no weight** due to being recently withdrawn and does not materially affect the assessment.

Overall Summary

Across all relevant policies, the pre-application report identifies **no new harm** relating to:

- **Design or character**
- **Residential amenity**
- **Highway safety or access**

The sole issue raised is a **policy-based concern regarding "overdevelopment"**, not a technical or harm-based objection. All technical planning criteria remain satisfied, consistent with the earlier formal permissions.

Submitted Documents (Confirmation of Application Package)

The following documents are submitted in support of the application for:

Regularisation of Existing C3 Residential Use (Two-Bedroom Dwelling) – The Coach House, 489A Semington Road, Melksham, SN12 6DR.

1. **Design, Access and Planning Statement** – comprehensive assessment of **design, character, amenity, access, highways, policy compliance, and planning history**.
2. **Officer Objection Table – Officers Delegated Report – Pre-Application ENQ-2025-01496:**

2.1 Officer's Objection Table

A structured, evidence-based table presenting each officer objection alongside the applicant's direct counter-argument, highlighting contradictions, unsupported reasoning, and inconsistencies within the LPA's own reports.

2.2 Judicial Rulings Supporting the Counter-Arguments

Authoritative case-law references demonstrating alignment with established legal principles and identifying clear conflicts within the officer's reasoning.

2.21 Judicial Rulings – Why They Matter and Why They Cannot Be Ignored

Citing established judicial authority is not an academic exercise – it is fundamental to lawful decision-making. Planning officers are **legally required** to apply binding case law when interpreting policy, assessing harm, and determining whether a proposal is acceptable. These rulings exist precisely to prevent the type of inconsistent, unevidenced, or procedurally flawed reasoning seen in the officer's Pre-Application response.

Judicial rulings such as **Gravesham, Burdle, Impey, South Bucks v Porter (No.2), Coventry v Lawrence, Kides, Peat, Wavendon, and Williams v Powys** establish clear, enforceable principles:

- **Harm must be evidenced, not asserted.**
- **Temporary permissions confirm acceptability; they cannot be used to argue the use is unacceptable in principle.**
- **Amenity assessments must be based on actual effects, not hypothetical concerns.**
- **Character impact must relate to physical change, not administrative change.**
- **Decision-makers must avoid internal inconsistency and must apply the development plan correctly.**
- **Where no physical changes occur, any alleged harm must be specifically demonstrated.**
- **The tilted balance requires approval unless harm is significant and demonstrable.**

These rulings are not optional. They are binding legal constraints on how planning decisions must be made.

If an officer ignores these principles, refuses on a fabricated or unevidenced basis, or contradicts their own earlier findings, the decision becomes **legally vulnerable** and is likely to be overturned at appeal. Judicial authority exists to prevent planning decisions being made on personal opinion, inconsistent reasoning, or speculative harm.

In short: Judicial rulings ensure planning decisions are lawful, rational, and evidence-based. If an officer disregards them, any refusal is procedurally unsound – and appeal becomes the corrective mechanism.

This is why the case is structured around these rulings: they anchor the arguments in established law and clearly expose where the officer's reasoning departs from required decision-making standards.

2.3. Harm Matrix – a clear matrix showing that **no actual harm exists**, comparing each alleged impact against the Temporary Delegated Report, the Pre-Application advice, and Wiltshire Council's own stated positions, confirming full compliance with local and national policy.

3. **Wiltshire Council – Emerging Local Plan** – sets out the legal and policy implications of Wiltshire Council's formal withdrawal of its emerging Local Plan, confirming that all emerging policies now carry **zero weight** and cannot lawfully be used in the assessment or refusal of this application.

4A. Location & Site Plan – Existing

4B. Location & Site Plan – Proposed

5A. Site Layout & Perimeter Plan – Existing

5B. **Site Layout & Perimeter Plan – Proposed** – unchanged; demonstrates site layout and access.

6A. Elevations, Floor Plans, Sections & Roof Plans – Existing

6B. Elevations, Floor Plans, Sections & Roof Plans – Proposed

The existing and proposed layouts, plans and elevations (A & B) are identical, owing to the building's **established C3 non-ancillary residential use** granted under **PL/2024/09323**, which has now been in place for **over two years** without any physical changes to the structure or the site. This includes **no proposed alterations**, fully consistent with the **Regularisation of Existing C3 Residential Use (Two-Bedroom Dwelling) – The Coach House, 489A Semington Road, Melksham, SN12 6DR**.

During this period of **over two years of non-ancillary residential use**, there has been **no conflict** between the two buildings, nor any conflict between the **independent occupants** of 489A and The Coach House. The site has operated **safely, appropriately, and without any amenity issues** throughout the temporary permission.

These documents collectively satisfy the **national and local validation requirements** for a full planning application seeking **permanent C3 non-ancillary residential use**.

If the **Regularisation of Existing C3 Residential Use (Two-Bedroom Dwelling) – The Coach House** is refused, and the matter proceeds to appeal, **an application for a full award of costs will be submitted by the applicant**.

7. Supporting letter from current tenants in principle property 489A

The tenants have expressed a **high level of satisfaction** with the property and its neighbouring relationship, noting that the proximity of The Coach House has never affected their enjoyment of the home. Their contentment is such that they have asked the landlord not to dispose of 489A, preferring to remain in tenancy.

8. Supporting letter from Wrights Residential Lettings

Wrights Residential Lettings, a long-established and reputable local agency, confirms **full professional support** for the separation of the Coach House from 489A Semington Road. The Director, Adam Wright, states he has known you for **20 years**, describing you as consistently **professional, polite, and of high integrity**.

He highlights that **489A is a highly desirable rental property**, attracting strong interest and positive feedback on its internal layout, functionality, and the **secluded private rear garden**. He notes that the **2-metre privacy fence** and **mirrored/privacy glazing** between the two dwellings ensure **complete separation and privacy**, with **no concerns ever raised** by prospective tenants.

Wrights further confirm that the current tenants are **extremely comfortable**, have **no issues whatsoever** with your proximity in the Coach House, and that both properties already **function seamlessly as independent homes** with **no overlooking, privacy, or amenity concerns**.

Officer's Delegated Reports

9A. **PL/2021/06824 – Garage & Office Conversion (Original Approval)**

9B. **PL/2024/09323 – Temporary C3 Non-Ancillary Residential Use (Coach House)**

9C. **ENQ-2025-01496 – Regularisation of Existing C3 Residential Use (Pre-Application)**

The three delegated reports are provided for clarity and completeness, as each forms part of the site's formal planning history and directly informs the assessment of the existing C3

non-ancillary residential use. Their inclusion ensures that the LPA has immediate access to the officer's own findings on **design, amenity, highways, and residential acceptability**, all of which were previously confirmed as acceptable. Submitting these reports supports a transparent and evidence-based determination and assists in identifying any inconsistencies between earlier officer conclusions and the current assessment.

Conclusion – Regularisation of Existing C3 Residential Use

The evidence across all stages of assessment demonstrates clearly and consistently that the Coach House already functions as a safe, appropriate, and fully compliant C3 dwelling. Both formal permissions (PL/2021/06824 and PL/2024/09323) confirm that the building is acceptable in terms of design, character, amenity, access, and highway safety, and the pre-application report identifies **no new harm** arising from continued residential occupation. The proposal does not introduce any physical change, intensification, or alteration to the established pattern of use; it simply seeks the **regularisation of an existing, long-operational C3 dwelling**.

All technical planning considerations remain satisfied. The building has operated independently for over two years without complaint, conflict, or amenity impact, supported by direct evidence from tenants, the letting agent, and the Highways Authority. Judicial authority supports the conclusion that the temporary C3 permission remains a significant material consideration and that any allegation of new planning harm should be supported by evidence, particularly where the physical circumstances remain unchanged. With Wiltshire's housing land supply below the required threshold, the **tilted balance** applies, and in the absence of any identified harm, national policy requires approval.

Accordingly, the regularisation of the existing C3 residential use of the Coach House is fully supported by the planning history, officer findings, adopted policy, case law, and real-world operational evidence. The proposal is sustainable, compliant, and free from adverse impact. It is respectfully submitted that planning permission should now be granted.