

Angela Ellis.
Planning Officer.
Development Services
Wiltshire Council
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
Wiltshire.
BA14 8JN.



Date: 08 September 2026.

Dear Angela Ellis,

Hazelcombe, Brokerswood, Westbury, Wiltshire. BA13 4EY.

Application Number: PL/2026/04746

Proposal: Removal of an Agricultural and Forestry Occupancy Condition - Condition 1 of Planning Permission A/4188.

We object to the above planning application and will outline our reasons as follows:

Background:

It is our understanding that Planning Permission Number: A/4188 for Hazelcombe was granted on 21 March 1966.

This planning permission included three conditions.

Condition 1 as follows:

'The occupation of the cottage shall be limited to persons employed locally in agriculture as defined in Section 221(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1962 or in forestry and the dependants of such persons.'

The aforementioned condition is an occupancy condition which limits the occupation of Hazelcombe to those employed locally in agriculture or forestry and their dependants. It is of standard terminology and typical of occupancy conditions.

I, Andrew Wesley have lived in Brokerswood since the late 1950s and saw the construction of Hazelcombe in 1966 / 1967.

Hazelcombe is situated in Brokerswood and adjoins about 120 acres of woodlands.

The Application:

We note from the Planning Application that Mr M. Cassidy 'the Applicant' is the current sole owner of Hazelcombe who purchased the property in August 2024.

We further note that the Applicant purchased Hazelcombe in the knowledge that it had an occupancy condition.

See the Supporting Statement, paragraph 1.2: 'At risk, they have allowed their son and partner to temporarily occupy it, neither of whom comply with the occupancy condition.'

Therefore we are at a loss as to why the Applicant is now dissatisfied with this occupancy condition.

This application cannot be considered a Section 73 application because there has been no continued breach of this occupancy condition. The Applicant and his wife have not occupied the property since he purchased it in August 2024 and their son and partner only occupy it temporarily.

The marketing exercise clearly demonstrates that a significant number of potential purchasers (about 25%) do comply with this occupancy condition.

This is strong evidence that in the surrounding area of Hazelcombe there is a high demand for employment in agriculture and forestry.

Consequently there is a requirement for properties in the surrounding areas of countryside to meet this demand, like Hazelcombe, which are only constructed when an occupancy condition is in place

As a result the marketing exercise shows no support for this planning application and only serves to endorse this occupancy condition.

Conclusion:

There has been no continued breach of this occupancy condition.

The marketing exercise shows no evidence to support this application and only serves to endorse this occupancy condition.

In any event occupancy conditions are designed to remain tied to a dwelling in perpetuity and Hazelcombe would be no exception.

If requests, like this application, were considered this would make a mockery of national Planning Law. The floodgates would be opened for occupancy conditions to be removed on all tied properties.

All dwellings constructed in the countryside since 1962 have occupancy conditions, which is why Hazelcombe's planning permission correctly and rightly had one included in compliance with Planning Law.

This application is most unprecedented and without basis.

There is no reason or justification for the removal of this occupancy condition and it should therefore remain.

Yours sincerely,



A. R. Wesley, J and A. M. Wesley.