



The Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Refusal of Full Planning Permission
Application Reference Number: PL/2025/09935
Decision Date: 26/02/2026

Applicant:	Mr Wayne Clark 1 The Meads, Burton, Chippenham, Wiltshire, SN14 7LS
Particulars of Development:	Regularisation for creation of enlarged hardstanding & Storage Cabin on agricultural land
At:	Land near Raybarrow Farm, Nettleton Shrub, Nettleton, Chippenham, SN14 7NN

In accordance with paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), this planning application has been processed in a proactive way. However, due to technical objections or the proposal's failure to comply with the development plan and/or the NPPF as a matter of principle, the local planning authority has had no alternative other than to refuse planning permission.

In pursuance of their powers under the above Act, the Council hereby REFUSE TO GRANT PERMISSION for the development referred to in the above application and plans submitted by you, for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reason

- 1 The proposed development represents an incongruous character and appearance in this rural setting. Visually it does not appear to be related to agricultural activity or use, and no information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate any specific agricultural need. Core Policy 57 (i) and (ii) require that development responds positively to the value of the natural setting and relates positively to its landscape setting, and that important landscaping features are retained and enhanced. The application conflicts with these fundamental aims of Core Policy 57, as well as the NPPF aims of development being sympathetic to its landscape setting (paragraph 135) and creating high quality, beautiful and sustainable places (paragraph 131).

Refusal Reason

- 2 The site is situated within the Cotswold National Landscape within which there is a duty on the local planning authority to 'further the duty' of conserving and enhancing

land situated within this designated area. The former agricultural character of the site, which complemented its rural location and setting, has been materially eroded and harm has been caused to the site, its setting, and thus the Cotswold National Landscape. The impacts of the proposal thus lead to conflicts with Core Policy 51(ii, iii, v, ix) (WCS), Saved Policy NE14 (NWLP) and Section 15 of the NPPF in terms of landscape and visual impact.

Refusal Reason

- 3** The site falls within the Bath and Bradford-on-Avon Bat Special Area of Conservation and, per paragraph 194(a) of the NPPF, the site is afforded the same protection as a habitats site. Core Policy 50 (WCS) requires that proposals 'avoid harm' to ecological assets and to deliver biodiversity and enhancement. The proposed development, an extent of which has already occurred, does not meet this policy requirement and as such the application conflicts with Core Policy 50 (WCS) and paragraphs 193-195 of the NPPF.

Refusal Reason

- 4** There is no demonstrated need for the creation of an additional (second) access to the site, as shown on the submitted plans. The application does not demonstrate acceptability in highway terms, in particular: (i) the provision of appropriate visibility splays (without reliance on third-party land), and (ii) the necessary set-back of the proposed gates from the highway, the latter of which may well have impacts on design and character. As such, the proposal is unacceptable in terms of highway safety, and conflicts with Core Policy 61 (WCS).

Nic Thomas - Director of Planning, Economy and Regeneration

NOTES

1. **Appeals.** If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the local planning authority to refuse permission, they may appeal to the Secretary of State for the Environment in accordance with Section 78(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 within six months of the date of this decision. (Information and forms relating to the appeals process can be found at the Planning Portal - [Appeal a planning decision: Overview - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/appeal-a-planning-decision-overview)).