

Appeal 6009225

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Written
Appeal site	Land at Elms Farm, Elms Cross, BA15 2AL
Agent contact details	Eleanor King eleanor@atlasplanninggroup.co.uk +441722638008
Local planning authority	Wiltshire
Application number	PL/2025/08747

Interested party 1

Comments

I wish to object to Appeal 6009225 against refusal of Planning Application pl/2025/08747 - new build at Elms Cross Westwood on the following grounds:

1. I believe this Planning Application for the construction of a new build 2 storey 4 bedroom is contrary to National and local planning policies which establish a strong presumption against new residential development on the Green Belt.

2. The Appellant's statement of appeal places significant emphasis on the existing approval for a Class Q dwelling. However there are significant material differences between the two applications. The Class Q development is an Agricultural Barn sitting alongside an existing hedgerow and blending in to the countryside. The site for PL/2025/08747 forms part of a larger undeveloped area. The introduction of a substantial detached residential dwelling with the consequent residential amenities of garden, parking, lighting etc would materially affect the character of the site and result in urbanisation of previous undeveloped land,. This conflicts with the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy to prevent urban sprawl and safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

3. The site is highly visible from public viewpoints including footpaths, and the photograph included in Para4.4 of the applicant appeal presents a misleading image of the location of the site. The photograph attached illustrates the clear open view from the very popular footpath ww007 which is part of the Bradford on Avon Walking Wheel network . The Class Q barn can be seen blending into the hedgerow, the development of a very obviously residential new build located on open undeveloped land would have a significant impact on the open vista from the footpath.

Para5.3. There is significant material difference from the approved Class Q and this application which would represent a clear change of character. The Class Q approval is for an agricultural barn which retains it's form, size, location and appearance, sitting closely to the surrounding hedgerow. This proposal increases the height, size,

location and appearance of the new build which would sit on previously undeveloped open countryside and would represent clear change from open countryside to urban sprawl .

Para5.7 I strongly disagree that the housing deficit is a factor as the Class Q provides for a 3 bedroom residential family dwelling which provides a residential property developed to sustainable standard as requested and approved under the Class Q application made by the applicant.

4. It is my view that this appeal has not demonstrated any material benefit or very special circumstance why approval should be given for this new build. The existing Class Q approval addresses the need for housing stock and ensures the rural landscape is not harmed whereas the new build would result in clear urbanisation of the Green Belt. This application proposes taking existing open equestrian land of a greater footprint than the Class Q approved dwelling and urbanising it to build an obviously residential home with associated garden, car parking etc.

5. I see nowhere in this application where permission for change of use of this land for residential purpose has been requested. I also believe that if this application were to be allowed it could set a damaging precedent for further speculative or isolated housing proposals in the Green Belt to be made by adjoining landowners for similar forms of development.

Supporting documents

[Barn.JPG \(/published-document/3bf79add-6ca5-4f7f-9998-0b752e3458b5\)](#)

Interested party 2

Comments

I am an interested party and do not support the Appeal ref 6009225. I believe the applicant is making their case on a false premise. I believe the starting point is that there is a Class Q property established and that the applicant is in reality demolishing a Class Q dwelling on one site and replacing it with a substantially different dwelling on another [adjacent] site which has significantly greater curtilage (Drawing 25/841/EDC1 Rev B). I suggest that this dwelling would not pass planning being in Green Belt and visually out of keeping with the location. The site sits within Westwood Parish, outside of the village boundary and in Green Belt. There are 3 other nearby Class Q dwellings having recently received Planning Approval; 2 dwellings have been developed as Class Q dwellings maintaining their nature and structure, the third also maintaining the nature and structure is awaiting minor considerations before development.

Referring to the "Statement of Case".

Paragraph 1.9 makes assertions regarding the PL/2022/04384 dwelling that I suggest are incorrect.

- Firstly it is not similar it is on the same site as the Class Q approval (PL/2021/10080); unlike this Planning appeal.
- Secondly the site is not adjacent, it being over 200m away across agricultural land used for equestrian and dog day-care businesses. Paragraph 2.1 asserts that the proposal takes into consideration the context of the site and surrounding nearby character. The nearby

character is 3 nearby Class Q Barn conversions and not a substantial residential ‘manor’ house on a green field site. The fall-back position mentioned is on a totally different site.

Paragraph 2.1, the Decision Notice “very special circumstances” appear to be presented by the applicant in paragraph 5.7 however the reasons given appear spurious for instance the Council’s significant housing deficit it met by the Class Q etc.

Paragraph 4.11 asserts this to be similar to other dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site, the applicant has made a vague assertion but not listed such dwellings as one would expect if it were factually correct; I believe this to be a false assertion.

Paragraph 4.11 mentions new planting to the north and east of the dwelling; I understand this to be that of PL/2025/09768 which is an acoustic fence for noise reduction of the dog day care which required a hedge to reduce the visual obtrusiveness of a 2.4m high fence; this is hardly applicable.

Paragraph 5.6 actually creates future sprawl by nature of the significantly increased curtilage and location away from the class Q dwelling in green field.

The Class Q Building can be clearly seen in full frontage from the Footpath WW007, the proposed dwelling being closer to the Footpath and of considerably greater scale would be more visually obtrusive from the Footpath.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

