



Pana Kwabe
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Development Services
Wiltshire Council
Tel: 0300 456 0114
Email: developmentmanagement@wiltshire.gov.uk
www.wiltshire.gov.uk

19th June 2026

Dear Ms Kwabe

Appeal and application No:	6008434 and PL/2025/09810
Appeal proposal:	Permission in Principle (PiP) application for residential development consisting of a minimum of 4 no. dwellings and a maximum of 9 no. dwellings.
Site Address:	Land at Brakenhill Mews, Upper Seagry, Chippenham, SN15 5EU

STATEMENT OF CASE

Further to the Planning Inspectorate notification dated 7th May 2026 and the attached appellant statement.

Please find attached as an appendix to this letter the delegated report prepared at the time of the determination of the planning application. Since the appellants position does not substantively alter from that expressed at the time of the planning application, in very large part the Council is content to rely upon the assessment and conclusions reached within that report, which is appended to this letter.

It is, however, noted that the appellant references several appeal decisions so as to support their position. Those appeal decisions relate to entirely different sites, in different settlements and in many cases, in entirely different parts of the Country and for different scale of development. Clearly, it is would not be safe for an Inspector to slavishly follow the conclusions reached about proposes for different forms of development in different contexts. In this case, the appeal proposals for potentially 9 new dwellings on a site that is so very obviously not part of a built-up part of an identified settlement. To grant permission for such would be the antithesis of a sustainable forms of development and diametrically opposed to local and national policy.

It should also be noted that the appellants attempt to somehow claim that the Council's Highway Engineer did not raise concerns about the sustainability of the location lacks authenticity. Factually, the Highway Engineer regards any new housing at the site as only ever realistically being accessed by the private car, and the Council as the Local Planning Authority agreed with that viewpoint because it a real-world conclusion to reach.

For the above reasons and those set out within the delegated report, and the eloquent objections to the proposals from the local community, it is respectfully requested that the Inspector dismiss this appeal.

Yours faithfully

Nic Thomas - Director of Planning, Economy and Regeneration

Enclosures:

- Delegated report – PL/2025/09810

APPLICATION FOR FULL-PLANNING PERMISSION CASE OFFICER REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2025/09810
APPLICATION TYPE:	Permission in Principle
SITE ADDRESS:	Land at Brakenhill Mews, Upper Seagry, Chippenham, SN15 5EU
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Permission in Principle (PiP) application for residential development consisting of a minimum of 4 no. dwellings and a maximum of 9 no. dwellings.
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

SITE DESCRIPTION / PROPOSAL

This application seeks Permission in Principle (PiP) for the erection of between 4no. and 9no. dwellings on a site of some 0.49ha located on the eastern side of Seagry Road some 600m north of where that highway crosses over the M4 motorway. To the immediate south of the site is the residential dwelling Brackenhill Mews, which forms one of a collection of several rural dwellings, including The Coach House, Hungerdown Lodge and Stable Cottage. To the north, east and west of the site is generally open agricultural land, with some paddock land to the immediate east of the site.

Along with a Site Location Plan, two separate Site Plans have been submitted demonstrating how the proposed range of dwellings could be accommodated on the site. These are only indicative at this in-principle stage and no further details have been provided. The Site Plan for the 4no. units shows these as detached dwellings arranged loosely around a cul-de-sac access drive; the 9no. units are shown as a terrace form along a slightly extended access spur. Extracts of the indicative layouts are shown below, which demonstrates that in each case access will be taken from the existing access from the highway serving the agricultural land:



Submitted Site Plans for 4no. and 9no. dwellings

The site is not within any conservation area and the nearest listed building is Seales Court, some 275m to the west of the site. There are no Public Rights of Way crossing or adjacent to the site, the nearest being SEAG4 which runs broadly east-west some 200m to the north of

the site. The site falls within flood zone 1 and is not shown to be at any elevated level of flood risk from other sources. The site is recorded as being Grade 2 Agricultural Land, which falls within the Best and Most Versatile (BMV) classification.

In the first instance, a decision on whether to grant permission in principle to a site must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan unless there are material considerations, such as those in the National Planning Policy Framework and national guidance, which indicate otherwise. The scope of a PiP application is limited to consideration of issues of: (i) location; (ii) land use; and (iii) amount of development. Issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters should be considered at this permission in principle stage; other matters are left to be considered at the technical details consent stage.

PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal / Summary
18/01585/PNCOU - Notification Decision - Withdrawn Date: 28/3/2018 – Prior Approval for a Change of Use from Storage or Distribution Buildings (Class B8) and any land within its curtilage to Dwellinghouses (Class C3) - Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 - Schedule 2, Part 3, Class
N/06/01774/COU - Full planning permission Decision - Approve with Conditions Date: 11/9/2006 – Change of Use of Land to Menage

RELEVANT LEGISLATION, POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Statutory Legislation:

- The Town & Country Planning Act 1990

National Planning Policy:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- National Design Guide

Development Plan:

The development plan for Wiltshire comprises the *Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) (adopted January 2015)* and any made neighbourhood plans, which remains the principal statutory planning document guiding development across the county. In line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Though the development plan is considered as a whole, those parts deemed to be particularly relevant to this application are listed below:

The adopted *Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS)*, with particular regard to:

- Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy;
- Core Policy 2 Delivery Strategy;
- Core Policy 3 Infrastructure Requirements;

- Core Policy 10 Spatial Strategy for the Chippenham Community Area
- Core Policy 45 Meeting Wiltshire's Housing Needs;
- Core Policy 50 Biodiversity and Geodiversity;
- Core Policy 51 Landscape
- Core Policy 57 Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping;
- Core Policy 58 Ensuring the Conservation of the Historic Environment;
- Core Policy 60 Sustainable Transport;
- Core Policy 61 Transport & Development;
- Core Policy 62 Development Impacts on the Transport Network;
- Core Policy 67 Flood Risk;

Draft Wiltshire Local Plan Policies [delete/insert above as appropriate]

- Policy 1: Settlement Strategy
- Policy 2: Delivery Strategy
- Policy 3: Reserve sites and broad locations for growth
- Policy 4: Addressing climate change
- Policy 5: Securing infrastructure provision from new development
- Policies 6-20: Chippenham Area Strategy
- Policies 76 – 84: Social, housing, community, public open space and wellbeing
- Policies 85 – 101: Sustainability, ecology, water and landscape, heritage, air quality

The draft Local Plan is currently going through Examination and at this stage is subject to unresolved objections. As such, the policies contained within that draft Local Plan are considered to hold only limited weight.

Seagry Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – 2036 ('SNP', Made May 2021)

- Objectives O1, O5, O6
- Planning Policy SNP6: Small Infill Development

Supplementary Planning Documents and other Guidance:

- Wiltshire Design Guide (adopted April 2024)
- Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026, adopted 2015 - including the Car Parking Strategy and Cycling Strategy, adopted 2015
- A Green & Blue Infrastructure Strategy for Wiltshire: Wiltshire's Natural Environment Plan 2022-2030
- Wiltshire Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)
 - Active travel infrastructure design standards 2022
 - Active travel parking standards and design guide 2022
- LTN1/20 – Cycle Infrastructure Design (July 2020)
- Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan, adopted 25 February 2020

ISSUES

The issues arising for consideration from this Permission in Principle application proposal are as follows:

- Location
- Land Use
- Amount of Development

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Seagry Parish Council: Object on basis of being contrary to policy (Seagry Neighbourhood Plan/ Wiltshire Core Strategy/ NPPF), unsustainable and not well related to any settlement

WC Highways: Objection to the principle of development and sustainability of the site / No objection to highway impact or parking

REPRESENTATIONS

In accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), the application was publicised by way of:

- A site notice displayed at the site;

These methods were used to inform interested parties and provide a period of 21 days for comments to be submitted.

Below is a summary of the representations received during the consultation period. Only material planning considerations have been taken into account in the assessment of this application. Non-material issues, such as property values or private legal disputes, cannot be considered in the determination process.

2no. representations were received with regard to the application, both in objection raising the following points:

- Inappropriate and unsustainable location
- Policy conflict (Seagry Neighbourhood plan / Wiltshire Development Plan) / development should only be for infill within the existing settlement
- Danger of precedent being set

ASSESSMENT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

In accordance with this statutory requirement, this application has been assessed against the relevant policies of the Development Plan, including the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) and, where applicable, any made Neighbourhood Plans. Consideration has also been given to the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as a material consideration in the assessment.

The scope of assessment for the first stage of a PiP application is limited to 'in principle' considerations of **location**, **land-use** and the **amount of proposed development** only. In the event of approval in principle, the second stage, known as the 'technical details consent' stage, involves the submission of the detailed development proposals. The technical details stage involves assessment of all of the usual range of considerations that relate to full planning applications, for example design, appearance, layout, access, parking, landscaping, ecology and heritage impacts. The granting of a PiP application does not guarantee the acceptability of the proposals at the technical details consent stage.

Planning conditions cannot be imposed on the grant of PiP however conditions can be applied in the usual way at the technical details consent stage. Any PiP approved for residential development must be expressed indicating the minimum and maximum net number of dwellings which are, in principle, permitted. For a valid PiP application only a plan to identify the land to which the application relates is required.

Principle of Development

Location – Settlement Strategy

The main in principle issue is whether the proposed development would constitute a suitable location for new residential development. This is to be considered having regard to the settlement strategy set out in the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS), and the accessibility of the site in terms of services and facilities.

The Settlement Strategy and Delivery Strategy for the district are set out in Core Policy 1 and Core Policy 2 of the WCS respectively. Taken together these policies seek to direct new residential development to the existing urban areas and defined settlements to meet the general aims of promoting sustainable development and the protection of the countryside. The settlement hierarchy set out in the WCS is Principal Settlements, followed by Market Towns, Local Service Centres and then Large Villages – each of these sizes of settlement have designated settlement boundaries. At the lowest end of the hierarchy, 'Small Villages' do not benefit from designated settlement boundaries.

This application site is not situated within or adjacent to any designated settlement. The nearest designated settlement is Upper Seagry, which is some 300m to the north-west of the site.

Being bound by open countryside on three of its sides, the site clearly falls outside the definition of 'infill' development. The principle of the development of dwellings outside any recognised settlement boundary, and not constituting 'infill' development, would thus be contrary to the development plan, specifically Core Policies 1, 2 and 10 (WCS), as well as Saved Policy H4 (NWLP) which is relevant given the location of the site outside any settlement boundary, and Planning Policy SNP6 (SNP). For clarification, Saved Policy H4 does not fully align with the provisions of the NPPF, nor Core Policies 1 and 2 (WCS) and SNP6 (SNP), which are more up to date and are therefore afforded greater weight. The location of the site also gives rise to conflict with the sustainable transport objectives of the Core Strategy and NPPF, in particular Core Policies 60 and 61, as indicated by the Highway Officer response.

5 Year Housing Land Supply

The Wiltshire Housing Land Supply Statement (June 2025) provides the latest position on the Council's ability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land, which is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024. This has reintroduced the requirement to meet five years' worth of deliverable sites and a buffer to be applied to the five-year housing requirement in all circumstances, and has revised the Local Housing Need calculation to establish the five-year housing requirement. These factors have resulted in a substantial increase in the five-year housing requirement to be met from the previous calculation. When this is assessed against the housing land supply which can be delivered within five years, the recalculation shows a significant reduction in the number of years supply. The resulting position shows that the Council can currently demonstrate a 2.42 years housing land supply of housing at a unitary authority level. This is considered to be a substantial shortfall.

The absence of a five-year housing land supply is a material consideration in the determination of this application. In accordance with Paragraphs 78 and 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), for applications involving the provision of housing, where there is a shortfall in the supply of deliverable housing sites, the most important policies for determining the application should be considered out of date. The current housing land supply shortfall is a factor that must be considered in the planning balance and in this case, as a five-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated, the weight that can be applied to the most important policies for determining this application should be assessed and altered in the light of the shortage in housing land supply. The proposal must be assessed against the national policy context of the need to boost housing supply and the benefits of delivering new homes whilst having particular regard to the key policies set out in paragraph 11(d)(ii) and Footnote 9 of the NPPF.

Previously developed land

The Applicant has referenced that the site is 'previously developed land.' Paragraph 125(c) of the NPPF requires LPAs to *'give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused...'* Previously developed land is defined within the NPPF as: *"Land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed). It also includes land comprising large areas of fixed surface infrastructure such as large areas of hardstanding which have been lawfully developed. Previously developed land excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; ..."*

Whilst the submitted Design Access & Planning Statement asserts that the use of the site is as 'commercial and equestrian yard'. However, it has not been demonstrated that the lawful use of the former Nissen Hut is 'commercial', and that notwithstanding, the majority of the site comprises generally open land of hardstanding / gravel / grass with some established trees,

along with a stable building to the southern boundary. Given the location of the site away from any defined settlement, coupled with the established generally rural character of the site (albeit in part equestrian rather than definitively 'agricultural'), the weight attributed to this site being 'previously developed land' as part of the planning balance is significantly reduced.

Location – Access to services and facilities

As a 'Small Village' in the settlement hierarchy, Upper Seagry has a corresponding range of facilities, including: primary school, public house and recreation ground. However, the site itself is not at all well connected to the settlement, being located on a 'C' classified highway with a speed limit of 60 and with no inter-connecting designated pedestrian routes or pavement, or available bus stops.

As such, whilst not 'isolated' in the technical sense, the site is not well related to the closest settlements and it would be unrealistic to anticipate that residents would travel to these by means of transport other than private car.

This is confirmed in the Highways Officer response, which states that:

As this would lead to separate dwellings outside of identified development boundaries, the proposal would usually attract an adverse highway recommendation on sustainability grounds as follows:

The site is located outside of any settlement policy boundary, raising concerns with regards to the sustainability of the site for residential development due to the likely reliance upon the private car for any occupants and their visitors. This proposal is therefore, in my opinion, contrary to Core Policies 60 and 61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which aim to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car and encourage the use of sustainable transport alternatives."

Core Policies 60 and 61 of the WCS set out that the Council will help to reduce the need to travel by private car by planning developments in accessible locations. New development should be located and designed to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car, and to encourage the use of sustainable travel alternatives. The location of this proposal is not considered to accord with the objective of these policies, as confirmed by the response from the Highways Officer, and would also conflict with the broad aims of the NPPF which seeks to promote sustainable development and reduce growth in the length and number of motorised journeys. This conflict is afforded substantial weight against the proposal.

Reference to various appeal decisions in the submitted Planning Statement has been noted, but it is maintained that a number of recent appeal decisions in the County for similar forms of development at locations which were considered to be unsustainable have confirmed the importance of the connectivity and sustainability of the site in terms of acceptability – these are referenced in this report below.

Location – Landscape Character and BMV

The scope of this Permission in Principle application is restricted to the extent that detailed design and layout of the proposal cannot be considered at this stage. In principle, site specific locational factors to consider are the fact that the site is currently a parcel of agricultural / paddock land which is located within a rural and generally agricultural setting and very visible from the public highway.

The NPPF generally directs new development towards more sustainable locations and / or previously developed and brownfield sites. Section 15 of the NPPF relates to the natural environment, and Core Policy 51 (WCS) requires development not to have a harmful impact on landscape character, including:

“ii. The locally distinctive character of settlements and their landscape settings.

iii. The separate identity of settlements and the transition between man-made and natural landscapes at the urban fringe’.

The district-level North Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment identifies the site as being within the Open Clay Vale / Avon Valley Lowland Landscape Character Area. The Assessment notes that this large landscape area, which stretches from Chippenham to Malmesbury is predominantly flat and with ‘arable dominating the freer draining higher-grade agricultural land’ (4.200). The Management Guidelines include an overall objective to ‘conserve the rural character, and ensure development of the urban fringe does not compromise the nature of the area’ (4.211).

Thus, the extension of built form into the countryside at this rural location would be detrimental to the general landscape character of the area and the spread of residential development outside of any settlement boundary as proposed would lead to landscape harm and as such contrary to Core Policies 51 and 57 (WCS).

The site is classified as being Grade 2 agricultural land, which falls within the ‘best and most versatile (BMV) category. The NPPF is clear that the ‘best and most versatile’¹ agricultural land should be reflected in planning policy and decisions. However, given the scale of land which would be lost from productive agricultural use in this instance (0.49ha), it is not considered that this scale is ‘significant’ (in the context of footnote 65 of the NPPF and the 20ha threshold used to trigger an assessment by Natural England) and as such would not represent a justifiable reason for refusal in this instance.

Location – Access

Aside from the locational and sustainability arguments put forward by the Highway Officer’s response (as above), the Highway Officer has not raised any specific concerns regarding access to the site, or the capacity of the local highway network to accommodate the increase in movements arising from additional dwellings. The existing access is sufficient such that no works are required to the access which would give rise to any character or townscape / landscape impacts. On this basis, access and highway capacity / safety issues would not warrant refusal of the application.

¹ ‘Best and most versatile agricultural land’ is defined in the NPPF Glossary as: ‘Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification.’

Location – Ecology

The site is not shown to be subject to any specific ecology designations. No ecology surveys have been provided as part of this application but should there be any potential for bats or any other protected species at the application site, this would need to form part of the technical details approval. Details how Biodiversity Net Gain is achieved would also be required at that technical details stage.

Land Use

The NPPF outlines the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes. WCS Core Policies 1 and 2 are the Local Plan's overarching policies in respect of establishing suitable locations for sustainable new development. The parameters of these policies are quite clear in setting out in spatial terms where new housing is considered to be sustainably located and thus acceptable. The arguments regarding the acceptability of the principle of new housing on this site are set out above.

Amount of Development

The amount of development, namely the range of 4no. to 9no. dwellings, is not considered to give rise to any specific impacts on the amenities of occupants of neighbouring properties. Based on the submitted indicative Site Plans, the 'amount' of development in this instance would not represent any specific reason for refusal, other than the scale of development and trips generated from a site which is considered to be unsustainable.

Other matters

Scope of application type

The application is a Permission in Principle and therefore detailed consideration of such matters as neighbour amenity, impact on the character and appearance of the area, drainage, access / highway safety and ecology would be considered as part of the technical details stage. These matters have been considered within this report from an in-principle viewpoint only to be able to consider location, land use and amount of development.

Other application / appeal cases

The submitted Supporting Statement references other appeal decisions which are considered relevant to this application proposal. However, conversely there are a number of recent appeal decisions which have been dismissed for sites which are considered unsustainable, as referenced below². By way of example however, the Inspector concluded with regard to the main issue as to: 'whether or not the site is suitable for residential land use, having regard to its location and its accordance with the spatial strategy of the development plan' for 3361696 that:

² For example (and not exhaustive but most recent only):

3371671 Land at The School, The Green, Biddestone, Wiltshire, SN14 7DG (19 December 2025)

3367300 Land at 20 Malmesbury Road, Leigh, Cricklade, Wiltshire SN6 6RH (27 November 2025)

3364563 Land to the north of Newtown Road, Ramsbury, Wiltshire SN8 2PP (11 September 2025)

3361696 Land at Tiddleywink, Yatton Keynell, Wiltshire SN14 7BY (03 September 2025)

“15. Taking the above into account, ... I conclude that the appeal site would not be a suitable location for residential land use and would conflict with the spatial strategy of the development plan, specifically WCS policies CP1, CP2 and CP10. I have no firm reason to find that there would be unacceptable impacts on highway safety or the road network, but the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it seeks to minimise the number and length of journeys required by households and to offer a genuine choice of transport modes.”

And similarly for 3364563 that:

“20. In view of the above and recognising that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, I find that the proposal would allow future occupiers access to a reasonable range of village services within walking or cycling distance, along with bus services to other settlements. However, future occupants would still be likely to be generally dependent on the use of a private motor car to access services, facilities and employment in larger settlements.

21. As such, the location of the proposed development would conflict with the spatial strategy of the development plan, in particular its accessibility to services and facilities, namely WCS policies CP1, CP2 and CP14 and policy CP61.”

And similarly for 3367300 that:

“11. Therefore, even taking into account that the opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, for the above reasons, residential development in the proposed location would cause a moderate level of harm to the settlement strategy in the development plan. It would conflict with WCS Core Policies 1, 2, 13, 60 and 61 which seek to control development outside the defined limits of development; ensure that development takes place in sustainable locations and is located to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car.”

Clearly, each case must be treated on its own merits, but the above extracts do demonstrate the importance of the sustainability of the site in terms of transport connections and options for travel by more sustainable modes.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

At the heart of the NPPF there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development requiring local planning authorities to approve development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; and where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless (taken from paragraph 11d of the NPPF):

- The application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing development proposed; or
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole;

Having regard to paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework and the provisions of footnote 7, the Local Planning Authority considers that the presumption in favour of sustainable development (‘tilted balance’) is engaged. This is because relevant policies of the development plan are considered out-of-date.

In terms of considering how much weight to apply to the housing policies of the WCS, the extent of the lack of five-year housing supply has been considered. The higher the shortfall, the greater the need for additional unplanned housing sites to meet this need. As such, whilst there is a need to identify additional sites for housing, and allow windfall and unplanned development in suitable locations, these should be in sustainable locations with an identified need, and proposals remain to be assessed against the particular constraints of any specific site.

A consideration of the potential benefits and adverse effects associated with the principle of this development is set out below:

Benefits of the Proposal

The proposal would provide a modest contribution of open-market housing towards addressing the county-wide shortfall. There would be some employment and economic benefits associated with the construction phase although given the scale of development the weight to be attached to this benefit would be limited and temporary.

There would also be some benefits for the local area regarding increased economic expenditure from new residents; however, again this would be relatively limited given the scale of the proposal and would generally be outside of the settlement given the paucity of facilities available within proximity of the site and within the Parish. There would also be some biodiversity net gain benefit, as well as contributions towards community infrastructure.

Adverse Effects

Whilst Wiltshire Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land, this does not render development plan policies relating to the principle of development irrelevant; such policies remain capable of attracting significant weight where they align with the National Planning Policy Framework in directing growth to the most sustainable locations. This is the case here.

The proposed dwelling would be in a location which has generally poor access to local services and facilities and is contrary to the development plan's housing delivery policies. In a plan-led system there is significant harm in granting consent for new housing in a location contrary to the development plan's housing delivery policies, which directs housing to suitable and sustainable locations. As such the proposal does not represent sustainable development in the context of the WCS and the NPPF and would be contrary to Core Policies 1, 2, 10, 60 and 61, as well as Saved Policy H4. Substantial weight is attached to these conflicts.

The site is neither within nor adjacent to any designated settlement and is located within the open countryside for the purposes of planning policy. Residential development of this site, which has a clearly rural character, would introduce a contrasting and incongruous form of development within this rural area which would alter the visual appearance and prevailing rural character of the site and area and would result in landscape harm, leading to conflict with Core Policies 51, 57 and 58 (WCS) and Sections 12, 15 and 16 of the NPPF.

It is acknowledged that the NPPF makes note of the contribution that can be made by small and medium sized sites and windfall developments. However, these are clearly directed

towards previously developed land and existing settlements as more sustainable solutions to meeting the current housing shortfall.

Planning Balance

Overall, the provision of between 4no. and 9no. dwellings would make a relatively limited contribution towards the supply of open market housing in an area with an under supply. There would also be a relatively modest amount of social and economic benefits arising from the construction phase and future spending of occupants. However, given the scale of proposed development these benefits are afforded limited weight.

When assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, and its overarching objectives of sustainable development, there is conflict arising with the spatial policies of the Wiltshire Core Strategy – specifically Core Policies 1, 2 and 10 (WCS) and SNP6 (SNP). The Council's settlement strategy set out in the Core Strategy clearly directs applicants to the locations that it has assessed as being sustainable and suitable for new development in order to conserve countryside, protect undeveloped green spaces and reduce reliance on the private car for the majority of journeys.

Coupled with the adverse landscape impacts arising, these locational and sustainability concerns would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits arising.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its location outside of any defined settlement boundary within the open countryside and not falling within the definition of 'infill' development, would be contrary to the settlement, delivery and community area strategies of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The proposed development is deemed to be unsustainable as it would conflict with the Council's plan-led approach to sustainable development and is unacceptable in principle. The application therefore fails to accord with Core Policies 1, 2 and 10 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy; Saved Policy H4 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan; and Sections 2 and 4 of the NPPF.
2. The proposal, located remote from a range of services, employment opportunities, is contrary to the key aims of local and national sustainable transport policy guidance which seeks to reduce growth in the length and number of private motorised journeys. New development should be located and designed to reduce the need to travel by private car and should encourage the use of sustainable transport alternatives. The site is in the open countryside and is not well served by public transport and as such, the vehicle movements associated with the site are likely to take place via private modes. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policies 60 and 61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and Paragraphs 115 and 117 of Section 9 of the NPPF.
3. The proposed location of the development is on a clearly rural site which is visible from the public highway. The current character of the site complements its rural location and sits in context with its surrounding. Conversely, introducing a residential form of development on the site would irrevocably and demonstrably harm this character and

setting. The impacts of the proposal would thus lead to conflicts with Core Policy 51(ii, iii, v, ix) (WCS) and Section 15 of the NPPF in terms of landscape and visual impact.



The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 The Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017

Refusal of Permission in Principle

Application Reference Number: PL/2025/09810

Decision Date: 05/02/2026

Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Allun and Kate Sutherland Brakenhill Mews, Upper Seagry, Chippenham, SN15 5EU
Particulars of Development:	Permission in Principle (PiP) application for residential development consisting of a minimum of 4 no. dwellings and a maximum of 9 no. dwellings.
At:	Land at Brakenhill Mews, Upper Seagry, Chippenham, SN15 5EU

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

Refusal Reason

- The proposed development, by reason of its location outside of any defined settlement boundary within the open countryside and not falling within the definition of 'infill' development, would be contrary to the settlement, delivery and community area strategies of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The proposed development is deemed to be unsustainable as it would conflict with the Council's plan-led approach to sustainable development and is unacceptable in principle. The application therefore fails to accord with Core Policies 1, 2 and 10 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy; Saved Policy H4 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan; and Sections 2 and 4 of the NPPF.

Refusal Reason

- The proposal, located remote from a range of services, employment opportunities, is contrary to the key aims of local and national sustainable transport policy guidance which seeks to reduce growth in the length and number of private motorised journeys. New development should be located and designed to reduce the need to travel by private car and should encourage the use of sustainable transport alternatives. The site is in the open countryside and is not well served by public transport and as such, the vehicle movements associated with the site are likely to take place via private modes. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core

Policies 60 and 61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and Paragraphs 115 and 117 of Section 9 of the NPPF.

Refusal Reason

- 3 The proposed location of the development is on a clearly rural site which is visible from the public highway. The current character of the site complements its rural location and sits in context with its surrounding. Conversely, introducing a residential form of development on the site would irrevocably and demonstrably harm this character and setting. The impacts of the proposal would thus lead to conflicts with Core Policy 51(ii, iii, v, ix) (WCS) and Section 15 of the NPPF in terms of landscape and visual impact.

Nic Thomas - Director of Planning, Economy and Regeneration

1. Appeals

If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the Local Planning Authority to refuse permission for the proposed development, he/she may appeal to the Secretary of State for the Environment in accordance with Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. Forms can be downloaded from the web site: www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk or accessed via the Planning Portal: <http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals>.

Appeals must be made within 6 months of the date of the refusal. The Secretary of State has power to allow a longer period for the giving of a notice of appeal but he will not normally be prepared to exercise this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal. The Secretary of State is not required to entertain an appeal if it appears to him that permission for the proposed development could not have been so granted by the Local Planning Authority, having regard to the Statutory requirements, to the provisions of the Development Order, and to any Directions given under the Order. A copy of the appeal documents should be sent direct to the Council using the following email address: planningappeals@wiltshire.gov.uk.