

Appeal 6008434

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Written
Appeal site	Land at Brakenhill Mews, Upper Seagry, Chippenham, SN15 5EU
Agent contact details	John White John@agm-ltd.co.uk 01225681589
Local planning authority	Wiltshire
Application number	PL/2025/09810

Interested party 1

Comments

I wish to formally object to the proposed development of between four and nine dwellings on land outside the defined built form of Upper Seagry. The proposal is in clear conflict with the development plan, including the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the Seagry Neighbourhood Plan, and would result in demonstrable harm. My reasons are set out below.

1. Unjustified Development in Open Countryside
(Wiltshire Core Strategy – Core Policy 1, Core Policy 2)
The site lies outside the defined settlement boundary and is therefore located within Open Countryside, where development is strictly controlled.

- Core Policy 1 (Settlement Strategy) directs development to sustainable locations and restricts development in the open countryside.
- Core Policy 2 (Delivery Strategy) confirms that at Small Villages, development is limited to small-scale infill only.

A scheme of 4–9 dwellings is a substantive form of development, not an exception or rural diversification. It is therefore contrary to the spatial strategy of the development plan.

Approval would represent an unjustified encroachment into the countryside and would set a harmful precedent for further development beyond the settlement boundary.

2. Inappropriate Scale for a 'Small Village'
(Core Policy 1 & Core Policy 2)
Upper Seagry is designated as a Small Village, which is explicitly identified as:
a settlement where development is restricted to meet local needs and limited to small infill only
The proposal for up to nine dwellings:

- is significantly above the scale envisaged by policy
 - introduces a form of growth that is strategic rather than incidental
- This is fundamentally inconsistent with the role and function of Small Villages in the settlement hierarchy, which are not intended to accommodate meaningful housing growth.

3. Failure to Meet 'Small Infill' Definition

(Core Policy 2 + Seagry Neighbourhood Plan)

Core Policy 2 and the Seagry Neighbourhood Plan are clear that development in Small Villages must be restricted to "small infill sites".

This is consistently understood as:

- sites within the built form, and
- small gaps between existing dwellings, typically for 1–2 units

This proposal:

- lies outside the built form, and
- proposes up to nine dwellings

It therefore:

- fails both limbs of the infill definition, and
- represents a clear breach of both Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policy

There is no credible policy basis to justify the scheme as infill.

4. Harm to Rural Character and Settlement Form

(Core Policy 57 – Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping)

Core Policy 57 requires development to:

- respond positively to local character
- maintain distinctiveness
- integrate effectively with existing settlements

The proposal fails on all counts:

- it extends development beyond the natural edge of the village
- it results in a dispersed and incoherent pattern of growth
- it erodes the clear distinction between settlement and countryside

Rather than reinforcing the settlement, the proposal represents incremental urbanisation of rural land, which is directly contrary to the aims of Core Policy 57 and the Neighbourhood Plan.

5. Unsustainable Location and Over-Reliance on Private Vehicles

(Core Policy 60 – Sustainable Transport)

Upper Seagry has:

- limited or no regular public transport provision
- minimal local services and facilities

Under Core Policy 60, development should:

- reduce the need to travel
- support sustainable transport choices

This proposal would:

- generate additional private car journeys
- increase reliance on unsustainable travel patterns
- conflict with the objective of reducing carbon emissions

As such, the site is intrinsically unsustainable for development of this scale.

6. Highway Safety and Traffic Impact Concerns

(Core Policy 60)

The development of up to nine dwellings would result in:

- a material increase in traffic movements
 - additional pressure on local rural road infrastructure
- Local roads in and around Upper Seagry are:
- narrow, rural in character, and not designed for increased traffic flows
 - likely to have limited visibility at junctions and access points
- Without clear evidence demonstrating safe access and capacity, the proposal gives rise to:
- highway safety concerns, and
 - conflict with Core Policy 60, which requires development to provide safe and suitable access for all users

7. Drainage and Flood Risk Concerns

(Core Policy 67 – Flood Risk)

Core Policy 67 requires that development:

- does not increase flood risk elsewhere
- incorporates appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)

Greenfield land currently allows natural drainage. Development would:

- increase hard surfacing and runoff rates
- potentially overwhelm existing drainage infrastructure

Without robust and detailed drainage evidence, the application raises concerns that it could:

- contribute to localised flooding
- place additional strain on existing drainage systems

This is contrary to the precautionary approach required under Core Policy 67.

8. Pressure on Local Infrastructure and Services

(Core Policy 3 – Infrastructure Requirements)

Core Policy 3 requires that development:

- is supported by adequate infrastructure
- does not place unacceptable strain on local services

Upper Seagry has:

- limited local services and facilities
- constrained infrastructure capacity

A development of up to nine dwellings would introduce:

- additional demand on utilities and services
- increased pressure on nearby settlements for schools, healthcare, and amenities

No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that infrastructure can adequately support the proposal.

Conclusion

This proposal is clearly contrary to the development plan:

- Core Policy 1 & 2 – inappropriate development in open countryside and Small Village
- Core Policy 57 – poor integration and harm to rural character
- Core Policy 60 – unsustainable transport impacts and highway concerns
- Core Policy 67 – unresolved drainage risks
- Core Policy 3 – lack of infrastructure justification
- Seagry Neighbourhood Plan – direct conflict with infill policy

It represents:

- unjustified expansion of the settlement

- a clear breach of the definition of infill
- an unsustainable and poorly located form of development

Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
No such material considerations have been demonstrated in this case.

Formal Position

I therefore strongly object to the application and respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuse planning permission. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Supporting documents

No documents
