

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE CASE OFFICER REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2026/03416
APPLICATION TYPE:	Permission in Principle
SITE ADDRESS:	Land to the North East of Rodbourne Road, Corston, Malmesbury, SN16 0HB
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Permission in Principle for residential development of a minimum of 7 dwellings and a maximum of 9 dwellings.
RECOMMENDATION:	REFUSE

PROPOSAL

The application is made under the Section 70(1A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for Permission in Principle (PiP) for the residential development of a minimum of 7 dwellings and a maximum of 9 dwellings.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to part of an agricultural field on the north side of Rodbourne Road, approx. 150m southeast of Church of All Saints. The field is roughly rectangular with continuous hedgerow boundaries and some hedgerow trees. Relevant land-use designations and constraints include the nearby Grade II listed building Firs Farmhouse and Boundary Wall and Railings [NHLE: 1022277] and Grade II* (two star) listed building Church of All Saints [NHLE: 1363872], C-classified highway (Rodbourne Road), and predicted Grade 3b agricultural land¹.

PLANNING HISTORY

PL/2025/06697 - Land at Newlands Farm, Rodbourne Road, Corston, Malmesbury, SN16 0HB (APPROVED 06/10/2025).

- The applicant has drawn attention to this application for Permission in Principle, also made by the applicant on a nearby site. The officer's report found that the development would similarly conflict with the settlement strategy of the development plan but found that material considerations would outweigh the conflict against the backdrop of the Council's deficient HLS position at the time. The differences in location and amount of development between that and this application are considerable, and particularly in their density and relationship to

¹ Predictive Agricultural Land Classification Map for England
(<https://environment.data.gov.uk/explore/a817d96f-271d-487b-89ad-48d271f931aa>).

the village edge. For these reasons, it would not indicate that this application should be considered other than on its own merits.

RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS):

- Core Policy 1: Settlement Strategy (CP1)
- Core Policy 2: Delivery Strategy (CP2)
- Core Policy 13: Spatial Strategy for Malmesbury Community Area (CP13)
- Core Policy 44: Rural Exceptions Sites (CP44)
- Core Policy 45: Meeting Wiltshire's Housing Needs (CP45)
- Core Policy 48: Supporting Rural Life (CP48)
- Core Policy 50: Biodiversity and Geodiversity (CP50)
- Core Policy 51: Landscape (CP51)
- Core Policy 52: Green Infrastructure (CP52)
- Core Policy 57: Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping (CP57)
- Core Policy 58: Ensuring the Conservation of the Historic Environment (CP58)
- Core Policy 60: Sustainable Transport (CP60)
- Core Policy 61: Transport and new development (CP61)
- Core Policy 62: Development Impacts on the Transport Network (CP62)
- Core Policy 64: Demand Management (CP64)
- Core Policy 67: Flood Risk (CP67)

Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan

Saved policies of the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 (NWLP)

- Saved Policy H4: Residential Development in the Open Countryside

Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan: Made February 2015 (MNP)

- Volume I - Main Body: Policy 3, Policy 4, Policy 5, Policy 13
- Volume II – Design Guide: Task 8.5

Draft Wiltshire Local Plan (WLP):

- At Full Council on 19 May 2026, the elected members of Wiltshire Council agreed to withdraw the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. The said Plan has no material weight for the purposes of the application.

In accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2026, on 30th June 2026 Wiltshire Council published a notice of intention to prepare a new local plan for Wiltshire. The next stage is a Scoping Consultation which commences on 2nd September 2026. This plan is at a very early stage and carries no weight for decision making.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide (NDG)

Wiltshire Design Guide SPD (WDG)

Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment – December 2005 (WLCA):

- Character Area 16A: Malmesbury-Corsham Limestone Lowlands

North Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment – June 2004 (NWLCA):

- Character Area 8: Hullavington Rolling Lowland

Historic England Guidance:

- Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2 (GPA2)
- The Setting of Heritage Assets. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 (2nd Edition) (GPA3)

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council – Comment, raised concerns about the cumulative effect of maximum proposed units together with consents on adjoining land, advising that seven houses maximum is preferred, and concerns about highway safety due to that additional vehicle movements on local highway network (27/07/2026).

Wiltshire Council's Conservation Officer – Comment, describes the contribution that the site makes to the significance of listed buildings known as Firs Farmhouse (Grade II listed) and Church of All Saints (Grade II* listed) as part of their settings, advising that there would be a low level of less than substantial harm caused to the significance of Firs Farmhouse, that a detailed design scheme could be developed to assist in mitigating some of the harm but that the application does not establish that the site is suitable in principle (16/07/2026).

Wiltshire Council's Highways Team – Comment, that the location outside of any settlement policy boundary would attract a highways objection on sustainability grounds due to lack of pedestrian infrastructure and reliance on private vehicles, but that the location, land use and amount would not raise concerns in respect of highway capacity or safety provided technical standards can be met at TDC stage (07/07/2026).

Historic England – Comment, drawing attention to relevant duties, policy and guidance, advising that the development will have an impact on the setting of Firs Farmhouse and the Church of All Saints, the latter of which the applicant has not identified, that they have no significant concerns regarding the application but that the significance of the heritage assets should be duly considered and any harm mitigated through the detailed design scheme, requesting that further consultation be undertaken with them at that stage (30/07/2026).

County Archaeologist – No overriding archaeological constraint, WSI may be required at TDC stage to mitigate impacts on unrecorded archaeology (Telecon at 12:45 29 July 2026).

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by display of a site notice on 3 June 2026. No letters of representation were made by members of the public.

ASSESSMENT

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Preliminary matters

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that Permission in Principle (PiP) is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development.

The PiP consent route has two stages: the first stage establishes whether a site is suitable in principle and the second stage, Technical Details Consent (TDC), involves assessment of the detailed proposals. This application relates to the first of these stages only.

The scope of the considerations for PiP is limited to *location, land use* and the *amount of development*. All other detailed matters are considered as part of a subsequent TDC application if permission in principle is granted.

It is also pertinent to the consideration of the principle whether there are any overriding land-use designations or constraints which would clearly and demonstrably prevent the site from being developed in principle without prejudice to the TDC stage.

Whether the proposed location, land use and amount of development is acceptable in principle

The application site forms part of an agricultural field on the north side of Rodbourne Road to southeast of Corston. Core Policies 1, 2 and 13 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) are relevant for setting out the spatial strategy for this area, together with Policy 3 of the Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) and Saved Policy H4 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan (NWLP)

CP1 outlines a hierarchical spatial strategy for accommodating new housing in Wiltshire, with development focused on principal settlements, then market towns, then local service centres, then large villages and, finally, small villages. The first four of these settlement categories have defined settlement boundaries. The lowest end of the hierarchy, small villages, do not benefit from having designated settlement boundaries.

CP2 sets out a housing delivery strategy and states that, unless permitted by other policies within the WCS, as set out in paragraph 4.25, development will not be permitted outside the limits of development, defined by the settlement boundaries. At small villages, it says development is limited to infill within the existing built area.

CP13 identifies the settlements which comprise the Malmesbury Community Area and sets out the number and distribution of homes to be provided within the area, the majority of which are directed towards Malmesbury (Market Town under CP1).

Policy 3 of the MNP sets out that housing development in the small villages of Milbourne and Corston is expected to be on 'windfall' sites and that the number of dwellings should ideally not exceed single figures in order to preserve the rural character of the villages.

Saved Policy H4 of the NWLP sets out a similar restrictive approach to residential development in the open countryside. It sets out that new dwellings in the countryside, outside of framework boundaries, will not be permitted unless they are required in connection with the essential needs of agriculture or forestry or rural based enterprise, or they are replacements of an existing dwelling, subject to certain criteria.

The existing built-up area of the small village of Corston is delineated in relation to the application site by the dwellinghouses known as Old Forge House and Firs Farmhouse, on north and south sides of Rodbourne Road respectively, which provide the village edge.

To the southeast of Corston, and on the north side of Rodbourne Road, there is a residential development of 'Cornish Unit' houses. This development is remote from the built-up area of the village, separated by the agricultural field of which the application site forms a part and surrounded by open countryside on remaining sides.

The application site is not allocated for development and comprises greenfield land in the open countryside. The value of the site includes the transition it marks between the village and its rural setting upon entrance and departure, which the Cornish Unit house development does not undermine. It is demonstrably not a small gap within the existing built area of the village and its development would not comprise infill, particularly in the strict definition of CP2 (see: 4.34).

As concluded above, the site location is in open countryside. There is no indication that any of the CP2 paragraph 4.25 or Saved Policy H4 exceptions would apply in this case and, therefore, the development would be contrary to CP1, 2 and 13 of the WCS, Policy 3 of the MNP and Saved Policy H4 of the NWLP.

The location's relative proximity to Corston and the dwellinghouses at Rodbourne Road is such that the development would not create wholly isolated homes in the countryside.

The nearby small village of Corston has a "*low level of services and facilities, and few employment opportunities*"; it has a public house, a church, the 'Corston and Rodbourne Reading Room' and a recreation ground. Day-to-day needs would need to be met approx. 2.5 miles north in Malmesbury (a Market Town under CP1).

An access to the highway would need to be formed on the north side of Rodbourne Road, which is a single-carriageway rural road (C-classified highway) subject to 30mph by the site. Wiltshire Council's Highways Team are satisfied safe means of access could be secured at TDC stage.

The development would be served by no protected footpaths, street lighting, or ample opportunities for pedestrians, cyclists or other wheeled users to avoid traffic until they reach the junction with the A429 (Main Road) in Corston. However, walking or cycling would not provide a genuine modal choice for access to day-to-day needs from this location.

Corston is served by public transport, and the nearest bus stops would be within an approx. 4-minute walk. These are opposite the Radnor Arms (services towards Chippenham) and by the pedestrian crossing opposite the Reading Room (services towards Malmesbury).

Buses run Monday to Saturday at a frequency of once every hour between morning and late evening. However, there are no services on Sundays or public holidays. Furthermore, the walking route would be undesirable from a safety and practicality perspective, and would be particularly so with/by children, when carrying the weekly shop, and during inclement weather.

The location would only provide the limited range of services available within Corston, insufficient to meet day-to-day needs. Therefore, the development would be heavily reliant on private motor vehicles for day-to-day journeys due, in part, to the nature of Rodbourne Road and the distance to higher-order facilities in the larger settlements.

The NPPF (paragraph 110) acknowledges that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. It is also noted that the Highways Team suggest electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities would be required, which could be brought forward at TDC stage and would provide a more sustainable transport option.

Nonetheless, having had regard to its rural context, the location would not afford the development with a genuine choice to encourage use of the most sustainable modes represented in the modal hierarchy illustrated in CP61.

The location of the development would therefore conflict with CP57 (xiv), CP60 and 61 of the WCS which aim to promote the most sustainable travel patterns by locating development in order to reduce reliance on private vehicles.

For the reasons given, the location of the development would be unacceptable in principle and conflict with Policy 3 of the MNP and CP1, CP2, CP13, CP57 (xiv), CP60, CP61 of the WCS and Saved Policy H4 of the NWLP.

There is nothing inherent about the proposed use of the land for residential purposes that would be fundamentally incompatible with the surroundings, and detailed matters would otherwise be assessed at TDC stage. Furthermore, although no indicative layout is provided, the site appears spatially capable of accommodating between seven to nine dwellinghouse plots with associated infrastructure.

Although the Parish Council's concerns are noted, the Highways Team consider that the proposed location, land use and amount of development would not have an unacceptable impact on the safety of the surrounding highway network.

The proposed use would result in a permanent loss of agricultural land. However, the available evidence indicates that the site is unlikely to comprise Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land for the purposes of paragraph 187 of the NPPF.

Character and appearance of the area

The site lies in Character Area 8 of the North Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment (NWLCA) the main characteristics of which includes its rolling and lowland hills, its patchwork of irregular, medium sized fields and larger more recent enclosures, continuous hedges, and its fine stone villages.

The NWLCA advises that the *“whole area has an essentially tranquil and pastoral character within which only small-scale, sensitively designed development, appropriately associated with existing built form, could be successfully accommodated without adverse landscape impacts”* while the overall objectives include to *“conserve and enhance its pastoral character, and ensure that any new development respects the grain of the dispersed settlements in the area”*.

In the county-level Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment (WLCA) the site lies within Character Area 16a, the positive features of which include its peaceful rural landscape, strong network of hedgerows, distinctive traditional limestone villages and network of rural roads.

The WLCA advises that pressures on its character include *“new development along rural lanes and around existing settlements”* and *“increasing traffic on narrow rural lane network leading to urbanisation through kerbing, additional lighting and signage”*. It advises that *“the peaceful rural nature of the area”* and *“the setting, containment and scale of the limestone villages”* are inherently sensitive qualities of the landscape.

The site is a modest field with continuous hedgerow boundaries and some hedgerow trees. It has a peaceful rural nature that contributes positively to the character of the landscape, and particularly the setting and containment of the small, limestone village of Corston. It also reinforces the character of Rodbourne Road, part of the area's narrow network of rural lanes.

While the detailed design matters of the development would be assessed at TDC stage, residential development of this scale and amount, and its associated incidental developments and paraphernalia, including formation of an access in its present continuous hedgerow boundary, would have an inevitable and permanent urbanising effect on the rural character of the lane, the containment of Corston and the peaceful rural nature of its setting.

For these reasons, the land use and amount of development would not respond positively to the character and appearance of the area and landscape contrary to Policy 13 of the MNP (through particular conflict with Task 8.5 of MNP Vol II) and CP51 and CP57 of the WCS which aim to ensure development responds positively to the local distinctiveness and character of the site's setting and Wiltshire's settlements and landscapes, among other things.

Effects on heritage assets

On the south side of Rodbourne Road, forming the edge of the built-up area of Corston, is the Grade II listed building known as Firs Farmhouse and Boundary Wall and Railings [NHLE: 1022277]. Its significance and special interest can primarily be derived from its architectural and historic interest as an early 19th century farmhouse with later additions and garden boundary features.

The Swindon and Wilts HER records Firs Farm as a “*partially extant 19th century farmstead of dispersed plan*” and “*located within or in association to a village*”.

Further into the village along Rodbourne Road is the Grade II* (two star) listed building Church of All Saints [NHLE: 1363872], the significance and *more than* special interest of which primarily derives from its architectural and historic interest as an early 15th century rural parish church rebuilt in late 19th and early 20th century.

S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the “PLBCA”) makes it a duty to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Wiltshire Council’s Conservation Officer (CO) advises that the site has associations to the historic land holdings of Firs Farm, and acts as an important agricultural backdrop to the edge of the village it forms.

The Tithe map² of 1840 shows plot numbers for Firs Farm and surrounding land, where the farm is plot 706. The application site is shown as plot 712, described in the Tithe Awards³ as “*John Gales Orchard, Pasture*”, owned by the Earl of Radnor and occupied by Jacob Bullock. Bullock was the owner and occupier of Firs Farm at that time.

The post-war development on Rodbourne Road has introduced some suburban features in outward views, however the site continues to contribute to the prevailing rural setting of Firs Farmhouse and the village.

Historic England (HE) advise that development of the site would impact on the setting of both heritage assets. Although they raise no significant concerns, the CO advises that residential development of the site would harm the significance of Firs Farmhouse.

Residential use of the land, particularly at this quantum of development, would unavoidably and irreversibly change the rural, agricultural character of the site with suburban built form, undermining its present visual and historical relationship with the Firs Farmhouse. This would diminish the contribution this part of its setting makes to the appreciation and understanding of its significance as a 19th century farmhouse.

The applicant’s Planning Statement considers that “*it is anticipated that there will be no inter-visibility between the designated heritage asset [known as Firs Farmhouse] and the site*”.

² Available from Know Your Place (<https://maps.bristol.gov.uk/kyp/?edition=wilts>).

³ ‘Tithe Awards’ layer available from Know Your Place.

Inter- and co-visibility would be evident to varying degrees, particularly at different times of year when foliage is less full. Nonetheless, the extent of the setting of a heritage asset is not fixed nor is it limited to visual matters as it may include, among other things, intangible associations with its surroundings⁴.

It is noted, as also observed by HE, that the applicant does not identify or consider the effect on the setting of Church of All Saints. Nonetheless, the CO notes that the site makes a minimal contribution to the significance of the Church of All Saints, as part of its wider setting in a rural village, but that there are no significant views that would be adversely impacted. The church has a modest height bell turret which does not appear as an overtly prominent within the wider landscape or village setting.

The CO does not identify harm to the significance of the Church of All Saints and, based on the evidence available and observations made on site, the degree of separation and intervening features would ensure its setting could be preserved. However, for the reasons given, the proposed location, use and amount of development would inevitably cause harm to the significance of Firs Farmhouse through change within its setting.

Residential development would not, therefore, preserve the setting of Firs Farmhouse and would fail to conserve a designated heritage asset contrary to CP57 (i and iv) and CP58 of the WCS.

Heritage balance

S66 of the PLBCA sets a strong presumption against granting permission unless, in having special regard, the harm would be clearly and convincingly justified and outweighed by the public benefits secured by the development when tested against the NPPF (paras 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 219).

The CO categorises the harm as less than substantial harm and toward the lower end within that spectrum. However, irrespective of the level of harm, considerable importance and weight is attached to it. Furthermore, in applying paragraph 215 of the NPPF, great weight is given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset.

The TDC stage would provide the detailed design of the development, which could minimise the harm as noted by the CO and HE. However, the harm would be unavoidable given the site would be unavoidably and permanently urbanised, destroying its agricultural character and undermining the contribution it makes to the significance of the listed building as part of its setting.

Weighing against the harm, the development would deliver a small but not insignificant number of housing units, providing some help to meeting the Council and

⁴ GPA3

Government's house-building objectives and there would be some social and economic benefits. Some environmental benefits would be secured through the 10% BNG requirements, noted on the indicative location plan.

Although these are genuine public benefits, they are not unique to this site. There is nothing to indicate that they could only be realised through development in this location which is also unsuitable for other reasons. Therefore, when weighing these public benefits against the less than substantial harm identified, they are not considered sufficient to clearly and convincingly justify and outweigh the harm.

Conflict is found with CP57 (i and iv) and CP58 of the WCS, and material considerations do not lead to a different conclusion in respect of effects on the conservation of the historic environment.

Other matters

Although the Parish Council have indicated a preference that seven units be a maximum, rather than nine, the proposed development has been considered in respect of a range from seven to nine and is found unacceptable in principle in relation to its location, land use and amount.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

The development would conflict with the development plan, having particular regard to Policy 3 and 13 of the MNP, CP1, 2, 13, 51, 57, 58, 60, and 61 of the WCS and Saved Policy H4 of the NWLP.

Wiltshire Council can currently demonstrate a 2.8-year supply of deliverable housing land⁵, a significant shortfall against the five-year supply required by the NPPF.

Policy 4 of the MNP expects housing developments to be tested against the current evidence of local demand and supply from sources including Wiltshire Council population forecasts, the Social Housing Register, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the most recent Neighbourhood Survey.

Policy 5 of the MNP advises that housing developments should be assessed against the demand net of cumulative consents given in the period, not the gross demand identified at the beginning of the period.

Wiltshire Council's latest Housing Land Supply Statement sets out that the Malmesbury Community Area has exceeded its forecasted housing need. However, in the context of the significant county-wide housing land supply shortfall, and the age

⁵ Wiltshire Housing Land Supply Statement 2025
(<https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/1084/Monitoring-and-evidence>).

of the MNP in relation to paragraph 14 of the NPPF, these policies could not act as a ceiling on development.

Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF therefore indicates that permission should be granted unless:

(i) the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or

(ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

Footnote 7 to paragraph 11(d)(i) identifies designated heritage assets as areas or assets of particular importance which the application of policies in the NPPF are designed to protect.

As set out in the assessment, less than substantial harm is identified to the significance of a listed building, a designated heritage asset, and it is concluded that the harm would not be clearly and convincingly justified and outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. This creates conflict with the policies contained within Chapter 16 of the NPPF, which recognises and sets out a strategy for the conservation of the historic environment as a fundamental part of the planning system's achievement of sustainable development objectives.

Although a low level of harm, it attracts considerable importance and weight consistent with the great weight given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. The development would not preserve the setting of the listed building and S66 of the PLBCA therefore sets a strong presumption against granting planning permission.

This is considered to provide a strong reason for refusing the development and, as such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is not engaged.

Although for the preceding reasons it is not necessary to carry out the test under paragraph 11(d)(ii), for completeness, were the LPA to have found that the heritage harm identified did not provide a strong reason, then paragraph 11(d)(ii) (the 'tilted balance') would have advised that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

The development of 7 to 9 dwellings would make a small but positive contribution to addressing Wiltshire's housing land supply shortfall, including the social benefits of new housing, some environmental benefits through the present requirement to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain at TDC stage, and economic benefits would inevitably accrue during the construction phase of development.

Weighing against the proposal, granting permission would undermine the WCS' planned strategic approach to sustainable development, creating a group of dwellinghouses in the countryside, poorly located in relation to services, facilities and employment, and heavily reliant on the private car for day-to-day journeys.

Furthermore, the development would cause harm to the significance of a Grade II listed building through change within its setting. It would harm the character and appearance of the area by permanently diminish the site's valuable contribution to the character of the landscape and rural setting of the village, and it would form a further urbanising encroachment into open countryside harming its intrinsic character and beauty. It would also cause a minor loss of agricultural land.

For these reasons, notwithstanding the finding that the heritage harm provides a strong reason for refusal, the adverse impacts would nonetheless be found to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme when assessed against the policies of the NPPF as a whole.

Material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The application should be refused.

RECOMMENDATION

That Permission in Principle be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The development, primarily by reasons of its location, would create between 7 and 9 dwellinghouses in open countryside for which there are no relevant exceptional circumstances to provide justification. It therefore represents an unsustainable form of development due to the location affording poor access to local services, facilities and employment opportunities and resulting in the development being heavily reliant on the use of private vehicles without genuine choice for other more sustainable modes of transport, and it would be a further urbanising encroachment into open countryside to the detriment of its intrinsic character and beauty. It is found contrary to Core Policies 1, 2, 13, 57 (xiv), 60 and 61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (January 2015), Policy 3 of the Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan: Volume I (February 2015) Saved Policy H4 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan (2011), and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).

2. The development, by reasons of its location, land use and amount, would introduce an urbanising form of development that would permanently diminish the rural, agricultural character of the site and undermine its visual and historical relationship with the listed building, failing to conserve its significance by eroding the contribution its surroundings make to how it is experienced and appreciated. It therefore causes less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset and which would not be clearly and convincingly justified and outweighed by the public benefits that the development would secure. It is found contrary to Core Policy 57 (i, iii, iv, vi) and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (January 2015), and paragraphs 210, 212, 213, 215 and 219 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).
3. The development, by reasons of its location, land use and amount, would introduce an urbanising form of development that would permanently diminish the rural, agricultural character of the site to the detriment of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, the contribution it makes to the character of the landscape, and the value of the site's openness to the rural setting of the village of Corston, therefore harming the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is found contrary to Policy 13 of the Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan: Volume I (February 2015), Core Policy 51 and 57 (i, ii, iii, vi) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (January 2015), and paragraphs 131, 135, 139 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).