

From: Adam Brill <adambrill@abadesign.co.uk>
Sent: 08 September 2026 15:11
To: West-1 <west1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: kevin lockwood
Subject: Appeal reference number: 6012410

You don't often get email from adambrill@abadesign.co.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Inspectorate.

On the local authority's final comments they have made reference to the new NPPF, Since our final comments were made against the previous NPPF I would like to offer the following comments against the NPPF 2026 and the Local Authority's final comments;

Refusal Reason 1:

The council acknowledges that policy S5(1)(j) is "the only potentially relevant category" however policy S5(1)(j) clearly states that "Development which would address an evidenced unmet need (including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites" and where development would "i. Be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure" which this site clearly is.

The site is also "physically well-related" to the area given that the site links directly to existing highway/ canal infrastructure and adjacent residential curtilages. It should also be noted that "physically well-related" does not require inclusion within a boundary – it requires functional and spatial proximity to existing built fabric which this site has.

Whilst the council also notes that the proposal remains in conflict with policy 19 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (JMNP2). The NPPF 2026 (Paragraph 2 of Annex A) states: "Development plan policies (or parts of those policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in this Framework should be given very limited weight and whilst the Wiltshire Core Policies CP1 and CP2 act as strict spatial caps that blanket-restrict development outside defined settlement boundaries. Because the NPPF 2026 (via Policy S3 and S5) creates express routes for out-of-settlement housing to address unmet supply failures, CP1 and CP2 are fundamentally

inconsistent with national decision-making policy. Under Annex A, their restrictive weight must be heavily downgraded.

Refusal Reason 2:

Refusal Reason 2 relates to the landscape and countryside impacts of the proposal brought about by the urbanisation of the site through built form and domestic paraphernalia associated with residential development. The council's argument that policy S6 of the NPPF 2026 does not alter the council's conclusions should be reconsidered, as whilst Policy S6 NPPF 2026 gives significant weight to the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (made August 2025) and its separation/landscape rules. Policy S6 supports neighbourhood plans, but it does not override national policies on housing supply shortages or the primary decision balance under Policy S5.

Therefore a single, high-quality, sustainable dwelling on this specific site does not create "urbanisation" or undermine the macro-level separation between Semington and Berryfield. The high boundaries of native species hedgerow and existing screening ensure that openness and identity of the wider area are preserved.

Housing Land Supply:

Given that the former paragraph 11 "tilted balance" approach is no longer the relevant framework for determining the appeal means that Policy HO7 of the NPPF 2026 comes into effect and whilst the council concludes that a single dwelling attracts positive weight, but the landscape/ separation harm outweighs this. However, Under Policy HO7, substantial weight must be explicitly attributed to homes contributing to evidence needs. When paired with a 2.8 year supply position, the national threshold requires the Council to prove that adverse impacts **substantially outweigh** the benefits. In a single-dwelling infill/edge setting, localised landscape impact rarely reaches the high threshold of "substantially outweighing" substantial housing benefits.

Taking the above into account I feel that the NPPF 2026 gives substantial weight to this proposal and feel that it should be given the approval it deserves.

Hopefully you can accept this additional information as part of the appeal process given the nature of the change to the NPPF and the new material considerations in the determination of this appeal.

Kind Regards

Adam Brill

Director

