



22nd September 2026

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

6009057 / PL/2026/01149

Development Services

Wiltshire Council

Tel: 0300 456 0114

Email: developmentmanagement@wiltshire.gov.uk

www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Dear Ms Kwabe,

Appeal and application No.:	6009057 and PL/2026/01149
Appeal proposal:	Change of use of rural building to form Class C3 dwellinghouse
Site Address	Park Farm Barn, Lacock Road, Westrop, Corsham, SN13 9QF

ADDENDUM STATEMENT OF CASE –IN RESPONSE TO UPDATED NPPF

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to updated National Planning Policy Framework and any implications on the consideration of this appeal since Wiltshire Council determined application PL/2026/01149.

The Council acknowledges that the National Planning Policy Framework published on 17th August 2026 ('NPPF 2026') is a new material consideration in the determination of this appeal and offers the following response.

Annex A

Paragraph 2 within Annex A of the NPPF 2026 outlines that: *"Development plan policies (or parts of those policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in [the NPPF 2026] should be given very limited weight,"* but expresses that, *"... development plan policies should not be given reduced weight simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of this Framework."*

The Council is not of the opinion that the development plan policies referred to within the reason for refusal are materially inconsistent with the NPPF 2026.

Refusal Reason 1

S5: Principle of development outside settlements

The sole reason for refusal relates to how the scheme is contrary to the aims of Core Policies CP1, CP2 and CP11 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS). Concluding that the development is unacceptable in principle, being contrary to the settlement, delivery and community area strategies.

‘Settlement’ is defined in the NPPF 2026 Glossary, which confirms that: *“Settlements do not include hamlets and scattered groups of houses located outside predominantly built-up areas, unless specifically defined as a settlement in the development plan;”* which is the case for this appeal site.

Policy S5 is thus directly relevant to this appeal, this states that: *“Only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, as set out in the following list. These should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework,”* and goes on to list out those specific forms.

The appeal proposal relates to the conversion of an existing ancillary residential building, that status having been previously agreed through S106 legal agreement and which remains in force.

The appeal proposal does thus not fall into any of the specific forms of development listed at Policy S5. As such, in line with S5(4), the proposal should only be supported: *“... in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including to the character of the countryside and in relation to promoting sustainable patterns of movement.”* That is not considered to be the case for this appeal proposal.

In addition, although the site may not be considered ‘isolated’ in a technical sense, the appeal proposal would also not fall into any of the specific criteria which would provide support for an ‘isolated home in the countryside’ under HO11.

Limb (i) of criterion (j) requires that sites: *“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.”* As set out in the Officer’s Report, it remains the case that the site is not ‘physically well related to any existing settlement’ and as such, the proposal does not accord with S5(j).

The NPPF 2026 continues to emphasise that the planning system should be genuinely plan-led and that decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It remains the case that the site is located in an unsustainable location – being not related well to any existing settlement and not well connected by sustainable modes of transport, this being contrary to CP60 and CP61.

Whilst the NPPF 2026 introduces a new approach to development outside of settlements, it continues to promote sustainable patterns of development and a plan-led approach to decision-making. Taking fully into account Annex A of the NPPF 2026, the Council does not consider that the development plan policies referred to within the refusal reason are materially inconsistent with the NPPF 2026 given that the underlying objectives of the WCS remain aligned with the NPPF 2026 insofar as seeking to direct development to sustainable locations. Examples of NPPF 2026 policies relevant to the reason for refusal include:

- Policy TR3 which expresses that development should be *located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure*;
- Policy CC2 which expresses that proposals should, where relevant:
 - o a) *accord with policies TR3 and TR4 [...]*
 - o b) *Support good access to facilities in order to limit the need to travel [...]*
- Policy DP3(2)(d) which expresses that, where relevant, development proposals should *provide good connections to the wider settlement (or those nearby) and prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport*.

Housing Land Supply and Conclusion

The Council's Housing Land Supply (HLS) position for Wiltshire engaged the former 'tilted balance' approach under Paragraph 11 of the previous version of the NPPF, which is not an approach that has been carried forwards to the NPPF 2026. Policy HO7 of the NPPF 2026 does, however, express that *substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community [...]*

The Council's most recent HLS position remains at 2.8 years. The Council has taken account of HO7 of the NPPF 2026 and accepts that substantial weight should be attributed to the delivery of additional housing. However, following review of the NPPF 2026 as a whole, concerning its relevance to this appeal, on this occasion the Council does not consider that the publication of the NPPF 2026 alters its position, or undermines the reason for refusal in this case.

Conclusion

The appeal proposal is situated outside of, and well away from, the nearest settlement. The reason for refusal relates to how the scheme is contrary to the aims of Core Policies CP1, CP2 and CP11 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy in terms of the settlement, delivery and community area strategies and consequently the principle of residential development is unacceptable and contrary to the development plan when taken as a whole.

It remains the case that the site is located in an unsustainable location – being not related well to any existing settlement and not well connected by sustainable modes of transport, this being contrary to CP60 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

It is not considered that the revised National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026) changes or undermines the sole reason for refusal. In particular, the appeal proposal does not fall into any of the specific forms of development listed at Policy S5 and there are no 'exceptional circumstances' demonstrating that the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects. Similarly, the appeal proposal is not acceptable under Policy HO11, not falling into any of the 'exception' circumstances set out under that policy.