



**FORMAL PRESENTATION TO WILTSHIRE COUNCIL STRATEGIC  
PLANNING COMMITTEE (27<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2020) IN RESPECT OF PLANNING  
APPLICATION 20/02387/OUT - LAND AT POUND FARM, SOUTH VIEW,  
LYNEHAM, WILTSHIRE.**

Lyneham and Bradenstoke Parish Council wish to reaffirm our objection to the above application.

As such we wish to bring to the Committees attention the following factual points.

**Development Creep**

We know that when the applicants first mooted the original development in 2015 (15/12487/OUT) they proposed a development of 110 dwellings, which quite rightly was rejected.

Since then, though a further 4 rejected applications, they have reduced the size of the development in an attempt to obtain a small development permission, this is now down to 50 dwellings over 3.9 hectares.

We would draw to the Committees attention that if they obtain the precedent, then Gleeson, by holding adjacent land charges of approximately 20 hectares, would be in the position to apply for development of the remaining 16.1 hectares with the potential for a further 270 dwellings in the knowledge that this would probably be approved.

We would suggest to the Committee that just as concerning is that if permission was granted for the green fields, they would be setting a highly significant precedent, which Gleeson's and other developers would jump on to argue for developing other insignificant green spaces in Wiltshire.

We would recommend that this Committee rejects the application, as by granting it they could easily turn a rural village into a small town by increasing the size of the civilian village by just under 25%.

## **Gleeson's Hidden Appeal**

We bring to the Committee's attention that Gleeson's have already lodged an appeal with the Planning Inspectorate (*APP/Y3940/W/20/3248635 – 10<sup>th</sup> March 2020*), which they are even now progressing for this site.

To members of the public, and obviously yourselves, it will be seen as a deliberate and a direct attempt to bulldoze through the planning system, with zero respect to the affected communities or yourselves!

## **National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 11d**

We are commenting here as *Hallam Land Management v SoS DCLG [2018] EWCA Civ 1808* made this a material consideration which can be considered, but not necessarily accepted as the most important factor. This has also been reinforced in *Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd. [2017] UKSC 37*.

We know that Wiltshire Council has conceded that Wiltshire appears not to be able demonstrate a 5-year land supply. This, we contend, should not be the overarching factor in this application, as all other relevant development plan policies are current, and carry at least equal or even more weight. Further, we contend that the adverse impact of granting this would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

We are aware that in a recent Planning Inspectors determination (*APP 3940/W/18/3202551 (Purton Road, Wiltshire)*), where this was offered as a 'right to build'. The Inspector rejected this, making it clear that this short supply (of less than 0.38) was only one factor, and as all other policies, plans and schemes were current, then this could be not the *prima facie* decider. As a result, the application was correctly dismissed by the Inspector.

We would recommend that this Committee also takes a similar stance and reject the application.

## **Conclusion**

We would strongly recommend that the Committee members reject this application, as there is evidence that the applicant is attempting to turn a village into a town, that NPPF 11d can be discounted, as shown in law and by application of the law, and that the applicant is already progressing an appeal against the Council and the Community.