

Update to Objection to Planning Application 25/01696/OP

Application Reference: 25/01696/OP

Site: Land Adjacent to Elm Tree Farm, Hambridge Way, Pirton

Applicant: Gladman Developments Ltd

Case Officer: Naomi Reynard

Submitted on behalf of local residents by: Michael Campbell

Date: 08/01/2026

Response to Additional Submissions by Gladman Developments Ltd

1. Introduction and Status of the Appeal Decision

This representation responds to the further technical submissions recently provided by Gladman Developments Ltd.

The site is materially the same land that was previously the subject of a dismissed appeal. The Planning Inspector's conclusions in that appeal remain a **highly material consideration**, and no compelling evidence has been submitted to justify a different outcome.

The purpose of this response is to demonstrate that the additional material **does not address the Inspector's principal reasons for dismissal**, nor does it materially alter the planning balance.

2. Principle of Development – Inspector's Findings Remain Determinative

The Inspector identified the **main issue** as whether the site was suitable for development having regard, in particular, to:

- its location outside the settlement boundary;
- the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and
- the site's sustainability and accessibility.

The Inspector concluded that, notwithstanding the tilted balance, the site was **not suitable** for development.

None of the new submissions alter the following findings:

- The site lies **outside the defined settlement boundary**, within open countryside.
- It represents an **outward extension of the village into the rural area**.

- This spatial harm is inherent to the proposal and cannot be mitigated away.

The Inspector expressly found that countryside restraint policies remained relevant and carried weight, and that the proposal conflicted with them.

Conclusion:

The principle of development remains unacceptable for the same reasons identified at appeal.

3. Landscape and Countryside Harm – Previously Identified and Unchanged

The Inspector concluded that the proposal caused **harm to the character and appearance of the countryside**, and that this harm was not outweighed.

The additional landscape material now submitted relies on the same approach previously rejected, namely:

- structural planting;
- boundary reinforcement; and
- the passage of time to soften visual effects.

The Inspector was clear that:

- reliance on future planting does not remove initial harm; and
- harm arising from the erosion of the rural edge is not negated by mitigation proposals.

The fundamental landscape harm arises from:

- the breach of the settlement boundary; and
- the urbanisation of open countryside.

That harm remains inherent and unavoidable.

It is also relevant that Pirton has already experienced a scale of recent development that has materially expanded the village footprint. Continued outward growth through further unallocated edge-of-settlement sites risks cumulative harm to countryside character and undermines the planned distribution of development. The Inspector previously identified the sensitivity of the village edge at this location, and that concern is heightened rather than diminished by subsequent development.

Conclusion:

The Inspector's landscape findings remain directly applicable and unchallenged by the new evidence.

4. Sustainability and Accessibility – Inspector’s Reasoning Still Applies

The Inspector acknowledged that facilities were reachable in theory but concluded that:

- the site’s location would result in **heavy reliance on private car travel**; and
- this weighed against the proposal in sustainability terms.

The newly submitted transport and accessibility work repeats the same evidence base, focusing on:

- walking distances;
- cycle times; and
- the existence of bus services.

However, the Inspector’s concern was not whether routes *exist*, but whether the location supports **realistic, day-to-day sustainable travel patterns**.

Nothing in the new submissions changes:

- service frequency limitations;
- reliance on car travel for employment, healthcare and retail; or
- the rural nature of the settlement.

Conclusion:

The sustainability harm identified by the Inspector persists and continues to weigh against the proposal.

5. Technical Matters – Removal of Objections Is Not a Material Change

It is accepted that further work has addressed procedural matters relating to drainage, archaeology and ecology.

However, the Inspector’s decision makes clear that:

- these matters were not determinative; and
- the appeal was dismissed on **principle, landscape and sustainability grounds**.

Resolving technical objections does not convert an unsuitable site into a suitable one.

Conclusion:

The additional reports do not undermine the Inspector’s core conclusions.

6. Planning Balance – Inspector’s Conclusion Still Holds

The Inspector accepted the benefits of housing delivery but concluded that:

- the harm to the countryside and the unsustainable location **significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits**, even applying the tilted balance.

The current application presents:

- no materially different site circumstances;
- no change to the settlement boundary position; and
- no new evidence capable of displacing that conclusion.

Conclusion:

The planning balance remains decisively adverse.

7. Overall Conclusion

The Planning Inspector’s findings remain directly relevant and compelling.

The additional material submitted by Gladman Developments Ltd:

- responds to technical matters;
- but does not address the fundamental reasons for dismissal.

The proposal continues to conflict with countryside and sustainability policy, and the harm identified previously remains undiminished.

The application should therefore be refused, for reasons consistent with the Inspector’s earlier decision.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Campbell