Appeals referenced in Appellants Evidence

1. Chalgrove, South Oxfordshire — February 2026

Appeal ref: 3370273 | 160 dwellings | Allowed

Despite conflict with neighbourhood plan and settlement boundaries, housing need and a 3.6–3.8-year land supply outweighed harms.

Why pertinent: Relevant because neighbourhood plan conflict is not necessarily determinative under NPPF S6.

Planning Proof of Evidence: §§5.94–5.100; Appendix D

2. Wootton, Bedfordshire — July 2026

Appeal ref: 6004689 | 90 dwellings |Allowed

Housing outside local and neighbourhood plan boundaries was allowed despite the Inspector treating NPPF paragraph 14 as engaged, against a 2.38-year housing supply.

Why pertinent: Relevant because even significant weight to a recently made neighbourhood plan can be outweighed by housing need.

Planning Proof of Evidence: §§5.101–5.109; Appendix E

3. Snarlton Farm, Melksham — July 2026

Appeal 3373278 | 300 dwellings | Allowed

Secretary of State allowed the scheme despite clear conflict with a recently made neighbourhood plan, given a 2.16-year supply and uncertainty over housing requirements.

Why pertinent: Relevant because uncertain housing figures underpinning neighbourhood plan allocations need not prevent further development.

Planning Proof of Evidence: §§5.110–5.113; Appendix F

4. Buntingford, Hertfordshire

Appeal 6008238

A site separated from Buntingford by the A10 was considered physically well-related having regard to connections, proximity, intervisibility and no intervening countryside.

Why pertinent: Relevant to Gladman's argument that the Tattenhall site meets the S5(1)(j) physical relationship test.

Planning Proof of Evidence: §§5.187–5.189; Appendix G

5. Lydiard Millicent, Wiltshire

Appeal 6001260

Inspector stated that S5 does not require adjoining principal built form or a continuous segregated footway.

Why pertinent: Relevant to the interpretation of "physically well-related" under S5(1)(j).

Planning Proof of Evidence: §5.190; Appendix H

Previous appeals on the Appeal site

8. Tattenhall — 137 dwellings, dismissed April 2017

Appeal ref: 2185667

Secretary of State dismissed the appeal against the Inspector's recommendation, finding five-year housing supply and development plan conflict.

Planning Proof of Evidence: §3.3

Why pertinent: Planning history

9. Tattenhall — 30 dwellings, dismissed December 2018

Appeal 3202053

Inspector found settlement boundary policy conflict and some character and appearance harm when five-year housing supply existed.

Planning Proof of Evidence: §3.4

Why pertinent: Planning history