

PL/2025/09486

My starting point is proposal of site H2.6 as part of WHSAP in 2018. During the Public Consultation at County Hall I met planning officer Tim McCombe. I was encouraged to contribute to the enquiry even though my prime concerns could be addressed only if a future planning application reached REM stage. My interest was in evolution of proposed development of north-eastern boundary of the site which is now shown on Statement of Compliance page 17.

WHSAP Historic Environment Assessment dated March 2018 Section 7 H2.6 Southwick Court, Trowbridge: notes in paragraph 7.28 "While a small number of units could be accommodated in the extreme eastern extent of the site, this would need to be very carefully designed to "sit down" into the landscape – but the comparatively flat site and open landscape does not lend itself to this type of intervention".

Wiltshire Council Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping is relevant to this issue. Paragraph iii) informs that development should respond "positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials, streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting". Paragraph vi) that account should be taken of "the characteristics of the site and the local context to deliver an appropriate development which relates effectively to the immediate setting and to the wider character of the area". Paragraph vii) considers "the impact on the amenities of existing occupants, and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself, including the consideration of privacy, overshadowing, vibration, and pollution".

This makes it mandatory for any developer to ensure that account is taken of existing infrastructure in effect looking into the proposed built form.

May I refer to Application Number 17/03844/REM: Bellway Homes Tithegrove Manor and particularly to Case Officer's report.

Section on Residential Amenity begins "The proposal has been designed with bungalows on the western edge of the site backing onto existing bungalows and sited at a lower level. Whilst the outlook of those existing properties would be affected, their amenity would not be and overlooking, loss of light and other potential amenity impacts would be avoided".

This shows that developer proposed a solution respecting the existing built form which included bungalows.

Immediate setting of north-eastern edge of development area is a row of 20th century bungalows and my aspiration was that proposal would include a small run of corner turning bungalows and respond positively to the existing townscape. This sadly is not the case.

Statement of Compliance section 3.1 Design Evolution (page 9) includes the following :

"A Design Principles plan was produced to support the outline application and which should be used as guidance to shape the detailed scheme which should be in *general accordance* with it.

With due regard to the plans approved and those aspirations from the outline an early sketch was produced to adhere to the identified constraints and reflect those key design principles.

The initial sketch was reviewed in detail by a team of expert consultants before evolving into a Planning Layout that as a team we felt would be supported".

I imagine that Planning Layout was produced by the team of expert consultants using specialised CAD software to broadly turn Design Principles plan into a firm proposal. The development footprint was fixed in Outline Application so it seems reasonable to assume that Planning Layout provides developer with optimum use of site. "The development will be predominantly 2 storey dwellings with a single 3 storey apartment building located as the backdrop to the 'central green'. There are also some 2.5 storey dwellings and these are positioned around the 'central green' or in prominent vista locations away from existing properties and the edges of development". Repeated reference to the "central green" implies that design configuration is to fit approved parameter plan and takes no account the adjoining bungalows that are part of the traditional housing typologies and simple form of the wider area. Yet this proposal does not fit that plan as page 17 (01) of Statement of Compliance proposes a variation : "Very minor adjustment to land use shape to achieve a better shaped development blocks and edges". This includes a 2.5 storey 4 bedroom Hillgrove detached house at north-eastern edge closest to existing bungalows which is described as a key corner turning building.

Report for Strategic Planning Committee meeting dated of 22nd February 2023 Application Number 20/00379/OUT includes on page 28 "In any event, the scheme as applied for is for up to 180 dwellings, which does allow flexibility to reduce the numbers should that be necessary at REM stage because of unforeseen issues". This should not include enabling the proposal to hit the target numbers whilst not taking into account other factors.

Urban Design's response dated 09th January 2026 raises an objection on the grounds that "The development proposals would not meet the high quality design and place shaping requirements of CP57 nor would they meet the high quality locally relevant design requirements of the SNDP ..."

Consultation response dated 06th January 2026 made by Housing Enabling Team regarding affordable housing requirement sets out clearly the needs of local people. This requires provision of 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed bungalow. It seems reasonable to site these units and make them into the key corner turning feature in place of currently proposed 2.5 storey dwelling. This holistic approach would respect existing townscape and may contribute to a sense of community.

I therefore wish to object to this proposal on the following grounds:

Proposal does not fit into the Planning Layout without variation which is a design not an unforeseen issue.

Proposal takes no regard of requirement for any developer to ensure that account is taken of existing infrastructure in effect looking into the proposed built form.

Proposal does not meet specific requirements set out in Housing Enabling Team's consultation dated 06th January 2026.