

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

URBAN DESIGN

Officer name: Brian Johnson Dip Arch, Senior Urban Design Officer, Wiltshire Council

Date: 22.01.2026

Application No: PL/2025/03672

Proposal: Full Planning Application For Residential Development To Provide 55 Dwellings, Public Open Space, Access, Drainage, Landscaping, Associated Infrastructure And Ancillary Works

Site Address: Land East of Biddestone Lane, Yatton Keynell

Case Officer: James Taylor

Urban Design response dated 09/05/2025 on PL/2025/03672 in black text below.

Revised drawings Dec 2025 and Jan 2026 - comment in blue text below.

Objection maintained - re reasons points 1, 2, 7 and 8 below.

Satisfactorily addressed indicated ✓

Not satisfactorily addressed or not addressed indicated X.

The design would not accord with high standard of design and place shaping required by Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed site layout is a series of branching cul de sacs and private drives off these. This would represent Building for a Healthy Life (BfHL) (Homes England 2021 - referenced as an assessment tool in the NPPF) page 18/19 'what red looks like' and not page 16/17 'what green looks like' as 'continuous street along the edges of development' whereas the furthest cul de sacs could be joined up as through streets to create a through return vehicle 'loop' off the principle street through the development placing majority of dwellings on a through return route.

X Not addressed on revised Site Layout 948 100 C (B&W) and 948 101 C (Coloured site layout).

- 2) The ends of the private drives do not connect up with each other or the PROW. This again would represent BfHL 'what red looks like' page 19 whereas 'Streets for a Healthy Life', a companion to Building for a Healthy Life' good design practice is for these to be connected up as surfaced foot/cycleways.

X Not addressed on above revised Site Layout

- 3) Re drawing 948 103 -The 1.8m high boundary walls fronting the street are indicated in masonry. The Design & Access Statement says this would be red brick. While masonry for robustness and lasting appearance, brick would not be characteristic of the village or local area context and setting and is virtually absent. This should be in local stone or tie as for the proposed dwellings.

✓ 948 103 Rev C – satisfactorily addressed - brick deleted – Boundary walls fronting the street now shown as ‘reconstituted stone’.

- 4) Similarly, the garages in brick would be out of character whereas garages on neighbouring new development are all in stone.

✓ 948 104 Rev C -satisfactorily addressed - brick deleted -garages now identified in reconstituted stone.

- 5) Mid height stone walls to the front of dwellings are a defining characteristic of the village and have been incorporated on the principal street of other development e.g. Drovers Green. They are absent from the proposed layout and should be incorporated lining the principal street into the depth of the development.

✓ 948 103 Rev C - satisfactorily addressed – 0.9m high dry stone walls added to front garden boundaries along principal street.

- 6) The following dwellings would represent on their deep side elevations BFHL ‘what red looks like’ page 55 with largely blank side elevations at street corner /open space returns -houses 35,41,47 (type A2) with minimal size ground floor window to habitable room , house 21 (type D) essentially blank side elevation at street corner whereas page 52/53 ‘what green looks like’ images show the degree and size of ‘habitable’ room windows at ground and first floor (It would help for clarity if the relevant plots were identified on each house type elevation drawing).

✓ The above comment was on earlier proposed site Layout 948 106 . The current layout has revised the layout of dwellings and numbering of plots. On current site layout 948 100 C return side elevations fronting street and open space appear to be appropriately addressed on the house type floor plans and elevations. (It would help for clarity if the relevant plots were identified on each house type elevation drawing).

- 7) ✗ The revised site layout - 948 100C (B&W) and 948 101 C (coloured) has reduced the depth of some rear gardens, so that they are now less than the footprint of the dwelling. These are to current plot numbers 20,31,39,40,42,43,44,45, 46, and 47. This would not meet the ‘Wiltshire Design Guide SPD’ expectation 9.2.2 and as set out in the table page 75 , and whereas some other rear gardens would appear disproportionately large.

✗ Numerous rear gardens would also not meet the minimum length of garden to set out in Expectation 9.2.2 and in the table.

✗ The rear garden of plots 47 is of a pointed shape that would not meet Wiltshire Design Guide SPD’ expectation 9.2.4 that these should be of practical usable shape.

- 8) ✗ Plots 16, 38,39,40 which all rely on rear accessways would exceed the maximum carry distance for refuse containers from rear garden to the collection point of 25 metres stipulated in the Wiltshire Council Waste storage and collection SPD.