

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

URBAN DESIGN

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

Date: 24.02.2026

Proposal: Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except means of access from the B4069) for up to 90 no. (class C3) residential dwellings (including 40% affordable dwellings) including the creation of a new vehicular access (from the B4069), pedestrian and cycle paths, parking spaces, public open space, biodiversity enhancement, landscape planting, surface water attenuation, associated infrastructure and other associated works.

Site Address: Land at Gate Farm, High Street, Sutton Benger

Case Officer: Oliver Phippen

Reference:

'Illustrative Site Layout' STN-GEN-SW-DR-MP-06 Revision C , Design and Access Statement December 2025 Revision B.

Policy and guidance which should inform the design.

Wiltshire Core Strategy, Core Policy 57 'Ensuring high quality design and place shaping'; (abbreviated CP57 below); Wiltshire Design Guide ,Wiltshire Council Supplementary Planning Document adopted 25th March 2024;

Sutton Benger and Draycott Cerne Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2035 Made March 2025 : Appendix 1. 'Sutton Benger Parish Character Appraisal December 2024' (abbreviated SBPCA) and Appendix 2 the 'Sutton Benger Parish Design Code December 2024' (abbreviated SBPDC) (separate documents) ;

Building for a Healthy Life and companion guide Streets for a Healthy Life (both Homes England 2021).

Objection

The development proposed by virtue of its size and coverage in its context and setting would not meet the high standard of design and placemaking required by CP57i : it would not relate positively to its landscape setting and the existing pattern of development and not ensure important views are retained; CP57iii : it would not respond positively to the existing townscape and landscape features; CP57vi : not relate effectively to the immediate setting and wider character.- for the following reasons;

Information contained in 'Illustrative Site Layout' and Design and Access Statement also incorporates reserved matters detail which would not meet the high standard of design and place shaping required by CP57 iii. No weight should therefore be attributed to these in conditions to any Outline Planning consent.

- 1) The Illustrative Layout is shown set within an aerial photograph of its surroundings. The overall size, and coverage of the development proposed would be appreciable in its context and setting. This would convey a comparably much greater density, regular layout and built form that would critically undermine the appreciable characteristic pattern of low density, irregular layout and

individual built form that is a distinct characteristic of this edge of village surroundings forming a gateway and gradual transition into the contained higher density core of the village.

In this regard I concur with the 'Assessment' in the Conservation Officer consultation response. It would therefore not accord with SBPDC page 9 Code SB.02 – 'Layout & Siting': d, e, f & g. and not accord with SB.03 – 'Density': a or b, at the size and coverage of development proposed this would represent an overwhelming adverse impact on this character.

- 2) The development would be appreciated in the setting of Character area 3, page 44 of the SBPCA, which are areas identified opposite the east and southern edge of the site. The 'Character Appraisal' important view PM1 from the High Street exiting the contained part of the village indicates this as a wide cone of view looking northwest over the field towards Draycott Park whereas this effect would appear to be essentially lost on the Illustrative Layout by the relatively narrow corridor of open space running between proposed dwellings closing in this view.

This would not accord with Page 32 of the Appraisal which says, *'It is considered that the following viewpoints are considered to be part of the key character of the parish and should not be adversely impacted upon by new development.'* It would also therefore not accord with corresponding SBPDC page 9 Code SB.02 d as a response to this landscape context and 'important views'.

- 3) A reserved matters detail conveyed in the Design and Access Statement which would not, respond positively to existing townscape and landscape features in order to accord with CP57 iii is pages 46,47 & 48 :

- Buff brick images and reference to 'alternative brick type in keeping with surrounding material palette colour' : brick generally and buff brick for its superficial colour resemblance to stone is not a characteristic of the village.
 - Boundary treatments in stone including mid height front garden walls as a key characteristic of the village and High Street would be expected to be substantial through the development, i.e. as Facenda 'Britains Close' development in the village, not just in incidental focal point locations.
 - In addition to the image of a 'traditional' slate tile which should be at least reconstituted slate -textured, riven edge, an image also appears to also show grey concrete roof tiles/plain tiles. This would not be characteristic and incongruous in this context and setting. There is no inclusion of 'stone' slates to reflect this characteristic of traditional roofs in the village and as used on the recent Arms Gardens development in the village.
-