

Sutton Benger – RM Consultee comments response



Site: Land off High Street, Sutton Benger
Council: Wiltshire Council
Planning app ref: RM - PL/2025/09623

Planning Officer – 23/02/2026 – Comment	Applicant Response
The Housing Enabling Team has clarified that the tenure mix does not meet with the S106 requirement, this will clearly need to be resolved.	The accommodation list included within the S106 Agreement is described as an 'indicative mix only'. The proposed accommodation schedule within the application proposes only one plot that is different which is considered to be in line with the indicative mix. However, following discussions with Wiltshire Council the tenure of all Affordable Homes is amended to First Homes due to the lack of interest from any Registered Provider for the Affordable Rented and Shared Ownership homes. This amendment is included within the resubmitted drawings.
The LEAP area shown on the plan is of considerably reduced size than that approved at outline (as per the DFP: CSA/3324/120 Rev G). I would concur entirely with the comments of the Landscape Officer on this point (and particularly given the lack of landscaping through the site); the central area provides no space for informal games. The comments of the PC regarding the boundary treatment is I think in part in response to this, an enclosed LEAP with a timber knee-rail fence around (the entirety) of a more informal space would be a much better solution. (obvs see also the POS Officer's comment on this).	The central Public Open Space (POS) area has been significantly increased in size so it now also includes an incidental seating and recreational space alongside the LEAP area.
Related to the above, in terms of the NPPF objective of having tree-lined streets (para.136), I appreciate there may be some conflict with the Wessex Water pipeline restriction(?), but with the restricted central area this issue is compounded. [Wessex Water's response is still awaited and will be important given their responses at outline stage]. If it is demonstrated that tree-lined streets are not possible, the planting of several 'signature trees' could potentially be a suitable alternative.	Additional tree and hedge planting has been included in the central POS area, including a more prominent cluster of trees on the spine road edge. A signature tree is also included centrally as a focal feature, from which the path arrangement is set out.
In terms of sustainability, the inclusion of solar PVs would be welcomed and I note that despite the claims in the Energy Statement (submitted with PL/2025/09568), no ASHPs are shown on any submitted plans – please could these added (along with the EV where missing, as identified in the Highway Officer comments). It may well be beneficial to include	Locations of ASHP have been added to the Planning Layout and the missing EV charger points are also now included.

an additional 'Energy & Sustainability' plan (or similar) with these items rather than add to existing plans(?) The comments re trees above is also relevant to this point.	
You will have noted the Urban Design Officer's comments re appropriateness of materials – many local residents have also noted the inappropriateness of black window frames.	Black windows are not proposed, this appears to be a misunderstanding. Windows are shown as 'Light Ivory' on the Materials Layout plan and individual housetype drawings.
There does seem to be a large number of different house types and I do have some sympathy with the third-party comment on this (16no.(?) house types have been submitted, this for a scheme of 60 units), but note that there is no specific comment on this from the Urban Design Officer. However, I would be grateful for clarification as to: - whether any Audley units are intended (submitted drawing 550.011-1 but not shown on the Accommodation Schedule); and - which of the Seacombe units is intended: 550.010-1 or 550.010-2?	The variation in house types is a reflection of the variation within Sutton Benger. This provides variation within the street scene and helps form the different character areas within the site. The Audley units are the maisonette units, required as part of the S106 Affordable Homes mix. The housetype name has been added to the accommodation schedule to clarify. The two Seacombe housetype sheets are provided as each shows the different elevation treatment. Some of these Seacombe units include the render elevation in focal locations, hence the two different design sheets.
The northern boundary of the attenuation basin is shown as landscaped – please clarify what the boundary treatment is for the remainder of this facility, and in particular whether any fencing is needed for safety reasons. If so, clarify on plans, including additional landscaping as necessary.	A knee rail fence has been included around the SuDS feature.

Summary of Public comments	Applicant Response
The development is located outside of the village boundary and is contrary to NDP	This is an Outline consideration and not applicable to the reserved matters stage. It is acknowledged that the site is located outside of the village boundary, however the reasoning for granting Outline planning permission is set out in the Planning Inspectors decision. The proposed development is presented in accordance with the NDP policies, and commentary on this is set out in the planning application Cover Letter and Design Statement.
There is a lack of facilities within the village, such as shop and post office	The inclusion of additional homes and new residents within the village will make the opening of these facilities a more viable venture. Similarly, the nearby shop and post office in Christian Malford will be further supported by the future occupants of this development.
Application does not address the strain on local infrastructure such as the village hall, sports fields, doctors surgery and primary school.	The development is not large enough to deliver new facilities on site, however the Outline application includes approximately £392,000 of financial contributions towards education, sports facilities and public art. Furthermore, approximately £650,000 of CIL funding will be provided by Charles Church to Wiltshire Council to be spent on a wide range of infrastructure including transport, flood defences, schools, hospitals and other health and social care, parks and open space, culture

	and sports facilities. Local authorities must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and they will decide what infrastructure is needed. The Parish Council will directly receive 25% of this funding as there is a Neighbourhood Plan in place. As of February 2026, Sutton Benger GP Surgery is accepting new patients and Sutton Benger Primary School has capacity for new students.
Road network is over capacity	Highways and access constraints were reviewed and approved during the Outline planning application. It is noted that transport modelling was provided in line with Wiltshire Councils own technical guidance which was accepted by the Councils Highways Engineer and Planning Inspector.
Access is inadequate	The speed limit on the B4069 is currently 50mph adjacent to the development site, reducing to 30mph at the existing village boundary. As such, the proposed vehicle access was designed to accommodate the 50mph speed limit with the required visibility available in both directions. Charles Church welcome the reduction of the speed limit to 30mph on this road and have had discussions with the Parish Council to see how we can support this.
Flooding of the B4069	It is acknowledged that there have been a number of flooding events on the B4069. This is expected given that part of this road between Sutton Benger and Christian Malford is within Flood Zone 2 and 3. The proposed development includes a comprehensive surface water strategy that ensures no additional surface water is directed towards the highway. Instead, surface water is attenuated in a basin in the south-east corner of the site and then discharged at a controlled rate to the stream north of the site.
Sewer capacity	Enquiries have already been made to ensure capacity is available for the new development, which has been confirmed by Wessex Water.
No drainage information provided	As requested by Wiltshire Council, details of conditions attached to the Outline planning permission are submitted as part of a separate Discharge of Condition application. This includes the detailed drainage design submitted within application PL/2025/09568. It is noted that comments have been issued by Wiltshire Councils Drainage Officer and additional information will be provided to address this.
What assurances can be provided that there will be no damage to the existing hedge along the western boundary	The existing hedge along the western boundary of the land will be retained. Only a ~4m length of hedgerow is required to be removed for the drainage connection which is located in the north-east corner of the site, away from any of the existing dwellings. The proposed development identifies all the existing trees along the site boundary to be retained and an additional 250m+ of new native hedgerow is also being planted To ensure the existing hedgerow remains protected, tree protection fencing will be erected along this boundary between the new homes and the hedgerow to ensure that no vehicles or machinery disturb this hedge. This will also be erected along the northern boundary to

	protect members of the public using the public right of way. This fencing has been shown on the Tree Protection Plan.
Inclusion of 'mown path' footpath adjacent to western boundary through POS area.	The Planning Layout has been amended to remove these informal paths. Instead, Wiltshire Council have requested that the private drives along the edge of the development are connected up to provide continuous pedestrian and cycle access around the periphery of the development. This is shown on the amended layouts.
Trees are placed within the 6m sewer easement	There are two pink dashed lines on the Planning Layout which show the overall 6m width of the sewer easement. No trees are located within this 6m corridor.
Black window frames are not reflective of local character	It is thought that this is maybe a misinterpretation of the plans. The housetype sheets, street scenes, 3D visuals and material layout all identify the windows and doors to all dwellings as 'Light Ivory'. Extract from the materials plan below; The image is a screenshot of a materials plan. It contains two sections. The first section is titled 'Front Entrance Door Colours' and shows a light beige color swatch next to the text 'RAL 1015 Light Ivory'. The second section is titled 'Door, Window, Entrance Frames & Fascia' and also shows a light beige color swatch next to the text 'RAL 1015 Light Ivory'.
Light pollution from street lights will affect nearby homes and gardens	Street lighting is provided to streets in accordance with Wiltshire Councils technical requirements. There is no street lighting proposed to surrounding footpaths or within areas of open space. The Street Lighting plan is provided within Discharge of Condition application PL/2025/09737.
Arrangement of dwellings within the site is pushed away from the road and is overly populated	The site layout is based on the Development Framework Plan, approved as part of the Outline application. This identifies the offset from the B4069 and location of various open space features (LEAP, allotments).
Lack of single storey homes (bungalows)	There are no Open Market restrictions in the Outline planning permission. The proposed development includes a mixture of 3-, 4- and 5-bed open market properties which Charles Church believe is commensurate with the market expectations in this locality. The Affordable Homes mix is set by the Council. The Council have included a mixture of homes and apartments but have not stipulated a requirement for Bungalows or single storey homes. As such, none are required by the S106.
Choice of trees could provide opportunities for greater use of native species	The proposed tree species have been amended.
Assurances that wildlife-positive features will be provided, including bird/bat nest boxes and hedgehog highways	Charles Church is committed to the Homes for Nature pledge which ensures that one habitat feature is included for every new dwelling. At Sutton Benger this includes either a bird or bat box on every home, as well as the inclusion of hedgehog holes to form hedgehog highways through the development. These features are identified on the Biodiversity Framework Plan.

Allotments may be used at a later date for future development	The S106 Agreement secures the provision of the allotment land within the site and there is no mechanism within the application to convert this to residential development at a later date. The Outline requirement is for five allotment plots which are 250sq/m each – these are identified on the Planning Layout. The access and operation of these allotments will be management by the Management Company for the new development and full-sized plots can be divided into half or quarter plots, like those at Sutton Lane.
---	--

Sutton Benger Parish Council – 20/01/2026 – Comment	Applicant Response
The black window frames shown on the houses' design are out of character with existing houses in the village and do not confirm to the design recommendations given in the existing Neighbourhood Development plan.	The housetype sheets, street scenes, 3D visuals and material layout identify the windows and doors to all dwellings as 'Light Ivory'. Extract from the plan below;  The image shows a color specification box with the title 'Front Entrance Door Colours'. It contains two entries: a color swatch followed by 'RAL 1015 Light Ivory' for 'Front Entrance Door Colours', and another color swatch followed by 'RAL 1015 Light Ivory' for 'Door, Window, Entrance Frames & Fascia'.
The railings shown around houses in the middle of the site are more suitable for an urban estate and do not reflect the rural nature of the estate's surroundings. These should be replaced by natural boundaries, e.g., wood, or shrub planting.	Shrub planting is provided in conjunction with the estate railings. We have discussed this with Wiltshire Council who request that this remains as estate railings. The timber fences have a shorter life span than the metal railings, which puts the burden of replacement on to the future occupants. Estate railings are much longer lasting and maintenance free.
Councillors request a deeper tree planting barrier on the West side of the site, to obscure more of the buildings from the existing dwellings. In addition, the cut path shown along the side of the site closest to these existing cottages is not a right of way and encourages walkers close to these cottages. No paths along this side of the site should be made with any hardcore base.	Additional tree planting has been added along this boundary. It is noted that the existing hedgerow will remain in place. The informal path has been removed along the western and eastern site boundaries.
Councillors were concerned that adequate plans are being put in place for regular watering of young trees given recent very hot summers. Local experience in two other large sites has been that many trees have died as a result lack of attention during the summer droughts.	The care of new (and existing) planting is covered by the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, submitted as part of a separate DOC application. This document includes, amongst other things, the programme for watering of all trees/hedges/shrubs within the public areas of the site which will be carried out by the Management Company.
The village sewage system is already under strain and sewage overflow in the High Street in recent years during heavy rain means raw sewage can flow down the B4069 towards the site.	A foul drainage strategy has been provided as part of the separate DOC application which identifies how and where the proposed development will connect into the foul system. It is noted that the WW STW is located to the south-east of the site and that the wider network is directed in this direction.
Councillors request assurance that the significant flooding in recent years following the extreme weather conditions has been fully considered and that water flow from the site to	Similarly, the surface water drainage strategy is also provided as part of the separate DOC application. The Councils Drainage Officer has requested further details relating to the

the attenuation pond will be contained within the estate under all circumstances and will not cause further flooding on the B4069.	various flood calculations which have been provided. This demonstrates that the proposed system will appropriately manage the predicted flood events, including the allowance for climate change.
Councillors appreciate that the entrance to the estate has been designed in accordance with existing Highways requirements for exiting onto a 50 mph public road. However, the Parish Council statistics for speeding vehicles, currently under review by Wiltshire Police, show that this is an unsafe lane with a significant number of regular speeders. The Parish Council's recommendation, as a matter of urgency, is that the village's 30 mph speed limit is extended along the B4069 toward Christian Malford to a point beyond the new entrance.	We will work with Wiltshire Council to review this. It is noted that Charles Church are also supportive of this.

Arboricultural Officer – 19/01/2026 – Comment	Applicant Response
Please provide Tree Protection Plan which forms part of Condition 15 of Appeal Decision.	Condition 15 requires the submission of a CEMP. This document and associated TPP is submitted as part of DOC application PL/2025/09568. The TPP is appended within the CEMP.

Archaeology – 12/12/2025 – No Objection	Applicant Response
<i>Note that comments have been provided on the associated DOC application PL/2025/09568;</i> I have previously reviewed and approved the Written Scheme of Investigation for Additional Archaeological Evaluation and Mitigation submitted in support of this application. I am therefore happy to recommend discharge of Condition 26(a) only. I will be able to consider recommending full discharge of condition once the approved programme of archaeological work has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.	n/a

Conservation – 29/12/2025 – Comment	Applicant Response
Previously, I raised the issue of materials and the need for a harmonious relationship with the wider locality of the village. To that end, samples of the proposed external materials are required, and an analysis as to how these compare to the wider setting in which the development would be perceived.	Sample panels can be provided as part of an RM condition.

Education – 16/12/2025 – No Objection	Applicant Response
We note the details of this REM application, and that the Education requirements are secured by an S106 dated 17/12/2024.	n/a

Environment Agency – 17/12/2025 – No Objection	Applicant Response
This application does not fall within the criteria set out in our External Consultation Checklist which defines the planning applications we should be consulted on. We therefore consider we should not be consulted, and we will not be providing any comments on this proposal.	n/a

Fire and Rescue – 30/12/2025 – Comment	Applicant Response
Summary; Comments provided on regulatory compliance but no objection raised.	n/a

Highways – 12/01/2026 – Comment	Applicant Response
The parking proposals for vehicles is detailed on a separate plan and seems to indicate a different housing type in regard to bedroom quantum. When looking at the number of 3-bedroom and 4-bedroom dwellings, this gives a slightly higher parking provision than would be required as a minimum, which is not necessarily an issue until you look at the allocated parking for the proposed 2-bedroom apartments where it is suggested that a single space is required. All 2-bedroom dwellings require a minimum parking provision of 2 spaces per dwelling; therefore, this should be amended to provide the correct level of off-street parking for plots 39 and 40.	These have been amended and updated plans provided.
A footway connection is proposed to link to the footway provisions proposed along the site frontage which link to the development access, it does not appear that this is proposed to be adopted, clarification of this would be required, any unadopted footpath would be required to be maintained by a management company along with any other links through public open space.	It is expected that this path will be maintained by the development Management Company, who will also be liable for maintaining other footpaths and open space within the site.
Cycle parking has been demonstrated on the parking, cycle storage and EV charging plan, where garages are proposed this is suitable for cycle storage and where a dwelling has no garage space, there are cycle storage facilities proposed. There is no visitor cycle parking proposed, where there should be an element of visitor cycle parking within the site at a rate of 1 visitor space per 20 bedrooms, this should be conveniently and appropriately located.	Cycle visitor parking has been added at the LEAP and Allotments.
EV charging is demonstrated for 57 properties, it would appear that plots 2, 15 and 34 have no EV charging proposed, this should be amended.	These have been amended and updated plans provided.

Housing Enabling Team – 12/01/2026 – Comment	Applicant Response
I note that the tenure mix proposed within the Reserved Matters application differs from the S106 agreement, reducing the number of Affordable Rented units from 14 to 13 (with 2 x 3B6P Affordable Rented units instead of 3 x 3B6P units) and increasing the number of First Homes from 6 to 7 units (2 x 3B5P First Home units instead of 1 x 3B5P unit).	Schedule 1 Part 4 of the S106 Agreement specifically identifies the mix as '<u>an indicative mix only</u>'. However, following discussion with Wiltshire Council it is agreed that the tenure of the Affordable Rent and Shared Ownership will be amended to First Homes.
I note discrepancies between the Key Table shown on the Affordable Housing Layout Plan and the unit sizes / House Types / Tenure. The following amendments are required: • The Key Table shows Shared Ownership House -Type Haldon as 3 bed unit, this should be a 2-bed unit • The Key Table shows Shared Ownership House- Type Rendlesham as a 4-bed unit, this should be a 3-bed unit. • The Legend on the Affordable Housing Plan refers to the Affordable Housing units as 'Social Rented units' – this requires amendment to 'Affordable Rented units'.	These have been amended and updated plans provided.
Plot 37 – 2B4P House, Affordable Rented - 2 parking bays should be provided in curtilage or adjacent to the property. At present, the parking bays do not meet these criteria and are not acceptable.	Parking spaces are provided to the front or side of dwellings except for instances of mid-terraced properties where parking is located at the end of the terrace. The mid-terraced property benefits from a rear pedestrian access to the garden, and the gated access is located next to the parking space. This is standard design practice and has been accepted on many other sites within Wiltshire. As such, no changes are proposed to the layout on this matter.
Plots 39/40 – 2B3P Flats, First Homes - 2 x parking bays are required for each of the 2 bed, 3 person flats (First Homes). At present, only one parking bay is provided for each flat.	These have been amended and updated plans provided.
Plots 43/49 – 1B2P Flats, Adapted M4(2) Affordable Rent - Parking spaces for M4(2) units should meet the required standard with respect to location and width and be shown on the Plan.	These have been amended and updated plans provided.
Plot 52 – 2B4P House, First Homes - 2 parking bays should be provided in curtilage or adjacent to the property. At present, the parking bays do not meet these criteria and are not acceptable.	Parking spaces are provided to the front or side of dwellings except for instances of mid-terraced properties where parking is located at the end of the terrace. This is standard design practice and has been accepted on many other sites within Wiltshire. As such, no changes are proposed to the layout on this matter.
All Affordable Homes must meet at least 85% of the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS), relevant to the dwelling type and minimum person criteria, to ensure that the affordable housing units are eligible for inclusion in Homes England's Affordable Housing programme. To ensure each house type complies with at least 85% NDSS, and where applicable complies with M4(2) adapted standards, revised floorplans are required for each house type as listed below, showing the total internal floor area (Sqm) and bedspaces. (The floorplans submitted to date do not provide this information). • Audley – 1B2P Maisonette Flats, require measurements (sqm), bedspaces, M4(2) compliance for ground floor units (plots 43, 49)	Paragraph 5.1 of Schedule 1 Part 1 within the S106 Agreement states that the Developer must construct '<i>all of the Affordable Housing Units to the Standards except the First Homes which shall be constructed to no less than the standard applied to the Market Housing Units</i>'. The definition confirms that the 'Standards' refer to size standards of at least 85% of NDSS. Floor areas have been added to the Affordable Rent and Shared Ownership housetype sheets to confirm the sizes of these dwellings. As required, these are no less than 85% of NDSS.

• Haldon – 2B4P Houses, require measurements (sqm) and bedspaces. • Rendlesham – 3B6P Houses, require measurements (sqm) and bedspaces. • Ennerdale – 4B7P Houses, require measurements (sqm) and bedspaces • 2BM – 2B3P Flats, require measurements (sqm) and bedspaces • Alnmouth – 2B4P Houses, require measurements (sqm) and bedspaces • Danbury – 3B5P Houses, require measurements (sqm) and bedspaces	
--	--

Landscape – 20/02/2026 – Objection	Applicant Response
The 'central green' space was promoted as a key feature and means to provide a focal point to the new development and its new residential community. The size of this central place shaping feature has been substantially reduced in area/size from that illustrated within outline development parameters. The outline 'Central Green' area was larger and incorporated a centrally located 'Local Equipped Area of Play' (LEAP) surrounded by trees. The submitted RM submission has in effect reduced this to just an area for a LEAP surrounded by trees. As a consequence, this raises relevant issues around nuisance from noise arising from play activity for residents in adjacent dwellings (i.e. outline layout illustrated a15m buffer was achievable, while RM layout does not provide for this). In addition, the 'central green' should provide more than just an equipped play area. The design intent was to provide a heart to the scheme, act as a green verdant focal point for the new development, to support opportunities for community cohesion / social interaction for all residents, not just children.	The central Public Open Space (POS) area has been significantly increased in size so it now also includes an incidental seating and recreational space alongside the LEAP area. Additional tree planting is provided, including a signature tree centrally within the space. Appendix 2 of the S106 Agreement identifies that the LEAP shall have a '<i>buffer zone of not less than 10m in depth between the activity zone and the boundary of the nearest dwelling</i>'. The proposed layout complies with this.
Materials - I fully endorse the comments of this council's urban designer in relation to a reasonable expectation that materials used within dwellings and boundary treatments better support the existing primary character of the village. This is considered particularly important fronting onto listed buildings, the conservation area, and high street frontage and transitioning with open countryside, especially along road approaches and views into the development along the primary access. The use of natural stone within key frontage boundary treatments and as unifying frontage boundary enclosures has been consistently requested and secured for other recent development within the village. This should be viewed as a key character supporting design response for development at this site. The use of recon stone in the proposed garden screen walls and dwarf walls is not supported especially where this is being proposed to front onto the views from the high street or fronting the listed buildings / conservation area.	It is confirmed that the wall surrounding the site entrance will be constructed from natural stone. Additional wording has been added to the Boundary Treatment Layout plan to confirm this. Material for the building elevations and screen walls within the site is recon stone which is considered appropriate for this location.
Garden sizes • Plot 44 doesn't appear to have any amenity garden space. • The rear garden of Plot 26 is terrible shape, dominated by garage incursions. • Rear garden of Plot 39 appears to be unacceptably small.	The garden sizes have been reviewed in discussions with the Urban Design Officer and updated layout provided.
Footpath surfacing - Concern is raised as to the suitability of mown amenity grass paths to achieve 'access for all' standards through POS areas, including to seating areas. It is not	The mown paths on the western and eastern boundaries have been removed.

clear on the submitted landscape plans what surface treatment is being proposed for the retained northern public footpath route, or whether improvements to the existing footpath route continuing northwest of the site are still proposed.	No amendments are proposed to the surfacing of the public right of way along the northern boundary. Given the rural context either side, it would not be appropriate to amend this short section to a hard surface.
Landscape edge / transition with High Street - There is a notable difference between the levels of the site and the level of the adjoining High Street, which will be exacerbated by the excavation to cut back this bank further to create required safety visibility splays from the new access onto the High Street. I request further detail in the form of additional cross section/s illustrating how the development proposal responds to this level change including the relationship with any resulting boundary treatment/s along the southern edge of the site. The outline illustrative application material illustrated a low natural stone wall, identified to be characteristic roadside features at approaches to limestone villages from open countryside, as highlighted within landscape character assessments and in this instance a consistent unifying feature running along Sutton Benger's High Street are low natural stone retaining walls, of which this application site is an extension of.	Three sections have been provided through the front area of the site to show the relationship between the highway, open space and front plots. The gradient of the path is shown on one of these. Given the significant set back of development from the High Street, a stone wall along the site boundary would appear notably separated from the development. In this setting on the edge of the village, it is considered more appropriate to provide a softer planting buffer to assist with transitioning to the field boundaries beyond the site.
Landscape edge / transition with High Street - There is also a notable departure from the illustrated outline treatment of building frontage (facing the high street west of the vehicular access point) overlooking the conservation area / listed building green open space at the southwest corner of the site. The RM layout introduces long bays of frontage side-by-side / perpendicular parking to serve the larger housing units (plots 43-49), in arguably the most sensitive part of the site in design terms.	As part of discussion with the Urban Design Officer, the frontage parking to plots 43-50 has been removed.
Visitor Parking - It is observed that some visitor parking spaces (x 6 no.) are being proposed within unadopted cul-de-sac road spurs, typically not accepted in principle by highways officers. These visitor spaces are likely to be required to be relocated within adopted roads. The relocation of these spaces and knock on effect to street lighting will impact the current layout and potentially impacting upon the currently proposed street tree planting locations. Every effort should be made within layout revisions to maximise street tree planting.	No highways objection has been raised in relation to this. Is it entirely reasonable that visitor spaces also serve dwellings on private drives.
Disparity between various plans submitted - The planning layouts and detailed landscape proposals do not illustrate a consistent southern boundary treatment fronting on to the new footpath link to the High Street. In the interests of planning certainty and future planning governance, revised plans submitted for approval must align.	The amended plans confirm there is no new hedge in this location. This was an error on the previous Planning Layout.
Tree planting - Street trees - No Street tree planting locations are demonstrated to be feasible until internal street visibility splays from private drives, road junctions and road bends are included on landscape plans to demonstrate there will be no locational conflict with the required line of sight. As well as details of restrictive tree planting easements for the recently laid sewer, the landscape proposals plan should additionally include details of other main utility services (existing or proposed) routes alongside any associated easement corridors that restrict tree planting. This is necessary to check that planting locations for street trees are feasible, and not at risk of requiring subsequent removal by any adopting utility company.	Visibility splays have been included on the landscaping plan at junctions. No trees are located within these splays.
Tree planting - Eastern Site Boundary - The currently proposed use of Betula pendula (Silver Birch) as hedgerow trees is not appropriate or supported within a native hedgerow bordering open countryside to the east. The currently proposed silver birch hedgerow trees	The tree species specification has been amended to include a native mix.

should be substituted with a more characteristic medium-large native hedgerow tree species found in the local hedgerow network to assist characteristic countryside transition, given this will be a forever settlement edge fronting onto the adjoining lower floodplain farmland. Small native pollinating hedgerow trees should also be introduced (randomly spaced) into the eastern and northern allotment boundaries to help the boundary transition with adjoining open countryside, without unacceptably shading allotment plots etc.	
Tree planting - Northern Site Boundary - The originally envisaged northern edge woodland planting (as illustrated on the outline application's 'Fig 7.1 Green Infrastructure Plan') proposed to help screen and integrate new urban development edge with countryside is not incorporated into the RM submission. I appreciate that new hedgerow tree planting will not be possible to achieve along the site's existing retained northern boundary hedgerow due to overhead cables following its line. However, some additional tree planting might be possible where space permits within this green northern perimeter corridor. Further consideration should be given to strategic placement of feature trees, potentially at ends of roads or to frame an end of street, or path view.	Additional tree planting is included along this boundary. It is noted that the mature hedgerow is retained along this boundary, and the proposed planting is in addition to this.

Natural England – 21/01/2026 – No Objection	Applicant Response
Natural England has no comments to make on this reserved matters application.	n/a

North Wilts Swifts – 15/12/2025 – Comment	Applicant Response
We note that on related application PL/2025/09568 the Biodiversity Features Plan (GE Consulting) shows 45 integrated swift bricks in 15 clusters of 3 Ref 3112-LEMP-F1 and that the LEMP Pg 3 Table 2 Additional Features - 45 no. Internally mounted bird boxes. We request these two documents are conditioned with photographic evidence of installation or signed confirmation from an ecologist provided to discharge the condition.	This discrepancy has been amended and updated documents provided in the separate DOC application. The documents will be listed as approved plans and no further condition is necessary.

Public Protection – 23/12/2025 – No Objection	Applicant Response
We have reviewed the Noise and lighting assessments provided and have no adverse comments.	n/a

Urban Design – 03/02/2026 – Objection	Applicant Response
--	---------------------------

The development comprises a series of cul de sacs throughout. This would represent BfHL 'what red looks like' page 19/20 rather than page 16/17 'what green looks like' 'connected streets' and 'continuous streets along the edge of development'. The NMDC2 page 7 also advises a connected street network. The layout would not accord with the WDG expectation 5.1.8 'Cul de sac development should be short with their turning head/far end visible from the junction with a through road'. A through vehicle street(s) would be reasonably expected to be achieved for this size of development / regular shaped site. To address this and WDG expectation 5.1.8 the cul de sac alongside plot 22 could be joined to the cul de sac alongside plot 26 as a through vehicle route and meaningfully for this purpose the continuation as an adopted highway of full two-way width with pavement one side to facilitate all vehicles including refuse vehicles. <u>Comments from Planning Officer</u> <i>I would defer to the Urban Design Officer on this point and their request relates to overall site legibility – at present it is entirely cul-de-sac form which I am sure you would agree does not represent good design for a 60 unit scheme.</i>	Following discussions with the Planning Officer and Urban Design Officer, a circular highways connection has been provided within the site so that a continuous adopted highways is included.
The ends of the communal/private driveways should be connected up as surfaced foot /cycleways in order to meet WDG expectation 5.1.8 that 'foot and cycleways should follow desire lines and link cul de sacs and accord with the BfHL principle of connected streets and SFHL page 53 for 'Edge lane/private driveway' 'good practice principle' is to 'ensure' that these are connected for pedestrians and cyclists. The end of each communal/private driveway should be linked and connected up in this way to its neighbour around the perimeter open space. The mown grass strips shown on the Layout through the public open space are not a substitute for this, they would be indirect, impermanent/reliant on regular upkeep and an inadequate surface for the above purpose.	Following discussions with the Planning Officer and Urban Design Officer, connections between the private drives around the periphery of the site are provided to allow for continuous pedestrian and cycle connectivity. As such, the mown paths along the western and eastern edge of the site have been removed.
Plots 42, 45 and 46: WDG 9.2.2 Their rear gardens are of less depth than WDG expectation 9.2.2 that north facing gardens to houses should be a minimum of 12 metres long. The SBPDC also emphasises garden depth in relation to sunlight - paragraph SB.09 I. Plots 42 and 45 are of pointed shape. This would not meet WDG expectation 9.2.4 that these should create usable garden shapes avoiding irregular pointed corners and narrow strips.	Garden sizes have been rebalanced as part of the wider layout updates.
The omission of 'stone' window heads and additional masonry height between first floor openings and eaves. This is a characteristic feature of both stone faced and rendered facades in the village.	Whilst this feature can be found on some properties within the village, it is not characteristic of all properties and does not define the character of the conservation area. The proposed design is also a common feature within the village and conservation area and is acceptable.
The omission of stone window heads and stone cills to side elevation openings and to rear elevation openings (door and windows).	Stone window headers and sills are included on all frontage elevations – this includes side elevations on corner turn units.

The gable ladders universally applied to side elevation main gable ends and mid gables on front elevations whereas a mortared edge is an intrinsic characteristic. Eg Manor Farm Drive, Seagry Road recent housing.	Whilst this feature can be found on some properties within the village, it is not characteristic of all properties. The proposed design is also a common feature within the village and conservation area.
The roofs on all elevations appear to show a 'brown' stone slate which does not distinguish or correspond with houses which are in the grey 'anthracite' tile identified on the Materials Key Plan.	The development includes two different types of roof tiles; a plain grey tile and a brown profiled tile. These are differentiated on the Materials Key plan. As there are multiple of each house type, not every version has been shown where the roof tiles are different. Development within the village does not exclusively use slate tiles, and a large number of properties within the village use grey plain tiles – including properties within the conservation area, which this site is not. As such, the inclusion of grey plain tiles here is not uncommon or unexpected for Sutton Benger and is considered acceptable.
The reference to render should be a roughcast finish an intrinsic characteristic of render in the local area, not a smooth finish.	The wording on the Materials Key plan has been amended to confirm this.
The key reference to roof tiles as an 'Anthracite Plain tile' and 'Brown Profile Tile' does not establish a roof tile that would be characteristic of the village or of a suitable quality of appearance. Plain tiles are not a characteristic of the village. As a grey coloured tile this should not be concrete but be a natural or at least reconstituted textured face riven edge slate i.e. as seen on Britains Close housing. A brown profile tile should not be a modern Double Roman profile which have been a modern introduction and replacement but a traditional pantile an intrinsic characteristic of the village and on vernacular building in the wider rural area in the warm brown /red colour e.g. as seen opposite the site and along Seagry Road. The SBPDC page 20 discourages 'poor quality concrete tiles'. Reconstituted 'Stone 'slates' are a feature of other recent housing which in quality and appearance relate well to the traditional stone roof tiles characteristic of the village notably further along off the High Street and it would be reasonable for a development of this scale to consider inclusion of this.	Again, development within the village does not exclusively use slate tiles and a large number of properties within the village use grey plain tiles, including properties within the conservation area, which this site is not. As such, the inclusion of grey plain tiles here is not uncommon or unexpected for Sutton Benger and is considered acceptable.
The key 'Notes' identifies that all tiled porch canopies are to match main roof. This reference should also identify roofs over bay windows where these are shown to a house type should also match main roof. It should also be identified that porches and bay windows would incorporate timber framing and masonry faced posts and heads i.e. as quality of material and appearance seen on Britains Close and not for example forming a grp fabricated assembly.	Additional annotation has been added to the Materials Key plan to confirm that bay window roof materials will match the main dwelling roof. Porches to all properties are to be constructed from timber with a natural stain for weather protection.

The PVCu window frames and the front entrance doors are identified as 'Light Ivory' throughout the development which would over this scale of development benefit from as SBPDC page 21 in principle conveys some limited variation in colour palette and as for the two roof and two façade treatments, a complementary additional colour for example a traditional pale green could be introduced for doors and windows related to particular siting and house type.	It is entirely reasonable for a development of 60 dwellings to consist of one single window colour. Indeed it is the case at other sites Charles Church are progressing within Wiltshire where the windows/doors are one colour on schemes of 500+ homes. The 'Light Ivory' complements the use of render and stone and is acceptable.
0.9 m high reconstituted stone walls with cock and hen coping are identified to front and front side returns of five plots prominent on the open space approach to the development from the High Street. It is common in this relationship at the entrance approach to development for these to be of a natural stone walling as found in other developments in the wider area and closely relating to the quality of natural stone walling that is a traditional characteristic of property boundaries along and off the High Street. The Britains Close and Seagry Road recent housing uses natural stone to reinforce this characteristic and it would be reasonable to expect the subject development of the scale proposed to also follow this approach and impart this quality rather than reconstituted stone continued here.	It is confirmed that the wall surrounding the site entrance will be constructed from natural stone. Additional wording has been added to the Boundary Treatment Layout plan to confirm this.
There is the potential for vehicle overrun onto the public open space and informal parking up on this to the detriment of the street /open space scene and damage to the green without substantial use of knee rails or similar along the open space edges of the cul de sac turning heads and perimeter communal drives. Hedging is shown along the prominent open space perimeter of the communal drive fronting plots 1 to 3 and fronting plots 43 to 49 and it would be reasonable to expect this to be extended around the cul de sac and continue along the open space edge fronting plots 40 to 42. For adequacy and appearance this should be a 'native' species characteristic of the area and not the ornamental dwarf hedge variety. Re SBPDC page 16.	The enclosure of all turning head ends is considered unnecessary and would not normally be provided in these instances. This restricts pedestrian access to the open space, which is contrary to the connectivity strategy. This has not been raised as an objection by Highways and no amendments are proposed.

Waste Management – 09/12/2026 – Support	Applicant Response
Support. Requests contributions as follows; 60 x £115 = £6,900.	n/a

CPRE – 13/01/2026 – Objection	Applicant Response
The planning layout details of the houses show tiled roof tiles. Why are the roofs not shown with solar panels? This falls under Future Homes Standard requirement.	It is expected that the FHS legalisation will be published in December 2026, followed by a transitional period through to December 2027. Work is due to start on site in the Summer of 2026 and therefore is being delivered ahead of the introduction of FHS. Regardless, all of the new homes will be fitted with Air Source Heat Pumps – there will be no new gas connections/boilers on site.

Single, double and even triple garages are shown covering the majority of the units. The number of cycle sheds shown in proportion to the garages is a demonstration of a backward looking model of site development. Why are there so many garages, not parking plots with multipurpose lockable sheds?	Each new dwelling is either provided with a cycle store or a garage. The amount of cycle storage is calculated based on the number of bedrooms in accordance with Wiltshire Councils technical standards. Garages are almost exclusively used for the storage of belongings (such as bicycles) rather than vehicle parking, hence why additional cycle storage is not provided for dwellings with garages. These are also generally larger dwellings with larger gardens where there is ample space for the addition of a shed or store within the rear garden if required by the occupants. In addition, it is noted that visitor cycle parking has been added around the LEAP and allotments. Finally, the triple garage is to be used as the sales office, with Plots 1 and 2 to be used as show homes.
This proposal continues to promote car dependency contrary to policy aims of a reduction in car use and a shift to safe efficient public transport, cycling and walking. The site is easily accessible for buses along the B4069 directly to Chippenham or Swindon. Why is this not visibly encouraged and made a priority?	It should be noted that this application is for the approval of reserved matters and that development principles and access were reviewed and approved at Outline stage. The proposed development includes the delivery of a new pavement along the High Street that connects into the existing pavement in the south-west corner of the site. This was secured at Outline stage and is included in the Section 278 works. In addition, a second pedestrian link through the POS connects into this point as well. The nearest bus stop is then approximately 230m away on the High Street, with a direct service into Chippenham (approximately 16-minute journey to Chippenham train station, via service 91). Furthermore, public right of way SBEN18 runs along the northern boundary of the development and is partly included within the application area. This provides an alternative rural link to the services within Sutton Benger (restaurant, church, school, community centre, sports field) as well as the wider countryside PROW network.
Why are there no bungalows? 2-bedroom bungalows are needed for the increasing demand demonstrated by demographic statistics	The mix of open market accommodation is based on market research and demand within the area – this varies for each settlement and site. The Council have not identified a need for any bungalows to be delivered as Affordable Homes and therefore none were included in the Outline S106 Agreement AH indicative mix.
Why so many 4-bedroom houses when it is known that the market is flooded with this model?	The mix of open market accommodation is based on market research and demand within the area – this varies for each settlement and site.