

Document Reference: 25.0004-SCR

Land South of Trowbridge (Southwick Court Farm), Trowbridge, Wiltshire, BA14 0AG

Application Reference: PL/2025/09486

Reserved Matters Application for a) The scale of the development; b) The layout of the development; c) The access road and the 'foot-cycleway' connecting the housing with the A361: including kerbing, any cutting/embankment/retaining structures, camber, surfacing, drainage and the stream crossing; d) The external appearance of the development; e) The landscaping of the site following outline planning consent 20/00379/OUT

Actions taken from Consultation Responses – 15.05.2026

Consultee	Date	Response	Action Taken
Archaeology	16.12.25	Site has been the subject of an archaeological assessment. Trial trenching phase identified substantial area of Romano-British activity in south eastern end of the Site, which will have to be fully investigated by qualified archaeologists ahead of any development. To be completed under Condition 16 to the permission. At this moment, no further issues to raise specifically to this RM Application.	No action to take.
Education	18.12.25	No Comments to make.	No action to take.
Arboriculture	02.01.26	No objection in principle. Arb Impact Assessment demonstrates trees and hedgerows on-site have been considered during the design process, however full details are required including, but not limited to, the use and installation of protective fencing and ground protection, and installation of all drainage infrastructure including the installation of culverts and headwalls. Requested Condition:	Happy for the requested condition to be discussed and attached to a consent of this Reserved Matters Application.

	No demolition, site clearance or development shall commence on site, and; no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to site for the purpose of development, until an Arboricultural Method Statement, and Tree Protection Plan showing the exact position of each tree/s and their protective fencing, in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012: “Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations”; has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and; The protective fencing shall be erected in accordance with the approved details. The protective fencing shall remain in place for the entire development phase and until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Such fencing shall not be removed or breached during construction operations. No retained tree/s shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree/s be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars. Any topping or lopping approval shall be carried out in accordance British Standard 3998: 2010 “Tree Work – Recommendations” or arboricultural techniques where it can be demonstrated to be in the interest of good arboricultural practice. If any retained tree is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place, at a size and species and planted at such time, that must be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No fires shall be lit within 15 metres of the furthest extent of the canopy of any retained trees or hedgerows or adjoining land and no concrete, oil, cement, bitumen or other chemicals shall be mixed or stored within 10 metres of the trunk of any tree or group of trees to be retained on the site or adjoining land. [In this condition “retained tree” means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs above shall have	
--	--	--

		effect until the expiration of ten years from the first occupation or the completion of the development, whichever is the later].	
Housing Enabling Officer	06.01.26	<u>Affordable Rent – 32 units</u> 9 x 1-bed/2-person flats, including 3 x 1-bed built to M4(2). M4(2) should all be ground level, with level access showers rather than baths. Should be clearly shown on the floor plans. 12 x 2-bed/4-person houses. Ensuite not required. Should be reduction of 1 unit, so that 11 x 2-bed houses are provided with the 1 unit being a bungalow. 9 x 3-bed/5-person houses. Ensuite not required. These should be shown as 5-person houses. Should be a reduction of 1 unit, so that 8 x 2-bed houses are provided with the 1 unit being a bungalow. 2 x 4-bed/6-person houses. Notes: 2 and 3 bed houses do not require ensuite facilities as they create additional costs to Registered Providers and owners. 2 x 2-bed/3-person bungalows are required, mix should be adjusted accordingly (As outlined in bold above). <u>Shared Ownership (22 units)</u> 14 x 2-bed/4-person houses – ensuite not required. 8 x 3-bed/5-person houses – ensuite not required. <u>Other</u> - Affordable Homes meet 85% NDSS, which is acceptable. - Clustering of Affordable Homes shown on Affordable Housing Layout Plan is also acceptable, as are the parking arrangements for affordable homes. - Amendment to Legend on Affordable Housing Plan required, as currently makes reference to “Social Rent”, should be corrected to “Affordable Rent”. - At least 10% of Affordable Units (i.e. 5 affordable rented) should be provided as Adapted Units.	<u>Affordable Rent</u> - All 3 of the M4(2) units are the Ground Floor units. The baths have been replaced with a level access shower. - Ensuite has been removed from the 2-bed/4-person houses. - Ensuite has been removed from the 3-bed/5-person houses, and amended to a 3-bed/5-person. <u>Shared Ownership</u> - Ensuite has been removed from the 2-bed/4-person houses. - Ensuite has been removed from the 3-bed/5-person houses. <u>Other</u> - Correction has been made to make reference to “Affordable Rent” - 10% of Affordable Units are now provided as Adapted Units. - All 3 ground floor apartments are designed as M4(2), and have a shower instead of a bath.

		3 x 1-bed M4(2) flats should be ground floor, with level access showers instead of baths, and this be shown on floor plans. - In line with need and the Completed Unilateral Undertaking, a further 2 x Adapted Units are required. These should be 2 x 2-bed/3-person affordable rented bungalows, built to M4(2) Standard and having level access showers rather than baths. - Affordable Homes will be required for transfer to a Registered Provider, approved by the Council, or to the Council on a nil subsidy basis. Local Authority will have nomination rights to the Affordable Homes.	
Trowbridge Town Council	07.01.26	Objection on grounds that submitted information is inadequate. In particular, application doesn't sufficiently address flooding and drainage, despite new national standards (June 2025). Concerns regarding adverse impacts on wildlife habitats and heritage assets, given the site's significant historical importance. Site lies within yellow zone of Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy (TBMS), yet application doesn't appear to demonstrate compliance with required TBMS criteria. In addition, insufficient information has been provided on the design of proposed bridge, and its impact on development and surrounding area.	Regarding the TBMS, it is not made clear what exactly this refers to. The assumption is that there is some concern around the paths and proposed culvert within the 15m/30m buffer of the TBMS. From the perspective of the Ecology Consultant, the planning layout adheres to the buffers as shown on the Green Infrastructure Parameters Plan and Lighting Parameters Plan. How the Site layout adheres to the TBMS is shown within the updated reporting which forms this re-submission. Details of the culvert are now contained as part of this submission. Please see the Covering Letter for applicable drawing references.
Urban Design	09.01.26	A) The scale of the development 1. Block A (3-storey) exceeds the approved parameter (2.5-storey/9.5m) and introduces a design that does not reflect local character. <i>Recommend incorporating 'room in the roof approach' with dormers and additional architectural features which would reduce perceived massing and improve contextual fit.</i>	<u>A) The scale of the development</u> 1. - Block A has been reduced to 2.5 storey. 2. - Greendale and Oakrise are unchanged, but the number of units has been limited to 25.

	2. Greendale and Oakrise (approx. 10.6m) and Hillgrove (approx. 9.8m) exceed the 9.5m limit for 2.5-storeys. Woodmount (approx. 8.8m) and Willowcrest (approx. 8.9m) exceed the 8.5m limit for two-storey areas. <i>Recommend revision to ensure compliance with parameters and maintain design quality.</i> 3. DAS identifies location where 1.5-storey development would be most appropriate. <i>Recommend incorporating design responses that reflect historic context. e.g. 1.5-storey building in southwestern corner, locally distinctive materials, roof forms and proportions that reduce visual massing and compliment farmhouse setting, building clusters that emulate traditional rural farmstead forms.</i> 4. Outline design promotes design features that reflect local character. RM application relies predominately on semi-detached and detached house types, with only small number of small terraces, and a single apartment block. Approach does not align with aspirations of DAS or Design Principles Plan, risks producing a layout that lacks local distinctiveness. <i>Recommend scheme should incorporate greater variety of building forms and arrangements that reflect local massing, character, sense of place.</i> 5. DAS and DPP identify continuous development line as a defining feature of Character Area 4. RM does not achieve this. Buildings are positioned inconsistently, stepping forward and backward without clear development line. Irregular spacing disrupts the intended rhythm and visual coherence. Character Areas 2 and 3 lack the strong sense of enclosure and continuous built form illustrated in DAS and DPP. <i>Recommend RM Application establish a continuous development line in Character Area 4, comprised of lower-density detached dwellings with clear rhythm of gable frontages, strong continuous frontages in Character Areas 2 and 3 to reinforce enclosure and sense of place.</i> B) The layout of the development 6. Attenuation features should be designed to blend into the landscape, avoiding the appearance of artificial depressions. A more appropriate approach would distribute	- The roof pitch of the Woodmount and Willowcrest units has been lowered, so that they are both now under 8.5m. 3. - A 1.5 storey building has been introduced in the southwestern corner, tumbled recon stone has been agreed whilst tiles to be flat unprofiled. - Dutch barn hips have been introduced to reduce visual massing, and a barn clustering form has been introduced. 4. - At the entrance to the Site, an alternative approach has been agreed, with detached units set within well landscape frontages and set behind stone walling. - Agricultural barn forms are proposed to the south-west corner. - A courtyard cluster of dwellings is to be produced as per point 3. - Some additional terraces have been created, but semi-detached and detached have been kept to ensure a saleable mix, whilst still achieving a higher density compared to the edges. 5. - A continuous build line has been introduced, with an occasional exception where symmetry is created. - A mix of roof forms has been introduced to ensure variety.
--	--	---

		water volumes across the site using a combination of wetlands, rain gardens, small ponds, and permeable surfaces. <i>Recommend revising the drainage strategy to ensure full compliance with DEFRA SuDS National Standards and align with DWG expectations for green and blue infrastructure. Incorporate BfHL principles – naturalistic features such as rain gardens, swales and wetlands at the plot and street level.</i> 7. Gas main and associated easements in DAS and DPP are within extent of adopted highway. In the RM, the gas main is beneath a footpath, and easement beneath front gardens and parking spaces. Configuration may lead to future conflicts between residents and utilities provider, and limits opportunities for integrated green infrastructure. <i>Recommend relocating gas man and easements within the public realm/adopted highway and set building frontages further back. Noted that water main, including a 10.4m easement, is positioned beneath front garden and parking spaces in eastern part of the site. To prevent future conflict, the water main and easement should be relocated within adopted highway, following same design approach applied to the gas main.</i> 8. DPP identifies several north-south green links, including swales within verges that connect to both sides of primary road, as well as similar features along secondary roads. RM provides only one green link within the POS and omits such connections from secondary and tertiary streets or shared spaces. Many secondary streets or shared spaces are instead dominated by frontage parking, reducing opportunity for integrated green infrastructure. <i>Recommend incorporating green links within secondary and tertiary streets and shared spaces in accordance with the DPP.</i> 9. According to WDG, cul-de-sacs should be short, with turning head visible from the junction with as through toad. Proposed layout doesn't meet this expectation, conflicting with Policy 57. <i>Recommend introducing a looped primary road, or secondary road connections towards the east of the site and introduce a connected edge lane along the south of the site.</i>	- As agreed, more of a Parkland Edge has been introduced to the show area in Character Area 2, at plots 1-7. <u>B) The layout of the development</u> 6. - Rain gardens have been introduced, to form green routes to reflect the drainage strategy. 7. - As discussed through meetings with the Urban Design Officer, the gas main cannot be wholly within the highway, and the plans acknowledged the same. Please see the extract below. Please also refer to the Site Section shown on page 52 of the DAS, which shows the easement over the front garden. - A rain garden has been introduced to reflect the area on the Masterplan which front gardens setback. - As discussed, the water main cannot be wholly within the highway and the plans acknowledged the same, with frontages and parking so this approach has subsequently been agreed.
--	--	---	---

10. Car parking in DAS is illustrated as a primary space on-plot at the front of properties, with a secondary space in rear courtyard. The RM relies predominately on on-plot parking to side or rear, resulting in extensive frontage parking. Despite landscaping, this approach creates views along streets dominated by parking vehicles and irregular building lines caused by mixed parking arrangements.

Recommend introducing a broader range of parking solutions consistent with the DAS.

d) The external appearance of the development

11. Outline DAS and DPP set out a clear aspiration to create “a positive edge to Trowbridge to the south”, with design components including large chimney stacks and projecting window features, agricultural barn forms, courtyard clusters of dwellings, clear hierarchy of building forms. RM Application predominately uses standard developer house types that lack reference to local characteristics. Statement of Compliance does not demonstrate how proposed architecture responds to contextual analysis, resulting in design approach that appears generic and fails to meet expectations of DAS, DPP, WDG, BfHL, CP57.

Recommend reconsidering the building arrangement and architectural design to align with DAS and DPP aspirations, potentially including barn-inspired forms and courtyard clusters at key edges, locally distinctive features (prominent chimneys, varied rooflines, projecting windows), materials and detailing reflecting the rural context.

12. DAS sets aspirations for “modern family homes” with a contemporary architectural character. RM Application proposes predominately traditional house types, not aligned with DAS vision or intended character for the Site. Inconsistency extends to ancillary elements (e.g. bin and cycle store).

Recommend adopting a more contemporary architectural approach – potentially including modern derailing, varied rooflines, materials reflecting current design principles whilst respecting local context.

13. Street/street corner return elevations and street/open space corner return elevations have largely attractively placed and proportioned windows utilising house types



8.

- Rain gardens have been introduced, to form green routes to reflect the drainage strategy.

9.

- Another loop has been introduced, as discussed.

10.

- Parking typologies are now agreed, with the inclusion of hedges along the primary street and block paving introduced.

D) The external appearance of the development

11.

- Barn inspired forms have been introduced to the south-west corner.

- No chimneys proposed as GRP. Projecting bay windows have been proposed to the MEA houstypes.

		consciously designed for these purposes, but there are some exceptions – some marked as ‘Key corner turning buildings’ on the DPP. Plots included within the response are: Plot 19 (WC window only), Plot 27 (no windows), Plot 32 (WC window only), Plot 89/91 (WC window only), Plot 107 (WC window only), Plot 116 (symmetry/proportion), Plot 174 (WC window only), Ploy 180 (WC window only). <i>Recommend ensuring all key corner-turning buildings have side elevations designed as active frontages, incorporating windows from habitable rooms.</i> e) The landscaping of the site 14. All current frontage treatments rely on hedges or lawns, not fully reflecting local identity/character. DAS and DPP identify low stone walls, sometimes with plinths, combined with railings and hedgerows as characteristic features of the area. <i>Recommend incorporating low stone walls with railings and hedges behind, to define front boundaries in key character areas, particularly character area 2. Will reinforce local distinctiveness, complying with DAS and WDP guidance.</i> 15. DPP requires sensitively designed fencing – estate railings or timber post and rail fencing lining the parkland edge to the access road throughout character areas 1 and 2. No evidence in Materials Plan or Planting Plans of this being provided, no supporting evidence in Statement of Compliance why it is not. 16. DAS and DPP identify incidental green spaces as key features for public meeting and play. RM reduces these spaces by introducing private gardens and parking above gas main, reducing size and number of incidental spaces south of main road and in eastern part of Site. <i>Recommend reinstating incidental green spaces along primary route and to east of Site, incorporate wider verges as continuous green spine.</i>	- A local colour palette of recon stone, red brick and roof tiles is proposed. 12. - An amended streetscene character is now agreed, incorporating comments from the meeting with the Urban Design Officer. 13. - Side windows have been added to blank gables. <u>e) The landscaping of the site</u> 14. - Low recon stone wall with stone coping detail has been added to the Entrance/Arrival character area. Hedgerows are situated behind this. 15. - A timber P&R fence is proposed along the southern side of the entrance road, wrapping around in front of the Barn area. 16. - Incidental green spaces have been added to the west, but not the east as this was private. 17. - Verge widths agreed which reinforced the connectivity and biodiversity.
Historic England	13.01.26 –	Not officering advice on this application.	No action to take.

Ancient Monuments			
Chief Flood Warden for Trowbridge	15.01.26	• Site is on South to North gradient, bounded by watercourses to North, West, and South boundaries. Attenuation features only on South boundary – in other words protecting only proposed new build. • Application includes proposal to pump all surface water to top of slope into the Lambrook – a designated main river which is the seat of fluvial flooding for entire western edge of Trowbridge. Application seeks to increase content at which it creates flood zones 1, 3, 3b & 3b, without corresponding catchment or attenuation. This will exacerbate other issues. • No mention of attenuation to the north of proposed site, threatening current built form, also ignores additional developments already underway. Length of bridge has been reduced to around 50m, meaning it terminates within Flood Zone 3b. Current proposal also places curtilage of properties and associated infrastructure within Flood Zone 2. • Current fluvial flood zones are far more extensive than claimed, appear to include entirety of one of the uphill attenuation features within Flood Zone 3. • <i>“Taking the entire length of the main river, the current flood events, the non-compliance regarding conditions and the lack of any demonstrable sustainability, this application must be rejected in its current form.”</i>	Comments are noted and have, where applicable, been considered through the revised submission pack.
Salisbury & Wiltons Swifts	18.01.26	Support the recommendation of 180 integrated swift bricks across the development. Request that this is conditioned, with details of location clearly shown on an enforceable plan to ensure compliance, and with photographic evidence of installation / sign-off from ecologist.	Happy to discuss this further as the Reserved Matters Application progresses.
Natural England	21.01.26	No comments to make. Not assessed for impacts on protected species. Lack of comment does not imply no impacts on natural environment, but only that application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes.	No action to take.

Drainage	22.01.26	Holding Objection – Further information required. Full assessment cannot be completed due to insufficient information. Existing Flood Risk • Applicant must provide proposed drainage strategy drawings overlaid with filled transparent hatching of flood zones, and a separate drawing overlaying the modelled surface water flooding for the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year events with filled transparent hatching. • Noted that applicant has drawn lines indicating flood zones, however not overly clear and difficult to interpret in relation to proposed drainage strategy. Important that applicant represents pluvial and fluvial flood risk separately. ○ Required to increase visibility of the drainage strategies interaction with modelled flood risk & flooding. Revised drawings should enable applicant to demonstrate the flood mitigation proposed, how impact of flood risk to people & property will be safely managed. Overland Exceedance Flows • Noted that drainage exceedance plans provided, however further information required. Currently, exceedance flow arrows are provided along highway and plots, must also demonstrate where flow will be directed across the extent of the Site. ○ Required to demonstrate that applicant has considered how overland exceedance flows may impact adjacent people & property, and mitigated any flood risk. • Must also outline how exceedance in rear properties will be safely managed and safely disposed across the Site. Surface Water Catchments	Groundwater: - A 300mm liner using site won clay will be installed beneath any SuDS feature to prevent groundwater ingress. A detail is shown on the SuDS Sections drawing (dwg 0567) and a note has been added to the Drainage Strategy drawings (dwgs 0512.1-0512.3). Water Quality: - Please refer to Section 1.3 of the Drainage Technical Note (Report Ref. 0661). It can be seen that the level of water treatment achieved is well in excess of the requirements. Detailed Surface Water Drainage Design: - These comments are noted and the scheme now includes rain gardens for roads and plot drainage. Please refer to the revised Drainage Strategy drawing. - We understand there is consistency between the layouts and the calculations. There will be small discrepancies in the ponds/basins areas as it is well known short pipes in Microdrainage cause model instabilities, so the model cannot be an exact copy of the layout. Storage requirements, flow controls and pipe sizes will be consistent. There isn't an attenuation tank in this scheme, so we would like to query this. Overland Exceedance Routing: - We have reviewed the levels design and adjusted FFLs/external levels where required. The plan has been
-----------------	----------	---	---

- Must provide a pre-development surface water catchment plan, and post-development catchment plan. Each plan to include the entire site, not just developed area.
 - Required to demonstrate that there is no catchment transfer that could increase flood risk elsewhere / downstream as result of development.

Surface Water Disposal Hierarchy

- Noted in FRA Part 2 of Outline app that infiltration testing demonstrated some capacity to infiltrate surface water.
- While appreciated that not all surface water run-off from site may be able to discharge via infiltration, the applicant is expected to provide a drainage strategy that partially infiltrates in adherence to the surface water drainage hierarchy.
- Must demonstrate that the first 5mm of rainfall from majority of rainfall events will be managed by interception features and will not result in runoff from the site to surface water or piped systems.

Once above points have been resolved, the applicant can provide the following info related to surface water drainage strategy via condition:

- Drainage Technical Note page 3, inlet level of Attenuation Pond is stated as 38.65, however on drainage strategy drawings it is 39.65. Applicant to confirm which is correct and amend incorrect document.
- Surcharging and flood risk present within the 1 in 1 year event. Applicant must ensure no surcharging or flood risk at any node, aside from just prior to the flow control device.
- Access to site is proposed across main river. Noted bridge is proposed across the river, applicant must provide a flood evacuation plan to demonstrate how safe access and egress can be maintained during a flood event.
- Noted that swale in north is not connected to surface water network, but will intercept flows from northern catchment. Applicant must confirm whether discharge rate will be restricted to mitigate flood risk downstream of the river. Additionally, must outline how sufficient water quality treatment will occur prior

updated to show how exceedance runoff will move away from the development.

Construction Phase Management Plan:

- Please refer to the Wain Homes Construction and Environmental Management Plan.

		to discharging flow into the main river – required to demonstrate pollution risk to groundwater and watercourses is sufficiently managed. • Required to submit calculations which demonstrate that proposed drainage design provides a sufficient level of water treatment to prevent pollution of the receiving watercourse/groundwater in accordance with National Standards for SuDS. • Must provide detailed cross and long section drawings, and standard detail drawings any attenuation, conveyance or infiltration features and their components. Must also provide details of the lining and freeboard proposed for each separate feature. • Must provide construction management plan, clearly demonstrating how flood risk to people & property, and pollution to watercourses & groundwater will be prevented throughout construction. • Should provide additional detail regarding how sediment accumulation will be prevented, and how de-watering is proposed without increase flood or pollution risk.	
Southwick Parish Council	23.01.26	Object on following grounds: 1. Proposals contrary to Made Neighbourhood Plan for Southwick, which allocates sites for small development. 2. Southwick has met and will meet its allocation for housing within the parish, development of 180 homes will result in significant over-allocation of development. 3. Local infrastructure is already oversubscribed and over utilised, no capacity to accommodate residents for further 180 homes. Evidence provided by both Wessex Water and Wiltshire Council, who cannot permit water run-off into the existing infrastructure. 4. Above mentioned issue with water run-off creates a significant flood risk in area already prone to flooding as water run-off will return to the Lambrook stream.	Comments noted but it is respectfully pointed out that the site already has outline planning permission and therefore the principal of development has been established. Concerns relating to surface water run-off are addressed elsewhere.

		5. Continues to provide insufficient details for significant elements of proposals e.g. bridge info is limited. Parish Council doesn't consider that Wiltshire Council should determine until all elements of plan are fully disclosed and can be carefully reviewed. 6. Gravely concerned at issues of highway safety: - Frome Road and A361 have existing issues with high speeds and level of traffic. Traffic generated by proposals will further exacerbate an already dangerous highway situation. - Proposed cycle/pedestrian exist onto A361 presents safety issues, provision of only one limited pedestrian refuge is insufficient. 7. Gravely concerned at impact of proposed development on local heritage. Both Planning Inspector and Wiltshire Council previously referenced nature of Site as rare example of 16th century manor house in original setting. Grant of appeal requires developer to carry out full archaeological survey, which hasn't been carried out. Parish Council considers it unacceptable for this to only be conducted post-grant of planning permission. 8. Gravely concerned at impact of proposed development on rural nature of parish and subsequent loss of boundary between the parish and Trowbridge. Made Neighbourhood Plan clearly states the visual importance of Southwick maintaining its separate, visual setting and status – proposals threaten this.	
Environment Agency	28.01.26	Object to application as submitted because applicant has not supplied adequate information which assesses the schemes flood risk implications. Reserved Matters submission fails to include requested drawing detailing proposed bridge design and associated floodplain compensation works. Omission is significant and prevents a proper assessment of the schemes flood risk implications. Culvert and bridge design FRA submitted in support of Outline states "the bridge soffit shall be set 600mm above the design flood level, inclusive of a 39% allowance for climate change". However, in absence of relevant drawings and supporting calculations, it is not	Details of the Culvert are contained within this re-submission, please see plans: - CLFA142-CLFA-00-XX-DR-C-0505-S2-P01 (Access Road Culverts Sheet 1) - CLFA142-CLFA-00-XX-DR-C-0506-S2-P01 (Access Road Culverts Sheet 2) Further to this, a Hydraulic Modelling Note has been produced by Rappor and forms part of this re-submission (Reference 230522 V01). The Drainage

possible to assess compliance with this requirement, or to establish the impacts of the bridge on flood flows and floodplain storage.

- Proposed bridge must be designed and constructed so that it does not result in any reduction in floodplain storage capacity during any flood events, including events below both and exceeding the design flood level.
- Drawing FRA5 of Outline FRA indicates culvert lengths of 12.5m, 20m and 11m. However the RM Drainage Technical Note and associated drawing (CLFA142 CLFA 00 XX DR C 0500) show that the culvert lengths have been reduced to 10m, 20m and 10m respectively.
- Unclear whether revised culvert dimensions have been incorporated into the flood modelling. Clarification is required to confirm updated culvert sizes have been assessed, and reduction in size will not result in an increased risk of flooding on-site or third party land.

Floodplain Compensation

- Outline FRA states proposed development would result in loss of 493m³ of floodplain storage, with proposed compensation volume of 552m³, equating to 12% betterment. However, RM Technical Drainage Note references drawing CLFA142-CLFA-00-XX-DR-C-0500, indicating a floodplain compensation volume of 557m³ is proposed.
- Discrepancy between the figures has not been explained, unclear whether stated compensation volume accounts for the revised culvert dimensions. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the claimed 12% betterment remains valid in light of changes.
- Without clarity and justification, there is insufficient confidence that proposed floodplain compensation is appropriate, accurately calculated, or effective.
- Furthermore, applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that adequate floodplain compensation will be delivered. To assess acceptability of proposals, will require detailed information demonstrating that:
 - A volume of compensatory floodplain storage equal to or greater than the volume lost as a result of proposals will be provided.

Technical Note, produced by CLFA Design, has also been updated (Reference [CLFA142-CLFA-00-XX-DR-C-0661-S2-P03](#))

		○ This compensatory volume is achieved across all levels between lowest point of site and design flood level, rather than solely at a single level. ○ The assessment is undertaken using a recognised methodology, typically involving a comparison of lost and compensatory volumes through a series of horizontal slices across the relevant vertical range, with each slice generally no greater than 0.2m in thickness. Modelling • EA has recently undertaken updated flood modelling for surrounding area. This is not currently reflected in flood map for planning. Recommended that this data is requested and reviewed, in order to confirm that the flood zone extents align with those presented in the submitted modelling. Overcoming objection • Applicant should submit the requested drawings and documents which address the above to enable full review and assessment. • If information cannot be provided, it is likely that objection will be maintained.	
Landscape	28.01.26	Holding Objection. Comments made and labelled on the Planting Plans (in total, 20 Plans). Would request that: • Small strips of grass in front gardens and public areas are removed and replaced with shrub planting. • Publicly facing walls have climbers planted up them to soften them. • Attenuation ponds receive further shrub and tree planting to soften and break up their engineered profiles. • Vision splays are included on the planting plans to check for clashes against street trees in the same way that street lighting has been included.	These comments have been considered and, where applicable, applied within the revised Landscaping Pack. Due to the change in the layout, some comments are no longer relevant or applicable to the proposals. The changes to the Landscaping Pack include: - Scrub and trees to the basins. - Climbers to walls that didn't have hedge or plants in front. - Shrubs into front gardens where appropriate.

		LEMP does not seem to make any mention of watering or irrigation requirements, and especially where water will be sourced from in drought conditions to keep plants watered.	
Rights of Way	29.01.26	As identified by applicant, Public Footpaths SWCK3 and SWCK2 (possible small section NBRA44) will need to be diverted to accommodate the development. Applicant can apply for diversions prior to determination of the application (to allow for timescales involved in diverting PRoW). Applicant would require confirmed diversion order before work can start on the attenuation basin. If objections to the order were received, it could take over two years before order is determined. Two new bridges are going to be required to replace rural footbridges on SWCK1 and SWCK3, bridge design needs approval by Wiltshire Council Structure Team. Expect bridge to have much wider width (min 2m), approaches to both bridges should be step free to ensure compliance with equalities act, and therefore fully accessible. This may require a small alignment of SWCK3, for bridge and approach to be step free – or a drop kerb may be required. Would also make a request to see if applicant can improve the pedestrian entrance into Southwick Country Parking Local Nature Reserve by extending footway for approx. 8m to the point where it leaves the adopted highway. this will improve access from development into the Country Park. SWCK1 should be surfaced to adoptable standard, and included within a hybrid Section 38 278 works, the path should be constructed with a width of 3m. SWCK3 should be surfaced to adoptable standard, and included within a hybrid Section 38 278 works, this path should be constructed to a width of 2m, SWCK2 and SWCK3 should be constructed to Wiltshire Council Rural Path Specification, and constructed with a minimum surface width of 2m. Maintenance of these paths through the open space will need to be included within the management of the public open space.	The requirement to apply for a diversion of the Public Footpaths is noted, and will be taken into consideration as this reserved Matters Application progresses.

		Public access furniture (believe is a kissing gate) where NBRA4 meets NBRA3 will need to be removed as it will no longer be required for control of livestock. Access furniture on SWCK3 South of Westmead Crescent footbridge will also need to be removed. Access furniture on SWCK1 will also need to be removed at the footbridge. If development required any new access furniture, then it should be the least restrictive option that it is installed and these will need to be authorised by the Countryside Access Officers. During construction, it is likely that three PRoW across the site will need to be closed to allow for works related to the development. Please note that we require 12 weeks notice to process any Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders, and these will need to be extended if works are going to take longer than 6 months. Please contact rightsofway@wiltshire.gov.uk for the application form.	
Dorset & Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service	05.02.26	Building Regulation Matters • In event of granted planning permission, development will need to be designed and built to meet current Building Reg requirements. • Assessment of development proposal in respect of Building Control matters will be made during formal consultation, however early recommendations relate to following areas: ○ Recommendations identified under B5 of Approved Document B relating to The Building Regulations 2010 ○ Recommendations to improve safety and reduce property loss in the event of a fire	Building Regulation requirements acknowledged and noted.
Public Open Space	06.02.26	The plans for open space as shown in the Design Compliance Statement appear sufficient. Leisure Strategy Infrastructure Officer has looked at proposed LAP and states that more information is needed, both in terms of equipment and play value. Could the developer consider sensory and other disabilities in the layout and colours used etc. A double swing	

		at least is needed, along with other more varied equipment. We are looking for a play area that has more play value, and encourage metal equipment over wooden. Could developer please advise details of the safety surfacing around the equipment. Wetpour is recommended for safety over grass surfacing. Please could we have a resubmission of the equipped play area from the developer.	
Highways Department	12.02.26	Object, additional information/revisions required Will not comment on the principle of the approved access arrangements for the Site from the A361, due to its approval through the appeal process and the inspector not believing the proposed access or pedestrian/cycle facilities proposed on the A361 warranted a refusal on highway safety nor transport sustainability grounds. A361 Access Matters While access details generally considered acceptable based on Outline consent granted: 1. No details of street lighting proposed for the access, which is believed to be necessary. Aware of outline conditions restricting lighting of internal access road, but do not believe this includes A361 junction. A361 is partially street lit in this area, access location does not appear to have existing lighting so will need to be provided. 2. Refuge crossing should be lit. Given sensitivity of lighting this area, details of junction illumination should be provided within RM submission. Other Access Matters 3. Swept paths will be required for a fire appliance to demonstrate that such a vehicle would be able to use the access connection to Westmead Crescent acceptably. Access in general terms needs to be considered in more detail, and with a view to ensuring the access would always be available in an emergency situation. On-street parking provides a potentially significant	<u>Internal Access Road</u> Details of the Culvert are contained within this re-submission. <u>Other Internal Estate Roads</u> 11. Bollard at Plot 56 has been relocated, to the head of the turning head. 12. Visitor parking has been removed/relocated. It should be noted that the spaces have been provided with a 1m surround to the space, and space located within the shared surface. This is an approach previously agreed with Wiltshire Council Highways on other current Sites. These spaces create a short narrowing to 4m. 12. Visitor space has been removed/relocated. <u>Summary</u> Comments have been taken into consideration and, where appropriate, incorporated into the revised submission pack.

		obstruction, as does location on outside of a bend. This needs to be considered further. 4. Route crosses existing watercourse and requires a culvert/bridge, but no details provided. 5. Confirmation of surface specification for the multiple pedestrian connections across the Site (3 to the North, 1 to the South). 6. Pedestrian route to the south connects to NBRA3, details of connection not provided. Bridleway permits cycling, so would expect the route to be at least 3m wide. Details of connection and surface of the route to be provided. Internal Access Road 7. Access road will cross the watercourse and understand that this will require 3 separate sections of culvert/bridge. No details have been provided, but understand applicant is aware and due to submit details in due course. Internal Spine Road 8. Footpaths SWCK1 and SWCK3 cross the spine road, but no crossing facilities are shown in these locations. Crossing points should be designated as features to highlight the key crossing locations, and could also form part of the traffic calming design. SWCK1 crossing is at the beginning of development area, provides opportunity for 'gateway' style feature to the development, whilst providing a safe and highlighted crossing point. Due to the bend in the road, visibility splays will also be required. 9. A dropped kerb access for cyclists rejoining the carriageway is required at the start of the development area where the route reduces from 3m to 2m. Consideration should also be given to cyclists accessing the 3m wide route towards the A361 from the spine road. Other Internal Estate Roads 10. Refuse collection overruns the footway by plot 47 and adjustments to the swept paths and/or turning area will be necessary.	
--	--	---	--

		11. Additional bollards will be required next to plot 56 for the emergency access. Note that they are shown further north, but they need to be adjacent to the carriageway area. 12. Visitor parking spaces adjacent to plot 109, 110, 169 and 170 need to be removed/re-located. Visitor parking spaces off narrow private drives like these should be formalised, like those adjacent to plots 99 and 107 to avoid obstructing access. 13. Visitor parking space opposite plot 178 needs removing/re-locating to prevent conflict at the access to the spine road. Summary of required amendments/additions 1. Street lighting for A361 access 2. Street lighting for pedestrian refuge crossing on A361 3. Fire appliance swept paths for Emergency Access 4. Culvert/bridge details for Emergency Access 5. Confirmation Northward pedestrian connections to be tarmac surface 6. Widening of Southern connection to Bridleway to 3m, confirmation of tarmac surface and details of connection to Bridleway (e.g. bollards/gates etc) 7. Culvert/bridge details for internal access road 8. Inclusion of spine road crossing facilities for SWCK1 and SWCK3 9. Consideration of how cyclists enter and leave the principle shared use path to the A361 to/from the spine road 10. Amendments to turning area/swept paths for RCV near plot 47 11. Additional bollards to be provided on Emergency Access near plot 56 12. Visitor parking spaces adjacent to plots 109, 110, 169 and 170, to be removed/relocated 13. Visitor parking space opposite plot 178 to be removed/relocated	
Ecology	12.03.26	Objection – Further information required. HRA Required – Appropriate Assessment is required. Further information is required in order to conclude the AA positively.	An updated walkover survey has been completed, and no significant changes identified and so no updated impact assessment or further detail survey is required.

		- Detailed design of bridge over Lambrok Stream and paths in northern boundary to confirm the required extent of vegetation and resulting width of gaps in vegetation is required to demonstrate that Ecology Buffer Zones A and B will not be fragmented to a degree that would adversely affect bat foraging and commuting functionality. - To ensure the baseline, associated impact assessment, and biodiversity change calculations remain accurate, an updated walkover survey is required, where this survey identifies significant changes in site conditions, an updated impact assessment supported by updated detailed surveys must be provided. As detailed landscape plans are now available, the biodiversity metric must also be updated to confirm that the development will result in no net loss of biodiversity. LEMP - To safeguard on-site habitat Zones A and B in accordance with the TWBMS on-site mitigation standards, the LEMP must be amended to state the ongoing requirement to maintain compliance with the TWBMS standards. To provide clarity, the main principles and objectives of the TWBMS standards should be included. - To provide clarity, the main principles and objectives for the protection and enhancement of the Lambrok Stream should be emphasised. - The LEMP must be amended to identify operations that may result in harm to the protected and notable species (otter, water vole, reptiles, rooting bats, amphibians, birds), specify measures required to avoid harm and deliver enhancements. - The Management Schedule must be amended to include the Ecological Enhancement Features displayed on Figure 1 of the LEMP. Confirmation that these features have been included on an enforceable plan and technical drawings is required. Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) – Bath and Bradford on Avon Bat SAC - Insufficient information has so far been submitted to enable the AA to be concluded positively. Further information required and set out below: - An update survey confirming current conditions of the site is required	The outline application pre-dates the mandatory BNG, meanwhile the appeal condition wording does not specifically request an updated BNG calculation at Reserved Matters stage. It is therefore considered that providing updated BNG calculations is a requirement at this stage. LEMP - All points raised regarding the LEMP have been noted and included in the revised LEMP forming part of this re-submission. Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) - An update survey has been undertaken and completed, and is confirmed within the submitted reporting. - As mentioned on the BNG calculations, this is not a requirement of the conditions attached to the appeal and so it is considered to not be requirement as part of this Reserved Matters Application.
--	--	---	---

		- To confirm the validity of the BNG calculations, an update metric calculation using the requested updated baseline survey and detailed landscape plans is required.	
Waste (Refuse & Management)	07.04.26	No further responses to add in regards for structure and landscaping.	No action to take.