

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

URBAN DESIGN

Officer name:

Guy Bridgewood BA (HONS) MArch PGDip ARB
Senior Urban Design Officer
Wiltshire Council

Date: 25.02.2026

01.06.2026 Revised drawings and documents indexed 28th May 2026. Comment in Blue below (✗ indicates where reason not addressed or not satisfactorily addressed - ✓ indicates where reason has been addressed or mostly addressed with recommendations).

Application No: PL/2025/09907

Proposal: Approval of reserved matters (scale, layout, external appearance and landscaping) for 9 No. dwellings and associated vehicular access, pursuant to Condition 2 of outline approval (ref. PL/2021/10503)

Site Address: Brick Hill Farm, 48 Bath Road, Warminster, BA12 8PF

Case Officer: Julie Mitchell

Reference:

Drawings and documents indexed 19th December 2025 on the application webpage.

Policy and guidance:

- Wiltshire Core Strategy, Core Policy 57 'Ensuring high quality design and place shaping' (abbreviated CP57)
- Wiltshire Local Plan Review - Pre-Submission Draft 2020-2038 (Regulation 19) (September 2023) (abbreviated WLPR)
- Wiltshire Design Guide – Wiltshire Council Supplementary Planning Document adopted 25th March 2024 (abbreviated WDG)
- National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG December 2024) (abbreviated NPPF)
- National Design Guide (MHCLG January 2021) (abbreviated NDG)
- Building for a Healthy Life (Homes England June 2020) (referenced in the NPPF) (abbreviated BfHL)
- Streets for a Healthy Life: A companion guide to Building for a Healthy Life (Homes England) (abbreviated SFHL)
- Warminster Neighbourhood Plan (Made March 2016) (abbreviated WNP)
- Warminster Neighbourhood Plan 2 (Regulation 14 consultation) (abbreviated WNP2)

Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy Policy CP57 'Ensuring high quality design and place shaping': A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complementary to the locality.

Observations

Outline planning permission for the site (ref. PL/2021/10503) was granted on 09th January 2025 with conditions governing the design of the development. The principal design conditions are as follows:

2. No development shall commence on site until details of the following matters (in respect of which approval is expressly reserved) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:

- a) The scale of the development;*
- b) The layout of the development;*
- c) The external appearance of the development;*
- d) The landscaping of the site.*

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:

- Site Location Plan, Dwg No. 4161-BB-XX-XXX-DR-A-PL01 rev. D*
- Illustrative Overlay of Development Access and WWUE Roundabout, Dwg No. 014*
- Proposed Site Access, Dwg No. 012 rev A*

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

And

5. The development will be carried out in strict accordance with the following documents:

- Parameters Plan. DWG: 4161-BB-XX-XXX-DR-A-SK03 Rev A. Boon Brown (27/01/2023)*

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and for the protection, mitigation and enhancement of biodiversity

Objection

- 1) The development proposals do not accord with Condition 5 in so far as the development proposals would not strictly accord with the approved Parameters Plan (PP) and therefore would not constitute a high quality of design and place shaping required by CP57 in this regard for the following reasons:

A comparison of the Site Plan and the approved Parameters Plan shows that the proposed hedgerow between the development area and the Wildlife Enhancement Zone maybe positioned differently from the location indicated on the Parameters Plan. Additionally, Plot 1 is shown within the Landscaped Areas identified on the approved plans.

The Parameters Plan indicates a pumping station that is not shown on the Site Plan. It is expected that the development may require a pumping station and potentially a sub-station. If these facilities are necessary, their size and location must be clearly identified on the Site Plan.

The Landscaping Plan omits several existing trees along the western boundary between T10 and T12. These trees are shown as retained on the Parameters Plan, the Site Plan, and Drainage Strategy Sheet 1. It should be noted that some of these trees fall outside the site's red-line boundary. This discrepancy requires clarification to ensure consistent information across all plans

Recommendation: An overlay of the approved Parameters Plan onto the current Site Plan should be provided. This will help clearly identify any discrepancies between the approved scheme and the proposed development, enabling a thorough assessment of the submission.

- ✗ An overlay has been provided but the issues identified previously are still an issue.
 - Plot 1 still shown within the landscaped area of the parameter plan.
 - No pumping station shown or substation – evidence to prove these are not required should be provided
 - The trees between T10 and T12 are not present on the revised landscape plan and this omission still needs to be clarified.

- 2) The Site Plan does not correspond with Drainage Strategy Sheet 1 along the western site boundary. The drainage plan shows extensive retaining walls and steps to the rear of Plots 1-3, including structures around the Plot 2 garage. It is unclear from the submitted information how these features affect the Root Protection Zones (RPZs) of the retained trees in this area, or how the proposed engineering works will appear when viewed from Bath Road.

Recommendation: Provide a series of site sections – including through Bath Road - demonstrating that the retaining walls and steps will not encroach upon the retained trees, hedgerows, or hedgerow buffer identified on the Parameters Plan. The applicant should also ensure that the Site Plan is consistent with all technical drawings, including the drainage strategy, to avoid conflicting information.

✗ Site sections have not been provided to date. It is noted the site layout now corresponds to the drainage strategy and if the root protection area is drawn correctly then the walls do not encroach on the zone. However, the rear garden depth of Plots 1 and 2 now appear compromised and approximately 6 meters deep. This would contradict the WDG which notes south west facing gardens should be 10m deep minimum. These should be amended to be deeper.

- 3) The proposed site layout is dominated by a road with a wide tarmac carriageway and adjacent footpaths. It is unclear from the submitted information whether the intention is to create a shared surface or whether the footways will be defined by kerbs. Regardless, the arrangement currently reflects a car-dominated street structure, aligning more closely with what BfHL categorises as a 'red' outcome (pp. 66-67). This contrasts with the preferable 'green' healthy streets approach, which incorporates layered landscaping to enhance sensory richness and support healthier, more sociable places (pp. 64-65).

Recommendation: The street should be designed as more than a tarmac dominated route for motor vehicles. It should instead foster an attractive, safe, and inclusive environment that prioritises people and strengthens the character and social life of the neighbourhood. Incorporating more green and blue infrastructure – including street trees – at the plot and street level will ensure the proposals aligns with local design guidance and contributes positively to the site's character.

✗ The division between carriageway and footpaths remains unclear and the street is still tarmac and car dominated street scene. Higher quality materials should be introduced and permeable surfaces to enhance the drainage capabilities. Greater detail on the drawings is required to communicate this. The pavements should not be tarmac and instead a different material. Please see precedent below from Cambridge (Accordia). Please note the variation between carriageway and pavement as well as the change in tarmac colour for the raised table. These subtle changes add variety and avoid a homogenous black tarmac approach for both carriageway, raised table and pavement.



✗ The inclusion of more trees in the revised site plan are welcomed however more should be added, notably to the south side of the houses marked below. Trees play an important role in climate mitigation by shading properties and the streetscape. It is also worth adding that trees are preferable within the public realm where possible.



Providing deeper front gardens framed by low, natural stone walls and feature coping can further enhance the character of the streetscape and ensure the development relates more naturally to its setting.

Deeper gardens to plots 8 and 9 are welcomed however the natural stone walls have not been included and should be introduced.

- 4) Plot 5 is presented as a feature building within Street Elevation B-B, forming the termination of the internal street vista and being approached and framed by Plots 1, 2, 8, and 9. It is therefore surprising that Plots 1 and 2 are shown in a different facing material. For visual coherence and to reinforce the framed vista, it would be more logical for Plots 1 and 2 to be faced in natural stone, matching Plots 8 and 9.

✓ These plots have been amended to suit the comment above

- 5) Access to the Wildlife Enhancement Zone is taken along the side of Plot 3. The user experience in this space could be improved by incorporating a feature bay window on the side elevation of Plot 3, providing enhanced natural surveillance and a greater sense of openness.

✗ Plot 3 has not been amended and this comment still stands. Natural surveillance is critical here.

Similarly, Plots 1 and 9 would be strengthened through the addition of a feature bay window to their side elevations, helping to activate the entrance area and add architectural interest. The second floor bedroom window on these plots would also benefit from being relocated further away from the sloping eaves to achieve a more balanced and visually coherent elevation.

✓ These plots have been amended to suit the comment above.