

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

URBAN DESIGN

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

Date: 03.02.2026 [09.06.2026 Revised drawings \(comment in blue text below\)](#).

Application No: PL/2025/09623

Proposal: Application for the Approval of Reserved Matters (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) for the Erection of 60 Dwellings, Public Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure following Outline Planning Permission PL/2023/06204.

Site Address: Development site known as 'Land off High Street, Sutton Benger

Case Officer: Peter Crozier

Reference:

Application drawings and documents indexed 8 Dec 2025 And 12 Dec 2025 on Wiltshire Council application webpage for PL/2025/09623. [Revised drawings indexed 14 May 2026](#)

Policy and guidance which should inform the design of development.

Wiltshire Core Strategy, Core Policy 57 'Ensuring high quality design and place shaping'; Wiltshire Design Guide ,Wiltshire Council Supplementary Planning Document adopted 25th March 2024(Abbreviated WDG below); Sutton Benger and Draycott Cerne Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2035 Made March 2025 Appendix 2 the 'Sutton Benger Parish Design Code December 2024' (SBPDC) (separate document) ; Building for a Healthy Life (BfHL) and companion guide Streets for a Healthy Life (SfHL) (both Homes England 2021), National Model Design Code Part 2 (NMDC2)(MHLG 2021).

Objection

[09.06.2026 Objection ie reasons 3 \(in part\), 4a\),b\),c\) 6 , 8 , 9 and 10.](#)

The proposed design of the development for the following reasons would not meet the high standard of design and place shaping required by Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 including CP57 i, iii, vi, and xii in relation to the context and setting' of the development :

Planning Layout 550.100

- 1) 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.

✓ 09.06.2026 Satisfactorily addressed - The revised Planning layout 550.100 A provides a through vehicle return loop around the enlarged central green space with cul de sacs off this with their turning heads visible from their junction with this loop . This would accord with WDG expectation 5.1.8. (see also point 2 below)

- 2) 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.

✓ 09.06.2026 Satisfactorily addressed - The mown grass strips have been deleted. The ends of the private/communal driveways off the cul de sac turning heads are now shown linked to each other as bollarded surfaced pedestrian and cycle connections around the perimeter of the layout. The surface treatment for this connecting strip is not identified and should be clarified on the drawings.

- 3) 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.

✓ 09.06.2026 The revised General Arrangement Plan P3 layout has satisfactorily addressed this pointed shape for plots 42 and 45. ✗ but as north facing gardens are less than the 12m minimum depth expected by WDG 9.2.2 whereas plots 47 and 48 achieve this. These dwellings and communal drive in front of these could be moved forward/ southwards a small amount on the site to achieve this which would then also appropriately draw attention away from the rear garden of plot 29 across the end of this communal drive.


House type elevation drawings - general

- 4) In regard to the following detail, each house elevation would not respect the characteristic intrinsic features of dwellings in the village and which has been carried through in the design of other modern housing development in the village:
- a) 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. ✗ 09.06.2026 Not addressed
- b) The omission of stone window heads and stone cills to side elevation openings and to rear elevation openings (door and windows). ✗ 09.06.2026 Not addressed other than where side elevation directly faces the street. Rear elevations would be visible above rear garden high boundaries in views along the streets , and in conjunction with point 4a above.

- c) 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. **X 09.06.2026 Not addressed.**

Characteristic features of the village in points a) b) c) and d) are seen on recent housing development for example including the recent housing development along 'Arms Gardens' off High Street and inclusion of this detail would be reasonably expected to adequately respond to the SBPDC page 6 'General Principles for characteristic of the site and surroundings and Code SB1, and CP57 respond positively to existing townscape features.

X 09.06.2026 Not addressed - See precedent photo examples in the village below.



Characteristic of Sutton Benger - Britains Close and Arms Gardens -first floor stone window heads (not fascia eaves directly down over window opening) and stone heads and cills to rear elevation and side elevation openings also. Mortar gable ends, traditional sprocket eaves, not universal box fascia/soffit to eaves and gable ends. Stone slates (Arms Gardens example) , Reconstituted slate (texture face/ riven edge) not grey concrete tile, traditional clay pantile, not plain tile or modern Double Roman pattern.

- d) 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. (see also in relation to point 6 below).

Brown roofs are distinguished from grey roofs on the Material Plan

Materials Key Plan 550.102

- 5) The reference to render should be a roughcast finish an intrinsic characteristic of render in the local area, not a smooth finish.

Note added on Revised Material Plan 'Key' to this effect.

- 6) 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.

X Not satisfactorily addressed. Revised Materials Plan 550.102 A now identifies Roof tiles as ' Plain Grey Tile' and 'Profiled Brown Tile'. This does not establish roof tiles that would be characteristic of the village or of a suitable quality of appearance as described above or applied throughout.

- 7) 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.

Note added on Revised Material Plan 'Key' to this effect.

- 8) 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.

Not addressed.

Boundary Treatment 550.103 and Boundary Treatment Details 550.104

- 9) 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.

09.06.2026 X Revised Materials Key Plan 550.102 A still shows/key identifies these (green line) as 'reconstituted stone' to low walls across face of plots dwellings. This should be corrected to accord with revised Boundary Treatments Plan 550.103 A which shows/key identifies these (light blue line) as 'Natural Stone Dwarf wall /Cock &Hen copings -overall 0.9m high'.

- 10) 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.

X Not addressed or shown on revised Boundary Treatment Plan.
