

From: Burden, Richard
Sent: 20 July 2026 16:22
To: Richardson, Joe <Joe.Richardson@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: PL/2026/00843 : Land at Whitlocks, Bishopstone, Wiltshire

Hello Joe

Thank you for the re-consultation.

As you know, there has been considerable engagement with the applicant and some of the consultants, largely on the landscape and ecology sides, and particularly in relation to the LEMP.

Looking at the refreshed documents, it seems that the Planning Support Document from the architect may not show the updated landscape / ecological matters.

The Landscape Plan in the LVIA Part 2 appears to be the clearest representation of the scheme as it is likely to appear and around which the LEMP is constructed. I would, therefore, most strongly advise [to avoid any scope for misunderstandings] that that plan is presented as the landscape plan so that it can be referenced in any decision documents.

To aid your understanding of the advice provided and the uptake of it, below are the comments that CCNL received as the LEMP was being submitted on 7 July.

Thank you for your recent comments on the proposed LEMP for this site and your constructive engagement throughout this process. We have today, submitted the LEMP as attached to this email and this includes the following changes:-

1.5.1. the LEMP should relate to the proposed landscape plan, not an 'indicative landscape scheme'.

4.2.2 off site hedges. Should be 4.2.3

5.2 Preliminaries. 'planting ...during the first planting season after completion...' contradicts or confuses 1.5.3

5.3 'g'. probable diameter/dimension error

I do note that there were additional comments/observations on the LEMP and I summarise these below, along with our current position. We are being pressed by the LPA to submit the LEMP in order to allow the application to proceed towards determination. The LEMP, along with various other updated documents, will be considered by the Council and will be taken into account by the Case Officer as he moves towards a determination. We are confident that we have addressed matters that will allow the Council, on assessment of the planning balance, to make a positive determination.

The LEMP will be reviewed by the Council and where any requests for clarification are raised these will be addressed.

<i>As the document remains lengthy, an executive summary could be really useful, in addition to ensuring that key information relating to what, how, when and where that will be most useful to future users (the Management Agency and its contractors), is easily accessible and clear.</i>	<i>This is noted, however the LEMP is read as whole and is considered to provide an appropriate basis on which the objectives are articulated and secured.</i>
<i>The use of the three distinct 'landscape units' is extended and used throughout the document, so that each landscape unit contains relevant information relating to the habitat types within that unit.</i>	<i>We consider that the format of the LEMP is appropriate, but the comment is noted and can, if necessary, be addressed through any wider updates following comments from Wiltshire Council.</i>

3.4.4. which 'southern boundary'?	<i>This refers to the road frontage boundary</i>
3.5.1. Who is the 'management agency'? The LPA will need to know if it has to follow up non-compliance / enforcement. 5.2 refers to 'management company', so suggest consistent terms are adopted	<i>This is explained in para 1.3 of the LEMP. The appointment will be confirmed once planning permission is secured</i>
4.2.2 paragraphs 'c' and 'e' appear contradictory	<i>This is explained further in the text, where it sets out that any plants that have become tree sized will be cut back to lower than the overall hedge management height to allow for regrowth.</i>
5.1.1. useful to include reference to Landscape related 'outcomes', such as 'enabling the proposed development to integrate sufficiently with its landscape context within a National Landscape'	<i>This is set out in the introduction and is considered sufficient and avoids repetition.</i>
5.2 Maintenance operations. '...checked at regular intervals...' is vague. Suggest specific reference to frequency is included.	<i>This information is included within the management tables as requested previously.</i>
5.2.2 Irrigation schedule – frequency appears excessive	<i>This is based on industry standard and is therefore appropriate and expected as part of the LEMP.</i>
	<i>The intention is to ensure that all development waste and litter is removed before planting begins.</i>

5.5 Litter removal – possibly unnecessary for this proposed development	
5.3 Tree planting ‘e’. Spacing distance appears excessive	<i>This is to avoid a dense canopy that will restrict needed light for the proposed shrub understorey as well as the ground flora. It also avoids the need to thin out the tree planting over time as the trees will be able to grow more naturally.</i>
<i>Suggest include guidance on back-filling with in-situ arisings (as opposed to imported soil)</i>	<i>This is noted and will be considered following comments from Wiltshire Council</i>
<i>Maintenance operations ‘e’. (And 5.3.2 Maintenance Operations ‘b’). Suggest amend ‘...watered to ground capacity...’ to include specific water volumes’</i>	<i>We do not consider that this is necessary as it is not possible to state specific water volumes as water needs may change.</i>
5.3.2 Planting specifications. Fruit tree (note). The ‘type of orchard’ to be created is determined by the BNG requirement.	
<i>The creation of a ‘traditional orchard’ is referenced several times, so tree the choice of tree stock (and subsequent management principles) should align with the requirements to</i>	<i>This is noted and will be considered following comments from Wiltshire Council</i>

achieve Traditional orchards (UK BAP Priority Habitat description)	
--	--

The remaining comments listed above do not, in our view, change the overall approach and objectives of the LEMP. We anticipate comments from Wiltshire Council on the LEMP and therefore suggest in responding to the Council's comments, any outstanding queries raised by you, are addressed at that time. We are keen to maintain the dialogue on the LEMP now that this has been submitted.

I am extremely grateful to you for engaging with us on this and I look forward to discussing this matter again.

As you can see there are a number of issues that still ought to be 'topped and tailed'. You may wish to consider whether important matters such as the triggering and frequency of watering are able to be monitored or enforced and who would be accountable to the LPA for the implementation of the LEMP. Nevertheless, the amended application if implemented in full would fit into the landscape of this national landscape and provide both some nature recovery and some affordable homes. CCNL can, therefore, support the proposal and the associated landscape and ecological mitigation and enhancements.

I hope that is helpful to you and the team would, of course, be happy to assist with any clarification you may need.

Regards Richard

Richard Burden BSc DipCons MSc MCMI(rtd) MCIPD FLI PPLI
Chartered Landscape Architect