

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

URBAN DESIGN

Officer name:

James Weddell RIBA
Senior Urban Design Officer
Wiltshire Council

Date: 10.08.2026

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

Meeting held: Saeed Mahmood / James Weddell (Urban Design Officer)
7th August 2026, 9am (online Teams call)

Outstanding objections raised by Urban Design Officer's (Brian Johnson 03-02-26):

The following objections still outstanding: 3 (in part), 4a),b),c) 6 , 8 , 9 and 10.

Point 3 second part:

BJ: 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.

JW: The applicant has confirmed that Plots 41 and 42 could be moved forward within the development. This is supported, as the issue is not solely the size of the rear gardens but also the limited back-to-back separation distance (ref. Sutton Benger Parish Design Code). These plots are approximately 15 to 17 metres from the adjacent dwelling, which results in a constrained relationship. Moving the plots forward by approximately 2 to 3 metres, as suggested by Charles Church, would be acceptable and would help to improve residential amenity

Point 4a:

BJ: 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. X 09.06.2026 Not addressed

JW: Whilst it is understood that Charles Church's comments that within the Conservation area some properties have additional height between first floor and eaves, many do not. As a compromise, it is recommended that stone window heads and additional masonry above first-floor openings are provided on primary elevations only, particularly on principal entrance facades.

This enhancement need not be applied across all dwellings but should be focused on the main crescent and properties overlooking the central Public Open Space and LEAP. These prominent

frontages offer an opportunity to enhance the appearance and character of the development, and such an approach would be welcomed.

Point 4b:

*BJ: The omission of stone window heads and stone cills to side elevation openings and to rear elevation openings (door and windows). **X** 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.*

JW: With regard to the stone heads and cills on the side elevation, the applicant has confirmed that additional stone detailing could be provided to first-floor cills, gable headers, and ground-floor headers and cills. Given that these elements would be situated on side elevations on corner plots, the proposed treatment is considered acceptable.

Point 4c:

*BJ: 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.*

JW: The interlocking dry verge system should be replaced with the proposed continuous dry verge system, which would result in a lower visual impact and is therefore considered acceptable.

Point 6:

*BJ: **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.*

JW: To allow for a full assessment, samples should be submitted, with a preference for the provision of an on-site sample panel. This requirement should be secured by a suitable condition.

Point 8:

BJ: 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.

JW: I have no objection to the windows being a single colour. I understand why previous Urban Design Officers requested a complementary second colour to add variety. However, it could help to emphasise the key elevations and differentiate them from other parts of the building, improving legibility overall.

Point 9:

*BJ: **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'.*

JW: The applicant has confirmed that the material plan key will be updated, which is considered acceptable.

Point 10:

*BJ: **X** Not addressed or shown on revised Boundary Treatment Plan.*

JW: This comment relates to the potential for vehicle overruns to damage the adjacent grassed area. I can understand the concerns raised by the previous Urban Design Officer. Based on the submitted layout, there appears to be no defined edge treatment to the grass verge, and there is no footway along this side of the carriageway.

Further details are required to demonstrate how occasional vehicle overruns can occur without causing damage to the grassed area. This may be addressed through the detailed design, for example by incorporating a kerb upstand, reinforced verge, rumble strip, or other appropriate edge treatment.

This matter could be addressed through a planning condition requiring details of the verge edge treatment to be submitted and approved, ensuring that any potential vehicle overrun does not result in damage to the grassed area.