

Steve Simms
Wiltshire Council Planning officer.

Application Reference
PL/2026/04391

Date. 10th September 2026

Dear Mr Simms,

As discussed in our conversation, i have formed this document to provide the facts as i know or see them in relation to the various comment made during the consultation period.

Should you require and further information, expansion or supporting information for any matter stated in this document, please reach out and it will be forwarded without delay.

Responses to consultees comments relating to the application for consideration of the planning officer.

SW Drainage Comments requesting more information.
Please consider the following.

Response to Holding Objection – Surface-Water Drainage

The applicant proposes a sustainable surface-water drainage strategy designed to retain and manage rainfall within the development site.

Rainwater from the roofs of the three proposed dwellings will initially be collected in a suitably sized rainwater-harvesting tanks. The stored water will be reused for non-potable or grey-water applications, including WC flushing and garden irrigation, thereby reducing both mains-water consumption and the volume of surface water requiring disposal.

When the rainwater tanks reach capacity, their controlled overflows, together with surface water from the parking and other impermeable areas, will discharge to suitably located soakaways within the site.

The soakaways will be designed with sufficient storage capacity to receive and dissipate the remaining roof and surface-water runoff without increasing flood risk within the site or affecting neighbouring land. Their final dimensions, locations and construction will be determined following site-specific infiltration testing and detailed drainage calculations undertaken in accordance with BRE Digest 365 and the requirements of the approving authority.

Permeable paving will also be used where practicable to provide additional attenuation and infiltration. No uncontrolled surface-water discharge onto Fore Street, adjoining land or the public highway is proposed.

The applicant is willing to accept a suitably worded pre-commencement condition requiring the detailed surface-water drainage scheme, including infiltration-test results, rainwater-harvesting capacities, soakaway calculations, exceedance routes and maintenance arrangements, to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

On this basis, it is respectfully requested that the holding objection be withdrawn, subject if necessary to the imposition of an appropriate drainage condition.

JACQUELINE SAY

Comment left on
02/9/2026

Stance

Comment

My property is not level with 20,22 24,26 and 28. It drops down 4 ft so the normal 26ft high for a new build will become 30ft for me. Most of these properties are along my boundary line..one of them so close I will be able to touch it. This will plunge me into darkness with absolutely no sun at all. I will be overlooked the complete length of my garden. I also have a pond which has been a breeding pond for great crested newts for at least 23 years. The land planned for development falls within the 50 mtr exclusion zone for great crested newts. I will also be a victim if there are any drainage problems, as last year there was a burst main a couple of doors up and my garden was a complete bog due to the level of the land, gravity brought it all into my garden and it spread around 9 feet across my garden. This application will plunge me into a dungeon like existence.

Height, ground levels and sunlight

The proposed dwellings are located to the south of the objector's property. However, they are separated from her house by an extensive rear garden approximately 40 metres long. The proposed buildings are therefore a considerable distance from the principal residential accommodation and its windows.

It is accepted that buildings situated to the south can cast shadows northwards, particularly during the winter months when the sun is lower. Any shadowing is, however, likely to be concentrated principally upon land closest to the shared boundary. Given the approximately 40-metre separation from the proposed dwellings to the objector's house, the assertion that the development would place her house in a permanent "dungeon-like" condition appears significantly overstated.

The objector's reference to an apparent height of approximately 30 feet arises from the difference between the respective ground levels. The relevant planning consideration is the actual relationship between the proposed buildings, the boundary, the garden and the windows of her house. This can be demonstrated through accurate site sections showing:

- existing and proposed ground levels;
- finished-floor, eaves and ridge levels;
- the position of the shared boundary;
- distances between each dwelling and the boundary;
- the approximately 40-metre distance to the objector's house; and
- the likely shadow pattern at representative times of the year.

A proportionate daylight, sunlight and shadow assessment can be submitted if the Local Planning Authority considers it necessary. This would provide objective evidence rather than relying upon the objector's worst-case assumptions.

Privacy and overlooking

The objector's house is separated from the development by its approximately 40-metre-long garden. This substantial distance materially limits the potential for direct overlooking of the house itself.

The proposed windows and their relationship with the private areas of the neighbouring garden should nevertheless be reviewed. Should the officer deem it necessary, any identified overlooking can be mitigated by:

- repositioning or omitting sensitive upper-floor windows;
- installing obscure glazing;
- using high-level windows or rooflights;
- restricting the opening of obscure-glazed windows;

Great, crested newts

The reported existence of a breeding pond is noted. Its precise location, distance from the development and current ecological status should be established through appropriate evidence.

The application site consists predominantly of previously developed and hard-surfaced land containing garages and parking areas. It is also separated from the neighbouring garden by a pre-existing boundary wall approximately four feet high. This wall and the developed character of the site are relevant constraints upon ecological connectivity, although it would be inadvisable to state categorically, without ecological evidence, that great, crested newts could never cross the boundary, the species is not known for its vertical face smooth substrate climbing abilities.

If necessary, reasonable-avoidance measures could include controlled site clearance, with careful competent person supervision, sensitive working methods and the provision of improved wildlife habitat within the proposed site.

The assertion that the land lies within a “50-metre exclusion zone” should be supported by evidence identifying the pond, confirming its distance from the development and explaining the relevant ecological basis. Proximity alone does not necessarily prevent development where appropriate surveys, licensing and mitigation measures are provided.

Drainage and flooding

The flooding described by the objector reportedly resulted from a burst water main at or near 28 Fore Street. It was therefore caused by an exceptional escape of water from an existing property or utility and was unrelated to surface-water runoff from the proposed development site.

The development will incorporate a sustainable surface-water drainage system designed to retain and manage rainfall within the application site. Roof water will initially be collected in rainwater-harvesting tanks for non-potable uses, including WC flushing and garden irrigation.

Permeable paving will be provided where practicable. Surplus roof and surface water will be directed to suitably sized soakaways designed following infiltration testing and detailed drainage calculations. The soakaways and any exceedance routes will be positioned and designed so that water is not directed toward the objector’s lower garden or any adjoining property.

The drainage details, including tank capacities, soakaway dimensions, infiltration results, exceedance routes and future maintenance arrangements, can be secured by planning condition.

MELANIE ROE

Comment left on
25/8/2026

Stance

Object

I do not want my wall damaged as it is the back of the garages and my back garden wall. The builders are using it as a dumping site now. I suffer from severe anxiety and depression as the noise will be too much for me to bear. I do not want people being able to see into my house. There is also a bats nest somewhere near the proposed work. The bats circle around that area as I can see them late at night.

The matters raised by the neighbouring occupier have been considered and can be addressed through appropriate work, construction controls and planning conditions.

Garage wall and boundary

The wall referred to is the rear wall of the applicant’s existing garages, which are proposed to be demolished as part of the development. The garages built in 1981 predate the construction of the development now known as Kingfisher Drive with the property in question not constructed until 1997.

The garage wall has subsequently served as part of the physical enclosure between the application site and the neighbouring garden; the wall is the rear wall of the applicants existing garages.

A suitable permanent boundary fence formed from posts and rails with feather edge boarding will be installed as part of the development. Details of its position, height, materials and construction can be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before the existing garage wall is removed. A photographic condition survey of the adjoining boundary can also be undertaken before work starts. The area currently occupied by the existing garages is proposed to become parking spaces only with the height of the fence sufficient to prohibit invasion of privacy.

Alleged use as a dumping area

The applicant does not propose to use the boundary or adjoining land as a dumping site. Any materials currently stored within the application site will be removed or properly contained.

A construction-management plan can require:

- designated storage and waste areas within the development site;
- regular removal of waste by an authorised contractor;
- no permanent storage or depositing of materials against the neighbouring boundary;
- measures to control dust, mud and debris; and
- contact details for the site manager so that any concerns can be promptly addressed.

No materials or equipment will be placed within the neighbouring property.

Construction noise and personal health concerns

The applicant acknowledges the occupier's concerns regarding anxiety and depression. Some temporary disturbance is unavoidable during the demolition and construction of any development, but it can be controlled through a construction-management plan.

The plan can restrict noisy work to reasonable daytime hours, prohibit unnecessary idling and amplified music, require properly maintained equipment and provide advance notice of particularly noisy operations. Demolition of the garages will be undertaken in a controlled manner, and the construction period will be temporary.

The site manager's contact details can be supplied to neighbouring occupiers so that any unreasonable disturbance can be reported and investigated.

Privacy and overlooking

The neighbouring house is situated to the north of the proposed development and is separated from it by an extensive rear garden approximately 40 metres long. This substantial separation materially limits the potential for direct overlooking into the house.

The position and orientation of proposed upper-floor windows will nevertheless be reviewed. Where necessary, privacy can be protected through obscure glazing, high-level windows, rooflights, restricted opening, should it be deemed necessary.

These measures can be shown on the approved drawings or secured by planning condition. On this basis, the development should not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy.

Bats

The observation of bats flying around the area is noted. Bats commonly travel across gardens and developed areas while commuting or feeding. Their presence in flight does not necessarily demonstrate that a roost is located within the garages or the application site, in fact the garages have open ceilings and with flat roofs and have no concealed roosting areas. The probability is the roost will likely be in the pitches and storage lofts above the conservative club, formerly known as Ferndale House.

As the proposal includes demolition, the existing structures will be assessed by a suitably trained individual for features capable of supporting roosting bats. If potential roost features or evidence of bats are identified, any necessary activity surveys, mitigation measures and licensing requirements will be completed before demolition.

External lighting will be designed to avoid unnecessary illumination of neighbouring gardens, boundary vegetation and potential bat-commuting routes. Suitable measures may include low-level, warm-coloured and downward-directed lighting controlled by timers or motion sensors. All lighting will be low level and ambient in design and nature.

Conclusion

The representation does not identify a matter that is incapable of mitigation. The issues can be addressed through:

- confirmation of the legal boundary and wall ownership;
- a pre-commencement boundary condition survey;
- controlled demolition and replacement boundary treatment;
- an approved construction-management plan;
- window and screening measures protecting privacy; and
- proportionate ecological assessment before demolition.

These safeguards can be secured through appropriately worded planning conditions.

JULIE & MARK CAREY

Comment left on
19/8/2026

Stance
Comment

We do not object to the principle of developing the land behind 20 Fore Street, Westbury. However, I would like to raise concerns about the loss of rear pedestrian access to my property. My household has used the rear access to our garden for approximately 20 years. This access is important for moving refuse bins, taking a bicycle to and from the property, and avoiding the need to bring bins and other items through the house. We have also received correspondence from the waste

department advising that bins should not be left on the pavement. Since we have been told that we can no longer use our rear gate and the driveway to the front of the house, this creates a practical difficulty for storing and moving refuse bins safely and appropriately. Using rubbish bags instead of bins would not be suitable because there is an ongoing rat problem in the area. Bringing refuse bins through the house is also not a reasonable or hygienic solution. There is also a safety concern. In the event of a fire, the rear access provides an important means of escape from the property. If planning permission is granted, I respectfully request that a pedestrian access route is retained along the rear of the three existing properties on Fore Street. We have also reviewed the development plans and note that House 3 appears to be positioned in the corner of the site. I understand that this area may not be clearly within the applicant's ownership, and I ask that the Council checks the ownership and boundary position before determining the application Parking and Highway Impact. We are also concerned that the proposed parking provision appears insufficient for the number of dwellings affected by the development. The plans show three parking spaces for the three proposed houses, which provides only one space per house. In practice, many households now have more than one car. If each of the new houses had two cars, this could result in three additional vehicles needing to park on Fore Street or Frogmore Road. There are also wider parking pressures connected with properties owned by the developer. I understand that 18 Fore Street comprises two townhouses. If those households also have two cars each, this could add further demand for on-street parking. I already find it difficult to park my own car opposite my house, and any further increase in vehicles would worsen the existing situation. In addition, the plans appear to allocate three spaces for the four flats owned by the developer. If residents of those flats have more than one car, they are also likely to rely on parking on Fore Street. Existing on-street parking is already limited for nearby residents. The development appears to remove 10 spaces from a car park that currently provides 17 spaces. We respectfully ask that the Council considers whether the proposed parking provision is adequate and whether the loss of existing parking would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residents and the surrounding streets. Thank you for considering our comments. Yours faithfully, Julie & Mark Carey

Response to Comments from Julie and Mark Carey

The applicants note that Julie and Mark Carey do not object to the principle of developing the land.

Rear pedestrian access

The applicant's title documentation does not identify a legal pedestrian right of access across the application site benefiting 24, 26 or 28 Fore Street. Any previous access was permitted informally or by private monthly rolling arrangement with the former landowner which included termination notice within 4 weeks of the notice being provided.

Since acquiring the site in 2024, the applicant has not granted a permanent right of access. Any future access would therefore be entirely at the developer's discretion and would require a separate written licence or contractual agreement setting out its terms, duration, permitted use, maintenance responsibilities and arrangements during construction.

The practical concerns regarding bicycles and refuse bins are understood. However, convenience of access across privately owned land does not, by itself, establish that a permanent legal right exists or require the development layout to provide one. Any assertion that a legal right has arisen through historic use is a private legal matter requiring supporting evidence and determination outside the planning application. The developer has already prior to the application made an offer to each of the properties currently only accessed from the front elevations. This offer, subject to acceptance offered a free right of pedestrian access for a three-month period and an undertaking, that this arrangement would be formalised under a rolling agreement should consent be approved. The offer has not been accepted despite a carefully drafted document to ratify this offer was sent by email to each of the three respective households. This restriction and condition were not intended to apply pressure to gain the support of the local residents, but a realistic offer that would not be punitive in the event that planning consent was not approved and the developer decided to sell the site to another individual that may have a different set of requirement as the existing owner.

Fire escape

The rear access across the application site is not identified as an approved or legally secured fire-escape route. The existing dwelling retains its normal access and escape arrangements through its own frontage. If the occupiers consider their property's fire precautions inadequate, that should be assessed separately by a suitably qualified person; it does not establish a right of escape over the applicant's land, though they have substantial gardens and always have the option to shelter from an incident involving fire on a designated safe area basis.

Ownership and House 3

The applicant considers House 3 and its associated land to be within the application site and the applicant's sole right of access. An application for possession will be made to the land registry in due course supported by an affidavit from the previous owner providing evidence of the sole maintainer and user of this land for the 30 plus years he owned the adjoining land.

Planning permission does not determine private boundary ownership. If any precise boundary position remains disputed, that can be established through the Land Registry documents and, if necessary, a measured boundary survey. No development can lawfully be undertaken on third-party land without the necessary ownership rights or agreement. which will be dealt with in due course should the application be approved.

Parking provision

The proposal provides one dedicated parking space for each of the three proposed two-bedroom dwellings. This is consistent with the parking provision previously accepted for the applicant's two-bedroom properties at 18 and 18A Fore Street, each of which was approved with one allocated space.

Parking is also retained for the applicant-owned properties at 20, 20A, 18 and 18A Fore Street in accordance with the relevant planning permissions.

The assumption that every two-bedroom dwelling will have two cars is understood to be planning policy guidance. Parking provision should be assessed against the applicable planning policies, the size and location of the dwellings and the availability of sustainable transport, rather than an assumed maximum level of vehicle ownership and are at the discretion of the planning officer.

The parking area within the application site is private land. Since the applicant acquired the site in 2024, the parking spaces have not been used or enjoyed by neighbouring residents or other third parties. The proposal therefore does not remove any public parking spaces or any legally allocated parking belonging to 24, 26 or 28 Fore Street or any other properties in the local area. The allocations indicated within the application are suitable under the framework indicated above.

The assertion that the development removes ten spaces from a 17-space public, or residents' car park is not accepted. Any previous informal or commercial parking arrangement did not create a permanent public parking facility or confer continuing parking rights upon neighbouring properties, and any rights previously licensed that were terminated upon acquisition almost three years since

Conclusion

The concerns raised do not demonstrate that the proposal would extinguish a confirmed legal access or parking right that doesn't exist. The development provides dedicated parking for each new dwelling and retains the required parking for the applicant's existing properties.

Private questions concerning historic access, licences or alleged prescriptive rights should be addressed separately between the relevant landowners and should not prevent the planning application from being determined on its proper planning merits.

WESTBURY TOWN COUNCIL

Comment left on
19/8/2026

Stance
Object

At a meeting held on Monday 17th August 2026, Westbury Town Council Highways, Planning and Development Committee considered application: PL/2026/04391 – Land Rear of 20 Fore Street Westbury BA13 3AX and has the following response to make: Object Westbury Town Council objects to this application, based on the following grounds: • The proposal has insufficient provision for parking. • Currently the site provides parking for at least 7 vehicles servicing surrounding properties. • The development will therefore cause a reduction in parking spaces and exasperate the already severe problem of parking on part of the A350 and Frogmore Road, impacting on neighbouring areas. • The

density of the development proposed is not appropriate for the site. • The development will also cause accessibility issues for refuse.

Parking provision

The proposal provides one dedicated parking space for each of the three proposed two-bedroom dwellings. This is consistent with the parking provision previously accepted for the applicant's two-bedroom properties at 18 and 18A Fore Street, each of which was approved with one allocated space.

Parking is also retained for the applicant-owned properties at 20, 20A, 18 and 18A Fore Street in accordance with the relevant planning permissions.

The site does not provide any parking for any other properties other than the applicant's properties known as 20, the flat 20, 18 and 18A Fore Street as per the respective planning consents.

The allegation that the development will exasperate the already severe problem in the surrounding area is Not accepted, this application has sufficient allocation to cover the properties proposed causing no overspill into the surrounding area.

Further, the comment relating the development not being appropriate for the site is not accepted as the development ratios of foot print in relation to recreational space is compliant with planning guidelines.

CONSERVATION CONSULTATION - JANICE GOOCH

Comment left on
19/8/2026

Stance
Object

Conservation consultation response has been provided as an attachment.
Please select the Documents tab above to view.

I have prepared a dedicated document to provide evidence to attempt to address the concerns raised by Janice in her document. Please see attached.

PAUL WILTSHIRE & EMILY KEMP

Comment left on
19/8/2026

Stance
Comment

I am not opposed to the principle of the proposed development, and I have no objection to the erection of the proposed dwellings. However, I would like to raise a specific concern regarding access to the rear of the existing properties on Fore Street and ask that this is taken into consideration when determining the application. The existing properties along this section of Fore Street are historic properties, many of which are approaching 200 years old. Due to their layout, the fronts of the properties open directly onto the road and there is no practical frontage area in which household refuse bins can be left. For at least the last 20 years, the properties along this section of Fore Street, including number 26, have routinely accessed the rear in order to move their household refuse bins to and from the collection point. This is the established and practical method by which the properties have managed their refuse collection. Leaving bins on the pavement or roadside for extended periods is not a viable alternative and can result in enforcement action or penalties for obstructing the highway. I appreciate that the precise legal position regarding any historic rights of access may not be immediately clear from the individual property deeds. However, the longstanding use of the rear access by the existing properties is something I believe should be taken into account when considering the proposed development and the relationship between the new dwellings and the existing properties. There is also an important safety consideration. Given the age and layout of the existing houses, maintaining a means of pedestrian access to the rear would provide an additional means of escape and access for emergency services in the event of a fire or other emergency. I therefore believe that permanently removing the ability to reach the rear of these properties would have a detrimental practical and safety impact on the existing residents. I would therefore respectfully request that, should planning permission be granted, the development is designed and/or conditioned so that a small, suitable pedestrian access route is retained along the rear of the existing Fore Street properties. I am not seeking vehicular access or unrestricted use of the development site. The request is simply for a modest pedestrian route which would allow the existing properties to: Move household refuse bins to and from the rear of the properties for collection; Maintain the established means of rear access that has been used for many years; and Provide a practical additional means of pedestrian escape/access in the event of an emergency. I would hope that this could be accommodated without materially affecting the proposed development, and that a reasonable arrangement could be reached which protects the interests and safety of the existing properties while allowing the proposed development to proceed. I would be grateful if this representation could be placed on the planning file and considered as part of the assessment of application PL/2026/04391. I would also ask that consideration is given to whether an appropriate planning condition or other mechanism could be used to ensure that this access is not subsequently obstructed or built over as part of the development. Thank you for considering my comments. Kind regards, Paul Wiltshire & Emily Kemp Owner/landlord

The applicant's title documentation does not identify a legal pedestrian right of access across the application site benefiting 24, 26 or 28 Fore Street. Any previous access was permitted

informally or by private monthly rolling arrangement with the former landowner which included termination notice within 4 weeks of the notice being provided.

Since acquiring the site in 2024, the applicant has not granted a permanent right of access. Any future access would therefore be entirely at the developer's discretion and would require a separate written licence or contractual agreement setting out its terms, duration, permitted use, maintenance responsibilities and arrangements during construction.

The practical concerns regarding bicycles and refuse bins are understood. However, convenience of access across privately owned land does not, by itself, establish that a permanent legal right exists or require the development layout to provide one. Any assertion that a legal right has arisen through historic use is a private legal matter requiring supporting evidence and determination outside the planning application.

The developer has already prior to the application made an offer to each of the properties currently only accessed from the front elevations. This offer, subject to acceptance offered a free right of pedestrian access for a three-month period and an undertaking, that this arrangement would be formalised under a rolling agreement should consent be approved. The offer has not been accepted despite a carefully drafted document to ratify this offer was sent to each of the three respective households. This restriction and condition were not intended to apply pressure to gain the support of the local residents, but a realistic offer that would not be punitive in the event that planning consent was not approved and the developer decided to sell the site to another individual that may have a different set of requirement as the existing owner.

LYNDA REYNOLDS

Comment left on
14/8/2026

Stance
Mixed

I have just moved into my property that backs onto the land rear of 20 Fore Street (since January 2026). I have read the application and its states the land is being used just for garages and parking but I can assure you that it is being used commercially as a tip for stone, bricks and other building materials. I have pictures I can send you if you require them. I also have an issue with the garages being knocked down as they are a part of my boundary to the end of the garden, which the back wall of the garages provides privacy and seclusion. One of the main reasons I moved here. There are two trees there too which may be an issue. I would like the wall to be left as it is. Dont know if that is possible if they knock down the garages? I wanted to voice my concerns of the above.

Garage wall and boundary

The wall referred to is the rear wall of the applicant's existing garages, which are proposed to be demolished as part of the development. The garages built in 1981 predate the construction of the development now known as Kingfisher Drive with the property in question not constructed until 1997.

The garage wall has subsequently served as part of the physical enclosure between the application site and the neighbouring garden; the wall is the rear wall of the applicants existing garages.

A suitable permanent boundary fence formed from posts and rails with feather edge boarding will be installed as part of the development. Details of its position, height, materials and construction can be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before the existing garage wall is removed. A photographic condition survey of the adjoining boundary can also be undertaken before work starts. The area currently occupied by the existing garages is proposed to become parking spaces only with the height of the fence sufficient to prohibit invasion of privacy.

Alleged use as a dumping area

The applicant does not propose to use the boundary or adjoining land as a dumping site. Any materials currently stored within the application site will be removed or properly contained.

A construction-management plan can require:

- designated storage and waste areas within the development site;
- regular removal of waste by an authorised contractor;
- No permanent storage or depositing of materials against the neighbouring boundary;
- measures to control dust, mud and debris; and
- contact details for the site manager so that any concerns can be promptly addressed.

No materials or equipment will be placed within the neighbouring property.

ARCHAEOLOGY

Comment left on
10/8/2026

Stance

No Objection - Subject to Condition

Dear Mr Sims, Thank you for your consultation. The site of the proposed new housing is located on the edge of Westbury's medieval core. The site is also located close to the Bitham Brook. Development immediately to the north of Westbury has identified extensive later prehistoric and Romano-British settlement along the brook and there remains the possibility that further, as-yet unrecorded, sub-surface features dating from the late prehistoric through to the post-medieval periods survive within the site. I would therefore advise that the site is assessed via a trial trench evaluation. This evaluation is to be secured via a condition to be attached to any planning permission that may be issued. Such a condition is to be worded thus: 'No development shall commence within the area indicated by application PL/2026/04391 until: a) A written programme of archaeological investigation, which should include on-site work and off-site work such as the analysis, publishing and archiving of the results, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority; and b) The approved programme of archaeological work has

been carried out in accordance with the approved details. REASON: To enable the recording of any matters of archaeological interest.' If any archaeological activity is identified by the evaluation, then further work may be required in order to mitigate the impact of the proposed development upon it. This mitigation work would also be secured via the above condition. The trial trench evaluation and any subsequent mitigation work is to be carried out following the standards and guidelines as set out by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) as well as those set out in the document 'Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Assessment and Fieldwork in Wiltshire and Swindon Borough', issued by Wiltshire Council Archaeology Service (WCAS). The costs of this work are to be borne by the applicant. If you have any queries regarding this response, then please do not hesitate to contact me. Yours sincerely, Neil J. Adam BA ACIFA Assistant County Archaeologist Wiltshire Council CWI25157

Response to Archaeology Consultation

The applicant notes that the Archaeology Officer raises no objection subject to condition. The site contains no known undisturbed or previously undeveloped ground, having been extensively excavated over time for garages, underground services and boundary detail construction.

In view of this previous disturbance, the applicant respectfully requests that a proportionate archaeological watching brief, undertaken by a suitably qualified archaeologist during foundation and service excavations, be considered in place of separate trial trenching. If remains of potential archaeological significance are discovered, work in the affected area would cease and an appropriate programme of investigation, recording, analysis and archiving would be agreed with the Council and completed at the applicant's expense.

Yours sincerely

David Lux

Fore Street Developments Ltd.

07814 676556