

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

URBAN DESIGN

Officer name:

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

Date: 10.08.26

Application No: PL/2026/00347

Proposal: Approval of Reserved Matters (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) Following Outline Planning Permission PL/2022/02452 for 140 Dwellings, a Habitat Support Area and Associated Landscaping and

Site Address: WorksLand at Stones Farm, West Mill Lane, Cricklade

Case Officer: Joe Richardson

Reference:

Application files indexed 04.08.26

10.08.2026 Revised drawings and documents indexed 04.08.26. Comments in blue below (✗ indicates where reason not addressed or not satisfactorily addressed - ✓ indicates where reason has been addressed or mostly addressed with recommendations).

23.09.2026 Revised drawings and documents indexed 22.09.26. Comments in blue below (✗ indicates where reason not addressed or not satisfactorily addressed - ✓ indicates where reason has been addressed or mostly addressed with recommendations).

Policy and guidance:

Wiltshire Core Strategy, Core Policy 57 'Ensuring high quality design and place shaping' (Abbreviated CP57) ; Wiltshire Design Guide – Wiltshire Council Supplementary Planning Document adopted 25th March 2024 (abbreviated WDG) ; Building for a Healthy Life (Homes England June 2020) (referenced in the NPPF) (BfHL).

Objection

The proposed design would not accord with the high quality of design and place shaping required by CP57 for the following reasons:

Planning Layout (sheet 1 of 2) 247-06-01:

The following plots would not adhere to WDG page 74, expectation 9.2.2 '*minimum garden areas for all houses should be equivalent to the footprint of the house*' and as set out in the 'Guidance on minimum standards table' page 75. These are rear gardens of plots 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 82, 90, 123, 124, 125, and 126.

✓ It is acknowledged that the plots 43, 44 have been amended.

✗ 47, 48 are still small, it would be beneficial to claim back more garden space from plots 55 and 54.

✓ It is acknowledged these are the equal or greater than the size of the house footprint.

✓ 49, 50 have increased in size.

✗ 82 still appears to be the same area.

✓ This has been amended

✓ 90 has increased in size slightly.

✓ 123 has increased.

✓ 124 and 125 have increased slightly.

✓ 126 increased in size.

Plot 45 and plots 87 to 91 inclusive as 2 storey houses with north facing rear gardens would not adhere to WDG expectation 9.2.2 that for a typical 2 storey house this should be a minimum of 12m long.

✗ Plot 45 has marginally increased in size but the garden is still the same depth. One possible solution could amending the house design or orientation to allow light into the garden.

✗ This remains a small garden and only 8m deep however the WDG wording is acknowledged.

✗ For plots 87-91 It is acknowledged the gardens can't easily increase in depth without losing the plot to the north in most circumstances. Consideration should be given to other means of improving garden's potential for receiving sunlight. Possible solutions could include lowering roof pitches or introducing hipped roofs to facilitate more light for these north facing gardens.

✓ It is acknowledged that the retention of gable-ended roofs may assist in maximising the area available for solar photovoltaic panels, and on this basis no further amendment is sought. However, it should be noted that hipped roofs are capable of accommodating solar panels and their inclusion would not preclude the delivery of additional environmental credentials.

The rear garden of plot 108 and of plot 123 would not meet WDG expectation 9.2.4 that these should create usable garden shapes avoiding irregular pointed corners and narrow strips.

✓ It is acknowledged that these plots have been amended where possible.

The parking bay to plot 48 is across the face of house 47. This would not adhere to WDG page 77 expectation 9.3.7 *'any parking close to a habitable window should be allocated to the resident of that home ,in order to minimise noise disturbance'*.

✗ It is noted that the parking layout has been adjusted but the previous comment still stands with parking directly in front of 47 still. In addition now the parking is adjusted it is unclear how accessible the spaces are in the layout. There is now only one side to which the parking can be accessed by pedestrians and consequently the Part M4(2) requirement of a 900mm access zone is not being achieved.

✓ This has been amended to suit the above.

Furthermore, the proposed timber fencing demonstrated in the precedent image fails to satisfy Core Policy 57 criteria (i) and (ii), which require development to respond positively to local distinctiveness and create a high-quality sense of place. Timber fencing of this nature is a generic suburban boundary treatment commonly found on housing developments throughout the country and does not enhance local distinctiveness or positively contribute to the character of Cricklade. WDG Expectation 9.3.1 further states that boundaries should enhance the character of the local area and utilise locally characteristic materials.