

Please see below a table with the key issues outlined and responses from the applicant to these responses, I trust that all outstanding issues are now resolved and the application can be sent to the next available planning committee.

Attached is also a transmittal table showing the submitted documents and updated references for ease.

Key changes are outlined in bullets below for ease:

- The swale has been moved so that it does not interfere with the PROW or woodland.
- Rear garden gradients to ensure compliance with NHBC standards, with maximum gradients no steeper than 1:6.

It should be noted that the majority of documents have been updated with minor changes to be consistent with the above changes and the outcomes of their assessments have not significantly or demonstrably changed due to the minor changes to the site.

Outstanding Queries/Issues to be Resolved and Responses

Query/Issue:	Response:	Related key plan/ document reference(s):
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	N/A
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
Swale The proposed swales to the southern edge of the site would appear to infringe on the protected woodland as this	The swale has been moved to ensure that it does not infringe on the protected woodland or on the PROW to the east. This issue should now be resolved.	Proposed Site Layout (Ref 101 P27)

been considered by an AIA or can be made clearer in terms of proximity? Highways have also mentioned that the swale may impact on the proposed connected to the PROW to the east'		
Highways footpath Highways have also requested that the footpath to the front of plots 69 and 70 is extended to a minimum width of 1.8m	In this location the path only serves plot 69. In terms of connectivity to the wider scheme i.e. anyone using paths from plots to the North (plots 74-70) would cross in front of plots 69 & 68 negating the need for the 1.8m wide path around the Turning Head. It should be noted that this part of the site is not a through road and is located at the 'cul-de-sac' location of the site. Any persons visiting this part of the site would do so purposefully including deliveries or to visit residents. Therefore, traffic generation is expected to be lower than a through road and traffic speeds would be expected to be low due to the cul-de-sac location of this part of the site; allowing pedestrians to move safely. Having regard for the above the amendments to the footpath are not required due to wider site connectivity and the cul-de-sac location of the footpath.	N/A
Rear Garden Gradients Most of the rear garden plots have a gradient of 1:10, however plots 27, 29, 33, 39, 55, 56, 65 and 66 are labelled as 1:13 to 1:27 with the gardens of plots 30 and 31 split in the centre with a gradient 1:10 each part ? This raises some concerns over the usability of the spaces and result in	Revisions have been made to rear garden gradients across the Salesbury View site and the site is now compliant with NHBC standards, with maximum gradients no steeper than 1:6. This includes the addition of retaining walls and some minor tweaks to the layout to accommodate this such as the relocation of bin stores and of Air Source Heat Pumps.	External Works Sheet 1 (210687-EDGE-XX-XX-DR-C-1001_EXTERNAL WORKS SHEET 1[P03]) External Works Sheet 2 (210687-EDGE-XX-XX-DR-C-1002_EXTERNAL WORKS SHEET 2[P03])

retaining structures within or at the end of the plots we are particular concerns about impacts along the southern boundary to the protected woodland. I could not see that the previous proposal had gradients such as these proposed?		External Works Sheet 3 (210687-EDGE-XX-XX-DR-C-1003_EXTERNAL WORKS SHEET 3[P01]) External Works Sheet 4 (210687-EDGE-XX-XX-DR-C-1004_EXTERNAL WORKS SHEET 4[P01]) External Works Sheet 5 (210687-EDGE-XX-XX-DR-C-1005_EXTERNAL WORKS SHEET 5[P01]) Edge Retaining Wall Typical Sections (210687-EDG-XX-XX-SK-S-000001 EDGE RETAINING WALL TYPICAL SECTIONS [P02])
Visitor parking The proposed 11 visitor parking spaces were not requested by us or highways is this a result of third-party comments? They do seem to be rather sporadic around the site, and I presume these would be monitored and maintained by a third party. Just wondering if these are necessary or could be better sited in clustered closer to each group of properties to make them more useable?	The previous submission included 11 visitor parking spaces to avoid any degradation of the planning application; these have been carried over to this application. These spaces ensure that visitors do not put pressure on the existing and proposed highway network by having dedicated visitor parking within the development. These have been spread out across the development rather than grouped to encourage their use. For example, if the spaces were grouped together at the south of the site visitors to the north would be unlikely to use them and vice versa. Monitoring would be carried out by the resident owned management company.	Proposed Site Layout (Ref 101 P27) Transport Assessment (Rev 08)

**Planning queries
Housing mix etc.**

WSP responded to these queries on 09.03.2026 by email but for ease of reference your queries are in red with our response below in black.

Has a registered provider been secured for the site?

A registered provider had been secured for the previous application however, as the scheme has been amended we out to the market and actively seeking a provider.

The 2 bed Wentwood properties do not meet the nationally described space standards

The Wentwood is a 3 person 2 bed bungalow measuring circa 73m². The NDDS requires 2-bedroom 3- person one storey dwellings to be a minimum of 61m² and therefore the Wenwtood is NDSS compliant.

The over 55's accommodation are proposed to be delivered as a as affordable rent 2 storey units , and these units appear to be the larger properties. This would cause problems as the rental units need to be available for families . The definition of over 55 accommodation would be older person or requires the property due to mobility issues.

The site plan has been updated for clarity with green denoting over 55s properties, which includes select Wentwood 2-bedroom bungalow and Wareham 2 bedroom terrace and Barnwood 3 bed detached. All of the over 55s accommodation are M4(2) properties which can easily be converted for those with mobility issues and are therefore suitable for over 55s accommodation.

Rental units need to be restricted to LHA rate and be allocated in line with RVBC allocation policy.

First homes need to be 30% discount with local connection , priority to first time buyers.

Noted this will be captured in s106 agreement.

The text on page 44 mentions 2-4 bed affordable dwellings , however the table listing the 24 affordable units does not list any 4 bed units.

The 6 over 55 units labelled 'home', I presume are shared ownership ? please confirm.

Housetype booklet
(Rev P4)
Proposed Site Layout
(Ref 101 P27)

The plans show that there are only 6 over 55's units indicated plots 3,4,5, 6, 16 and 17. The other plots were 7, 18, 48, 52 and 53 which are now annotated as intermediate (blue)? There should be 11. The site layout plan rev P27 has been updated will respond to all the above queries grouped together

There are 2 5 bed dwellings still on the plans (Newgate) plots 31 and 34 although the Table 5-1 Total Housing Mix – Updated does not propose any 5 bed units. Can you please clarify this? The table has been updated below to include 4+ bed which captures the 5 beds and does not affect any of the assessments.

Table 5-1 Total Housing Mix – Updated

Bedrooms	Number Proposed	%
2	6	8
3	53	66
4 +	21	26
Total	80	100

BNG

GMEU response query dated 06.03.26
"the concern is that because the land in the blue edge is predominantly woodland then there is uncertainty as to whether the grassland uplift can be achieved within the space available – if you could ask your ecologist to review and come back with a response on this that would be appreciated."

6.76 units will be required off site to achieve the 10% BNG requirement. Persimmon are investigating local habitat banks and availability of units to purchase to achieve this uplift. Persimmon will be in a position to confirm the details once the units have been secured with a local habitat bank.

BNG Metric and Report Updated dated 20.03.2026

[illegible]