

RE: PLANNING APPLICATION No: 17/12491/FUL

I live at No: 15 directly across the road from the proposed development.

Although I don't object to development of this site, -- because it's at the heart of the conservation area adjacent to some historic listed cottages, it surely should be sympathetic as regards both size, style and placement.

The present plans don't satisfy any of these requirements and are actually poorer in those respects than those on the really attractive Paxcroft Mead development.

There,--- all the houses big or small are set on the same building line with detached ones mostly paired to match as left to right images of each other. Significantly, all of them have ridges parallel to the road with any L- or T- shaped extensions sited at the rear so as to provide an uncluttered frontage and views along the streets that are part of the attractions of the area.

There is nowhere in Paxcroft Mead or any of the excellent recent developments in the centre of town where there are two houses shoehorned together as a connected pair, one with a ridge parallel to the road and the other at right angles --- one with a ridge higher than the other ---- both with extensions at front ---- and both set behind the building line. This is an ugly feature of the present proposals.

I believe that this proposed development at No:16 Keevil would be refused on any site within Paxcroft Mead because of stylistic mismatch alone and to agree it in a conservation area would be perverse.

Even as regards parking there are problems. Comparable houses in Paxcroft Mead --- those for instance in the Painters Mead cluster (opposite Budgens etc.) have 2 garages and parking for another 2 cars with space for visitors if need be in parking bays. The parking requirements in Keevil are no less since the minimal bus service often necessitates cars for teenagers in large family houses. Any parking in the road outside will be extremely dangerous because of limited visibility round the bend in the road towards Trowbridge. Coming out of our entrance is already hazardous.

If the site is to be developed, I believe it is only suitable for a single 3-4 bedroom house or preferably 2 small starter homes --- these are really the sort of houses the village needs.

With reference to the current plan --- the houses should be much smaller -- 2 bedrooms. They should match as complementary mirror images. The ridges should be parallel to the road. The frontage should be on the existing building line and should be plain with at most a projecting porch. Any extensions should be at the rear. The houses should share a central driveway allowing more clearance at the sides to give proper access to the rear of the houses for dustbins, garden machinery and oil tank access etc. The central drive should lead to garaging or parking for 2 cars per house with adequate turning space at the rear. In other words, the development should simply conform to the general pattern of the neighbouring listed house and cottages.

P.B.Nutter.....15, Main St., Keevil