| Ap | olication Details |
|---|--|
| Application Reference Number: | 3/37/23/001 |
| Application Type: | Reserved matters |
| Earliest decision date: | 08 November 2023 |
| Expiry Date | 06 April 2023 |
| Extension of Time Date | 06 February 2024 |
| Decision Level | 9 April 2024 |
| Description: | Application for the approval of reserved matters |
| | following outline application 3/37/17/019 for |
| | the access, appearance, landscaping, layout |
| | and scale for the erection of up to 139 No. |
| | dwellings and associated works. |
| Site Address: | Land to the south of Doniford Road and |
| | Normandy Avenue, Watchet |
| Parish: | 37 |
| Conservation Area: | NA |
| Somerset Levels and Moors | NA |
| RAMSAR Catchment Area: | |
| National Landscape (AONB): | NA |
| Case Officer: | Russell Williams |
| Agent: | Mr Matthew Kendrick, |
| Applicant: | Mrs Katie Peters |
| Committee Date: | |
| Reason for reporting application to Committee | NA |

1. Recommendation

1.1 That permission be GRANTED subject to conditions

2. Executive Summary of key reasons for recommendation

2.1 The application has been subject to considerable revisions compared to its first presentation to the LPA and the amendments have shown notable improvement over

earlier designs. The development now and acceptable design scheme that will deliver 139no. dwellings with affordable housing, play space and extensive open space and landscaping such that it will not give rise to any significant level of harm to the area as a whole. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

3. Planning Obligations and conditions and informatives

3.1 Conditions (full text in appendix 1)

- 1. Approved plans
- 2. Materials
- 3. Landscaping
- 4. Access Doniford Road visibility
- 5. Access timing
- 6. Parking and turning
- 7. Cycle storage
- 8. Drainage Management and adoption
- 9. Bin storage
- 10. Water Consumption
- 3.2 Informatives (full text in appendix 1)
- 1. Proactive Statement
- 2. EV Chargers
- 3. RoW
- 4. Highways
- 5. Part M Building Regulations
- 3.3 Obligations

NA

4. Proposed development, site and surroundings

4.1 Details of proposal

The application seeks approval of Reserved Matters in relation to the development of 139 dwellings and associated works on Land south of Doniford Road and Normandy Avenue, Watchet.

The Reserved Matters for which approval is sought are layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, with access having been approved in detail at the Outline planning stage.

Access is approved for the development and is to be formed solely from the southern part of Doniford Road, south of Alamein Road.

During the course of the application, amended drawings have been submitted in order to address comments raised by consultees.

The development comprises of 90 open market dwellinghouses and 49 affordable homes, with a tenure split of 17no. 2 and 3 bedroom shared ownership homes and 32 no. 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom social rented properties, combining a range of flats, apartments, bungalows and two storey dwellings. The scale of development varies from single storey bungalows to two storey dwellinghouses.

Access will be derived via the approved access route established at the Outline stage. The submitted layout utilises the same spine road approach as that adopted as part of the Outline application with the adjacent private roads including Cherry Tree Way and Normandy Avenue linking into this. Pedestrian connectivity is provided across the site and link into existing local networks.

The application is supported by detailed landscaping plans, and a management plan to ensure its long-term delivery and maintenance. Strategic landscape planting is proposed to the periphery of the site, including the hilltop park to the northern end of the site. Other areas of informal open space with landscape planting are also proposed throughout the development, with tree planting along key highway corridors within the site.

In regard to drainage, foul water will be pumped to a local foul drainage system providing a connection into the adopted infrastructure. For surface water drainage, the proposals include SUDs basins and swales which reflect the approach set out at the outline stage, and the proposed features remain broadly in the locations that were put forward previously. Drainage mitigation measures have been sized appropriately to deal with the detailed design as proposed. It is proposed to connect the new features to existing ditches with flows restricted to green field run off rates, plus a 45% allowance for climate change.

The application is supported by the following details:

• Travel Plan prepared by Hydrock

- Drainage Strategy prepared by Hydrock
- Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation prepared by Cotswold Archaeology
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) prepared by Pegasus
- Construction Management Plan prepared by Edenstone/Grass Roots Planning
- Construction Ecological Management Plan
- Landscaping details
- Play Area Design
- Detailed design drawings

4.2 Sites and surroundings

The site lies on the eastern edge of Watchet, to the south of Doniford Road, between Normandy Avenue and Cherry Tree Way/Alamein Road. It comprises 4 irregularly shaped fields that provide approximately 3.45 hectares of agricultural land.

Existing residential development lies within close proximity to the north and west on Doniford Road. Houses at Admirals Close and Cherry Tree Way abut the application area along the western boundary.

Residential properties at Normandy Avenue and Alamein Road lie immediately adjacent to the site to the east with vehicular and pedestrian access gained to Cherry Tree Way, via Normandy Avenue.

The site and immediate surrounding area was previously used by the MOD and accommodated prefabricated structures to house army personnel and other related uses. These buildings have since been removed from the site and the use of the land reverted to agriculture. Albeit this use is primarily equestrian as the site accommodates pony paddocks.

| Reference | Description | Decision | Date |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 3/37/17/019 | Outline Planning Application with | Approved | 15/06/2021 |
| | all matters reserved, except for | | |
| | means of access, for the erection | | |
| | of up to 139 dwellings and | | |
| | associated works at Land south of | | |
| | Doniford Road and Normandy | | |
| | Avenue, Watchet, Taunton | | |

5. Planning (and enforcement) history

6. Environmental Impact Assessment

Not EIA development.

7. Habitats Regulations Assessment

Not applicable.

8. Consultation and Representations

Statutory consultees (the submitted comments are available in full on the Council's website).

- 8.1 Date of consultation: 25 October 2023
- 8.2 Date of revised consultation (if applicable):
- 8.3 Press Date: 12 January 2023
- 8.4 Site Notice Date:

8.5 Consultees the following were consulted:

| Consultee | Comment | Officer Comment |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Watchet Town Council | Object to the application. | Noted and comments |
| | | addressed within the |
| | Watchet TC support the | report. |
| | comments made by | |
| | Williton Town Council and | |
| | the Committee support the | |
| | comments made by the | |
| | Affordable Housing Group, | |
| | including; | |
| | The unit types for | |
| | affordable housing should | |
| | reflect the mix of the | |
| | overall development; | |
| | Apartment blocks are not | |
| | acceptable owing to the | |
| | communal entrances and | |

| | | Γ |
|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| | the lack of private outdoor | |
| | space. These should be | |
| | replaced with self- | |
| | contained 1 and 2-bed | |
| | homes with sole entrances | |
| | and private outdoor space; | |
| | Affordable units in the | |
| | form of flats over garage | |
| | are discouraged due to the | |
| | complications of | |
| | maintenance where space | |
| | is utilised by multiple | |
| | residents on a fairly | |
| | frequent basis; there | |
| | should be better | |
| | distribution of Shared | |
| | Ownership properties and | |
| | The affordable housing | |
| | should not be visually | |
| | distinguishable from the | |
| | market housing on site. | |
| | The Committee would also | |
| | support comments made | |
| | by a Cherry Tree resident | |
| | regarding the amendment | |
| | to footpath away from | |
| | Cherry tree. | |
| Highways Development | No objection subject to | Noted. Amendments have |
| Control | conditions: | addressed points. |
| | | |
| | Access | |
| | Under the outline | |
| | permission the proposed | |
| | access arrangements | |
| | initially included two | |
| | vehicular access, one at | |
| | the northern end of the site | |
| | and one at the southern | |
| | end of the site. During the | |
| | course of the application | |
| | the northern access was | |
| | | |

| | removed from the scheme | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| | and the application was | |
| | approved on the basis of | |
| | being served by a single | |
| | vehicular access at the | |
| | southern end of the site. | |
| | When the application was | |
| | determined however the | |
| | approved plans condition | |
| | included plans for the | |
| | northern access in error. | |
| | Whilst access was included | |
| | as a detailed matter at | |
| | outline stage it has been | |
| | listed as a reserved matter | |
| | for consideration as part of | |
| | the current reserved | |
| | matters submission, | |
| | presumably to address the | |
| | aforementioned anomaly. | |
| | The current submission | |
| | reflects the access | |
| | arrangements, including in | |
| | terms of pedestrian / cycle | |
| | connectivity, accepted by | |
| | the Highway Authority as | |
| | part of the outline | |
| | permission and as such | |
| | this aspect of the scheme | |
| | is considered to be | |
| | acceptable. | |
| | | |
| | Layout | |
| | | |
| | Our Estate Roads team | |
| | have reviewed the layout | |
| | and made the following | |
| | observations: | |
| | Advanced Payment | |
| | Codes - The applicant | |
| | should be aware that in the | |
| L | | |

| instance of any laying out | |
|--|--|
| of a private street, and as | |
| such under Sections 219 to | |
| 225 of the Highways Act | |
| 1980, will be subject to the | |
| Advance Payments Code | |
| (APC). A section 50 licence | |
| will be required for sewer | |
| connections within or | |
| adjacent to the highway, | |
| the application form for | |
| which is available from the | |
| Traffic and Transport | |
| Development Group, | |
| Somerset Council: Tel – | |
| 01823 357521 | |
| Visibility - Appropriate | |
| adoptable forward visibility | |
| splays will be required | |
| throughout the inside of all | |
| carriageway bends and | |
| should be plotted on a | |
| drawing at a scale of 1:200 | |
| for consideration. | |
| Turning Heads - Swept | |
| path drawings have been | |
| provided based on the | |
| largest FTA Design Vehicle | |
| expected to manoeuvre | |
| within the turning heads. | |
| These would appear to | |
| indicate that such vehicles | |
| will be able to access and | |
| turn within the site, some | |
| slight over-running of the | |
| verges are shown in areas, | |
| this will need to be | |
| resolved at technical | |
| approval stage. | |
| Carriageways and | |
| Footways - Any shared | |
| i Jotways - Any Shareu | |

| | |
|--|--|
| surfaces proposed on the | |
| site to be constructed in | |
| block paving. The area of | |
| footway behind plots 107 | |
| and 106 should ideally be | |
| flush against the | |
| carriageway, and the | |
| driveway for the parking | |
| areas should extend out to | |
| the carriageway edge, to | |
| avoid kerb overrun. This | |
| can be reviewed at | |
| technical approval stage. | |
| Garages and Gates - No | |
| doors, gates, or low level | |
| windows/utility boxes/down | |
| pipes to obstruct | |
| footways/shared surfaces. | |
| The highway limits should | |
| be limited to that area of | |
| footway/carriageway clear | |
| of all private service boxes, | |
| inspection chambers, | |
| rainwater pipes, vent pipes, | |
| meter boxes (including wall | |
| mounted), steps etc. | |
| Tactile Paving - Tactile | |
| paved crossings are to be | |
| laid out in accordance with | |
| DfTs "Guidance on the use | |
| | |
| of Tactile Paving Surfaces". | |
| Dropped kerbing should | |
| have an upstand of 0-6mm | |
| and gullies must be | |
| provided immediately | |
| upstream in drained | |
| channels. | |
| Landscaping - A | |
| comprehensive planting | |
| schedule for all proposed | |
| planting within or adjacent | |

| to the bighway should be | |
|--|--|
| to the highway should be | |
| submitted for checking and | |
| approval at technical | |
| approval stage. Planting | |
| within adopted areas will | |
| require a commuted sum. | |
| Drainage - It should not | |
| be assumed that any new | |
| highway drainage can | |
| connect into the existing | |
| highway drainage system | |
| as the existing system may | |
| not be suitable/have the | |
| capacity to carry the | |
| additional water. Where it | |
| is acceptable that a | |
| connection can be made, | |
| this must not be done | |
| without a signed and | |
| bonded legal agreement in | |
| place. The developer | |
| should establish at an early | |
| stage that a suitable outfall | |
| could be provided to | |
| discharge surface water | |
| run-off from the | |
| development (permission | |
| must be sought for the | |
| outfall). Private drainage | |
| should not be located | |
| within the prospective | |
| public highway areas. | |
| Private surface water | |
| from driveways is to be | |
| intercepted by positive | |
| drainage systems. Gully | |
| pots or similar should be | |
| used where drives fall | |
| towards garages. Channels | |
| / drains etc must be | |
| | |
| connected into the private | |

| , | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| surface water system. | |
| Attenuation Tanks - Any | |
| attenuation tanks proposed | |
| on the site need to be | |
| sited at least 5 metres | |
| from the proposed | |
| highway. Details of who the | |
| attenuation tanks will be | |
| maintained by to be | |
| submitted to Somerset | |
| Council. | |
| • Areas for Adoption - If | |
| there are areas which the | |
| Developer would like to put | |
| forward for adoption this | |
| will need to be discussed | |
| at the technical detail | |
| stage and no presumption | |
| should be made that all | |
| areas would be adopted. If | |
| the Local Planning | |
| Authority should grant | |
| approval, the estate layout | |
| is not quite suitable for | |
| • | |
| adoption in its current | |
| form. If there are areas | |
| that are to remain private | |
| we would require details of | |
| future maintenance | |
| arrangements. | |
| _ | |
| Parking | |
| The proposal would see the | |
| erection of 139 dwellings | |
| on the site, these vary | |
| between 1 and 4 bedroom | |
| properties. | |
| The site is located within | |
| Zone B of Somerset | |
| Council's adopted Parking | |
| | |

| the principle of the | |
|------------------------------|--|
| No objection is raised to | |
| | |
| Drainage | |
| | |
| condition. | |
| details can be secured by | |
| It is accepted that these | |
| with EV charging facilities. | |
| properties to be provided | |
| requirement for all | |
| property. There is also a | |
| be provided for each | |
| space per bedroom should | |
| parking equivalent to 1 | |
| secure, covered cycle | |
| the SPS it is expected that | |
| charging facilities. Under | |
| cycle parking or EV | |
| provided in relation to | |
| No details have been | |
| combined length of 10.5m. | |
| these will need to be a | |
| parking spaces are used | |
| Where 2 longitudinal | |
| 'up and over' garage door. | |
| wall 5.5m, or 6.0m when an | |
| when in front of a boundary | |
| minimum of 5.0m long, | |
| are expected to be a | |
| be noted that parking bays | |
| and size however it should | |
| concerns in terms of layout | |
| details raise no particular | |
| Zone B. The submitted | |
| parking recommended for | |
| accord with the level of | |
| which appears to generally | |
| plan has been provided | |
| the submission a parking | |
| Strategy (SPS). As part of | |

| proposed surface water | |
|------------------------------|---|
| management strategy, | |
| which relates to both the | |
| existing public highway | |
| fronting the development | |
| and the proposed access | |
| roads serving the | |
| development, however the | |
| following observations are | |
| made to inform any | |
| subsequent detailed | |
| design: | |
| 1. As the site falls towards | |
| Doniford Road then it is | |
| critical that all surface | |
| water run-off up to the | |
| exceedance event is | |
| prevented from | |
| discharging onto the public | |
| highway. High-capacity | |
| gullies will therefore be | |
| required at the junction of | |
| the new access road onto | |
| Doniford Road to achieve | |
| this. | |
| 2. The site survey | |
| information would indicate | |
| the presence of potentially | |
| both a foul and surface | |
| water drainage system | |
| within Normandy Avenue | |
| which could potentially be | |
| severed by the new | |
| residential access road. | |
| Further intrusive | |
| investigations should be | |
| undertaken to determine | |
| the extent of any such | |
| drainage systems and to | |
| what extent they may need | |
| to be lowered, protected, or | |
| | 1 |

| | ··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | diverted to accommodate | |
| | the construction of the new | |
| | residential access road. | |
| | 3. Further surface water | |
| | drainage provision will be | |
| | required within Normandy | |
| | Avenue to prevent the | |
| | discharge of surface water | |
| | run-off from this private | |
| | road out onto the new | |
| | residential access road. | |
| | 4. It is noted that the | |
| | attenuation ponds are | |
| | located in close proximity | |
| | to both new residential | |
| | access roads and the | |
| | retained access track | |
| | serving Liddymore Farm | |
| | and as such the designer | |
| | will therefore need to | |
| | assess the safety and | |
| | structural stability | |
| | implications of that | |
| | proposal. These ponds | |
| | should be offset as much | |
| | as is possible from the | |
| | roads/access tracks to | |
| | minimise these | |
| | implications. | |
| | | |
| | Conditions recommended. | |
| Landscape | Original Objection: | The comments and queries |
| | | have been addressed by |
| | SUMMARY | the applicant and matters |
| | These landscape | are discussed in the |
| | comments are in addition | assessment. |
| | to comments made by the | |
| | Council's Placemaking | |
| | Officer, which identify | |
| | issues that are also | |
| | | |
| | landscape concerns. These | |

| | L |
|---|--|
| С | comments aim to expand |
| C | on landscape concerns, |
| a | and hopefully don't repeat |
| t | oo much of what has |
| a | already been said in terms |
| с | of placemaking. |
| 1 | 1. Design Approach / |
| | Constraints |
| 1 | • The proposed layout is |
| | rather strange. It |
| | doesn't follow what |
| | would generally be |
| | considered to be a |
| | good approach to |
| | design and |
| | placemaking, as it |
| | seems to jar with the |
| | existing neighbouring |
| | development to the |
| | east – having no |
| | regard to its form and |
| | concept. I can only |
| | think that there are |
| | reasons that have led |
| | to the outcome that |
| | have not been |
| | explained fully in the |
| | Design and Access |
| | Statement. I was not |
| | involved at outline |
| | stage and so I am |
| | afraid that I am |
| | assessing the |
| | proposals based on the |
| | information in front of |
| | me. Unfortunately, the |
| | Design and Access |
| | Statement doesn't |
| | |
| | justify the design. This needs to be addressed |
| | |
| | and is probably dealt |

| | with best via a | |
|----|----------------------------|--|
| | meeting. | |
| 12 | . Concept | |
| 2. | The design lacks a | |
| | concept that makes | |
| | sense of residential | |
| | development in what is | |
| | an outer extreme limb | |
| | of Watchet. The design | |
| | adopts very urban | |
| | solutions that are | |
| | inappropriate for such | |
| | a settlement edge | |
| | location. | |
| 13 | Access | |
| 3. | With regard to the site | |
| | entrance, it is noted | |
| | that the entrance from | |
| | Doniford Lane was | |
| | approved at outline | |
| | stage, however, it | |
| | makes no sense, in | |
| | landscape and | |
| | placemaking terms, to | |
| | create a new point of | |
| | access rather than | |
| | using the existing | |
| | entrance into Alamein | |
| | Avenue which serves | |
| | the existing residential | |
| | Ū. | |
| | development to the | |
| | east. Using this | |
| | entrance would avoid | |
| | the need to remove a | |
| | large section of the | |
| | roadside boundary | |
| | hedge in order to | |
| | create a visibility splay, | |
| | as well as introducing | |
| | a second entrance of | |
| | Doniford Lane that | |

| | | |
|---------|------------------------------|--|
| | would add to the | |
| | urbanising of its | |
| | generally rural | |
| | character. If there is | |
| | no justifiable reason | |
| | for the need for an | |
| | independent access | |
| | then the site should be | |
| | accessed via Alamein | |
| | Avenue. | |
| | 14. Layout / Design | |
| | The positioning of | |
| | the built | |
| | development within | |
| | the redline area | |
| | makes sense – | |
| | avoiding higher | |
| | ground, however, the | |
| | layout is: overly | |
| | regimented series | |
| | of cul-de-sacs; that | |
| | lacks a sense of | |
| | there being a | |
| | "place", point of | |
| | arrival, or focus for | |
| | the development; is | |
| | overly dominated by | |
| | the highway; and | |
| | has a grain, scale, | |
| | density, and | |
| | building typology | |
| | that is overly even | |
| | throughout the site. | |
| | - | |
| | The development is | |
| | clearly not tenure blind. | |
| | | |
| | There are no | |
| | concessions to the | |
| | site being in a | |
| | settlement edge | |
| | location and as such | |

| | it does not adhere | |
|----|---------------------------|--|
| | to the guidance as | |
| | set out on page 27 / | |
| | 28 of the district | |
| | | |
| | wide design guide | |
| | SPD. | |
| | https://www.somers | |
| | etwestandtaunton.g | |
| | ov.uk/media/3285/d | |
| | istrictwide-design- | |
| | guide-adopted- | |
| | dec2021.pdf | |
| 4. | | |
| | that the layout not only | |
| | looks at Watchet Town | |
| | for reference but also, | |
| | particularly at the | |
| | edges and key spaces, | |
| | takes cues from the | |
| | West Somerset village | |
| | character and reflects | |
| | a <u>contemporary</u> | |
| | interpretation of | |
| | settlement /building/ | |
| | spatial typologies | |
| | found in a rural | |
| | context. Such | |
| | typologies include: | |
| | terraced cottages | |
| | directly abutting the | |
| | street with private | |
| | hidden domestic | |
| | curtilages, Edwardian | |
| | villas, farmsteads, (with | |
| | traditional and | |
| | contemporary barns). | |
| | See the district wide | |
| | design guide SPD. | |
| | Regard should be | |
| | given in particular to | |
| | spatial arrangement, | |
| | spanaranangemeni, | |

| | the juxtaposition of | |
|----|--------------------------|--|
| | blocks to create | |
| | spaces, and informal | |
| | layout for highways and | |
| | parking. Boundary | |
| | treatment is also of key | |
| | consideration and | |
| | provides a useful | |
| | linking feature to the | |
| | surrounding context. | |
| 5. | The precedent building | |
| | typologies and | |
| | characteristics | |
| | referenced in the | |
| | Design and Access | |
| | Statement that | |
| | supports the | |
| | application, do not | |
| | reflect what could be | |
| | considered to be the | |
| | best or the most | |
| | distinctive character of | |
| | the context, and instead | |
| | reflect stereotypical | |
| | building materials and | |
| | details that suit volume | |
| | house building, whereas | |
| | the precedents | |
| | suggested in the | |
| | outline Design and | |
| | Access Statement – | |
| | shown in figure 1 - and | |
| | include forms, patterns | |
| | and materials that | |
| | reflect what is good and | |
| | characteristic of the | |
| | context. This pallet of | |
| | building types needs to | |
| | be revisited, but also | |
| | | |
| | expanded upon by | |
| | looking at West | |

| Somerset villages and |
|---------------------------|
| not just Watchet. |
| 6. It is noted that stone |
| elevations are shown. |
| This is welcomed on |
| the understanding that |
| the stone is natural |
| local stone and not |
| reconstituted. Small |
| amounts of local stone |
| and render would be |
| preferable to large |
| amounts of |
| reconstituted stone. |
| 15. Connectivity |
| 7. Although it is noted |
| that there are routes to |
| the shops and school |
| etc, these routes do |
| not "drive" the layout |
| and place emphasis on |
| active travel as it |
| should. |
| 8. There are no |
| connections with |
| Donniford Road, where |
| a connection would be |
| of benefit, not only |
| accessing the coast |
| and coast path from |
| the site, but also |
| providing access for |
| residents living off |
| Mariners Way and |
| Helwell Street to the |
| hilltop park. A 4m wide |
| tarmac surfaced path |
| should be provided to |
| serve mixed uses and |
| a gentle gradient |
| should be achieved. |
| שייש של ארווביבע. |

| 9. | The paths shown |
|-----|--|
| | within the public open |
| | space are shown as |
| | being gravel. Whereas |
| | this would be |
| | acceptable for some |
| | paths, the major circuit |
| | connections should be |
| | smooth and provide a |
| | dry path surface in all |
| | weathers. A 4m wide |
| | mixed-use path is |
| | recommended. |
| 10 | . There is too much |
| | reliance on grass |
| | paths. The grass paths |
| | shown should be |
| | |
| | gravel, and the gravel |
| | paths shown should be |
| 10 | bituminous macadam. |
| | Landscape proposals |
| 11. | The character of the |
| | proposed park reads |
| | as being too urban. |
| | The public open |
| | spaces should aim to |
| | provide lots of paths |
| | and routes of different |
| | lengths for recreation, |
| | as well as places to sit |
| | at a minimum of 200m |
| | distance, but this |
| | should be in a country |
| | park character. |
| 12 | The character of the |
| | proposed tree planting |
| | is too urban. Tree and |
| | shrub planting should |
| | |
| | . – |
| | be established through forestry techniques – |

| | size transplants at 2m |
|----|---------------------------|
| | centres, in clumps, |
| | · · · |
| | rather than using |
| | standard trees dotted |
| | about. The proposals |
| | need to give an |
| | indication of the |
| | spatial character that |
| | will be created by the |
| | tree and shrub planting |
| | by demarcating (in the |
| | graphics) vegetation |
| | that will have a raised |
| | canopy and which bits |
| | are mass at eye level. |
| 13 | 3. The plan also needs to |
| | include contours. |
| 1/ | 4. Consideration needs to |
| 14 | |
| | be given as to how the |
| | area will be used by |
| | people exercising their |
| | dogs, secure fencing |
| | needs to be provided, |
| | with areas where dogs |
| | can be allowed to |
| | exercise freely. |
| 15 | 5. The orchard is not an |
| | orchard but a group of |
| | trees. The |
| | incorporation of a |
| | traditional orchard |
| | would be positive for |
| | landscape character; |
| | however, the trees |
| | would need to cover a |
| | much larger area, with |
| | trees on standard |
| | (M25) rootstock, |
| | |
| | planted on a regular |
| | 10m grid. |
| | 5. With regard to the |

| | ecological area, it may | |
|-----|--------------------------|--|
| | be more appropriate to | |
| | manage the land as a | |
| | traditional orchard. | |
| | Access should be | |
| | prohibited, otherwise | |
| | the resultant character | |
| | is that of undervalued, | |
| | waste land, that results | |
| | in its abuse. | |
| 17. | SUDS needs to be | |
| | designed with input | |
| | from a landscape | |
| | architect. There is a | |
| | need to see a more | |
| | detailed plan with | |
| | contours that shows | |
| | how planting and | |
| | topography will work to | |
| | create a place that is | |
| | attractive, safe, and | |
| | usable. Details (in the | |
| | form of elevations) | |
| | need to be provided of | |
| | the water entry and | |
| | exit points. Structures | |
| | | |
| | need to avoid being | |
| | too engineered/ urban | |
| | in their solution. Cross | |
| | sections need to be | |
| | provided that | |
| | demonstrate that the | |
| | slope is safe and | |
| | usable and makes use | |
| | of vegetation on steep | |
| | sections and is also | |
| | used to assimilates | |
| | water entry and exit | |
| | points. It is noted that | |
| | the there is an | |
| | intention for the | |

| attenuation areas to |
|-----------------------------|
| hold water at all times, |
| this is positive, |
| however there is |
| concern that the |
| attenuation areas are |
| at the edge of the site |
| and do not appear to |
| provide any |
| recreational enjoyment |
| /engagement. |
| |
| 18. Planting in general |
| There is no sense that |
| planting throughout the |
| scheme has been |
| considered as a |
| positive green |
| infrastructure corridor, |
| and instead the |
| planting has been fitted |
| around a development |
| layout filling in left over |
| space. There are trees |
| dotted through the |
| residential areas but |
| they do not provide the |
| connectivity tor network |
| that is desired. |
| Although it is clear that |
| there has been some |
| professional landscape |
| input in some areas, |
| strategic landscape |
| input is lacking. |
| Tofe constitute to constant |
| |
| on the approach being |
| taken to tree planting – |
| it is recommended that |
| all trees are container |
| grown specimens, |

| | planted at smaller sizes | |
|---|--|--|
| | so as to achieve better | |
| | establishment. | |
| • | Species should help | |
| | reinforce a rural | |
| | character suited to the | |
| | more rural context and | |
| | not urbanise the site | |
| | with overly exotic | |
| | species and street tree | |
| | forms. | |
| • | Ideally, street trees | |
| | should be avoided in | |
| | favour of occasional | |
| | individual trees or | |
| | clumps. Trees would be | |
| | best established in | |
| | hedges. Hedges should | |
| | be used widely. | |
| • | The landscape | |
| | proposals envisage an | |
| | approach that delivers | |
| | a finished landscape | |
| | with feature trees. This | |
| | is unrealistic, instead | |
| | planting needs to be | |
| | achieved through | |
| | management as well as | |
| | planting. Feature trees | |
| | need to be achieved | |
| | through a large number | |
| | of trees being planted | |
| | and then thinned. The | |
| | need for staked, over | |
| | , | |
| | large, heavy standard trees should be avoided | |
| | | |
| | because invariably | |
| | events lead to some | |
| | becoming out of plum | |
| | which gives rise to a | |
| | shabby appearance. | |

| 17 | Construction methods | ; |
|----|---|---|
| | / soil management | • |
| | Assurance needs to be | |
| | provided that the | |
| | development of the site | |
| | • | : |
| | will result in the least | |
| | amount of disturbance | |
| | to the soil, and that | |
| | there is limited need to | |
| | dispose of material off | |
| | site. To this end, it is | |
| | recommended that a | |
| | plan is provided that | |
| | sets out: which areas | |
| | will be disturbed, the | |
| | existing and proposed | |
| | ground levels, where | |
| | retaining walls will be | |
| | situated, and evidence | |
| | that's sets out the cut | |
| | and fill is in balance. | |
| 10 | | |
| 10 | . More specific | |
| | comments that relate | |
| | to the Landscape | _ |
| | Masterplan. (Should be | |
| | read in conjunction with | ו |
| | the marked-up plans | |
| | below and not | |
| | withstanding earlier | |
| | comments.) | |
| 19 | The location of the | |
| | pumpstation requires | |
| | that the structure is | |
| | concealed and detailed | k |
| | in a way that is | |
| | sympathetic to the | |
| | rural context to the | |
| | south and east. This | |
| | may be better | |
| | accessed from the site | |
| | rather than the | |
| | | |

| | entrance from Doniford | |
|-----|--------------------------|--|
| | Lane. Security fencing | |
| | should be avoided in | |
| | favour of stone walls. | |
| 20. | The Doniford Lane | |
| | boundary should be | |
| | formed from a large | |
| | hedge bank planted | |
| | with native hedge | |
| | species. The bank | |
| | should be to a | |
| | minimum of 1.2m high | |
| | and 1.2m wide. The | |
| | hedge should comprise | |
| | a double staggered | |
| | row of mixed native | |
| | species including a | |
| | minimum of 15% holly | |
| | and should be | |
| | managed to form an | |
| | effective screen by | |
| | being flailed twice per | |
| | year. The hedge should | |
| | be established through | |
| | being allowed to grow | |
| | in 25cm stages until it | |
| | is 3m above ground | |
| | level. The hedge bank | |
| | should sweep into the | |
| | site - see below. Where | |
| | the hedge bank nears | |
| | built development or | |
| | ends, it should morph | |
| | into a stone-faced | |
| | hedge bank and then | |
| | stone wall. Again, the | |
| | stone should be | |
| | natural local stone. | |
| | Hedgerow trees (oaks) | |
| | should be set within | |
| | | |
| | the hedge at 10m | |

| | centres. | |
|----|----------------------------|--|
| 2 | 1. Tree planting along the | |
| | main highway is overly | |
| | tight to hard surfaces | |
| | and will require to be | |
| | planted in crates or the | |
| | design modified to | |
| | provide more space – | |
| | the latter would be | |
| | preferable. Street trees | |
| | are best avoided in | |
| | what is a rural context. | |
| 2 | 2. The development is | |
| | tight to the boundary | |
| | and leaves very little | |
| | room between built | |
| | development and | |
| | neighbouring property, | |
| | as well as being oddly | |
| | juxtaposed to it. | |
| 2 | 3. Contours need to be | |
| 2 | shown on the layout | |
| | and it would be helpful | |
| | if any retaining wall | |
| | could be indicated. | |
| | | |
| ľ | 9. Plot boundary | |
| | treatment – further | |
| | information needs to be | |
| | provided on the | |
| | boundary materials – | |
| | apologies if these have | |
| | been overlooked. | |
| s | econdary comments | |
| c | onfirmed some matters | |
| a | ddressed and requested | |
| fu | urther clarification. | |
| F | urther comments: | |
| M | le continue to ask for a | |

| path/cycle route to be | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| provided to connect with | |
| Doniford Road (north of | |
| site) through the hilltop | |
| park. There appears to be | |
| an existing cut through on | |
| the arial photo, figure 1 and | |
| there would appear to be | |
| room between the last unit | |
| see figure 2. Some | |
| provision for a connection | |
| needs to be made on the | |
| land in control of the | |
| developer to allow possible | |
| future connection even if | |
| the council needs to serve | |
| a CPO to make the final | |
| connection. | |
| The amendments to the | |
| layout are noted, and in so | |
| far as we are being asked | |
| to judge the scheme in | |
| plan form only and with no | |
| details, the issues raised | |
| appear to have been | |
| addressed. | |
| Where are the key | |
| buildings and key | |
| groupings? | |
| Where is unit 81? | |
| There is a lack of | |
| information with regard to | |
| landscape treatment, | |
| however it is appreciated | |
| that the detail can come | |
| | |
| later. However, further | |
| reassurance needs to be | |
| given as to the scope and | |
| quality of the landscape | |
| proposals and it is | |
| recommended that this | |

| 1 | |
|------------------------------|--|
| could be provided in the | |
| form of a landscape | |
| strategy, setting out: the | |
| purpose for the planting | |
| (assimilation of dev, | |
| screening from road, | |
| softening of SUD's, etc); | |
| including information on | |
| the approach to planting; | |
| and information on long | |
| term management (it | |
| might be better to work | |
| backwards from a vision of | |
| the site after 50 years, and | |
| what works are being | |
| carried out to deliver this. | |
| It is recommended that, | |
| other than in regard to tree | |
| planting in close | |
| proximity to built | |
| development where | |
| standard trees will be | |
| acceptable, and other | |
| minor exceptions, that tree | |
| planting should aim to be | |
| achieved through planting | |
| of 90 -120cm tall | |
| transplants or small | |
| feathered trees using | |
| forestry techniques of | |
| planting at 2m centres and | |
| then thinning over time, | |
| rather than using amenity | |
| landscape techniques and | |
| that standard trees should | |
| be avoided. In this way the | |
| planting will look less | |
| urban. Species mix should | |
| aim at being rural in | |
| character. Although this | |
| does not mean all native. | |
| | |

| With regard to the park. it | |
|------------------------------|--|
| would be preferable for the | |
| whole area to be a | |
| traditional orchard, made | |
| up of standard (form) trees, | |
| planting on a 10m grid | |
| pattern in the manner | |
| illustrated in marked up | |
| plan figure 3 below. With | |
| the paths and play areas | |
| inserted and with trees | |
| removed from the grid | |
| where necessary. In this | |
| way the orchard will truly | |
| be a positive bold element | |
| and help reinforce positive | |
| landscape characteristics, | |
| whist also being beautiful | |
| and a great place for play | |
| and with a large | |
| recreational user carrying | |
| capacity. | |
| Greater info on boundary | |
| treatments, including all | |
| areas seen from public | |
| realm to be walling not | |
| close-boarded fencing. | |
| The treatment of the | |
| | |
| frontage onto Doniford | |
| Road (east of the site) is | |
| accepted, although greater | |
| use of chimneys to | |
| frontage and along main | |
| road is required. | |
| Does Normandy Avenue | |
| link to Alamein Avenue, | |
| what is the treatment? | |
| There is a lack of | |
| reassurance regarding the | |
| character of the suds. | |
| These areas should read as | |

| | natural and not just long linear forms. Further information is required, such as contours showing banks with varying slopes; planting, with planting extending into wet areas and aquatics. Also need to be shown with scenarios of different water levels Boundary treatments plan needed. Is the stream running across the road? | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Housing Enabling Officer | No objection following revised proposals: The developer is required to deliver 35% affordable homes on this site under the signed S106 Agreement (dated 9th June 2021), with 60% of the units to be social rent and 40% shared ownership. We note the Reserved Matters application confirms No.49 of the total No.139 homes being proposed will be affordable housing units. This meets the required 35%. | NOted. the AH provision is to be controlled through the s106 Agreement and further dialogue with the Council to satisfy the applicants legal obligations in this regard. |
| | Affordable Layout drawing, reference (A0) DRNO 104 REV B, (uploaded to the planning portal on 2nd | |

| January 2024) includes the | |
|------------------------------|--|
| revised accommodation | |
| schedule. | |
| The overall tenure mix | |
| proposed is: | |
| Social Rent | |
| 4 x 4-bed houses | |
| 4 x 3-bed houses | |
| 3 x 3-bed bungalows | |
| 6 x 2-bed houses | |
| 1 x 2-bed flat over garage | |
| 4 x 2-bed apartments | |
| 2 x 1-bed apartments | |
| 8 x 1-bed Monnow type | |
| apartments | |
| The affordable units are | |
| integrated across the | |
| development with a mix of | |
| property types and sizes | |
| reflecting the housing need | |
| requirements. The | |
| affordable housing is not | |
| considered to be visually | |
| distinguishable from the | |
| - | |
| market housing on site. | |
| The dwelling sizes have | |
| been assessed and plans | |
| show the affordable houses | |
| either meet or exceed the | |
| minimum internal floor | |
| space requirements. | |
| All affordable homes have | |
| at least 2 parking spaces, | |
| the exception being those | |
| homes with 1-bedroom. | |
| The distribution of visitor | |
| parking spaces could be | |
| improved as the majority | |
| are located in the top third | |
| the development. | |
| Service charges should | |

| | [| |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | reflect the necessity to keep these properties affordable. It is recommended that any service charges should be calculated on a per metre square basis rather than per unit. In accordance with the S106 agreement, the affordable housing scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Development Enabling Specialist at Somerset Council – West. Active engagement with the Development Enabling Specialist to agree the affordable housing provision is recommended. All affordable homes are required to be let or sold in accordance with the terms of the S106 Planning Agreement dated 17 March 2020. The developer should seek to provide the Housing Association tied units from Somerset Council – West's preferred affordable housing development | |
| | | |
| Avon & Somerset Police | No objection. Crime Statistics – reported crime for the area of this proposed development (within | Comments noted and addressed where possible in the design. |

| 500 metre radius of the | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| | |
| grid reference) during the | |
| last 12 months is as | |
| follows: - | |
| Arson & Criminal Damage | |
| - 1 Offence | |
| Theft – 1 Offence | |
| Violence Against the | |
| Person – 3 Offences | |
| Total – 5 Offences | |
| ASB reports for the same | |
| area and period total 3. | |
| Compliance Statement – at | |
| para.3.2 headed | |
| 'Community Safety' states | |
| that the design | |
| incorporates the principles | |
| of 'Secured by Design' and | |
| lists several bullet | |
| points in this regard which | |
| I agree with and support. | |
| This indicates to me that | |
| the applicant has taken | |
| some account of designing | |
| out crime in respect of this | |
| development. I comment | |
| further on these bullet | |
| points and other aspects of | |
| designing out crime below. | |
| Layout of Roads & | |
| Footpaths – vehicular and | |
| pedestrian routes appear | |
| to be visually open and | |
| | |
| direct and are likely to be | |
| well used enabling good | |
| resident surveillance of the | |
| street and public open | |
| spaces. The use of physical | |
| or | |
| psychological features i.e., | |
| surface changes by colour | |

| or texture, rumble strips | |
|------------------------------|--|
| and similar features within | |
| the development helps | |
| reinforce defensible space | |
| giving the | |
| impression that the area is | |
| private and deterring | |
| unauthorised access. The | |
| single primary vehicular | |
| entrance/exit to the | |
| development, has | |
| advantages over through | |
| roads in that this can | |
| disrupt the search and | |
| escape patterns of the | |
| potential criminal. | |
| Orientation of Dwellings – | |
| all dwellings should be | |
| positioned facing one | |
| another, which allows | |
| neighbours to easily view | |
| their surroundings and | |
| makes the potential | |
| criminal more vulnerable to | |
| detection. A large | |
| proportion of the dwellings | |
| are also | |
| oriented back-to-back, | |
| which is also | |
| advantageous, as this | |
| helps restrict unlawful | |
| access to the rear of | |
| dwellings which is where | |
| most burglaries occur. | |
| Bullet point | |
| 3.2.2 in the DCS states that | |
| this advice will be | |
| | |
| complied with. | |
| Dwelling Boundaries – it is | |
| important that all | |
| boundaries between public | |

| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| and private space are | |
| clearly defined, and it is | |
| desirable that dwelling | |
| frontages are kept open to | |
| view to assist resident | |
| surveillance of the street | |
| and public areas, so walls, | |
| fences, hedges at the front | |
| of dwellings should be kept | |
| low, maximum height 1 | |
| metre, to assist this. More | |
| vulnerable areas such as | |
| exposed side and rear | |
| gardens need more robust | |
| defensive measures such | |
| as walls, fences, or hedges | |
| to a minimum height of 1.8 | |
| metres. Gates providing | |
| access to rear gardens | |
| should be the same height | |
| as adjacent fencing and | |
| lockable. Bullet points 3.2.4 | |
| & 5 in the DCS states that | |
| this advice will be | |
| complied with. | |
| Rear Access Footpaths – | |
| • | |
| the development | |
| incorporates some rear | |
| access footpaths and, | |
| where essential for access | |
| and refuse disposal | |
| purposes, the footpath | |
| should be gated at the | |
| front building line of the | |
| dwellings to deter | |
| unauthorised | |
| access e.g., between Plots | |
| 28 & 29. | |
| Vehicle Parking – is a | |
| mixture of on-plot garages | |
| and parking spaces, which | |

| is the recommended | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| option, communal on- | |
| street parking spaces and | |
| small rear mews courts. | |
| The communal on street | |
| parking spaces are limited | |
| in number, close and | |
| adjacent to homes they | |
| serve, well overlooked from | |
| dwellings with allocated | |
| parking | |
| spaces, which is also | |
| recommended. Rear | |
| parking courts are | |
| discouraged as they | |
| introduce access to the | |
| vulnerable rear elevations | |
| of dwellings. Such | |
| courtyards can | |
| also be left unlit and | |
| encourage anti-social | |
| behaviour affecting the | |
| rear of dwellings | |
| and parked vehicles. | |
| However, some of the rear | |
| parking courts appear to | |
| be overlooked from | |
| dwellings within them e.g., | |
| Plots 54-58 which is | |
| recommended for | |
| this type of parking. | |
| Communal Areas – have | |
| | |
| the potential to generate | |
| crime, the fear of crime | |
| and antisocial behaviour | |
| and should be designed to | |
| allow supervision from | |
| nearby dwellings with safe | |
| routes for users to come | |
| and go. In this regard, I | |
| have some | |

| concerns regarding the | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| location of the proposed | |
| LEAP at the northern edge | |
| of the development | |
| adjacent to Hilltop Park. It | |
| is visible from several | |
| dwellings to the south | |
| but children using it are | |
| potentially vulnerable from | |
| any offender in the vicinity | |
| of Hilltop Park. From a | |
| safeguarding children | |
| perspective, I recommend | |
| relocating the | |
| LEAP to a more central | |
| location with good all- | |
| round surveillance from | |
| dwellings. | |
| Landscaping/Planting – | |
| should not impede | |
| opportunities for natural | |
| surveillance and wayfinding | |
| and must avoid creating | |
| potential hiding places. As | |
| a general | |
| recommendation, where | |
| good visibility is needed, | |
| shrubs should be selected | |
| which have a mature | |
| growth height of no more | |
| than 1 metre and trees | |
| should be of the open- | |
| branched columnar variety | |
| devoid of foliage below 2 | |
| metres, so allowing a 1 | |
| metre clear field of vision. | |
| This is particularly relevant | |
| in respect of the LEAP, | |
| Formal Seating Area, | |
| Orchard Area, and any | |
| other areas of POS. | |
| טנווכו מובמז טו דעז. | |

| Access Control (Apartment | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | |
| Further comments: | |
| | |
| dwellings. | |
| security of | |
| crime and the physical | |
| regarding designing out | |
| comprehensive guidance | |
| - which provides further | |
| www.securedbydesign.com | |
| - | |
| Secured by Design website | |
| guide available on the | |
| 'SBD Homes 2019' design | |
| advised to refer to the | |
| granted, the applicant is | |
| if planning permission is | |
| Secured by Design (SBD) - | |
| or equivalent. | |
| to PAS24 security standard | |
| rooflights must be tested | |
| accessible windows and | |
| and ground floor or easily | |
| entrance doorsets) | |
| communal and flat | |
| dwelling (including | |
| a means of access into a | |
| external doorsets providing | |
| Building Regulations, all | |
| Security – Dwellings, of | |
| Approved Document Q: | |
| Dwellings – to comply with | |
| Physical Security of | |
| BS 5489:2020. | |
| areas should comply with | |
| footpaths and car parking | |
| private estate roads and | |
| highways and footpaths, | |
| lighting for adopted | |

| Block) – the block | |
|------------------------------|--|
| incorporates front and rear | |
| communal entrances into a | |
| communal lobby and the | |
| security of the | |
| development is enhanced | |
| by deterring casual entry | |
| by non-residents, so an | |
| appropriate form of access | |
| control and visitor door | |
| entry system connected to | |
| each flat should be | |
| installed for use by | |
| residents and visitors e.g | |
| proximity fob, swipe card | |
| or similar. A tradesman | |
| button should be excluded | |
| as these have been shown | |
| to result in ASB and enable | |
| unlawful access to the | |
| building. The block | |
| incorporates substantial | |
| internal Bike and Bin | |
| | |
| Stores, which is | |
| recommended, and which | |
| should be lockable to deter | |
| theft of pedal cycles and | |
| misuse of | |
| wheelie bins for climbing | |
| or arson. Communal areas | |
| of the block i.e. lobby, | |
| stairs, landing should have | |
| 24-hour lighting. | |
| Frome Unit (Type 1) – these | |
| units comprise a flat over a | |
| drive-through, which | |
| enables access to an | |
| internal ground floor Bin & | |
| Bike Store. Bearing in mind | |
| the flat above, the double | |
| door access to this store | |
| the flat above, the double | |

| 1 | |
|--|--|
| should be of substantial | |
| construction and lockable | |
| to prevent any risk of theft | |
| of cycles and misuse of | |
| wheelie bins for climbing | |
| or arson. | |
| Doorsets complying with | |
| PAS 24 security standard | |
| are recommended for this | |
| store. | |
| Frome Unit (Type 2) – I | |
| have some concerns | |
| regarding the security of | |
| these units which | |
| comprise a flat over | |
| carport which are open to | |
| the front and rear, meaning | |
| that parked | |
| vehicles in the carports are | |
| out of sight of owners and | |
| potentially vulnerable to | |
| theft and vandalism. I am | |
| also aware of incidents | |
| | |
| where other property stored in under croft | |
| | |
| carports has been set on | |
| fire causing serious risk to | |
| the occupants of the flat | |
| above. I recommend any | |
| such carports be fully | |
| enclosed and secured at | |
| the front by a suitable | |
| garage door. | |
| Frome Unit (Type 3) – | |
| Similar to Type 2, although | |
| these carports are | |
| enclosed at the rear, | |
| they are also open at the | |
| front and for the same | |
| reasons should also be | |
| secured by a | |

| | garage door. | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| SCC - Ecologist | Requested that further information be submitted to address conditions on Outline application. | The discharge of Condition 9 and requirement to submit further information is a separate process to the considerations of the Reserved Matters. The applicant will submit the required infomration in order to address the ecology conditions on the Outline separately. |
| Somerset County Council - | No objection subject to | Noted. Conditions also |
| flooding & drainage | conditions following submission of further information. | applied to Outline permission that will control drainage engineering and flood risk impacts. |
| | Conditions required to confirm details of future Management Company and to address connections to WSessex Water infrastructure. | Additional conditions regarding will be added. |
| Rights of Way Protection Officer | No objection: We can confirm that there is a public right of way (PROW) recorded on the Definitive Map that runs through the site (public footpath WL 28/21) at the present time. I have attached a plan for your information. I have not visited the site. The Definitive Map and Statement are legally conclusive of the existence and status of those public rights of way | Noted. Advisory note to be added as requested. |

| they are not conclusive as | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| to what they | |
| omit. Therefore, the fact | |
| that a right does not | |
| appear either on the Map | |
| and Statement, | |
| does not necessarily mean | |
| that it does not exist. | |
| 1. Specific Comments | |
| Surface improvements to | |
| and the crossing point of | |
| path WL 28/21 over the | |
| proposed access | |
| road should be secured | |
| through a s106 agreement | |
| and can be technically | |
| approved under | |
| a s38 adoption agreement. | |
| In the event that there is | |
| not a s38 agreement, then | |
| a separate | |
| s278 agreement will be | |
| required. | |
| 2. General Comments | |
| | |
| Any proposed works must | |
| not encroach onto the | |
| width of the PROW. | |
| The following bold text | |
| must be included as an | |
| informative note on any | |
| permission granted: | |
| Development, insofar as it | |
| affects the rights of way | |
| should not be started, and | |
| the rights of way should be | |
| kept open for public use | |
| until the necessary Order | |
| (temporary 2 | |
| closure/stopping | |
| up/diversion) or other | |
| authorisation has come | |

| • • • • • • • | |
|------------------------------|---|
| into effect/ been | |
| granted. Failure to comply | |
| with this request may | |
| result in the developer | |
| being prosecuted if the | |
| path is built on or | |
| otherwise interfered with. | |
| The health and safety of | |
| the public using the PROW | |
| must be taken into | |
| consideration | |
| during works to carry out | |
| the proposed development. | |
| Somerset County Council | |
| (SCC) has | |
| maintenance | |
| responsibilities for the | |
| surface of a PROW, but | |
| only to a standard suitable | |
| for the public use. SCC will | |
| not be responsible for | |
| putting right any damage | |
| occurring to the | |
| surface of a PROW | |
| | |
| resulting from vehicular | |
| use during or after works to | |
| carry out the | |
| proposal. It should be | |
| noted that it is an offence | |
| to drive a vehicle along a | |
| public footpath, | |
| public bridleway or | |
| restricted byway unless the | |
| driver has lawful authority | |
| (private rights) | |
| to do so. | |
| If it is considered that the | |
| development would result | |
| in any of the outcomes | |
| listed below, then | |
| authorisation for these | |
| | 1 |

| | we also access to a second set | [] |
|---------------------|--|------------------------------|
| | works must be sought from | |
| | Somerset County Council | |
| | Rights of Way Group: | |
| | • A PROW being made less | |
| | convenient for continued | |
| | public use. | |
| | New furniture being | |
| | needed along a PROW. | |
| | • Installing any apparatus | |
| | within or across the PROW. | |
| | • Changes to the surface of | |
| | a PROW being needed. | |
| | Changes to the existing | |
| | drainage arrangements | |
| | associated with the | |
| | PROW. | |
| | If the work involved in | |
| | carrying out this proposed | |
| | development would: | |
| | • make a PROW less | |
| | convenient for continued | |
| | public use; or | |
| | • create a hazard to users | |
| | of a PROW, | |
| | then a temporary closure | |
| | | |
| | order will be necessary and a suitable alternative route | |
| | | |
| | must | |
| | be provided. | |
| Placemaking Officer | The site, situated to the | Noted. As discussed within |
| | south and east of Doniford | the report, the applicant's |
| | Road which abuts two parts | |
| | of the site, consists of | QRP design process and |
| | approximately 10 hectares | made numerous changes |
| | of agricultural land which | following consultation with |
| | comprises 5 irregular | Council Officer's. The final |
| | shaped fields crossing | design scheme is |
| | Normandy Avenue and | considered to be a |
| | abutting the defined urban | significant improvement |
| | edge of Watchet. The | upon the original and |
| | southern boundary of the | acceptable to Plannign |

| site partly adjoins Doniford | Officers as discussed |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Road as it sweeps from | within the report. |
| north to south along the | |
| eastern edge of the site. | |
| The reserved matters | |
| application proposes to | |
| locate the 139 dwellings | |
| that the outline application | |
| intended (Ref: | |
| 3/37/17/019), alongside | |
| supporting infrastructure | |
| that includes large areas of | |
| public open space that | |
| also accommodates a | |
| Local Equipped Area of | |
| Play, drainage features, | |
| access roads and | |
| landscaping. | |
| The proposed scheme fails | |
| to follow the advocated | |
| Design Process set out in | |
| the Council's adopted | |
| Districtwide Design Guide | |
| SPD, namely that a | |
| proposal should | |
| as part of their application | |
| carry out a Context | |
| Appraisal, Site Appraisal | |
| and Design Concept in | |
| order to demonstrate the | |
| thought process for | |
| • | |
| arriving at their | |
| proposed scheme. This | |
| logical process does not | |
| appear to have taken place | |
| and the design principles | |
| of the overall layout are | |
| fundamentally wrong and | |
| lacking in placemaking | |
| quality. | |
| The layout is a one long | |

| | [|
|-------------------------------|---|
| snaking cul-de-sac with a | |
| series of spur cul-de-sacs. | |
| This lacks perimeter blocks | |
| and vehicular and | |
| pedestrian/cycle | |
| connections with | |
| adjacent development. The | |
| proposed highway is | |
| standard estate road with | |
| one width of carriageway, | |
| standard pavements and | |
| sweeping corner radii that | |
| would merely encourage | |
| vehicular speeds. No effort | |
| has been made to consider | |
| the hierarchy of streets and | |
| places as set out in the | |
| Design Guide (Section 4.2) | |
| and this highways | |
| dominated scheme fails to | |
| provide any positive | |
| placemaking with an entry | |
| place, main place, parking | |
| squares, lanes etc. This | |
| layout would encourage | |
| car based movements and | |
| not active travel. | |
| The layout does not work | |
| with the existing road | |
| pattern and positively | |
| works against the grain of | |
| existing development with | |
| proposed housing not | |
| addressing existing road | |
| frontages or providing | |
| enclosure to create | |
| streetscape. The layout | |
| bisects Normandy drive | |
| - | |
| which abruptly stops with | |
| an awkward space between | |
| the existing and proposed | |

| road, which is likely to | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| become an informal | |
| crossover due to | |
| the need for connectivity. | |
| There are large areas of | |
| parking courts which would | |
| be anonymous and visually | |
| dominated by the parked | |
| car. | |
| The layout lacks any | |
| identity through clear | |
| identification of character | |
| areas, key groupings, key | |
| building, gateways, key | |
| frontages, termination of | |
| vistas etc. | |
| Overall it lacks any | |
| placemaking imagination | |
| and an identity. | |
| Buildings don't link | |
| together to provide any | |
| curvature and enclosure to | |
| the streetscenes and | |
| buildings are often | |
| awkwardly angled, in | |
| particular those on | |
| Alamein Avenue. The | |
| house types have no | |
| relevance to local | |
| vernacular forms | |
| which are more cottage | |
| rather than Georgian town | |
| house. The house types | |
| would greatly benefit from | |
| a local character study to | |
| inform both their form, | |
| plan form, architectural | |
| detailing and materials. | |
| Indeed, roofscape interest | |
| is entirely missed | |
| from the proposed house | |
| | <u> </u> |

| types and none of the | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| | |
| house houses effectively | |
| turn corners. | |
| The layout and buildings | |
| appear to have no vision | |
| for creating an identity for | |
| the place and this could | |
| easily pick up on some of | |
| the 'garden town' cues | |
| shown | |
| locally with groups of | |
| buildings set around green | |
| spaces etc. Equally | |
| buildings could be set | |
| around an informal village | |
| square with tight knit lanes | |
| enclosed by | |
| built form. | |
| The suburban anywhere | |
| layout and building types is | |
| also lacking in variation of | |
| density across the site | |
| which would be very | |
| repetitive. Affordable | |
| housing units | |
| are also not tenure blind | |
| and are associated with | |
| the large parking courts. | |
| No integrated play space | |
| appears to be provided | |
| within the scheme; | |
| peripheral | |
| play space would not | |
| provide adequate natural | |
| surveillance or easy walk | |
| distances. | |
| | |
| The proposed attenuation | |
| ponds are standard | |
| engineered forms and | |
| could be more integrated | |
| into the layout with rain | |

| gardens and more | |
|----------------------------|--|
| naturalised features. | |
| The established mature | |
| hedgerow to the front of | |
| the site would be removed | |
| the full width of the | |
| development parcel. This | |
| hedgerow is an important | |
| feature of the site and | |
| would benefit from being | |
| retained to better | |
| assimilate the | |
| development into | |
| the wider landscape. | |
| Far greater consideration | |
| also needs to be given to | |
| sustainable features such | |
| as PV's, EV charging, | |
| rainwater gardens, street | |
| trees, bike storage and | |
| recycling storage etc. | |
| In conclusion, this scheme | |
| fails to meet the standard | |
| of design required by the | |
| SWT Districtwide Design | |
| Guide and the | |
| requirements of section 12 | |
| of the NPPF which states | |
| at Para 126 'The creation | |
| of high quality, beautiful | |
| and sustainable | |
| | |
| buildings and places is | |
| fundamental to what the | |
| planning and development | |
| process should achieve. | |
| Good design is a key | |
| aspect of sustainable | |
| development, | |
| creates better places in | |
| which to live and work and | |
| helps make development | |

| | a a a su ta bla ta | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | acceptable to | |
| | communities'. | |
| | The size of this proposal | |
| | (above 50 housing units) | |
| | triggers the need for this | |
| | development to be | |
| | considered by the SWT | |
| | Quality Review Panel. | |
| Wessex Water Authority | No objection. | Noted. The outstanding |
| | | matters and technical |
| | Original comments: | design will be dealt with |
| | | through the discharge of |
| | Please find attached an | the drainage condition |
| | extract from our records | applied at the Outline |
| | showing the approximate | planning stage and through |
| | location of our apparatus | detailed discussions with |
| | in the vicinity of the site. | Wessex Water following the |
| | The applicant has | approval of Reserved |
| | indicated: | Matters and the |
| | "The northern foul water | agent/applicant |
| | catchment flows generated | understand this |
| | from the site will be | requirement. |
| | drained via | |
| | gravity to the west of the | |
| | site, connecting into the | |
| | existing foul sewer. The | |
| | • | |
| | existing | |
| | sewer in the northern | |
| | catchment will require | |
| | diversion to suit the new | |
| | proposed foul | |
| | sewer layout. Other areas | |
| | of the existing sewer will | |
| | require to be abandoned | |
| | as they cannot be diverted | |
| | to suit the new proposed | |
| | foul sewer layout. | |
| | The southern foul water | |
| | catchment flows generated | |
| | from the site will be | |
| | drained towards | |

| a foul pumping station | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| located to the southwest of | |
| the site. The pump station | |
| will then | |
| discharge and | |
| connect into to the gravity | |
| foul water system and | |
| discharge into the existing | |
| foul sewer." | |
| Drainage Strategy Sheet 1 | |
| shows the northern section | |
| of the residential area and | |
| sewers draining to an | |
| existing sewer crossing the | |
| site from west to east. The | |
| drawing shows a sewer | |
| diversion which has yet to | |
| be agreed by Wessex | |
| Water. The sewer serves | |
| | |
| dwellings in Cherry Tree | |
| Way. The current design | |
| will reduce the capacity of | |
| this sewer by abandoning a | |
| significant length due to | |
| diversion into the new on | |
| site sewers. The | |
| downstream on site sewers | |
| may require upsizing at the | |
| developer's cost to | |
| accommodate these | |
| additional flows. | |
| Drainage Strategy Sheet 2 | |
| shows the southern section | |
| of the site. The existing | |
| sewer serving properties in | |
| Normandy Avenue is not | |
| shown on either drawing. | |
| This sewer cannot be | |
| abandoned: the drawing | |
| must be amended to show | |
| how sewerage services to | |
| now severage services lo | |

| customers in Normandy | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Avenue can be maintained. | |
| It is not clear from Sheet 2 | |
| if all of this southern | |
| portion is to be served by | |
| the pumping | |
| station. Sewers must be | |
| added to the drawing to | |
| show how southernmost | |
| area is served. | |
| It is unclear how the | |
| pumping station is to be | |
| accessed by maintenance | |
| vehicles. Any | |
| access from the | |
| roundabout looks less than | |
| ideal. The applicant must | |
| supply a swept | |
| path analysis to prove safe | |
| access and exit from the | |
| pumping station by a | |
| 4000 Gallon | |
| Tanker. Grasscrete is not | |
| appropriate for use within | |
| the pumping station | |
| compound. | |
| The applicant must also | |
| prove safe access and exit | |
| from the roundabout into | |
| the pumping station. It | |
| must also be proven that | |
| there is access for fence | |
| maintenance between the | |
| compound and the swale. | |
| As the rising main is more | |
| than 50 metres in length | |
| septicity controls may be | |
| required. | |
| Where chemical dosing is | |
| required there are further | |
| pumping station | |
| | |

| requirements to | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| accommodate and secure | |
| additional equipment. | |
| Further details here | |
| https://www.wessexwater.c | |
| o.uk/services/building-and- | |
| developing/connecting-to- | |
| thepublic- | |
| sewerage-system/sewer- | |
| adoptions | |
| There must be no | |
| significant tree planting | |
| close to sewers or water | |
| mains. Details can | |
| be found on page 17 of the | |
| Design and Construction | |
| guide found here | |
| https://www.water.org.uk/se | |
| werage-sector-guidance- | |
| approved-documents/ | |
| The applicant has | |
| indicated surface water | |
| discharge to local land | |
| drainage. Elements | |
| of the on-site network can | |
| be offered to Wessex | |
| Water for adoption, further | |
| details can be found here | |
| https://www.wessexwater.c | |
| o.uk/- | |
| /media/files/wessexwater/s | |
| ervices/building-and- | |
| developing/suds-and- | |
| surface-water.pdf | |
| The applicant should give | |
| due attention to access | |
| arrangement to SuDs | |
| features for | |
| maintenance. We would | |
| encourage the installation | |
| of water butts or at the very | |
| e. mater suite of at the very | |

| least | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| ensuring down pipes are | |
| positioned for future easy | |
| installation. There must be | |
| no surface water | |
| connections to the foul | |
| sewer network. | |
| The point of connection for | |
| water supply is at the | |
| corner of Culvercliff Road | |
| and Doniford Road. The | |
| applicant will need to | |
| incorporate a 6 metre | |
| corridor (construction | |
| easements will be greater) | |
| through the site and | |
| landscaping area with no | |
| significant | |
| planting and 24 hour | |
| access to ensure this | |
| connection can be | |
| | |
| achieved. | |
| Subject to agreement of | |
| detail we are able to | |
| facilitate an initial point of | |
| connection to | |
| the 90mm main crossing | |
| the site. There must be no | |
| more than 20 properties | |
| from the application area | |
| connecting to this water | |
| supply network at the very | |
| maximum. Any | |
| more could cause a drop in | |
| levels of service for | |
| existing customers. | |
| The existing 90mm main | |
| must be marked on | |
| drawings. There must be | |
| no building or planting | |
| within 3 metres of this | |
| | |

| | main and the lowest rest |] |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | main and the layout must | |
| | show this main to be in | |
| | public areas for unfettered | |
| | access for maintenance | |
| | and repair. | |
| | Any damage to our assets | |
| | by third parties will result | |
| | in a claim for damages. | |
| | Wessex Water do not | |
| | object to the application | |
| | but invite the applicant to | |
| | contact the | |
| | undersigned to work | |
| | through these issues to | |
| | agree amendments before | |
| | the application | |
| | is determined. This should | |
| | avoid future issues with | |
| | protecting existing assets | |
| | and connection / adoption | |
| | applications. | |
| | | |
| | Final comments raised | |
| | regarding access, distance | |
| | between the pumping | |
| | station and swale and | |
| | distance of 15m required | |
| | from wet well pumping | |
| | station and habitable | |
| | buildings. | |
| SCC - Historic Environment | - | Noted. |
| Williton Parish Council | Objection: | Noted. The matters are |
| | | addressed within the |
| | First comments: | design and supporting |
| | | specialist reports and |
| | Access: | surveys. |
| | • It is believed the poor | The matters raised are |
| | road infrastructure will not | assessed within the report. |
| | be able to sustain the extra | |
| | volume of traffic, both | |
| | | |
| | during the building stage | |

| and after completion for | |
|--|--|
| 139 dwellings, which could | |
| lead up to more than 500 | |
| additional car journeys on | |
| the roads per day. | |
| There is no direct link | |
| | |
| onto a main A or B road, | |
| only onto a minor road | |
| which pass local First | |
| (Primary) schools. | |
| If approved, there is a | |
| need for a restriction on | |
| time of deliveries (not to | |
| clash with schools) and | |
| specific routes, taking into | |
| account environmental | |
| impact on increased | |
| pollution and noise. | |
| No joined-up thinking | |
| regarding ALL the | |
| applications around West | |
| Somerset and the impact | |
| on roads. | |
| No public transport | |
| No pedestrian/cyclist | |
| connection along the | |
| Doniford Road (Williton). | |
| The majority are being | |
| built in the parish of | |
| Williton and requires | |
| pedestrian access for | |
| schools, shops etc. | |
| Doniford Road (Williton) | |
| is a narrow unclassified | |
| road, with poor visibility | |
| and prone to flooding. | |
| Appearance: | |
| | |
| The proposed town | |
| houses are not in keeping | |
| with the area. | |
| Would prefer stone faced | |

| dwellings, using local | |
|--|--|
| stone. | |
| Chimneys would improve | |
| the character of the | |
| buildings and be more in | |
| keeping. | |
| Solar panels should be | |
| incorporated on each | |
| dwelling. | |
| Landscaping: | |
| Against the loss of | |
| ancient hedges. | |
| • Disturbing an area of | |
| historical value | |
| Layout and Scale: | |
| • The development is too | |
| large for the area, there is | |
| not the facilities or | |
| infrastructure to facilitate. | |
| The houses are too | |
| tightly packed, the number | |
| of dwellings should be | |
| reduced. | |
| | |
| Parking areas and | |
| electric car charging points | |
| - each dwelling should | |
| have sufficient supply for | |
| overnight charging for 2 | |
| cars. | |
| The Play area is on a | |
| slope which may cause | |
| problems for | |
| toddlers/elderly/infirm. | |
| Associated Works: | |
| Agree with Wessex Water | |
| comments regarding | |
| sewerage. | |
| Has the requested | |
| meeting taken place? | |
| • Is there sufficient | |
| infrastructure to ensure | |
| | |

| each dwelling has enough | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| | |
| power to charge two cars, | |
| on a fast, charge? | |
| In addition, we would like | |
| the committee to consider | |
| that the outline planning | |
| was granted before the | |
| problems now being seen | |
| regarding phosphates. | |
| Does the application still | |
| meet NPPF criteria? | |
| Consideration needs to be | |
| given regarding the impact | |
| on the hospitals, doctors, | |
| schools, employment, | |
| dentists etc. | |
| To reiterate previous | |
| comments, the proposed | |
| 35% affordable housing is | |
| welcome, some dwellings | |
| are in Williton Parish | |
| Council and the S106 | |
| should be amended so that | |
| Williton has priority for the | |
| houses in Williton parish. | |
| Conclusion: Williton Parish | |
| Council OBJECTS on the | |
| grounds listed above and | |
| previously submitted | |
| comments. This | |
| development is too large | |
| and would request if any | |
| building is granted, that | |
| the number of dwellings is | |
| greatly reduced. | |
| | |
| Secondary comments: | |
| Secondary comments. | |
| Objection maintained | |
| | |
| The Proposed town bouses | |
| The Proposed town houses | |

| are not in keeping with the | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| area. | |
| Would prefer stone faced | |
| dwellings, using local | |
| stone. | |
| Chimneys would improve | |
| the character of the | |
| buildings and be more in | |
| keeping. | |
| Solar panels should be | |
| incorporated on each | |
| dwelling. | |
| The dwellings should be | |
| placed in a manner more | |
| suitable for solar panels | |
| the proposed layout does | |
| not support this. | |
| Disturbing an area of | |
| historical value | |
| Concern for the loss of the | |
| ancient hedge would there | |
| be a way to "push back" | |
| the existing hedge. | |
| Ensure there is sufficient | |
| infrastructure to ensure | |
| each dwelling has enough | |
| power to charge 2 cars on | |
| a fast charge because of | |
| the location residents will | |
| rely on their cars to | |
| transportation to work | |
| school etc. | |
| Foot paths to link the | |
| estates and Doniford to | |
| Williton this will need to be | |
| foot/cycle path, there is no | |
| public transport there will | |
| need to be access to shops | |
| and schools for residents. | |
| Restrict construction hours | |
| to Monday to Friday 8am- | |
| | |

| | - | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------|
| CIL/s106 Monitoring | No objection. | Noted. |
| Nutrient Neutrality Officer | Not within catchment. | Noted. |
| | approved inspector). | |
| | building control (or | |
| | time when consulted by | |
| | detailed comments at that | |
| | Regulations and will make | |
| | current Building | |
| | consultee under the | |
| | Authority is a statutory | |
| | The Fire and Rescue | |
| | | |
| | 2010 is complied with. | |
| | of the Building Regulations | |
| | requirement within ADB Volume 1: Dwellings Part 5 | |
| | Please ensure that the | |
| | development. | |
| | hydrants for this | |
| | for the provision of fire | |
| | given at the design stage | |
| | Consideration should be | |
| | Rescue Service. | |
| | and facilities for the Fire & | |
| | comment on the access | |
| | we take the opportunity to | |
| | is a planning application, | |
| | Whilst we acknowledge this | |
| Rescue Service | | |
| Devon & Somerset Fire & | No objection. | Noted. |
| | | |
| | the site floods frequently. | |
| | The new access point to | |
| | with school. | |
| | deliveries as to not clash | |
| | restriction on times of | |
| | There will also need to be a | |
| | on a Sunday. | |
| | no work to be carried out | |
| | 6pm Saturday 8am – 3pm no work to be carried out | |

| Overall, we are pleased | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| with the details submitted, | |
| we feel that the design | |
| concept is good and have | |
| the following comments: | |
| 1. As the play area is not | |
| centrally located, a safe | |
| road crossing needs to be | |
| provided to enable children | |
| to get from the dwellings | |
| on the opposite side of | |
| the road to the play area | |
| safely. | |
| 2. The play equipment | |
| provided covers all the play | |
| disciplines and there is an | |
| inclusive pod swing. | |
| 3. The play area doesn't | |
| appear to be fenced and | |
| therefore there are no | |
| gates required. | |
| 4. The play equipment is | |
| wooden – Robinia wood (or | |
| similar) should be used | |
| and bases will need to | |
| have sufficient metal feet | |
| to prevent rotting. | |
| 5. Natural colour safety | |
| surfacing and grass safety | |
| matting under the play | |
| equipment is acceptable. | |
| 6. The use of gravel paths | |
| is acceptable but these | |
| paths will need to be | |
| maintained and topped up | |
| with gravel periodically. | |
| 7. We like the picnic tables | |
| as this encourages a | |
| - | |
| longer stay at the open | |
| space and provides more | |
| opportunity for socialising | |

| I | | |
|----|----------------------------|--|
| by | y both adults and | |
| ch | nildren, thereby fostering | |
| а | sense of community and | |
| in | nproved physical and | |
| m | ental health. | |
| 8. | . We like the additional | |
| in | formal play opportunities | |
| p | roposed as these | |
| | ncourage exploration of | |
| th | ie open space. | |
| | It will be important that | |
| ar | ny trees proposed within | |
| th | e public open space | |
| ar | reas are native species. | |
| 16 | 9. The S106 Agreement | |
| | ated 9 June 2021 | |
| at | tached to outline | |
| þq | ermission | |
| | /37/17/019 contains | |
| - | nildren's play and public | |
| | pen space obligations | |
| | at will need to be | |
| | omplied with. | |
| | | |

8.6 Local representations

Neighbour notification letters were sent in accordance with the Councils Adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

26 letters of objection and neutral comments have been received making the following comments (summarised):

Infrastructure Concerns:

- Many express worries about the lack of infrastructure to support additional housing developments, citing issues such as collapsing roads, inadequate pedestrian and cycle paths, and unadopted private roads in poor condition.
- Concerns are raised about the strain on existing services such as healthcare facilities, schools, and public transportation, which are already struggling to meet the needs of the current population.

- Concerns are raised about the strain on existing infrastructure, including roads, schools, healthcare facilities, and other amenities.
- Issues such as traffic congestion, lack of pedestrian access, and flooding are highlighted as existing problems that would be exacerbated by the development
- Worries about the capacity of local services to cope with an increased population, including GP surgeries, schools, and dental practices.
- Concerns about long waiting times for medical appointments and the inability of existing facilities to accommodate more patients.

Traffic and Safety Issues:

- Concerns about the condition of private roads (Alamein, Cassino, Normandy, and Rangoon) and their inability to handle heavy traffic, especially with an additional 139 homes. Questions raised about whether the council plans to adopt these roads and widen access to the main road.
- Safety concerns regarding the narrow main road between Williton and the Doniford estate, lack of pedestrian footpaths, and the potential increase in traffic accidents. No mention of how these issues will be addressed in the planning application.
- The proposed developments are expected to worsen traffic congestion on already narrow roads, posing risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and school children.
- Safety concerns are highlighted regarding the lack of footpaths and cycle paths, as well as dangers associated with increased vehicle traffic.
- Uncertainty about land ownership and future responsibility for road maintenance, prompting worries about potential neglect by the developer.
- Requests for changes to footpath routes to preserve privacy for residents and avoid increased foot traffic through private roads like Cherry Tree Way.
- Concerns about the impact of increased traffic on dangerous roads, such as Doniford Road, and the need for mitigation measures to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety.
- Assertion that the applicant does not own Normandy Avenue and Alamein Road, raising questions about their authority to propose developments affecting these areas.
- · Calls for better mitigation measures, such as improved access for pedestrians

and cyclists, and a reduction in single-occupancy vehicle use.

- Suggestions for active travel connections and improvements to existing infrastructure to support sustainable transportation options.
- Calls for reassurance that issues such as road safety, infrastructure, and service provision will be adequately addressed during and after construction.
- Concerns about increased traffic on already congested roads, with inadequate provisions for cycling and walking.

Environmental Impact:

- Concerns are voiced about the loss of green space and wildlife habitats due to development on greenfield sites.
- Residents express a desire to preserve the tranquility and natural beauty of the area, citing sightings of local wildlife and the importance of preserving these habitats.
- Request for the inclusion of swift nest boxes in the development to support biodiversity and comply with planning principles.
- Environmental impact, including increased pollution, loss of natural land, and threats to local wildlife and nature.

Community and Amenity Impact:

- Residents are concerned about the impact on local amenities and services, including healthcare, education, and access to shops and leisure facilities.
- Worries about the loss of community character and identity, as well as the potential for overcrowding and strain on existing resources.
- Questions about plans to expand local schools to accommodate the influx of children and handle the increase in patients at GP surgeries in Williton and Watchet.
- Opposition to the development due to concerns about insufficient local amenities, impact on an unclassified road, and disregard for the local community's needs.
- Concerns about revised plans affecting privacy and creating light nuisance for nearby residents, especially regarding footpaths and street lighting.
- · Concerns about the impact of the development on the local community, including

changes to the character of the area and loss of individual village identities.

• Worries that the proposed development sets a precedent for further overdevelopment and loss of local facilities.

Active Travel Infrastructure:

- Calls for improve and safe pedestrian and cycle access to local amenities to reduce congestion and promote alternative, more sustainable modes of transportation.
- Suggestions include the need for footpaths and cycle paths along major roads and within the proposed developments to facilitate safer travel for residents and reduce reliance on cars.

Planning:

- Many objectors express concern about the number of developments in the local area and argue that there is no need for additional housing.
- The proposed development is seen as unnecessary and detrimental to the quiet rural character of the area.
- Concerns are raised about the adequacy of the proposed plans and their consideration of existing infrastructure and community needs.
- Residents seek clarity on issues such as road access, maintenance responsibilities, and the potential impacts of the developments on local services and amenities.

9. Relevant planning policies and Guidance

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended ("the 1990 Act), requires that in determining any planning applications regard is to be had to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as is material to the application and to any other material planning considerations Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act") requires that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations strongly indicate otherwise. The site lies in the former West Somerset area. The Development Plan comprises comprise the Adopted West Somerset Local Plan to 2032, Somerset Mineral Local Plan (2015), and Somerset Waste Core Strategy (2013).

As a result of local government reorganisation Somerset Council was established from

the 1 April 2023. The Structural Change Order agreeing the reorganisation of local government requires the Council to prepare a local plan within 5 years of the 1 April 2023 and the Council will be bringing forward a Local Development Scheme to agree the timetable for the preparation of the local plan and scope in due course.

Relevant policies of the development plan in the assessment of this application are listed below:

- SD1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- SC1 Hierarchy of settlements
- SC2 Housing Provision
- SC4 Affordable Housing
- SC5 Self containment of settlements
- WA1 Watchet Development
- EC1 Widening and strengthening the local economy
- TR1 Access to and from West Somerset
- TR2 Reducing reliance on the private car
- CF1 Maximising access to recreational facilities
- CF2 Planning for healthy communities
- CC5 Water Efficiency
- NH5 Landscape character protection
- NH6 Nature conservation & biodiversity protection & enhancement
- NH7 Green infrastructure
- NH13 Securing high standards of design
- ID1 Infrastructure delivery
- R/12 Informal Recreation Facilities
- T/8 Residential Car Parking
- T/9 Existing Footpaths

Neighbourhood Plans:

No Neighbourhood Plan

Supplementary Planning Documents:

District Wide Design Guide, December 2021

Other relevant policy documents:

Somerset West and Taunton Council's Climate Positive Planning: Interim Guidance Statement on Planning for the Climate Emergency (March 2022)

National Planning Policy Framework

10. Material Planning Considerations

The main planning issues relevant in the assessment of this application are as follows:

10.1.1 The principle of development

Outline permission has been granted for 139 dwellings under permission 3/37/17/019. Along with the principle of development this approved the means of access only. This application therefore seeks approval of the detailed design scheme, being the scale, appearance, landscaping and layout.

The application makes provision of the required affordable housing stock and the developer has a Registered Provider working alongside them to deliver the affordable units.

The principle of development is established and this application must focus attention on the Reserved Matters only, being layout, appearance, scale and landscaping.

10.1.2 Heritage

The application site is not within a Conservation Area and is having regard to the wider setting of the site. The development is not considered to affect the setting of any heritage assets within the immediate or wider area.

10.1.3 Design of the proposal

The proposed design scheme builds upon the Masterplan presented at the Outline stage and delivers a range of dwellings varying from 1 bedroom apartments to 4 bedroom detached dwellinghouses.

During the course of the application various amendments have been made to the design of the application scheme, which have resulted from the applicant's positive engagement with the design Quality Review Panel (QRP) process and further engagement with Officer's.

Following the QRP process the applicants submitted amended proposals that sought to strike a balance between the recommendations of the Panel and Council Officers and what was deliverable on the site, taking into account site constraints and ensuring a viable development is brought forward. Certain matters that were requested, such as the creation of a foot/cycle link to the northern end of the site onto Doniford Road, simply aren't achievable as such an access was not part of the Outline consent and this would introduce safety concerns.

The main changes are summarised as follows:

- Plots 70-75 have been moved forward to directly face onto Alamein Av as requested;
- The orchard area on the hillock has been reconfigured to be more formal
- Access reconfigured front of Plots 123-128 to provide a larger green margin to the south of these plots by relocating visitor parking spaces elsewhere as requested;
- Plot 105 reconfigured to change the house type and allow the dwelling to be pulled further away from trees;
- Spine road units given a more uniform approach to materials, being almost all brick to reflect main spine roads elsewhere in the town, and then other roads will have a variety of materials used;
- The frontage to the south onto Doniford Road has been adapted to create a more diverse street scene, including a wider variety of roof forms to include hipped roofs, and the building line has been varied, so in general this frontage will be more diverse to reinforce its separate character.
- Other minor design details added such as chimneys..
- Updated landscape details.
- Amendments to boundary treatments, increasing walling where the boundaries will be highly visible from the public realm. In more visually enclosed areas rear boundaries will remain close boarded fence however they will not be particularly visible, such as within courtyard parking areas.

The amended scheme includes various amendments to the affordable housing provision, including:

- All carport FOGs have been removed (plots 81 & 82)
- 4 flats and 2 FOGs have been removed and replaced with houses and bungalows
- 3 accessible bungalows now provided (located in northern field to spread AH across the site)
- Private gardens for all the apartments and a shared seating area provided (plots 54 to 59)
- Plots 60/61 have been provided with a secure rear access to own parking spaces.
- Terraces have been grouped with single tenures.

The scale of the built form ranges from single storey to two storey buildings with traditional building heights across the site. All new properties meet or exceed the nationally prescribed minimum space standards and the scale of the development is therefore acceptable.

The layout of the proposed development has been amended on several occasions during the application process, both before and after the QRP review. It is considered that the layout before Members represents a significant improvement upon the originally submitted scheme and it has been confirmed to generally address the previous points and issues raised by the Council's landscape and urban design specialists.

In relation to layout, the site is broken down into three distinct parcels of land and it is commented on each as follows:

Northern parcel

The highway layout is generally circular providing ease of access around this part of the estate. A small number of cul-de-sacs are created but they avoid the use of large turning heads and terminate quickly to the edge of the built up area. Visitor parking is now well distributed around the area and enhanced soft landscaping proposed along the frontage of Normandy Avenue, with houses set well back from the highway and intervening landscaping used to soften the street scene. Some houses have been removed and replaced with affordable bungalows which enhances the distribution of affordable homes across the wider site.

Central parcel

The amended layout is dominated by the strong road frontage design along the principle street, with dwellings benefitting from front at gardens of a size that sets units back from the highway and creates a soft green corridor effect. Tree planting is indicated within the street scene and together with the informal front garden areas will deliver a more spacious and open appearance to the street.

The eastern side of the central parcel of land delivers the greatest density of houses across the scheme, which is supported and allows for a low density and more diffused pattern of development to the site periphery. This area is more urban in its appearance and in areas dominated by parking provision, but the units have been arranged into terraces which improves the urban character compared to the original submission. Dwellings are sited as to provide greater road frontage interaction with Normandy Avenue to the east which is also welcomed.

In the middle of the parcel is an area of open space with houses arranged around the shared space creating a formal village green effect within the design.

Southern parcel

The amended layout and house typology now better reflects the rural edge location of the built form. Dwellings are orientated to the periphery of the site to be outward facing, creating a strong built form to the edge of the development, which is softened by planting and SUDs features between the dwellinghouses and open countryside. The estate road layout creates will encourage movement and has various links creating circular routes and will encourage movement and create an attractive environment.

House types are suitably distributed throughout the development site, with the more urban typologies and terraces being used to best effect along the street frontage of the spine road and predominantly within the central parcel and northwest section of the southern parcel of land. This creates more distinct character to individual residential areas than originally submitted and is considered to improve character of the site in general.

The affordable homes have been redistributed across the site and are no longer as condensed as originally proposed. This will encourage social integration and cohesion and offer a better opportunity of delivering tenure blind affordable homes within the scheme.

The appearance of the dwellings will utilise brick render and stone to the dwellinghouses with a mix of roof finishes. The palette of material is generally reflective of those located within the town and on nearby residential developments. The approach is considered to be reflective of local distinctiveness and the amended scheme is considered to have a suitable finished appearance within the detailed design.

Having regard to the above considerations, the design reflects the immediate area, as proposed within the Design Guide, and will provide a residential development that responds positively to the various site constraints whilst also reflecting local character and distinctiveness. The development will relate well to the existing built environment and the rural edge location, and its overall design, having regard to the layout, scale and appearance is considered to accord with policies WA1, CF2, TR2, NH5 and NH13 of the West Somerset Local Plan.

10.1.4 Quality of Accommodation

The size of the dwellings meet the requirements of the nationally prescribed space standards and some variations have been made during the application process to ensure this is the case. All dwellings have access to private amenity space, which again has come through negotiations and the applicants have shown a willingness to improve the provision of private gardens/courtyards for flatted accommodation, which provides betterment to the living conditions of future occupants. All dwellings have access to rear garden, with an acceptable degree of separation between the rear of dwellings in order to maintain a suitable level of privacy, light and outlook for future occupiers. Properties have level access and would have access to a variety of publicly accessible areas of open space throughout the site.

The development now includes accessible dwellings for the disabled which further enhances the offering of suitably designed accommodation to meet an identified local need, which is welcomed by Officers.

It is considered that the quality of the accommodation and development as a whole is of a high standard and satisfies relevant design criteria, including Local Plan Policy NH13.

10.1.5 Access, Highway Safety and Parking Provision

The Outline planning permission approved details relating to the point of access to the site, with that being off Doniford Road, to the southern edge of the site. The principle of access is therefore established.

The Outline permission requires further details of the proposed access, highway engineering, and construction management to be submitted in order to discharge conditions and in most instances for the details to be agreed prior to commencement of works.

The submitted layout plan accords with the approved location of the site access and now indicates the internal estate road hierarchy and further connections for which approval is now sought.

The estate road layout creates connectivity between the proposed roads and footpaths in the site and with existing routes in the area. The layout is legible and provides good connection both through and around the site, which will encourage walking and cycling within the community.

The application is supported by a parking plan which indicates that 1 and 2 bed flats/apartments will benefit from 1 parking space per unit, 2 and smaller 3 bedroom dwellings will have 2 spaces each and larger 3 bedroom and 4 bedroom dwellings

will have 3 spaces per unit. 28 visitor parking spaces are proposed throughout the development, which equates to the required 20% provision for 139 dwellings.

The level of parking provision accords with retained West Somerset District Local Plan (to 2006) Policy T/8, the details of which are set out in the *Parking Provision Table 4: Residential Parking Guidelines*.

The application includes detailed highway engineering drawings that demonstrate how vehicle tracking standards will be complied with by domestic and service vehicles.

A bin and cycle storage plan is also submitted which demonstrates how each dwellinghouse will benefit from private or shared bin and cycle storage facilities, all of which are considered to be located in suitable and accessible locations across the development site.

The Highway Authority have reviewed the original submission and have not objected to the proposed development, subject to conditions. No comments have been received in relation to the amended development, though very little has changed with the design of the highway infrastructure and the point of access, as previously approved, remains unchanged.

It is pertinent to highlight that the applicants have applied to discharge conditions 6 and 12 of the Outline planning consent, which relate to the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Travel Plan.

Overall, the means of access, highway layout and level of parking provision are considered to be acceptable and would comply with retained Local Plan Policy T/8 and Local Plan Policy TR1 and TR2. Furthermore, the development would not give rise to any severe adverse impact upon highway safety and the proposals therefore comply with paragraph 115 of the NPPF.

10.1.6 Landscaping and the impact on the character and appearance of the locality

The application site benefits from an extant Outline planning permission which establishes the principle for residential development of 139 dwellings on the land, together with access and ecological enhancement areas. It is therefore accepted that subject to detailed matters, the site will be developed and that the design should be suitable for this edge of settlement location.

The site is not within a designated landscape and comprises a group of relatively

unremarkable parcels of agricultural land to the edge of Watchet town.

The key constrain in regard to landscape is the elevated nature of the land to the north of the site. To develop built form over this land would cause a significant impact upon the immediate and wider landscape setting of Watchet town, and therefore, the proposals have been designed to avoid new buildings over the higher parcel of land. Instead, built form is retained to the lower lying land which has a far more gentle topography to it, as well as a good relationship with existing residential development.

To the higher land to the north, it is proposed to create a country style park with public access around its area. This will include an element of new orchard planting and various other landscape features, together with a LEAP. A significant amount of hard and soft landscaping will be delivered to the Hilltop Park including planting of trees, hedges, and flowers, new footpaths, seating, picnic benches, dog bins and children play equipment. The design incorporates accessible pathways so not to restrict access to the disabled or infirm.

Concerns have been raised during the application process in regard to the planting schedule for the scheme. A significant amount of further information has now been submitted which provides for a varied landscaping scheme across the site. The proposed orchard within the Hilltop Park provides a suitable mix of native fruit trees and is set out in the grid pattern with paths intertwining between trees, as previously requested by the former Landscape Officer. This approach leads to a truly positive and bold element of landscaping and open space provision and helps reinforce positive landscape characteristics, whist also being beautiful and an enjoyable place for play and with a large recreational user carrying capacity.

Further information has been clarified on the planting schedule which now provides suitable soft landscaping and traditional, native species across the site as a whole.

A details boundary plan has been submitted setting out the various types and positions of different boundary treatments across the scheme. Harsh enclosures can be created by high closed boarded fencing and so the use of such an enclosure has been restricted to rear gardens and courtyards where they are not directly visible within the area and softer estate railings, brick and stone walls are located along the more prominent street scenes and highways.

The concerns previously raised by the former Landscape Officer over the hard and soft landscaping scheme are considered to have been addressed and the amended scheme now represent a high quality development that will reflect the characteristics

of the local area and deliver an attractive and well considered scheme, in keeping with the area. The proposals will therefore comply with LP Policies NH5 and NH13.

10.1.7 The impact on neighbouring residential amenity

The site occupies an edge of town location with established residential properties on two sides: to the north and east. The development of houses in the open fields that adjoin the existing residential property will, inevitability, change their outlook and aspect. However, the proposed relationships are considered to be satisfactory. The houses in Doniford Road are across the highway from the site and will be separated by planting and their own front garden areas. Existing and proposed planting will screen and separate existing houses from the proposed new houses. The housing proposed is of a lower density than many other new estates and is set away from neighbouring properties in order to minimise impact upon amenity.

The separation between existing and proposed housing, the change in levels and limited height of houses is such that there will be no significant adverse impacts upon the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

10.1.9 The impact on ecology and biodiversity

Matters relating to the ecological impact of residential development across the site were considered at the Outline stage and conditions applied to that permission, requiring the submission of an updated strategy for the protection and enhancement of ecological features and habitats across the site. The condition requires up to date surveys to be submitted when applying to discharge the condition as well as detailed relating to a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.

It is pertinent to highlight that the applicants have applied to discharge condition 9 of the Outline planning consent, which relates to the ecological impacts of the development and this is being considered at present.

Having regard to this matter, it is considered that a favourable status for wildlife can be maintained through the Outline planning condition and as such no further evidence is required at this time.

10.1.10 Waste/Recycling facilities

The application affords suitable provision for the storage and collection of waste and recycling for each property.

Storage and collection points have been indicated on submitted plans and a suitable plan showing refuge vehicle tracking demonstrates that each location is accessible to waste collection service providers.

10.1.11 Flood risk and energy efficiency

The application is supported by an updated drainage strategy and associated engineering designs for foul and surface water drainage.

Foul drainage will be disposed of via mains sewer and surface water drainage will be attenuated on site and then disposed of via a local watercourse.

Following discussions, the Lead Local Flood Authority have accepted the submitted details and confirmed that they do not object to the proposed detailed drainage scheme.

Condition 07 of the Outline planning permission requires the approval of a detailed surface water strategy prior to the commencement of development and so whilst the submitted design is acceptable to the LLFA, the applicant is still required to have their strategy assessed once more in detail.

It is pertinent to highlight that the applicants have applied to discharge condition 7 of the Outline planning consent, which relates to the detailed drainage strategy for the development. Those details correlate with the submitted detail supporting this application and, therefore, Officers are content that the drainage impacts of the development have and are being suitably assessed.

11 Local Finance Considerations

11.1 Developer contributions were secured by s106 Agreement as part of the Outline planning application.

12 Planning balance and conclusion

12.1 The general effect of paragraph 11 of the NPPF is that, in the absence of relevant or up-to-date development plan policies, the balance is tilted in favour of the grant of permission, except where the policies within the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a "clear reason for refusing the development proposed" or where the benefits of the proposed development are "significantly and demonstrably" outweighed by the adverse impacts when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

12.2 For the reasons set out above, having regard to all the matters raised, it is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

In preparing this report the planning officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010.

Appendix 1 – Planning Conditions and Informatives

Recommended Conditions

1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

(A1) DrNo 100-1 Rev B Masterplan

(A0) DrNo 100-2 Rev B Proposed Site Layout - Sheet 1 of 2

(A0) DrNo 100-3 Rev B Proposed Site Layout - Sheet 2 of 2

- (A1) DrNo 101 Site Location Plan
- (A1) DrNo 102 Demolition Plan
- (A0) DrNo 103 Rev B Materials Layout

(A0) DrNo 104 Rev B Storey Heights Layout

(A0) DrNo 104 Rev B Affordable Layout

(A0) DrNo 106 Rev B Site Sections

(A0) DrNo 107 Rev B Enclosures Layout

- (A1) DrNo 108 Rev B Street Scenes
- (A0) DrNo 109 Rev B Refuse & Cycle Strategy
- (A0) DrNo 110 Rev B Energy Layout

(A0) DrNo 111 Rev A Parking Layout

(A3) DrNo 112 Rev A Key Areas Plan

(A3) DrNo 150 Rev A House Type- Budleigh Corner Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 152 Rev A House Type-Monmouth Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 153 Rev B House Type- Monmouth Corner Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 154 Rev A House Type- Tintern Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 155 Rev B House Type- Dartford-Stone Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 156 Rev B House Type-Chepstow-Brick Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 157 Rev B House Type- Idris Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 158 Rev B House Type- Wye-Brick Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 158-1 Rev B House Type- Wye-Render Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 159 Rev B House Type- Ogmore-Render- Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 159-1 Rev A House Type Ogmore-Brick- Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 161 Rev B House Type- Bournemouth-Brick Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 163 Rev B House Type- Farnham Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 163-1 Rev A Rev B House Type- Farnham-Stone Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 164 Rev B House Type- Farnham Corner - Stone Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 164-1 Rev A House Type- Farnham Corner -Render & Stone Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 165 Rev B House Type 1 Brick- Burford -Type 1 Brick Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 165-1 Rev A House Type - Burford -Type 1 Render Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 165-2 Rev A House Type - Burford -Type 2 Render Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 166 Rev B House Type - Stanton-Stone Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 166-1 Rev A House Type- Stanton-Brick Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 166-2 Rev A House Type- Stanton-Render Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 167 Rev B House Type- Carcroft-Render & Stone Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 167-1 Rev A House Type- Carcroft-Brick & Render Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 168 Rev B House Type- Alveston-Brick Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 168-1 Rev A House Type- Alveston-Render Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 169 Rev B House Type- Ashford Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 170-1 Rev A House Type - Monnow- Type 1-Render Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 170-2 House Type - Monnow- Type 2 - Brick Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 171 Rev B House Type- Frome-Type 1 Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 171-1 Rev A House Type- Frome-Type 2 Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 171-2 Rev A House Type- Frome-Type 3 Floor Plans & Elevations

(A2) DrNo 173 Rev B Tyne- Apartment Block

(A3) DrNo 174 Rev A House Type-Wye Corner-Brick Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 174-1 Rev A House Type-Wye Corner-Render Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 175 House Type-Clyne Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 180 Single Garage-Floor Plans & Elevations

(A3) DrNo 181 Twin Garage-Floor Plans & Elevations

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 100 - 01 Rev E Engineering Layout Sheet 1

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 100 - 02 Rev E Engineering Layout Sheet 2

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 100 - 03 Rev D Engineering Layout Sheet 3

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 101 - 01 Rev D Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 1

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 101 - 02 Rev D Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 2

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 101 - 03 Rev D Drainage Strategy Layout Sheet 3

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 1002 - Exceedance Route Plan

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 200 Rev A Refuse Vehicle Tracking

(A0) DrNo 10381 - 201 Rev A Fire Tender Tracking

(A1) DrNo 10381 - 202 Rev A Large Car Parking

(A2) DrNo 10381 - 203 Rev A Pumping Station Vehicle Tracking

(A3) DrNo P22-2431_EN_00__002-E Play Area Details

(A1) DrNo P22-2431_EN_005 Rev A Detailed Soft On-Plot Landscape Proposals Sheet 1 of 6

(A1) DrNo P22-2431_EN_005 Rev A Detailed Soft On-Plot Landscape Proposals Sheet 2 of 6

(A1) DrNo P22-2431_EN_005 Rev A Detailed Soft On-Plot Landscape Proposals Sheet 3 of 6

(A1) DrNo P22-2431_EN_005 Rev A Detailed Soft On-Plot Landscape Proposals Sheet 4 of 6

(A1) DrNo P22-2431_EN_005 Rev A Detailed Soft On-Plot Landscape Proposals Sheet 5 of 6

(A1) DrNo P22-2431_EN_005 Rev A Detailed Soft On-Plot Landscape Proposals Sheet 6 of 6

(A1) DrNo P22-2431_EN_00__006C-01C Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals

(A1) DrNo P22-2431_EN_00__006C-02C Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2 Prior to the construction of any dwelling above damp proof course, samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained as such.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area

3 (i) The landscaping/planting scheme shown on the submitted plan shall be completely carried out within the first available planting season from the date of commencement of the development.

(ii) For a period of five years after the completion of the development, the trees and shrubs shall be protected and maintained in a healthy weed free condition and any trees or shrubs that cease to grow, shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species or other appropriate trees or shrubs as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area.

4 At the junction between the approved site access and Doniford Road, there shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 600 millimetres above adjoining road level in advance of lines drawn 4.5 metres back from the carriageway edge on the centre line of the access and extending to points on the nearside carriageway edge 70 metres either side of the access. Such visibility shall be fully provided prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: To ensure suitable access to the site is provided and retained, in the interests of highway safety.

5 No dwellinghouse hereby permitted shall be occupied until the access to the site has been fully provided in accordance with the approved plans. The access shall thereafter be retained in the approved form.

Reason: To ensure suitable access to the site is provided and retained, in the interests of highway safety.

6 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until spaces have been laid out, drained and properly surfaced within the site in accordance with the approved plans for the parking and turning of vehicles, and thereafter such areas shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles associated with the development.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate space within the site for the parking and turning of vehicles clear of the highway, in the interests of highway safety.

7 A scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities for each dwelling (equivalent to one bicycle space per bedroom) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. No dwellinghouse shall be occupied until the approved cycle parking and storage scheme has been fully constructed in accordance with the approved details and, thereafter, must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that adequate facilities are included for the storage of cycles, in the interests of sustainable transport.

8 No dwellinghouse hereby permitted shall be occupied until the developer has submitted to the Local Planning Authority the following details:

 A Surface Water Management Plan for the development site as a whole;
 Details of the Management Company responsible for the future maintenance and management of site wide surface water drainage infrastructure.
 Confirmation and evidence that the foul drainage infrastructure has been fully adopted by the Statutory Undertaker.

Reason: To ensure that suitable management and maintenance of the approved drainage infrastructure is secured.

9 The bin storage facilities shown on the submitted plans shall be constructed and fully provided prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, and shall thereafter be retained for those purposes.

Reason: To ensure that adequate facilities exist for the future residents of the site and that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area.

10 No individual dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until the optional requirement for potential consumption of wholesome water by persons occupying that dwelling in Part G of Schedule 1 and Regulation 36 of the Building Regulations 2010 of 110 litres per person per day has been complied with.

Reason: To improve the sustainability of the dwellings in accordance with the West Somerset: Local Plan to 2032 Policy CC5 and NH6 and the National Planning Policy Framework (Sept 2023).

Notes to applicant.

- 1 In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 the Council has worked in a positive and creative way with the applicant and has negotiated amendments to the application to enable the grant of planning permission.
- 2 The applicant is advised to make provision for facilities, in accordance with the Building Regulations, to charge electric vehicles within the curtilage in order to

promote sustainability and mitigate against climate change.

- 3 Development, insofar as it affects the right of way should not be started, and the rights of way should be kept open for public use until the necessary Order (temporary closure/stopping up/diversion) or other authorisation has come into effect/been granted. Failure to comply with this request may result in the developer being prosecuted if the path is built on or otherwise interfered with.
- 4 The applicant will be required to enter into a suitable legal agreement with the Highway Authority to secure the construction of any highway works necessary as part of this development. Please ensure that an advisory note is attached requesting that the developer contact the Highway Authority to progress this agreement well in advance of commencement of development.
- 5 Your attention is drawn to the needs of the disabled in respect of new housing and the requirements under Part M of the Building Regulations.