

**Committee date 27/02/2024**

**Application No:** 37/22/00126

**Application Type:** Full Planning Permission

**Case Officer:** Adrian Noon

**Registered Date:** 31/01/2023

**Expiry Date:** 01/05/2023

**Parish:** North Petherton

**Division:** North Petherton

**Proposal:** Erection of 150no. dwellings including access, landscaping, infrastructure and associated works.

**Site Location:** Bridgwater Gateway Development, Bridgwater Road, North Petherton, Bridgwater, Somerset, TA6

**Applicant:** Vistry Group

**\*\* THIS APPLICATION IS CODED AS A MAJOR APPLICATION \*\***



## **Committee decision required because**

This major application is referred to the area committee in light of the ward member's comments and to enable the issues regarding viability and the reduced affordable housing offer to be presented transparently.

## **Background**

The site comprises some c.8.5ha of undeveloped land situated south of the Stockmoor/Wilstock development and c. 700m north of the built up area of North Petherton. Although it forms part of the B4 residential/employment allocation, on the south side of Bridgwater, it is within the parish of neighbouring North Petherton.

It is bounded by agricultural land to the south and west and by undeveloped land within the allocation to the east and north. Access is currently via a field gate linking to the A38 Taunton Road, approximately 300m to the east, via an agricultural track. It comprises a single field bounded on all sides by native hedgerow interspersed with occasional trees. A small group of trees is situated in the northern part of the site, but the field is otherwise laid to pasture.

The site is gently sloping, though steepening at the eastern end, with some longer-range views. It currently drains to a network of field ditches. It is predominantly within Flood Zone 1, although its western end extends into Flood Zone 3, in an area benefiting from flood defences. There are no public rights of way crossing or immediately adjoining the site, however public right of way BW23/9 runs across adjoining land, roughly SW-NE, a short distance from the westernmost end of the site.

The proposal is for 150 houses, associated access, open spaces and infrastructure are proposed, comprising:-

- 6 two-bed flats
- 6 two-bed houses
- 60 three-bed houses
- 68 four-bed houses
- 10 five-bed houses.
- 437 parking spaces, including 36 visitor spaces
- a LEAP
- 2 LAPs
- incidental open space with the development
- attenuation ponds and associated drainage infrastructure
- an area of open space at the western end of the site

The dwellings would be 2-storey/2 ½ storey, however the flats would be provided within a 3-storey structure, positioned centrally in the site

Access would be via the existing junction off the A38 and the approved road through the employment

area (Bridgwater Gateway) and the adjoining residential parcel area which is currently subject to an application for 361 dwellings

The proposal has been amended to address issues raised by consultees and further consultations carried out.

No affordable housing is proposed and this site and the adjoining site to the west (the 'Boklok development', 37/22/00071) have been subject to a joint viability appraisal.

### **Relevant Planning History**

**37/21/00135** An environmental screening opinion has been issued concluding that the wider proposal does not constitute EIA development

In terms of the wider allocation the following are of relevance:

**37/21/00118** PP granted for change of use of units 1601 and 1602 (as approved by 37/17/00116) from class E to a mixed use of B2 (General Industry) and B8 (Storage and Distribution).

**37/20/00049** PP granted for erection of a coffee shop with drive-thru and associated car parking, circulation, refuse enclosure, landscaping and associated infrastructure – on site for previously approved PFS

**37/17/00116** PP granted for erection of 10no. light industrial units (Use Class B1(c) and associated infrastructure including accesses, parking and service yard

**37/15/00089** Reserved matters approved for erection of 3, three storey employment buildings (use class B1) and associated infrastructure (not implemented)

**37/15/00088** Reserved matters approved for erection of hotel, employment buildings (use class B1) and associated infrastructure

**37/15/00087** Reserved matters approved for erection of petrol filling station and associated infrastructure (not implemented)

**37/13/00091** Reserved matters approved for erection of three storey building (use class B1), formation of parking and access (not implemented)

**37/13/00087** Reserved matters approved for layout of internal spine road (Phase 1)

**37/11/00084** Outline PP granted for mixed use development to include: employment floorspace (Use Class B1), hotel (Use Class C1), petrol filling station (Sui Generis); strategic landscaping, infrastructure including internal roads, drainage, car parking; and

including detailed drawings for a new vehicular and pedestrian access on to the A38.

Additionally there is a scheme for 361 houses on the site immediately to the north – 37/22/00071, submitted by Boklok. This would provide part of the access to this site. The viability of the two sites has been jointly assessed.

## **Consultation Responses**

**North Petherton Town Council** – support on the grounds that:-

*it is a well designed scheme and offers improvement to the housing stock, however the approval should have the following conditions:*

- *A cyclepath / footpath through the development over Wilstock Way to Stockmoor should be included*
- *There should be a financial contribution to the Wilstockhub*
- *The flood defence and drainage issues should be addressed so there is no impact on existing homes, including those of other settlements affected by the watercourse*

Confirmed support in relation to the amendments provided that the Wessex Water and Environment Agency requirements are met and it does not overload the existing water and sewerage infrastructure.

**Councillor Revans** – comments:-

*my view is that this is a major application and needs public scrutiny to ensure it is policy compliant on grounds of health, education and transport infrastructure*

**Cllr Bradford** – comments:-

*I support the development area but have reservations regarding the type of material base. I suggest the committee takes a look at this one.*

**Planning Policy** – no objection, considering the proposal to be broadly consistent with the allocation.

**National Highways** – have considered this likely impacts of the proposal development in conjunction with the Boklok scheme and confirm that they have no objection.

*Following National Highways' comments in respect of assessment material for Phase 2 development (reference 37/22/00071), PEP provided further sensitivity testing to consider alternative variables including trip distribution, baseline traffic survey data for M5 Junction 24, and committed/ planned development assumptions. The findings were reported in a Supplementary Transport Note dated October 2022. The sensitivity testing considered a higher level of assessment traffic than accounted for by the current application, accounting for full build-out of the Bridgwater Gateway allocation and assuming provision of further on-site employment and a local centre rather than the proposed housing set out in the current application.*

*Whilst National Highways did not accept the Transyt model results reported in the Supplementary Transport Note due to the modelling of flared approaches to the A38 Huntworth roundabout, following further model investigations we accepted that the neighbouring Phase 2 development was unlikely to have an unacceptable or severe impact on the safe and efficient operation of M5 Junction 24.*

*On the basis the Phase 2 application assessed a higher level of traffic generation than is forecast for the current application, National Highways accepts the proposed development for 150 dwellings is unlikely to result in an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the SRN.*

*Notwithstanding this, traffic modelling work shows long queues on the A38 approaches to the Huntworth roundabout as a result of cumulative development coming forward. As the roundabout operates under MOVA control, it is likely that queues will be shared between approaches, with longer queues also occurring on the link between the A38 Huntworth roundabout and M5 Junction 24. Given the proximity to M5 Junction 24, we will seek to discuss the future operation of the A38 Huntworth roundabout with the Local Highway Authority, with a view to minimising any impact on the safe operation of the SRN.*

**Highway Officer** – no objection subject to the amended travel plan being secured by a s106 agreement and highways safeguarding conditions.

**Landscape Officer** – no objection subject to appropriate condition to agree tree protection measures and agreeing a landscape planting:-

*I have reviewed the detailed landscape proposals submitted by Golby and Luck Landscape Architects, in support of this application and confirm that I am satisfied with the proposed mitigation for vegetation loss and landscape enhancement proposed for the development. The species, quantities and stock sizes proposed are acceptable and the scheme, once established, should provide enhancement to the development and a positive contribution to biodiversity, I am therefore happy for the planting scheme to be formally approved in due course.*

**Public Health Specialist** – initially commented:-

*On housing design and affordability the HIA states that the proposal meets housing need. However, the HIA notes the ageing population in Sedgemoor. I would submit that 3-5 bed housing is not aimed at elderly households. However I note that Vistry has agreed with Boklok that affordable housing will be provided by the latter on the neighbouring site, where 101 2 bed units are proposed. Planning officers should satisfy themselves that across the two sites the housing mix, both market and affordable addresses housing need across the age spectrum, recognising that most population growth will come from over 65s.*

*In respect of both health and education capacity, the HIA determines there is adequate spare*

capacity in the system based on current patient lists and school rolls. It is not clear if the HIA author has taken into account demand from other developments already in the pipeline, including Boklok, to reach that conclusion. Planning officers should check with NHS Somerset and SCC Education officers to see if they concur with the findings.

**Regeneration Manager (urban design comments) – no objection**

*In general, these are both well-developed schemes indicating a high-quality output both in respect of layout, appearance and provision of environment.*

*I have the following points to make though;*

- Where the houses have public facing gable ends they should not be blank facades, this applies in particular to the Vistry scheme. I would like to see animation on these either through the addition of windows or brick detailing or planting.*
- Public outward facing timber boundaries should provide for climbing planting to screen, this is particular relevant on the boundaries of the Vistry site where long distance views into the site will see a long fence line (on the east boundary). I find that some of the public outward facing boundaries on Boklok confusing. The plan indicates that 0.9 high post and rail fences are proposed. It would seem likely that residents will immediately change this to 2m high timber boarded fences. Could the applicant please review? Otherwise provision should be made for climbing planting to screen, this is particular relevant on the boundaries of the site where long distance views in will see a long fence line.*
- SuDs drainage is disappointing as I see on the Vistry scheme reference to barbed wire and pig mesh fence around the attenuation basins and also see that it will be dry for the majority of the time with most discharge going directly into the ditch. This means that pollutants on the road and hard surfaces will go directly into the water course damaging the environment. It would be better for drainage to go into the attenuation ponds and be filtered through aquatic planting before discharging into the ditch. The basins could then be permanently wet / damp and support biodiversity and ecology. Access into these areas should also be permitted, barbed wire and pig mesh is not the right approach.*

*On Bok Lok I can't find any detail on the strategy apart from a plan so I can't see detail. I would suggest that there is a very good opportunity to create wetland suds here and it would seem that there is no provision for aquatic planting in the basins but reference to the two swales as treating waste water but again no detail on how.*

*The Council have been working with the Wildfowl and Wetland Trust (WWT) and implementing schemes all around Bridgwater which draw on the wetland approach to drainage. We have done this at Northgate Yard creating an urban wetland in the town centre, we are working on the Parrett Barrier and creating wetlands associated with infrastructure. We would welcome an introduction for Vistry and BokLok to revisit their drainage strategies*

*with WWT to get them right.*

*In conclusion, both applications generally conform to the requirements of the adopted Bridgwater Gateway Development and Design Principles document which covers the following objectives; Overall Concept, Sustainability, Land use and Density, Access and Movement, Green Infrastructure, Blue Infrastructure but I would like to be able to initiate a new conversation on the blue infrastructure side of the scheme.*

**Open Spaces Officer** – confirms that there is sufficient on-site public open space proposed to conform to the scale of development. This includes catchments for playing spaces and the laying out of these will need to be secured either by condition or as an obligation within a S106 agreement, should consent be granted.

**Police Design Officer** – notes that applicant has taken some account of crime prevention measures in the design of this development. Has identified a number of issues:-

- **Permeability** *(break throughs in western hedge) –a certain amount of permeability is obviously essential, however, excessive permeability permits and legitimises access into areas for potential offenders where they are less likely to be noticed and challenged. It allows anonymous and unrestricted opportunity to enter these areas, familiarise, search for vulnerable targets, offend and escape. I am still of the opinion that three break throughs in this hedge is excessive and recommend it be reduced to one.*

OFFICER NOTE: the amended scheme has 2 break throughs

- **Dwelling Boundary Treatments** *–I note that trellis has been added to the top of rear boundary fencing for those plots on the eastern perimeter backing onto POS, which will improve the rear security of these plots.*
- **Dwelling Rear Access Footpaths** *–I also note that rear garden gates will be pulled forward to the front building line of the dwellings, which will improve surveillance of these gates from the street, deter climbing over the gates by potential offenders and improve side and rear security of these dwellings.*
- **LAP on Western Edge** *–although the location was apparently chosen to satisfy LPA’s maximum travel distance, I remain of the opinion that this LAP is poorly overlooked and should be relocated.*
- **Public Facing Gable Ends** *–blank gable ends should be avoided, as this can result in crime and ASB affecting these dwellings, and the proposed provision of a window in public facing gable ends of such dwellings should deter this and improve surveillance of public spaces from these dwellings.*

OFFICER NOTE:- The amended scheme incorporates windows to most end elevations where they face the public realm

- **Flat Block** –incorporates front and rear communal entrances into a Lobby, so a suitable visitor door entry system and access control system should be installed for use by residents and visitors. The system should incorporate access to the building by use of proximity fob, swipe card or similar, vandal resistant external door entry panels with linked camera, live audio/visual communication between the occupant and visitor and ability to release the primary entrance doorset from the dwelling. The block also incorporates balconies on the first and second floors at the front so any climbing aids should be designed out.

OFFICER NOTE: Such matters would be an operational management issue for the freeholder of the flats.

**IDB** – initially sought clarifications and revisions to address concerns raised. Subsequently it is confirmed that:\_

*After discussion with the applicant and the review of the updated plan for surface water attenuation, the Board is now able to **remove the objection** to the proposals with the amendments that have now been made. A condition suggested to ensure compliance with the updated Drainage Strategy (DS) dated November 2023.*

**LLFA** – initially sought clarification about the detail and design of the surface water drainage strategy. In light of additional details and clarifications, and noting agreement of IDB and EA, have confirmed that the proposal is acceptable. However, in light of subsequent revision to address other matters have requested clarification of whether the revisions to the layout result in changes to the impermeable area of the site that affect the previously approved surface water drainage strategy.

OFFICER NOTE: It has been confirmed that the final revisions do not affect the impermeable area and previously approved drainage strategy.

**Environment Agency** – No objection subject to a condition to set the FFLs at 9.6m AOD

**Wessex Water** – no objection, noting at the site depends on the adjoining Boklok site for a connection. Accordingly a condition is suggested to ensure that details of this are provided

**Civil Contingencies Officer** – suggests a condition to complete and maintain a flood warning and evacuation plan for the site.

OFFICER NOTE: The residential parts of the site are not in an area of flood risk so this is not necessary.

**Affordable Housing Officer** – concerns that the proposal would not deliver affordable housing:-



*this parcel of land forms part of a wide parcel of land identified within the SDC local plan and is earmarked for residential growth - Policy B4. The Council has recently adopted stretched housing delivery targets. This development will be important in helping the authority achieve its ambitious housing delivery targets. This application is referred to as phase one (of three) which when built might see 511 new homes built.*

*The adopted local plan (Policy D6) requires greenfield land developments of this scale to contribute a minimum of 30% affordable housing (potentially 153 affordable homes) across all three phases. Taken in isolation, this application (phase one), a policy compliant affordable housing provision would equate to 45 homes. This application proposes 0% affordable homes. All the homes on this phase will be open market housing.*

*The applicant states (par 7.15 in their planning statement) that the affordable homes associated with this phase will be delivered on phase 2 & 3 by a third party. The planning application for phase 2 & 3 (37-22-00071) has not been agreed at this time. This approach to effectively deterring the delivery of affordable homes to later phases is in theory possible. This would effectively see an above policy number of affordable homes on phases 2 & 3. This approach does not support the Council's desire to create balanced and integrated communities.*

*Further, phases 2 & 3 would be delivered by a third party. Their application has not been determined and I am unclear how the proposed over-provision of affordable homes on phase 2 & 3 will be secured by the LPA should phase 1 go ahead or for that matter, if it did not. Should phase 1 be built, but not 2 & 3 not, the LPA would not secure any affordable homes here.*

**Education Officer** – no objection, and will seek the appropriate contribution from CIL funds:-  
*A proposal of 150 dwellings in this location will generate the following number of pupils for each education type:*

*14 Early years*

*48 Primary school*

*21 Secondary school*

*2 Special Education needs*

*Education contributions will be required for a new build Primary school with early years facilities and expansion of the secondary schools (Robert Blake and Chilton Trinity) in Bridgwater to accommodate the children from this development. The housing in this development combined with the children from the development under application 37/22/0071-Bridgwater Gateway Site, phase 2 – total 361 dwellings will require the school infrastructure to be in place as the homes are built as there is no capacity in the near by North Petherton school.*

*The former Sedgemoor Infrastructure Funding Statement indicates any requests for contributions would be requested via CIL.*

The cost to build for the number of children from this development alone are as follows:

£387,430 for early years

£1,328,333 for Primary pupils

£703,688 for Secondary

£244,730 for SEN

We as education authority will discuss the funding for the necessary school capacity increases to support this development with the planning team.

#### **NHS Somerset LPA Engagement – note that:**

The proposed development is for **150** dwellings (0 x affordable homes) and this will create an estimated of population of **333** new residents within the development based an average household size of **2.22**.

The closest GP surgeries to the proposed development are:

- **North Petherton Surgery (SFT) - Mill Street, North Petherton**
- **Somerset Bridge Medical Centre - Stockmoor Park, Taunton Road, Bridgwater**
- **Taunton Road Medical Centre - 12-16 Taunton Road, Bridgwater**

It is envisaged that the vast majority of the residents of the proposed development will register as patients with these practices.

The current combined medical centres providing primary care are up to their capacity and will not be able to absorb the increased patients arising from the proposed development.

The only way to mitigate the impact is to increase the physical capacity of the existing surgeries.

Accordingly a contribution of £91,718 (£611/dwelling) is sought to increase the physical capacity to mitigate the likely impact of the development. This is calculated as follows:-

The increased population from this development = **333**

a. No of dwellings x Average occupancy rate = population increase

b. 150 x 2.22 = 333

The new GP List size will be **28,352** which is over capacity by **1,547**

a. Current GP patient list + Population increase = Expected patient list size

b. 28,019 + 333 = 28,352 (1,547 over capacity)

c. If expected patient list size is within the existing capacity, a contribution is not required, otherwise continue to step 6

*Additional GP space required to support this development = **25.64m<sup>2</sup>***

*a. The expected m<sup>2</sup> per patient, for this size practice = 0.077m<sup>2</sup>*

*b. Population increase x space requirement per patient = total space (m<sup>2</sup>) required*

*c. 333 x 0.077 = 25.64m<sup>2</sup>*

*Total contribution required = **£91,718***

*a. Total space (m<sup>2</sup>) required x premises cost = final contribution calculation 25.64m<sup>2</sup> x £3,577 = £91,718 (**£611 per dwelling**).*

**Natural England** – no objection:-

*Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.*

**Ecologist** – No objection subject to safeguarding conditions

**Environmental Health Officer** – no objections subject to conditions to manage construction, address any land contamination, manage noise and construction

**Economic Development Officer** – no objection, suggests a condition to secure a local labour agreement so that local people have the opportunity to access jobs in the construction phase

### **Representations**

29 representations received:-

- 1 Lack of infrastructure to support development;
- Over subscribed surgeries, dentists and schools;
- Lack of affordable housing;
- Need housing for the elderly;
- Roads cannot cope, particularly the A38 through North Petherton when used as a diversion for the M5;
- Junction 24 is already bad, and is worse in summer
- A new bypass to the west of North Petherton is needed
- Speed limits are not enforced
- Lack of parking
- Impact on drainage
- Impact on wildlife
- Lack of parking in Wilstock and Stockmoor
- Lack of school, community centre and bus route at Wilstock
- Loss of green space between Bridgwater and North Petherton;
- Lack of buses;

- Car dependent development;
- Lack of accessible green space
- Rural view will be compromised

### **Most Relevant Policies**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), and Paragraphs 2, 11, 12, and 14 of the NPPF require that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2033**

Policy B4: Land at Bridgwater Gateway allocates this site are part of a wider mixed use development:-

*Land at Bridgwater Gateway Phase 2 (as defined on the Policies Map) is allocated for mixed-use development. Development will provide (unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority):*

- *About 400 new homes of a mixed size and type appropriate to the area*
- *6 hectares (gross) B1 employment and other appropriate ancillary uses*
- *Affordable housing in accordance with the Council's requirements*
- *A neighbourhood centre with appropriate facilities such as a convenience store, and community uses*
- *Public open space, and formal and informal recreation*
- *Comprehensive green infrastructure*

*Development will be built in accordance with an approved development and design principles document including an infrastructure delivery plan and master plan.*

*A Transport Impact Assessment will be required in accordance with Policy D14.*

*Access to the residential element will be from the A38 via the approved internal road hierarchy. Additional access from Willstock Way may also be provided as necessary. The delivery of housing and the identified accesses will be agreed with Somerset County Council and the LPA taking account of the required TIA.*

*The development will be expected to integrate with existing developments and the wider area through provision of public footpaths and cycle ways. This will be through a combination of new provision and enhancement of existing rights of way where appropriate.*

*Development of Phase 2 Gateway will not prejudice the delivery of the consented Phase 1.*

*Development proposals that would compromise the delivery of an identified strategic growth location will not be supported.*

The following policies are considered relevant:-

- S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S2: Settlement Strategy
- S3: Infrastructure Delivery
- S4: Sustainable Development Principles
- S5: Climate Change
- D1: Drainage and Flood Risk
- D2: Promoting High Quality and Inclusive Design
- D6: Affordable Housing
- D13: Sustainable Transport
- D14: Highways Impacts
- D15: Economic Prosperity
- D19: Landscape
- D20: Biodiversity
- D22: Trees and Woodland
- D25: Protecting Residential Amenity
- D26: Historic Environment
- D27: Education Provision
- D28: Health and Social Care
- D34: Outdoor Public Recreational Space and New Residential Areas

**Development and Design Principles Document (DDPD) Phase 2 Gateway Housing, adopted March 2022.**

**Somerset County Council Parking Standards**

### **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

The application is for residential development in North Petherton where the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is Urban Residential £55.91/sqm of additional gross internal floor area created. Based on current rates, the CIL receipt for this development would be in the region of £1,001,804.97. This amount does not take into account any existing floor space on site that may be converted or demolished, or any CIL exemption or relief that may be eligible.

### **Main Issues**

#### **Principle**

Notwithstanding local concerns about the loss of a green space, Local Plan Policy B4 Land at Bridgwater Gateway allocates this site for a mixed-use development that includes about 400 new homes and 6 hectares of B1 employment and other appropriate uses. The policy states that

development will be built in accordance with an adopted development and design principles document including an infrastructure delivery plan and master plan.

Phase 2 Bridgwater Gateway Development and Design Principles Document was adopted by Sedgemoor District Council as a material planning consideration on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2022. This document was based on a detailed assessment of constraints and opportunities and set out a number of design principles based on this analysis. The land use and density design principle refers to *“development will provide for approximately 470 new dwellings of a mixed size and type to the area”*.

As such the principle of the site’s residential development is accepted.

However this proposal with the adjoining Boklok site would see the anticipated number of dwellings exceeded. In combination the two applications would deliver 511 dwellings. This is an increase of 41 dwellings from the indicative figure in the design principles. However, the 496 of the proposed dwellings have full details and therefore the number and layout reflect detailed consideration of house types, mix, open space etc and demonstrate that slightly higher number of dwellings could be satisfactorily accommodated whilst still meeting the broad requirements of the development and design principles. In particular the 346 dwellings proposed under 37/22/00071 are based on a particular approach to communal open space and also reflect slightly greater densities associated with the proposed modular building techniques.

Whilst the total number of dwellings based upon the detailed consideration of the site, is slightly greater than the development and design principles, that document did not set an upper limit but rather referred to “approximately” 470 dwellings. It is clear that the total numbers proposed across the two applications is therefore broadly consistent with both the local plan and the adopted guidance that was a requirement of Policy B4. The overall combined developments are able to provide appropriate levels of open space and landscaping, whilst local infrastructure can accommodate these levels without any significant impacts.

Cumulatively therefore the level of development proposed across the two applications is considered to accord with the adopted development and design principles and also the local plan that set housing figures as minimums under Policy S2 Spatial Strategy for Sedgemoor.

## **Highways Issues**

The application site would be accessed through the Boklok site from Compass Avenue, off the signalised junction with the A38 Taunton Road between North Petherton and Bridgwater. This junction is a short distance south-west of the signalised A38 Huntworth roundabout. Junction 24 of the M5 sits approximately 200 metres south-east of the Huntworth roundabout and provides an ‘all-movement grade separated junction’. The potential for development to impact on the safe and efficient operation of M5 Junction 24 has resulted in National Highways raising concerns in relation to the residential development proposed by this application and the adjoining Boklok scheme.

This issue was addressed by a Transport Assessment (TA) prepared by Peter Evans Partnership (PEP) dated July 2022 who have worked with National Highways to:-

- broadly agree the assessment of traffic flows;
- review development traffic assignment via the M5;
- consider the cumulative impact of further development under the Policy B3 and B4 Local Plan allocations; and
- update traffic modelling work.

Subsequently a Supplementary Transport Note dated October 2022 has been provided. This provides updated traffic modelling work and sensitivity assessments in line with National Highways comments. The note indicates that there will be limited queuing on the M5 slip roads as result of committed and proposed development and with infrastructure improvements in place, including lane marking changes associated with the committed new Motorway Service Area to the east of the M5.

The traffic flow inputs for the modelling work have been agreed by National Highways. Whilst the Transyt model results reported in the Supplementary Transport Note are not fully accepted, National Highways have undertaken further investigations using the 'Flare function' for flared approach lanes – i.e. the ability for turn left lanes to provide additional capacity.

Overall, the modelling work undertaken for the development does not indicate that there will be an unacceptable or severe impact on the safe and efficient operation of M5 Junction 24. However, Transyt modelling forecasts that long queues are likely to form on the A38 approaches to the Huntworth roundabout given cumulative development. As the roundabout operates under MOVA control, it is likely that queues will be shared between approaches, with longer queues also occurring on the link between the A38 Huntworth roundabout and M5 Junction 24. Given the proximity to M5 Junction 24, National Highways will seek to discuss the future operation of the A38 Huntworth roundabout with the Local Highway Authority, with a view to minimising any impact on the safe operation of SRN.

On this basis it is not considered that there would be any undue impact on the safe operation of the SRN and in this respect the proposal complies with policy D14.

Turning to the local road network the highway officer raises no safety objection to the access to the public highway via Carnival Way and Compass Avenue to the A38 signalised junction). In terms adoption there has been ongoing dialogue between the Highway Authority and the applicant. Normally the Highway Authority does not adopt roads that only serve industrial plots as is the current situation. As such the highway officer has advised that the existing roads have been laid out and constructed without the technical oversight or involvement of the highways authority. Accordingly their position is that the roads on the proposed residential development would not be adopted, as they would not be linked to the public highway (i.e. the A38) by an adopted highway.

Nevertheless it has been confirmed that the existing roads on phase 1 were designed to an adoptable standard and are subject to a full 'ghost' s.38 agreement with the highway authority. The intent of

such agreement is to enable the roads to be adopted at a later date.

As it is now proposed to serve residential development via these industrial estates road this creates a potentially difficult situation whereby the access to the site from the public highways might not be adopted. Whilst this might be unusual, it is not objectionable in planning terms provide the arrangements are deemed to be safe. Accordingly the highways authority have not objected to the proposed access arrangements and do not require them to be adopted.

In any event adoption is covered by different legislation (e.g. s38 of the Highway Act) which would enable subsequent adoption should the suitability of the access from the A38 to the residential part of the site be resolved.

In terms of traffic modelling and local impact the highway authority have accepted that the A38 Huntworth Roundabout and A38/ Compass Avenue junctions would continue to operate within capacity in the 2032 baseline position with all committed development built out, and the same scenario exists when the development traffic is factored in, albeit with a slight reduction in overall capacity during both peak hours.

It is noted that a total of 84 and 88 trips (two way) would be generated respectively in the AM and PM peak hours. However the Highway Authority does not consider that these additional movements would have any detrimental or severe impact on traffic flows in the vicinity. As such it has been accepted that the supporting information demonstrates that there would be no undue impact on the local road network outside the site and that no off site improvements are required.

Within the site it is accepted that the overall proposed parking provision, 401 spaces for 150 dwellings plus 36 visitor spaces, is generally in accordance with the standard for Zone B, the standards for which indicate an optimum requirement for 408 spaces for the dwellings and 30 visitor spaces. Against this the proposal is 7 spaces short of the requirement for the dwellings and over provides six spaces for visitors; overall the proposal under provides by one space.

As Zone B typically includes small towns and villages, and not suburbs of the larger towns in Somerset which are typically in Zone A, where the requirement for a development of this size would be 366 spaces for the dwellings and 30 visitor spaces. Assessed against this the proposal over provides by 41 spaces. On this basis, in light of both NPPF and local policy advise that site characteristics and accessibility should be taken into consideration, the very slight under provision (i.e. 1 space) is not considered objectionable in this well connected location which is arguable more characteristic of Zone A rather than Zone B.

Electric vehicle charging points could be provided for each property in line with both national and SC guidance, although it is to be noted that this is now covered within the latest building control regulations. Additionally secure, covered cycle parking is proposed within the curtilage of each property with sufficient space to accommodate the number of cycles for the number of bedrooms proposed, in line with SC guidance.



Given the forgoing it is considered that the proposed level of car parking would be appropriate for this site location and meet the requirements of policy D14,

Allocation requires pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the Wilstock/Stockmoor development and Country Park to the north. The application site does not extend to this boundary, however it is well connected to the adjoining Boklok site through which a connection could be provided.

The application is supported by a travel plan which has been accepted by highways officers and would need to be secured through a s106 agreement to promote sustainable means of travel as required by policy D14.

On the basis of the foregoing it is considered that the highways and connectivity matters raised by this application have been adequately addressed in the proposal complies with the requirements of policies B4, D13, D14 and Development and Design Principles Document Phase 2 Gateway Housing, adopted March 2022.

### **Visual Amenity**

Policy B4 sets out the overall expectations of development and are supplemented by the development and design principles document (DDPD) and following detailed policies:-

- Policy D19 of the Local Plan requires proposals to ensure the landscape is enhanced wherever possible and that there are no significant adverse impacts on local landscape character, scenic quality, and distinctive landscape features.
- Policy D22 states that where possible development should seek in the first instance to avoid or minimise the loss of or damage to trees, woodland and hedgerow.
- Policy D2 requires high quality, sustainable and inclusive design for all new developments t

With regard to the landscape impact it has been accepted through the allocation of the site for mixed use development that there will be a change from undeveloped to developed and that with appropriate detailing this can be sensitively managed. To set out how this would be achieved the application is supported by a landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA).

The Site does not lie within any national or local landscape designations and there are no relevant designations within 2km of the Site. The Quantock Hills AONB is located approximately 3.3km south-west of the Site, at its closest point, however there is no intervisibility between the AONB and the site.

To the east is land committed for employment development', where "Phase 1' of the Bridgwater Gateway development has seen the erection of employment units, a Costa coffee 'drivethru' and

Premier Inn hotel, off the newly constructed Compass Way (off the A38).

This site and the Boklok site are in 'Phase 2', a mixed-use residential and employment development and would be seen in the context of the wider development and would be visible in limited long distance views as part of the wider settlement and proposed urban extension. It is considered that the proposals would not introduce incongruous features into these views. It is accepted that in short views from the west, the proposed development will, together with the BoKlok scheme, introduce new development into the view where there is currently little apparent. However this new built form would be contained within a retained and enhanced planting and green infrastructure network, that would create a new softened edge to the settlement.

The landscape officer has accepted the finding of the LVIA which concludes that:-

*.....there will be a neutral change in respect to the published landscape character. An adverse change has been identified in respect of the site-specific landscape character, due to the loss of the eastern field to the proposed development. However, this is considered in balance against the influence of the nearby settlement, the wider policy allocation, the landscape features that are retained and the enhancement and long-term management measures secured as a result of the proposed development.*

*In respect to views and the visual environment, those people who will experience the most change to their views are restricted to locations in the immediate surroundings. Although the proposed development will be visible from the wider landscape, the Site is attached to the settlement by the Phase 1 Bridgwater Gateway and, together with the BoKlok scheme, the Site is designed to create the new settlement edge to Bridgwater through the Council's allocation. The development of the Site will be experienced in the context of the land committed to employment to the north-east of the Site within Phase 1 and the industry surrounding junction 24 of the M5 and along the A38. This ensures the proposed development reads as part of the settlement. Mitigation and enhancement measures have been embedded from the outset, as part of the full planning application.*

Accordingly in respect of any landscaping impact on the setting of the site that the Site can accommodate the proposed development without undue effects on the landscape and views or the setting of the AONB.

A condition is suggested to ensure that the proposed landscaping is carried out and that a landscape and environmental management plan be secured through the s106 agreement to ensure the future management/maintenance of the existing and proposed landscaping, in order that the longevity of the landscape proposals can be secured into the future.

Subject to this it is considered that the transition of this allocated site, in this location, from undeveloped to development would be appropriately managed and mitigated. On this basis it is considered that the inevitable change in character from undeveloped to developed would be

sensitively managed and the resultant development would be well landscaped and sit comfortably in its context. As such the proposal visual impact in the landscape would comply with the requirements of the DDPD, and policies D2 and D19

In terms of on site impacts on existing hedges and trees, no trees proposed for removal as part of this proposed development. T4 is a 'U' category Ash located within a group of trees in an existing basin feature to the North-east of the site. This tree is accepted to be in significant decline, however it forms a part of the surrounding group and has features that could potential give a high ecological contribution. This is located such that it would not come into contact with any proposed road, pathway or dwelling in the event of its failure, and is therefore to be retained.

There would be some minor surfacing within the RPA of T2 (an oak in the same group at T4) as part of the development proposals. The tree is located down the sloped profile of the basin feature and below the proposed development levels and the proposed surfacing is not expected cause any significant impact to roots within its required excavation footprint. A large area has been indicated within the Tree Protection Fencing (TPF) which will help mitigate for any impact on the tree. A condition is recommended to secure an appropriate tree protect plan and methodology.

A section of H7 along the northern boundary of the application site is to be removed to allow for connection to an adjacent parcel of land and separate phase of development. This a small length of hedgerow and is of low quality in terms of its species diversity.

Pruning and sectional removal from the adjoining ends of both H1 and H20 are proposed to ensure that construction traffic can adequately access the site through the existing access route if required. This surgery would not have a significant impact to the overall hedgerows and its removal could be mitigated by additional planting.

Additional minor pruning is proposed along the length of H20 to allow erection of the TPF at least 0.5m away from all proposed surfacing and to facilitate construction of a proposed Bin Collection Point. The effects of the minimal loss required to implement the design, would be mitigated as detailed in the landscape proposals for the site.

Except for the garage structure for plot 37, a 1.5m off-set has been allowed for working room and scaffolding erection between the TPF and all proposed construction. A 0.5m off-set of the Tree Protection Fencing has been allowed from all proposed surfacing and excavation. Where the offset of TPF results in an encroachment into a retained RPA, additional space has been provided within the Construction Exclusion Zone created by the fencing.

It is noted that there would be encroachment within the projected RPA of T2, however this equates to less than 2.1% of this rooting zone. Given the ample amount of space provided within the TPF and the significant existing level difference between the base of the stem and the proposed surfacing, this impact is considered to be minimal and well within the threshold required to allow for the continued vitality of this tree.

Confirmation has been provided that there would be no construction proposed within the RPAs of retained trees. It is fundamental to tree protection that infrastructure design is sensitively approached, as trenching close to trees may damage roots and affect tree health and stability. Details of services have not been provided at the current time and it is necessary that all services should avoid areas of potential conflict.

It is suggested that the submitted tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement will need to be revised to provide the necessary details for services and to take account of any changes in ground levels on site which are still to be finalised. The landscape officer suggested that a condition be imposed to ensure that a suitably updated tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement is agreed prior to the commencement of development. Subject to such condition the landscape officer is content that all tree works will be carried out in accordance with BS3998:2010 Tree Work and any relevant arboricultural good practice. Accordingly, it is considered that in this respect the proposal would comply with the requirements of policy D19.

In terms of layout the proposal closely follows the broad principles established through the Illustrative Masterplan approved as part of the DPDD, with perimeter blocks and a pattern of streets that are consistent with the guidance. The principal routes would incorporate a combination of strong built frontage and tree-lined avenues to define and characterise these routes, with more organic and less regimented form of development toward the site periphery.

Attenuation basins would be provided on the lower parts of the site at the edge of the of the proposal. Play areas would be well integrated and accessible with an area public open space, including a LEAP in the northeast corner and a group of retained trees.

It is considered that this layout is acceptable in light of the requirements of policy D2 and expectations of the DPDD.

The majority of the buildings would be 2-storey with a number of 2 ½ storey houses and a 3 storey apartment building at the entrance to the site from the Boklok development. Their design, traditionally proportioned and detailed dwellings is considered acceptable. Most dwellings would be detached with some semi-detached properties and few short (3/4 property) terraces. Generally the outward facing properties are to the west and south are detached to give a softer edge to the development. Over all the scale of buildings and there distribution across the site is considered acceptable and would sit comfortably in the context and topography of the site.

The materials would be a mix of brick and reconstituted stone with grey and red roofing materials, the detail of which could be secured by condition. A mix of fencing (with trellis additions as requested by the police design advisor where necessary and brick boundary walls is proposed, again the detail could be agreed by condition. On this basis the appearance of the proposed houses ids considered acceptable and could comply with policy D2 and the expectations of the DPDD.

A detailed landscaping scheme has been provided which has been agreed by the landscape officer – a condition is suggested to ensure that this is implemented as part of the development to provide the necessary softening.

Accordingly subject to conditions to agree the materials and secure appropriate landscaping this aspect of the proposal was considered to comply with the requirements of policies B4 and D2.

### **Residential Amenity**

There are no existing residential occupiers that would be impacted by the development.

In terms of facilities for future occupiers, proposals for residential development under policies B4 and D34 are required to provide public open space and formal and informal recreation. A proposal of the combine size proposed would normally be expected to provide a multi-use games area (MUGA) under the terms of Local Plan policy D34 ('Outdoor Public Recreational Space and New Residential Areas'). However, the DDPD refers to the MUGA at Stockmoor Village as sufficient to fulfil the requirements of policy D34 as it is within 700m of the site.

Within the site a LEAP and 2 LAPs would be provided in accessible locations which are considered acceptable, additionally all dwellings would have private gardens of an appropriate size. Whilst the police design advisor's comments are noted about the western LAP, his concerns are not shared by the council's open spaces officers and it is noted that this area would be overlooked by the west facing dwellings in this part of the site. In this basis it is accepted that the play space would be well sited. The details of the equipment and a requirement for ongoing maintenance would be an obligation in the s106 agreement.

A condition has been suggested to agree measures to protect future occupiers from road noise. However the proposal does not front, and is not near to, a road that is likely to create problematic noise levels. To the front of the site, the A38 is subject to a 30mph limit, is some distance from the site and would be screened by intervening building and topography. To the rear Wilstock Way is again some distance from the site and is subject to a 30mph limit. Within the site there is no reason to presume the internal roads would be unduly noisy. As such the requested condition is not considered reasonable or necessary.

On the basis of the foregoing the proposal is considered to comply with policies D2, D24, D25 and D34.

### **Drainage and Flood Risk**

Majority of the site to be at 'very low' risk of surface water flooding. There is an area of increased risk at the western end of the site associated with the Stock Moor Rhyne. There is also a small area of 'high' risk at the northeast of the site which coincides with the location of a small basin and trees. Both areas would be kept free of development and all dwellings would be outside areas of flood risk.

Accordingly, subject a condition as recommended by the Environment Agency to set the FFLs at 9.6m AOD it is not considered that any proposed dwelling would be at risk of flooding.

It is proposed that all surface water runoff be discharged direct to the existing ditch at the northwest of the site. The Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (DEFRA 2015) stipulates that for greenfield sites the peak runoff rate from the development to any highway drain, sewer or surface water body for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event and the 1 in 100-year rainfall event should never exceed the peak greenfield runoff rate for the same event.

To achieve this surface water runoff from the proposed development will be conveyed via gravity-fed surface water pipe network to two detention basins situated to the west of the developable area. These basins would be linked and will be generally dry, so that they only fill with water during storm events. The LLFA accept that the combined storage volume provided by the basins would be sufficient to accommodate all surface water runoff from the 100-year rainfall event with the appropriate allowance for future climate change. From the basins the water would be discharged to the existing ditch on the northwest boundary of the site via a swale. A hydrobrake would be used to ensure that the rate of discharge is lower than the predevelopment rate. This represents a betterment of the existing situation.

Having sought additional clarifications and further details, the LLFA has confirmed that the supporting information that has been provided have addressed their concerns and that their initial objection has been withdrawn. The IDB are supportive of the proposal and have asked for the creation of a wetland feature in the area of open space to west which has been provided to assist with the management of the discharges from the site.

Accordingly, subject to a condition to ensure that a surface water drainage scheme, based on the submitted and agreed details is subsequently implemented, it is considered that proposed development would not be at risk of flooding and would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Accordingly the proposal complies with the requirements of policy D1.

Wessex Water note that the foul water strategy shown on the drawings does not indicate the location of the connection to the public foul network, rather the drawing is annotated: "*Connection to foul pipe stub provided by adjacent development which ultimately discharges to the public sewer system.*" It is understood that this foul connection would be provided by the Boklok scheme (37/22/00071). The water company is concerned that there maybe no guarantee that this will be provided or that the pumping station constructed to accommodate the initially approved development at Bridgwater Gateway has sufficient capacity.

A condition is suggested to require the agreement of the means of connection to the main sewage system. This is necessary to ensure that foul water is properly dealt with and no risk to the aquatic environment arises as required by policy D1.

## **Ecology**

The site currently comprises two fields of grassland that has generally been cut for hay, with scattered areas of tall ruderal and scrub, which are accepted as of negligible ecological importance. Small areas of the grassland are more diverse and parts of the western field are designated as Priority Habitats under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. The fields are bounded by native, intact hedgerows, with occasional trees, and rhynes. A number of trees are located within the grassland and ditches run along the central and southern hedgerows. All these habitats are of local ecological importance. The majority of habitats of local ecological importance, including the Priority Habitats identified will be retained and enhanced as part of the proposed development.

Three international/European statutory designated sites are located within 10km of the site with the closest being the Severn Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar located 6.8km north west. A dry depression, two ditches and adjacent rhynes are part of Stockmoor Local Wildlife Site (LWS). A further four LWS are located within the zone of influence. The site falls within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone for North Moor SSSI.

Natural England have been consulted on the likely risk of the proposed development and have not raised an objection.

Recorded levels of ten species of bat activity on the site were relatively low by, with the majority of passes by common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and soprano pipistrelle *P. pygmaeus*. Individual and low levels of activity from more light adverse species including lesser horseshoe *Rhinolophus hipposideros*, greater horseshoe *R. ferrumequinum* and barbastelle *Barbastella barbastellus* were recorded during automated static surveys.

A sensitive lighting strategy will be necessary with the developed area, designed to minimise light spill onto retained and enhanced habitats used by bats, including the hedgerows and trees; this can be conditioned as suggested by the ecologist. No lighting is proposed within the western grassland field immediately adjacent to the rhynes.

A partially-used outlier badger *Meles meles* sett is located within the east of the site and further setts are located within the wider landscape. A one entrance, disused sett is also located adjacent to the proposed access onto the site. Future monitoring of this sett will be undertaken prior to construction and this can be secured by as part of a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) to be agreed by condition as suggested by the ecologist

A licence from NE for disturbance to the partially-used outlier sett and, depending on the results of the monitoring, closure of the currently disused sett would need to be applied for and implemented if planning consent is granted. Again this could be agreed as part of the CEMP.

With the proposed landscape planting, including buffers around the majority of the hedgerows and retention of the western field, any population of badger would be able to continue to use the site for foraging, shelter and commuting post-development.

Water vole and otter are known to be present within the adjacent rhynes network. These habitats will be retained with protection measures implemented as part of the CEMP to ensure impacts are minimised.

Whilst not a requirement of this application, which was submitted prior to the introduction of biodiversity net gain (BNG) requirements, the supporting information sets out that the proposals achieve a BNG of 14.73% for habitat units and 10.43% for hedgerows with the enhancement of retained habitats, the creation of new hedgerows, planting of native trees and shrubs and creating a drainage basin on the site. All retained, created and enhanced habitats would be managed through the implementation of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).

The council's ecologist accepts that subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions to

- Secure the production and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure protection of retained features during construction;
- Secure the production and implementation of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to ensure habitats are managed appropriately post-development, including remedial actions in case habitats fail and a schedule for monitoring;
- Secure the production and implementation of a sensitive lighting strategy for bats; and
- Secure the method statement and licence application of badgers based on the principals outlined within this report.
- Secure biodiversity enhancements

the proposal would comply with policies D19, D20 and d22 and the Council's duties under the relevant wildlife legislation.

## **Other Issues**

### Heritage Assets

The site lies adjacent to an area where Bronze Age and Roman settlements were partially excavated in advance of the Gateway development. The remains included cremations, enclosures and roundhouses. It is likely similar remains are present on the proposal site. These remains are of local significance but should be investigated prior to development of the site. The archaeologist has suggested a condition to secure a "Programme of Works in Accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation" prior to development. Subject to such condition it is considered that the proposal would comply with the requirements of policy D26.

It is noted that there are no heritage assets adjacent to, or within 200m of, the site. The nearest listed building (Heathfield Farm, is c.200m to the south of the south-east corner of the site. Given this



separation and the proposed landscaping of this corner of the site, it is not considered that the proposal would harm the setting of this listed building. And as such there would be no conflict with policy D26 in this respect.

## Construction

A number of conditions have been suggested to ensure that the construction phase is suitably managed and mitigated. These are considered reasonable to prevent pollution and in the interests of managing the impacts on the local highway network, ecology and the living conditions of residents in the wider area as required by policies D14, D20, D24 and D25.

Additionally a condition has been suggested by the economic development officer to secure a 'local labour agreement' this would afford job opportunities to the local work force and is justified by condition D15.

## Outstanding Local Concerns

The potential for the loss of green space between Bridgwater and North Petherton is noted. In itself the proposal would not result on the two settlements become conjoined. Whilst it may result in the diminution of the sense of separation in some views, this would have been considered when this site was allocated for development. It is not considered that there is any justification to revisit this issue.

The concerns about the Wilstock and Stockmoor developments are noted however such matters are not considered relevant to the determination of this standalone development. It would not be reasonable to expect this developer to put right perceived failings of another site.

Concerns about the potential for this to be a car dependant development are also noted. However such matters would have been carefully considered when the site was allocated and in many respects there are opportunities for future residents to choose alternatives to the private motor car. In respect of bus services, the site is as well connected as any on the edge for Bridgwater. Similarly there are cycle routes between the site and the town. It is to be noted that, other than connectivity to Wilstock/Stockmoor, the allocation does not now require any off site improvements to pedestrian or cycle connectivity and a bus contribution has not been requested.

Whilst there may be concerns about the lack of bus contribution it is to be noted that the A38 is already well served by buses and given that the site is effectively a cul-de-sac it is unlikely that any passing bus service could be directed through the site. Accordingly it is unclear what a bus contribution could achieve in this instance.

It is acknowledged that the A38 is used when the M5 between junctions 24 and 25 is closed. However this is neither a regular nor a predictable occurrence and it would be unreasonable to resist development in the North Petherton area due to concerns that this section of the M5 will occasionally be closed. It is noted that neither Highways England nor the local highways authority are concerned

in this regard.

The desire for a new bypass is noted however this is not a requirement of this development nor does it feature in any part of the current local plan and it would not therefore be reasonable to seek to withhold planning permission for this development on this basis.

The enforcement of speed limits is not a planning matter and should be raised with the police.

### **Planning Obligations**

The following planning obligations have been requested:-

- 30% affordable housing;
- The provision of, and subsequent management of LEAP and LAPs, plus incidental on site open space,.
- A landscaping environment management plan (LEMP)
- A contribution of £91,718 (£611/dwelling) towards the provision of GP services to meet the additional need arising from the development
- A travel plan

Whilst the applicant has agreed to the provision and management of all the necessary on site open space, the NHS contribution and the requested travel plan, it is their view of that with 30% affordable housing the development and that on the adjoining site (37/22/00126) would be unviable. Policies S5 and D6 of the local plan make provision for reduced planning obligations where it has been demonstrated that these would make the development unviable.

In such situations it is the council's policy to require the developer to provide an open book valuation of the proposal by suitable third party expert at the developers cost. The applicant has provided a development appraisal of both schemes and is entered into protracted dialogue with the council's adviser who has in turn provided a report to the council on this matter which is appended to this report.

*We have carried out an appraisal based on the above assumptions with a 30% provision of affordable housing (See Appendix 1).*

*This results in a residual land value of £2,421,359. This is clearly below the benchmark land value.*

*We then carried out further appraisals with 20%, 10% and zero affordable housing which resulted in residual land values as shown in the table below.*

Affordable %	Land Value 25.5.23	Per gross acre	Per net acre	Per plot
--------------	--------------------	----------------	--------------	----------

30%	£2,421,359	£39,513	£56,324	£4,738
20%	£3,552,875	£57,978	£82,644	£6,953
10%	£5,473,067	£89,312	£127,310	£10,711
0%	£6,693,403	£109,227	£155,697	£13,099

*In our opinion, the appraisal with 10% affordable housing shows a residual land value that is close to the benchmark land value of £4,902,400 and demonstrates that the scheme is viable with 10% affordable housing.*

*It is our opinion that, at this stage, the scheme could support 10% affordable housing.*

*It should be noted, however, that this is, at this stage, a very high-level appraisal and any slight changes to any of the inputs will have an impact on the residual land value that is calculated.*

*It is our recommendation that any planning permission should have a review mechanism attached as the scheme is likely to be built out in phases over a number of years and the assumptions adopted will change over time.*

It is to be noted that it is suggested that the benchmark land value, i.e. the price that a willing seller and willing buyer would agree upon should be based on the existing use value plus (EUV+) model. In such scenario the seller expects to achieve a value based on a multiplier of the existing use value and the seller is prepared to pay this price in light of the uplift in value afforded by the grant of planning permission.

In this instance the agreed existing use value is £8,000 per acre based on agricultural use. It is advised that the uplift should be in the order of 10 times this value, i.e. £80,000 per acre for the whole site – 61.28 acres. A valuation appraisal has been carried out based on a scheme that provides 10% affordable housing; this would provide a benchmark land value of £89,312.43/acre, just over 11 times the EUV. This review of a scheme with 10% affordable housing is summarised in the following table.

<b>GDV (Net sales)</b>	<b>£149,339,650</b>
<b>Costs</b>	
Build costs	78,242,439
Other construction costs (infrastructure, including abnormals)	18,648,904
Professional fees, sales and acquisition fees and finance	15,166,543
Developer's Profit at 19.18% on GDV	28,643,345
<b>CIL</b>	<b>2,672,056</b>

<b>S106 contributions</b>	493,297
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	<b>143,866,584</b>
<b>RESIDUAL</b> for land acquisition (61.28 acres)	<b>5,473,067</b> <b>Or £89,312.43/acre</b>

It is accepted that this residual value, i.e. the benchmark land value (c. 11x the EUV) is slightly higher than the suggested value (10 x EUV), however the council's adviser suggests that it is reasonable in the context of what is a relatively high level valuation exercise. Furthermore it is suggested that, with an appropriate review mechanism secured in a s106 agreement, the council could be reasonably sure that a sufficiently robust approach has been taken. This would enable any improvements in the viability of the development as a whole to be reviewed and steps taken to secure a more policy compliant contribution of affordable housing.

Additionally it is to be noted that the suggested benchmark land value represents a more robust position to that taken in relation to other developments in Bridgwater where viability assessments at agreed benchmark land valuations up to 14 x EUV. This slightly lower valuation reflects the qualities of this site.

The following commentary is provided on the requested planning obligations.

#### Affordable Housing

Policy D6 requires 30% affordable housing to be provided, however this is subject to viability. The viability of the development has been assessed in conjunction with the proposal for 150 houses on the adjoining (Vistry) site, 37/22/00126. In total 511 dwellings are proposed

A reduction is proposed to 10% across the wider development with the 51 affordable units all to be provided on the Boklok site; none are proposed on this site. Policy D6 allows for such reduction where the evidence demonstrates that it is reasonable to deliver a viable development. If accepted it would be necessary to ensure there is provision for this to be reviewed so that should there be changes to the viability of the development, the affordable housing contribution could be reviewed and if appropriate increased. The detail of the tenure split and nature of other affordable options would be agreed as part of the s.106 negotiations in relation to the other site.

#### Highways

Travel plans, as required by policy D14, are agreed as a planning obligation to ensure that there are incentives and penalties that can only be delivered by way of a legal agreement. The proposal would maintain travel planning as requested by highways officers.

#### Open Space

Policy D34 sets standards for outdoor play space however contributions towards formal sports

facilities need to come via CIL so that this can be directed at either existing facilities that need improving or new provision that is located where it benefits wider community access. Furthermore, B4 does not set out a requirement for the provision of sports space on on-site and the design guide and local plan have not allocated a specific sports type facility on this allocation.

Within the site formal play space in the form of a LEAP and 2 LAPs would be provided as required by policy D34. The technical detail of that provision and subsequent ownership and maintenance would need to be secured through the section 106 agreement. This would also meet the requirements of the landscape officer in terms of ongoing landscape management.

It is suggested that the LEMP requested by the ecologist is also secured through the S106 as it will largely be connected with the management of public open space and therefore to avoid duplication and possible contradiction it is best dealt with in one place. The provision of the LEMP is necessary and justified in light of the requirements of policy D20.

### Health Care

Policy S5 expects development to address its impact on infrastructure where there is evidence that the existing infrastructure would be incapable of meeting the additional need arising from the development. This is echoed by policy D28 with regard to healthcare provision. Given this position it is considered that the requests of the NHS for a contribution to GP provision in the local area is reasonable.

Whilst local concern is noted about dentist provision, the NHS has not requested a funding contribution in this regard.

### Education

Although policy D27 expects development that creates a need for additional education facilities including preschool that cannot be met through existing facilities to meet any identified shortfall, it is accepted that, in line with the Council's Infrastructure Funding List, any early years and school expansion would need to bid for CIL funding. As noted by the education officer any education impacts as a result of the development that would need mitigation could be subject to a bid for CIL funding.

### **Conditions**

Generally the conditions requested by consultees are conditioned reasonable to secure the details of various mitigation measures such as a CEMP, BEMP, lighting, a CMP, drainage details, land contamination, tree protection and are considered reasonable to mitigate the impacts of the development and are justified by local plan policies. A condition to secure a LEMP is not necessary this would be addressed within the S106 agreement as part of the open space management as it would require a financial contribution that cannot be agreed by condition.

## **Conclusion**

It is the proposal as amended constitutes an appropriate development of this allocated site the records with requirements of policy B4 and the guidance contained within the adopted Development and Design Principles Document Phase 2 Gateway Housing. Whilst the scheme does not provide for 30% affordable housing as required by policy D6 members are reminded that this policy requirement can be relaxed where it has been demonstrated that such obligation would mean that the development is unviable.

The applicant has provided the Council's advisor with sufficient information for him to agree that the proposed 10% affordable housing across the wider development, including the adjacent Boklok site would be reasonable in this instance. This would equate to 51 units, all of which would be provided on the Boklok site. Initially no affordable units would be provided on this site, however both sites would be subject to a review mechanism to enable an uplift to be secured should the viability of either scheme improve. All other requested obligations would be provided for.

In all other respects the detail of the proposal is considered acceptable and subject to the suggested conditions and planning obligations the likely impacts would be reasonably mitigated and on this basis the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of policies D1, D2, D6, D13, D14, D15 D19, D20, D22, D25, D26, D28 and D34.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **GRANT PERMISSION**

Grant permission subject to:-

- A. the applicant first entering into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following:
  - The management of a LEAP and 2 LAPs, incidental on site open space and the attenuation areas to the satisfaction of the open spaces officer
  - A landscaping environment management plan (LEMP)
  - A contribution of £91,718 (£611/dwelling) towards the provision of GP services to meet the additional need arising from the development
  - A travel plan
  - A review mechanism to secure the uplift the affordable provision to 30% across the wider site should the viability of the development improve
- B. that the Service Director – Governance, Democratic & Legal Services and Monitoring Officer be authorised to prepare and seal the Agreement; and
- C. the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in schedule A.

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

### **Phasing**

- 3 No development hereby approved shall be commenced until a phasing plan for the development has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Such phasing plan shall include details of the phased delivery of the groundworks, all dwellings, including affordable housing, the public open space, roads, landscaping, surface water drainage and footpaths. Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

Reason: To ensure the comprehensive development of the site in the interests of the amenities of future residents in accordance with policies B4, D25 and D32 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011 to 2032.

### **Ecology**

- 4 The reserved matters application shall include a Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan (BEMP) the content of which shall provided for:-
  - All new fencing to have accessible hedgehog holes, measuring 13cm x 13cm to allow the movement of hedgehogs throughout the site.
  - 2x hedgehog houses to be installed within appropriate locations around site boundaries.
  - Initial creation and ongoing management of deadwood log refugia piles and stone piles/rockeries (as a shelter and resource for reptiles, invertebrates, amphibians, and small mammals) around the site in appropriate locations.
  - 50% of dwellings to have provisions for nesting birds in their design. This should include a mixture of provisions aimed to support different species such as sparrow terraces, open nest boxes, 32mm nest boxes etc. These should be installed directly under the eaves and away from

windows on the north elevations (or similarly specified by manufacturer's instructions such as within a mature tree on site). Under no circumstances should south or west elevations be used, and boxes aimed at different species should be spaced at least 2m apart. Woodcrete or WoodStone boxes should be used where possible due to increased durability and thermal stability.

- 20x bat boxes to support different species should be included within the design of the development and should be mounted at least 4m above ground on either the south or west facing elevations, and boxes aimed at different species should be spaced at least 2m apart.
- 40% of buildings to include at least 1x integrated bee brick built into an appropriate external wall space. The bricks should be placed 1m above ground level and vegetation must not block the entrance holes.
- A time table for the delivery these enhancements and provision for their subsequent maintenance.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved BEMP.

Reason: To safeguard protected species and in the interests of the biodiversity of the site in accordance with Policy D20 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

- 5 Prior to construction above damp-proof course level, a lighting design for bats, following Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK (ILP and BCT 2018), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design shall show how and where external lighting within the public and communal areas will be installed (including through the provision of technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent bats using their territory. The design should accord with Step 4 and Step 5 of Guidance Note 08/23, including submission of contour plans illustrating Lux levels, showing that lighting will be directed so as to avoid light spillage and pollution on habitats used by light sensitive species, and will demonstrate that light levels falling on wildlife habitats do not exceed an illumination level of 0.5 Lux (and below 0.2 lux on the horizontal plane, and at or below 0.4 lux on the vertical plane on any key & supporting horseshoe bat features and habitats). Shields and other methods of reducing light spill as outlined in Step 4 of Guidance Note 08/23 should be used where necessary to achieve the required light levels.

Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the local planning authority, all external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the design, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance



with the design. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the 'Favourable Conservation Status' of populations of European protected species in accordance with Policy D20 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

- 6 No development shall commence until the Local Planning Authority has been provided with either:
- a) a copy of the licence issued by Natural England pursuant to The Protection of Badgers Act 1992 authorising the development to go ahead; or
  - b) a statement in writing from the ecologist to the effect that he/she does not consider that the development will require a licence.

Reason: A pre-commencement condition in the interests of a UK protected species in accordance with Policy D20 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

### **Managing Construction Impacts**

- 7 Prior to the commencement of development a written commitment to the sourcing of local labour shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The written commitment, as a minimum, shall set out the following matters:
- i. The proportion of construction workers to be sourced from the local labour pool;
  - ii. Work experience/ apprenticeship opportunities;
  - iii. The proportion of local procurement and sourcing;
  - iv. On-going skills development and training opportunities;
  - v. The steps that will be taken to ensure that the above is implemented;

The operator shall maintain a record of i - v above and shall make that information available to the local planning authority at all reasonable times upon request.

Reason: To promote opportunities for the local population in accordance with policy D15 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

- 8 No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:
- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.

- b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”.
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements), including: results of update badger survey, badger buffer zones and safeguarding construction measures; precautionary habitat clearance measures for dormice; results of update otter and water vole survey, habitat clearance measures for otter and water voles, including confirmation as to the requirement for a licence;
- d) precautionary habitat clearance measures for amphibians and reptiles;
- e) nesting birds habitat clearance measures; precautionary measures for other highlighted species such as hedgehog, harvest mice etc.;
- f) Pollution Prevention Measures to be implemented during construction concerning on-site and nearby ditches / watercourses.
- g) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- h) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- i) Responsible persons, lines of communication and written notifications of operations to the Local Planning Authority.
- j) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- k) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
- l) Ongoing monitoring, including compliance checks by a competent person(s) during construction and immediately post-completion of construction works.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing the approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period. Upon completion of the construction phase a report, prepared by the Ecological Clerk of Works or similarly competent person, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Such report shall certify the required mitigation and compensation measures identified in the CEMP have been completed to the Local Planning Authorities satisfaction and shall details any necessary remedial works undertaken or required and a timescale for their implementation. Any approved remedial works shall subsequently be carried out under the strict supervision of a professional ecologist following that approval.

Reason: To safeguard protected species and in the interests of the biodiversity of the site in accordance with Policy D20 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

construction activity on site, an arboricultural method statement, tree protection plan and schedule of arboricultural supervision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such statement shall set out the measures to protect the retained hedgerows and trees from mechanical damage, pollution incidents and compaction of roots during construction. Unless agreed otherwise in writing the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details at all times.

Reason: To ensure adequate protection for the retained trees for the duration of the development in accordance with policy D22 of the Sedgemoor Local plan 2011-2032. This is necessary as a pre-commencement condition as the development of the site needs to be informed by measures to protect the retained trees and hedges.

10 Prior to the commencement of development, including any site clearance, groundworks or construction within each sub-phase (save such preliminary or minor works that the Local Planning Authority may agree in writing), a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to manage the impacts of construction during the life of the works, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, the CMP shall, amongst other things, include:-

- a) Measures to regulate the routing of construction traffic;
- b) The importation and of spoil and soil on site;
- c) The removal /disposal of materials from site, including soil and vegetation;
- d) The location and covering of stockpiles;
- e) Details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site and must include wheel- washing facilities;
- f) Control of fugitive dust from earthworks and construction activities; dust suppression
- g) Noise control plan (which includes control methods)
- h) A waste disposal policy (stating no burning on site)
- i) Details of any site construction office, compound and ancillary facility buildings;
- j) Construction and delivery hours
- k) Specified on-site parking for vehicles associated with the construction works and the provision made for access thereto
- l) A point of contact (such as a Construction Liaison Officer/site manager) and details of how complaints will be addressed, including an appropriate phone number.

The details so approved and any subsequent amendments as shall be agreed

in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be complied with in full and monitored by the applicants to ensure continuing compliance during the construction of the development.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety and to safeguard residential amenity in accordance with policies D14, D24 and D25 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

11 Development shall not begin until a scheme to deal with any contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such scheme shall include:-

- an investigation and assessment to identify the extent of contamination;
- a remediation plan to address any contamination found
- measures to be taken to avoid any risk to the public and environment when the site is developed.
- Steps to be taken in the event that any unexpected contamination is found during the course of the development
- Any monitoring necessary to assess effectiveness of the proposed remediation
- Provision of reports as necessary to confirm the outcome of the remediation strategy

Unless agreed otherwise by the local planning authority the development be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme

Reason: To ensure that any risks from land contamination to are minimised in accordance with policy D24 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

### **Archaeology**

12 No development hereby approved shall be carried unless a programme of archaeological work has been implemented in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which has been submitted and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The WSI shall include details of the archaeological excavation, the recording of the heritage asset, the analysis of evidence recovered from the site and publication of the results. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: A pre-commencement condition is necessary to safeguard the archaeological potential of the site in accordance with policy D26 of the

## **Drainage**

- 13 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment ('Gateway, Bridgwater – Flood Risk Assessment', ref. 25794-HYD-XX-XXRE-FR-0002 issue P01 dated 13 October 2022, Hydrock), including the mitigation measures it details. Finished floor levels for all dwellings shall be set no lower than 9.60 metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD). The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the risk of flooding to the development is mitigated in accordance with policy D1 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

- 14 Prior to the commencement of development full technical details of the surface water drainage scheme to serve the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall be based on the Drainage Strategy (DS) dated November 2023 by Tumu and shall provide for the following mitigation measures detailed within the DS:
- Limit the surface water run-off generated by all rainfall critical storms, up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus climate change, so that it will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site and not increase the risk of flooding off-site.
  - a surface water attenuation pond on site to attenuate the runoff from the site to 31.9 l/s from impermeable area.
  - A wetland pond for long term storage to further reduce the discharge to the rhyne.

Such scheme shall also include measures to prevent the run-off of surface water onto the highway and a phasing plan for implementation. Once approved the surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained in good working order at all times thereafter.

Reason: A pre-commencement condition is necessary to ensure the development is properly drained in accordance with policy D1 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

- 15 No development approved by this permission shall be occupied or brought into use until a scheme for the future responsibility and maintenance of the surface water drainage system has been submitted to and approved by the Local

Planning Authority. The approved drainage works shall be completed and maintained in accordance with the details agreed.

Reason: To ensure the development is properly drained in accordance with policy D1 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

- 16 No dwelling shall be occupied until it has been provided with a foul drainage connection in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the development is properly drained in accordance with policy D1 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

### **Materials & Detailing**

- 17 With the exception of ground works, no works to construct the dwellings hereby approved shall be carried out unless particulars of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-

- a) materials (including the provision of samples where appropriate) to be used for all external walls and roofs of the dwellings;
- b) details of the design, materials and external finish for all external doors and windows of the dwellings;
- c) details of all hard surfacing and boundary treatments for the dwellings.

Once approved such details shall be implemented as part of the development unless agreed otherwise in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity in accordance with policy D2 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

### **Bin and Cycle Stores**

- 18 No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied unless it has been provided with bin and bicycle storage facilities in accordance with details that have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity in accordance with policies D2 and D25 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

### **Landscaping**

- 19 Unless agreed otherwise in writing, the scheme hereby approved shall be fully

carried out within 18 months from the date of commencement of the development. The trees/shrubs shall be protected and maintained, and any dead or dying trees/shrubs shall be replaced to the satisfaction of the local planning authority for a period of five years following their planting.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies D2 and D19 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

## **Highways**

- 20 The proposed roads, including footways and turning spaces where applicable, shall be constructed in such a manner as to ensure that each dwelling before it is occupied shall be served by a properly consolidated and surfaced footway and carriageway to at least base course level between the dwelling and existing highway.

Reason: In the interest of highways safety in accordance with policy D14 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

- 21 No development commence unless the details of, and specification for highway works consisting of:

- a) *roads*
- b) *footways*
- c) *tactile paving*
- d) *cycleways*
- e) *sewers*
- f) *any retaining walls*
- g) *service routes*
- h) *vehicle overhang margins*
- i) *embankments*
- j) *visibility splays*
- k) *carriageway gradients*
- l) *drive gradients*
- m) *on street parking*
- n) *any landscaping for tree planting area in or adjacent to the highway,*
- o) *pedestrian and cycle routes and associated vehicular accesses and crossings,*
- p) *means of enclosure and boundary treatment next to the highways,*
- q) *street lighting and street furniture,*
- r) *all new junctions,*
- s) *proposed levels,*

- t) *highway drainage*
- u) *swept path analysis for a vehicle of 11.4m length*
- v) *service corridors.*

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. For this purpose, plans and sections, indicating as appropriate, the design, layout, levels, gradients, materials and method of construction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved highway works (and any agreed consequential and ancillary works) for that part of the site have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of highways safety in accordance with policy D14 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

- 22 The areas allocated for parking and turning on the submitted plan shall be kept clear of obstruction at all times and shall not be used other than for parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interest of highways safety in accordance with policy D14 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032.

### **Schedule A**

Location Plan Drg No. LP.01 Rev. B  
Site Layout Drg No. SL.01 Rev. G  
Electrical Vehicle Charging Point Layout Drg No. EVCP.01 Rev. D  
Site Clearance Plan Drg No. SC-01 Rev. A  
Material Layout Drg No. ML.01 Rev F  
Refuse Strategy Layout Drg No. RSL.01 Rev. E  
Streetscenes & Section Drg No. SS.01 Rev. D  
Preliminary Engineering Layout Drg No. PEL-01 Rev. E  
Preliminary Engineering Layout Drg No. PEL-02 Rev. D  
Preliminary Engineering Layout Drg No. PEL-03 Rev. E  
Preliminary Engineering Layout Drg No. PEL-04 Rev. B  
Preliminary Highway Layout Drg No. PHL-01 Rev. C  
Swept Path Analysis Drg No. PHL-02 Rev. D  
Extent of Adoption Drg No. PHL-03 Rev. D  
Swept Path Analysis 2 Drg No. PHL-04 Rev. D  
Highway Profile Drg No. PHL-05 Rev. B  
Highway Profile Drg No. PHL-06 Rev. B  
Highway Profile Drg No. PHL-07 Rev. A  
Highway Profile Drg No. PHL-08 Rev. A



Tree Protection Plan Drg No. VYH23996-03 Rev A  
Soft Landscape Proposals Drg No. GL1936 01 Rev C  
Soft Landscape Proposals Drg No. GL1936 02 Rev C  
Soft Landscape Proposals Drg No. GL1936 03 Rev B  
Soft Landscape Proposals Drg No. GL1936 04 Rev A  
Soft Landscape Proposals Drg No. GL1936 05 Rev A  
Soft Landscape Proposals Drg No. GL1936 06 Rev A  
Preliminary Drainage Strategy Drg No. 19586-PDL-01 Rev. G (also there is a second sheet: 19586-PDL-02 Rev. B)  
Swept Path (fire) Drg No. 19586-PHL-09 Rev. F

## **House Type Booklet**

HT.Elmslie Floor Plans & Elevations Drg No. HT.ELM.1.pe Rev. D  
HT.Elmslie Floor Plans & Elevations Drg No. HT.ELM.pe Rev. E  
HT.Aslin Elevations Drg No. HT.ASL.1.e Rev. E  
HT.Aslin Elevations Drg No. HT.ASL.2.e Rev. E  
HT.Aslin Elevations Drg No. HT.ASL.3e Rev. E  
HT.Aslin Floor Plans Drg No. HT.ASL.p Rev. B  
HT.Berkeley Floor Plans & Elevations Drg No. HT.BER.1.pe Rev. B  
HT.Berkeley Floor Plans & Elevations Drg No. HT.BER.pe Rev. E  
HT.Cottingham Elevations Drg No. HT.COT.e Rev. E  
HT.Cottingham Plans Drg No. HT.COT.p Rev. B  
HT.Fletcher Plans Drg No. HT.FLE.p Rev. B  
HT.Fletcher Plans Drg No. HT.FLE.e Rev. E  
HT.Grainger Plans Drg No. HT.GRA.1.e Rev. D  
HT.Grainger Plans Drg No. HT.GRA.p Rev. E  
HT.Grainger Plans Drg No. HT.GRA.e Rev. E  
HT.Knightley Plans Drg No. HT.KNI.1.e Rev. F  
HT.Knightley Plans Drg No. HT.KNI.2.e Rev. E  
HT.Knightley Plans Drg No. HT.KNI.p Rev. D  
HT.Leverton Plans Drg No. HT.LEV.pe Rev. E (ALSO HT.Leverton Plans Drg No. HT.LEV.1.pe Rev. E0)  
HT.Mountford Drg No. HT.MOU.1.pe Rev. E  
HT.Mountford Drg No. HT.MOU.pe Rev. E  
HT.Pembroke Plans Drg No. HT.PEM.1.pe Rev. E  
HT.Pembroke Plans Drg No. HT.PEM.2.pe Rev. B  
HT.Pembroke Plans Drg No. HT.PEM.pe Rev. D  
HT.Harcourt Plans Drg No. HT.HAR.pe Rev C  
HT. Mylne Plans Drg No. HT.MLY.p Rev B  
HT. Mylne Elevations Drg No. HT.MYL.e Rev C  
HT.Ripley Plans Drg No. HT.RIP.p Rev **B**  
HT.Ripley Elevations Drg No. HT.RIP.e Rev C  
Single Garage Plans & Elevations Drg No. GAR.01.pe Rev B

Double Garage Plans & Elevations Drg No. GAR.02.pe Rev B  
Twin Garage Plans & Elevations Drg No. GAR.03.pe Rev B  
Triple Garage Plans & Elevations Drg No. GAR.04.pe Rev B  
Extended Garage Plans & Elevations Drg No. GAR.05.pe Rev B  
Flat Block Ground Floor Plan Drg No. FB.F03L.p1 Rev A  
Flat Block First Floor Plan Drg No. FB.F03L.p2 Rev A  
Flat Block Second Floor Plan Drg No. FB.F03L.p3 Rev B  
Flat Block Front Elevation Drg No. FB.F03L.e1 Rev A  
Flat Block Side Elevation Drg No. FB.F03L.e2 Rev A  
Flat Block Rear Elevation Drg No. FB.F03L.e3 Rev B  
Flat Block Side Elevation 2 Drg No. FB.F03L.e4 Rev B

## DECISION

---