


Officer Report On Planning Application: 16/01832/REM


Proposal :	Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and design) following the approval of 14/01333/OUT (redevelopment and restoration of Lake View Quarry to provide 42 dwellings, 1,000 sq metres workspace for B1 use and associated community and recreation facilities.
Site Address:	Land At Lake View Quarry Chistles Lane Keinton Mandeville
Parish:	Keinton Mandeville
NORTHSTONE Ward (SSDC Member)	Cllr David Norris
Recommending Case Officer:	Adrian Noon Tel: 01935 462370 Email: adrian.noon@southsomerset.gov.uk
Target date :	2nd August 2016
Applicant :	Galion Homes (Lakeview) Ltd
Agent: (no agent if blank)	Mr Jack Appleton Pembroke House 15 Pembroke Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3BA
Application Type :	Major Dwlg's 10 or more or site 0.5ha+

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee to enable the issues raised to be debated.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL





This 3.15ha site is on the west side of Keinton Mandeville, lying between Chistles lane and Church Street, to the rear of properties in Queen Street. The village hall is to the north west of the site and the village primary school to the north east. There are residential properties to the south, east and north east, with the site bounded by agricultural land on all other sides.

The eastern part of the site is currently in use as a quarry, with the western part of the site comprising fallow land. The existing quarry access is from Chistles Lane and there is an industrial type steel framed building to the north west corner of the site. A public footpath runs along the eastern boundary. The Kingweston Meadows SSSI is approximately 250m to the west and the site is a designated county geological site.

Outline permission has been granted for up to 42 houses, including 35% affordable employment space, open space, allotments, parking for the school and a new access via Chistles Lane. This reserved matters application seeks detailed approval for:-

- 42 dwellings
- 1,000m² of employment space;
- allotments;
- a village green;
- additional parking and coach turning space for the school;
- associated on site open space.;

The application is supported by:-

- A Planning Statement;
- A Design and Access Statement
- A statement of community involvement;
- A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
- A Landscape & Visual Impact Appraisal;

The applicant has provided amendments to address concerns about levels, drainage, landscaping and points of detail about the design of several plots.

RELEVANT HISTORY

14/0133/OUT Outline permission granted for the redevelopment and restoration of Lakeview Quarry to provide 42 dwellings, 1,000 sq metres workspace for B1 use and associated community and recreation facilities

07/04959/FUL Planning permission refused for erection 16 houses on the grounds:-

01. Having regard to the location of the site outside of the development area on a greenfield site, no special justification has been put forward to warrant departure from the development plan the proposal is located in an unsustainable location that does not support economic activity. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy STR6 of the adopted Somerset and Exmoor Joint Structure Plan Review 2001-2011 and Policy ST3 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan 2006.
02. The development of the site would lead to the sterilisation of current existing mineral reserves leading to the loss locally distinctive materials in constructing the built environment. As such the proposal is contrary to Regional Spatial Strategy Policy RE3, Policy M31 of the adopted Somerset Minerals Local Plan and Policy 24 of the adopted Somerset and Exmoor Joint Structure Plan Review 2001 - 2011.
03. The site is located outside of the development area and is poorly related in terms of layout to the existing settlement form, detrimental to the appearance of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies VIS1, VIS2 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy ST5 of the adopted South Somerset Local Plan 2006.

97/02308/CPO Application permitted under Section 96 for determination of conditions on permission 2784/A and 25092 for quarrying of stone.

940152 Outline permission refused for erection of 5 dwellings

2784/A Extension of existing quarry approved 24/8/51

2784 Extension of an existing quarry approved 3/5/49

POLICY

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 repeats the duty imposed under S54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and requires that decision must be made in accordance with relevant Development Plan Documents unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

South Somerset Local Plan 2006 - 2023

The following policies are considered relevant to this reserved matters application.

SD1- Sustainable Development

HG5 – Achieving a Mix of Market Housing

TA5 – Transport Impact of New development

TA6 – Parking Standards

HW1 – Provision of open space, outdoor playing space, cultural and community facilities in new development

EQ1 – Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset

EQ2 – General development

EQ4 – Biodiversity

EQ5 – Green Infrastructure

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 4 - Promoting Sustainable Transport

Chapter 6 - Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes

Chapter 7 - Requiring Good Design

Chapter 8 - Promoting Healthy Communities

Chapter 10 - Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Chapter 11 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Keinton Mandeville Local Community Plan (2005)

- Housing Objectives 1 (production of Village Design Statement), 2 (local infrastructure – housing developments over 10 will be resisted) and 3 (affordable housing).
- Transport Objectives 1 (reduction in traffic volumes and speeds, and removal of HGV rat-running). 2 (resolution of parking problems particularly at the cross roads, village store and school) and 3 (maintain and improve public transport).
- Youth Provision Objective 2 (additional sports facilities)
- Economy Objective 3 (resist loss of business premises)
- Environment Objective 1 (improve quality of footpaths)
- Leisure and Cultural Activities Objective 2 (encourage leisure and cultural activities), 3 (provision of community facilities, open spaces and play areas)

CONSULTATIONS

Keinton Mandeville Council – initial comments as follows:

- *Positive aspect: This is a spacious housing development.*
- *Houses are too large to be a benefit to the school. A turning place for school coach which was promised in earlier application does not exist*
- *Infill of the site. This represents a fundamental change to the plan. It is scurrilous that infill seems to have slipped under the radar, the likely number of lorry movements required to import material for infilling the site is huge. In practice the movements will be doubled with lorries having to enter and leave the site. Initial (outline) plan did not require the site to be infilled, this represents a substantial change to plans and makes it impossible for the PC to support the application.*
- *There are changes to the drainage system and the new drainage proposals are unclear*

- *This is a large site with large homes - need to question the future use of triple garages with studios above.*
- *The development would be better served (in both the construction stage and finished state) by a road from the High Street. Many years ago, an application for development of the Quarry was refused, opinion at that time was that an additional access road from the High Street would be required, the same access issues remain, and more so with likely volume of infill traffic.*
- *The affordable homes are not integrated into the whole development. Social Housing accounts for 15 out of 42 houses - over a third of the total housing, but only a tiny proportion of the site. This will not contribute to community cohesion. This housing could be expanded onto the village green.*
- *Parking is required for the allotments.*
- *The school bus stop is on the wrong side of the road requiring school children to cross and then re cross the road, and as such would be dangerous.*
- *The traffic management plan for the top of Queen Street – bollard outside Bay Tree Cottage - is impractical. The line of sight indicated on the drawing does not exist. Local knowledge and experience suggests that this would cause more confusion and congestion*

RESOLVED: It was proposed and unanimously agreed to recommend refusal

Note:

The infilling required represents a substantial change to the approved outline application. It is not clear how many vehicle movements over what time period would be generated by the applicant's decision to raise the levels of the site. It is anticipated that this would be substantial and as such would affect the entire village. There has been no construction traffic management plan submitted as required by condition nine of the outline permission. Without this information the Parish Council is unable to make an informed recommendation, a traffic management plan MUST be submitted to the Parish Council for consideration.

In response to a notification of the amount of material initially thought to be necessary to achieve the proposed levels:-

'Infill of the site. This represents a fundamental change to the plan. It is scurrilous that infill seems to have slipped under the radar, the likely number of lorry movements required to import material for infilling the site is huge. In practice the movements will be doubled with lorries having to enter and leave the site. Initial (outline) plan did not require the site to be infilled, this represents a substantial change to plans and makes it impossible for the PC to support the application...The infilling required represents a substantial change to the approved outline application. It is not clear how many vehicle movements over what time period would be generated by the applicant's decision to raise the levels of the site. It is anticipated that this would be substantial and as such would affect the entire village. There has been no construction traffic management plan submitted as required by condition nine of the outline permission. Without this information the Parish Council is unable to make an informed recommendation, a traffic management plan MUST be submitted to the Parish Council for consideration

Subsequently additional details were provided to demonstrate that there is in fact sufficient material on site to achieve the required levels to make the drainage work. Revision to certain plots and the layout were also provided to address concerns raised and the PC were reconsulted. The Council commented:-

- *This was a change from the previous amendment which had indicated that a substantial amount of infill material was required - with the applicant now stating that no infill was required, this appeared to be an extraordinary turnaround. It would be important to have a condition to prohibit the importation of any infill material.*
- *Not clear why the chimneys have been removed*
- *Disappointed that the applicant was not prepared to alter the size of the plot for affordable houses*
- *Disappointed that the school drop off point remained in the same position and concerns about the safety aspect for children had not been taken into account.*

Parish Council opposition to the development remained, however, should the planning officer be minded to approve the application, the Parish Council would recommend a condition to prohibit importation of any infill material to the site.

Further details were provided in relation to the drainage strategy and the PC again consulted:-

Assurance is required that maintenance of the grass in enclosed area will have a proper designated land management / maintenance scheme as it will become shabby.

Resolution: Support the amendment to the plans (change of location of drainage scheme) subject to condition that the grass over top of attenuation site is properly maintained.

County Highway Authority – No objection subject to imposition of conditions and resolution of drainage as it was noted:-

1. *As the surface water management strategy now differs from that originally proposed in the Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment submitted in support of the Outline Planning Application (consented) then I believe the Flood Risk Assessment needs to be revisited to ensure that the effects of the new drainage strategy are assessed. As the proposal now is to discharge surface water from site into downstream systems and watercourses, then the potential resultant flood risk will need to be assessed. It is important to note that whilst the Somerset Drainage Boards Consortium didn't object to the original surface water management strategy at outline, they did advise that any additional surface water run-off from the development would drain to the watercourses in their area. This being the case, they requested that planning consent be granted conditional upon the need to control any additional surface water run-off generated by the development in a manner that would not increase flood risk elsewhere. Whilst no such planning condition was applied, condition 16 of the outline planning consent does require the Local Planning Authority to approve the surface water management strategy. As the proposal is now to discharge surface water to offsite systems, and in turn watercourses, then I believe that the Somerset Drainage Boards Consortium should be consulted.*
2. *Further, as this is classed as a major development for surface water management purposes, then Somerset County Council (Ann-Marie Wood), as Lead Local Flood Authority LLFA), have been consulted on the Reserved Matters application but the Outline Planning Application pre-dated the LLFA's involvement. The LLFA have commented that this application doesn't refer to the surface water drainage element of the proposed development, however, by virtue of the submission of the Design and Access Statement, the surface water*

management strategy has changed. I believe it important to advise Ann-Marie that this is the case as she may decide to review the proposals further.

- 3. It is noted that the decision to move away from soakaways serving as a means to discharge highway run-off has been made due to the high levels of groundwater present thereby not satisfying highway authority design requirement. Whilst this is correct, it may be beneficial to explore other infiltration drainage options to serve the site overall, such as infiltration basins etc. which won't need to be adopted by the highway authority provided that appropriate measures are put in place to secure the long-term maintenance of the asset.*
- 4. The drainage strategy refers to discharging surface water run-off into an existing highway culvert at the junction of Church Street and Queen Street but as no such culvert appears on our records, we are unable to confirm whether this is actually a highway authority asset. However, if it is proven to be a highway asset then it is important to note that there is no automatic right of discharge into it. Highway authority drains are considered to be suitable for their current purpose, within the constraints of our current maintenance budgets and regimes, and unless the designer can prove that this drain serves to collect run-off from the development land, then the proposal will increase the burden on our system. In this case the highway authority will require the existing system to be upgraded such that it is hydraulically and structurally capable of accommodating the additional flow without placing an increased liability upon the authority.*
- 5. The routing of the highway drainage system on-site is a cause of concern as it extends beyond the limit of proposed highway adoption to pass through private land. Whilst easements can be secured to protect the highway authority's interests, such easements in effect sterilise land, are routinely abused and are difficult to enforce. It can be extremely onerous and costly undertaking highway works in private land and designs should avoid the need to route highway drains through private land wherever possible. Preference should be given to providing maintenance corridors or routing drains under paths if drains need to extend beyond carriageways.*
- 6. The 'off-highway' route of the drain out onto Church Street via the narrow lane is a cause of concern as it is unsuitable to provide access, egress and turning for a fully laden tanker/jetter vehicle, which will need to gain access to the flow control and storage tank. Further, the visibility from this track westwards onto Church Street is insufficient and presents a safety concern for maintenance operations.*
- 7. The location of the storage tank, i.e. remote from the public highway, would place an undue liability on the highway authority in terms of maintenance and eventual replacement at the end the life of the asset.*
- 8. Commuted sums would need to be secured to reflect the future cost of maintaining and replacing the storage tank and the additional costs of maintaining an attenuated drainage system.*

In detail concern was raised that:-

The offsite highway drainage proposals are not acceptable as they entail piping through a culvert and the introduction of high level overflows. Further to this there are no assessments to determine whether the existing highway drainage system can accommodate the additional flow. This is a fundamental issue as unless a suitable

means to transfer run-off to the point of out approved by then the proposed surface water management strategy is not viable.

SSC as Lead Local Flood Authority – commented in relation to the updated drainage details:-

At this time I do not feel that the information submitted is suitable to discharge the conditions or approve reserved matters. The applicant has indicated their intention to utilise soakaway to capture, store and remove surface water from each individual property which the LLFA would approve of. However, the surface water drainage scheme proposed for the capture, storage and removal of surface water runoff from the highways is not acceptable, the applicant has indicated and intention to utilise existing highway drainage systems off site on Church Road which also includes and intention to install a surface water drainage pipe perpendicular through and existing stone culvert. This is not acceptable; the applicant will need to provide full calculations for the existing system, the culvert and the ditch at the proposed outfall to prove that the drainage option they are proposing will not have any detrimental effect on the existing system. The LLFA would prefer to see a new system installed from the development to the outfall therefore bypassing all the existing highway drainage systems and surface water drainage system.

At the time of writing clarification of the surface water drainage had been sought from the applicant along with a justification for the proposed method of discharge. An oral update will be necessary with regard to the final comments of the LLFA and highways authority.

Leisure Policy Co-ordinator – no objection, reminds applicant of need to comply with s106 requirements with regard to off-site leisure contributions.

Environment Agency – no objection subject to conditions to secure agreement of drainage details.

SSDC Environmental Protect Unit – no objection subject to a contaminated land safeguarding condition and part of the site may be contaminated.

SCC Rights of Way – no objection subject to keeping rights of way clear during construction and obtaining any necessary consents.

Landscape Architect – initially requested revision to detail of the landscaping scheme, no objection to revised scheme.

SSDC Ecologist – no objection. Notes that adequate information has been provided to discharge the ecology conditions of the outline permission.

Natural England – note the need, identified at the outline stage for great crested newt mitigation measures. No further comments to make.

Somerset Wildlife Trust – suggests conditions to require bird and bat boxes and minimize external lighting

Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor – no comment.

REPRESENTATIONS

21 representations were received to the first notifications:-

- Consultations should have notified properties in Queen St;
- A further road access should be provided, direct to B3153;
- Irving Road should not be opened.
- Increased traffic cannot be accommodated on local network, particularly Queen Street;
- Rat running through the village is a problem;
- Impact of construction lorries;
- Danger to pedestrians, particularly around school;
- Damage to road
- Impact on badgers, further survey work should be carried out;
- Loss of green field site outside village boundary;
- Layout does reflect linear character of Keinton Mandeville;
- Poor relationship with village;
- Too many dwellings;
- Not enough allotments
- Gardens are too small;
- Use of render not in keeping;
- Design asymmetrical;
- Employment units are not needed;
- Loss of view from footpath over open quarry;
- Increase risk of flooding to properties south and south east in Church St and Common La;
- Sewage problems
- Impact of importation of significant material;
- Noise and pollution;
- Drop off layby for school on wrong side of road;
- Impact on property values;
- New houses not needed;

The applicant was asked to clarify the amount of material it was proposed to bring on site (this was stated to be necessary in the application but not clarified). It was then stated that c.30,000 cubic meters of material would be necessary, equating to about 2,000 lorry load. This was considered so significant that it would be treated as materially altering the nature of the scheme and this then formed the basis of a second round of consultation, generating 46 further responses. Many re-iterated points already made above, however the unanimous view was that the road network simply cannot accommodate this level of HGV traffic without serious safety risks to other road users, pedestrians and residents. Concern was raised that the proposal is a best flawed, at worst a wilful attempt to mislead. In particular it was felt that 2,000 lorry loads was an under-estimate.

In light of this level of concern the applicants re-surveyed the site and subsequently confirmed that in fact no additional material will need to be brought onto site. Additional information was provided to confirm this and various amendments were made to the detail of the scheme to address comments made by various technical consultees. This updated information was then subject to a third round of consultations and a further 7 representations were received, generally expressing relief that there would not be large amounts of material imported. Again previous comments were reiterated, including a concern about how the levels could have been got so wrong; it was suggested that the application should be withdrawn and resubmitted. Further comments included:-

- Concern about the proposed drainage strategy and the position taken by the highway authority

- The figures need verification;
- Presumably and unspecified amount of topsoil to finish the scheme will have to be imported
- An unspecified plot was stated as overlooking an existing garden.

Finally in response to technical concerns about the drainage strategy, clarification of the strategy has been provided and a fourth round of consultation was carried out in relation to drainage matters. No further public response has been received.

CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of Development

The grant of outline permission has established the principle of the development of this site, together with the access arrangements via Chistles Lane. It would not be appropriate to revisit these fundamental issues at this reserved matters stage. The key considerations are therefore the reserved matters i.e. layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

Layout

The proposal for 42 dwellings and employment provision on this generous site is considered to be an appropriate level/density of development that would provide generous public and private space for future occupiers as well as allotments. Parking for the school and a centrally located 'village green' would be to the benefit of the wider community. The low density is considered appropriate for this edge of village location.

In terms of the detailed layout the county highway authority raises no objection on highways safety grounds or to the highways layout. Whilst the proposal is not a linear extension of the linear parts of the village it was clear at outline stage that this would not be the case. It is however reflective of the immediate context of development around Irving Road to the north of Chistles Lane.

There is substantial separation between the proposed houses and existing properties and it is not considered that any existing resident would be unduly impacted in terms of privacy. The proposed layout provides for adequate amenity for future occupiers of the development with a satisfactory degree of separation between the houses and the proposed employment units. It is noted that the proposed affordable units are smaller than the open market units however this simply reflects the reality of the provision of such accommodation, which in this case needs to comply with the requirements of the planning obligation to provide 35% affordable houses of a specified size.

On this basis the layout of development is considered to comply with policies TA5 and EQ2.

Scale of Development

The proposal is for 42 dwellings. This is compliant with the outline permission and is considered a reasonable level of development for a site of this size in this location. The scheme provides for an appropriate balance of built form and open space. In terms of the scale of the built form, all properties are 2-storey which is considered appropriate for the location.

Appearance

The properties are of an appropriate design and detailing, which, subject to agreement of the

detailed materials by condition, are considered to be compliant with policy EQ2.

Landscaping

Following amendments to the detailed landscaping scheme the landscape architect has no objection to the proposed planting scheme. On this basis this aspect of the proposal complies with policy EQ2.

Other Issues

Highways safety

The fundamental highways issues in terms of the access to the site and any wider highways impacts were addressed at the outline stage and should not now be re-considered. As noted above, the proposed layout is considered acceptable by the highway authority, subject to conditions, and meets parking and safety requirements. As such this aspect of the proposal complies with policies EQ2, TA5 and TA6.

Ecology

At outline stage detailed ecological mitigation measures were proposed and agreed. These are now subject to conditions imposed on the outline permission that require implementation as part of the development. The detail now proposed is considered to respect the agreed mitigation measures and as such the Council's advisors raise no ecological objection. Accordingly, notwithstanding on-going local concerns about possible wildlife impacts, particularly on badgers, the proposal is considered to comply with policy EQ4.

Residential Amenity

It is considered that there is sufficient space within the site to ensure that the amenities of existing and future residents would be safeguarded, in terms of garden size, parking provision, separation between properties etc. This could reasonably be assessed at the reserved matters stage. On this basis the proposal complies with policy ST6.

Drainage

At the outline stage an infiltration scheme was proposed to deal with surface water on site and it was stated that the site does not currently discharge any water off-site. A condition was imposed to secure the agreement of the technical details. Since then further testing has shown that the ground conditions are not suitable to accommodate the surface water that the now proposed scheme would generate and an attenuated drainage system with an off-site discharge is now proposed. This would be piped via the southeast corner of the site to Queen Street and from there a new pipe under the road would take the water to a roadside ditch at the bend on Common Road where it would discharge at a rate of 5l/s.

Whilst this might be acceptable in principle this strategy poses a number of questions:-

1. Why is it now necessary to create an off-site discharge where previously there was none? In this respect SCC as drainage advisor (the 'LLFA') has been asked to confirm that the technical justification for a switch from an infiltration to an attenuation system has been provided.
2. If an off-site discharge is necessary are the proposed details acceptable in terms of:-
 - a) The detailed design of the on-site system?
 - b) A discharge rate of 5l/s?
 - c) The off-site piped system under the road?
 - d) The capacity of the roadside ditch to accommodate the ditch?

At the time of writing it had been confirmed that, if an attenuated system is justified, the on-site detail and the rate of discharge is accepted. However a detailed response on the justification for an attenuated system, the suitability of the new off-site piped system under the road and the capacity of the roadside ditch to accommodate the discharge was awaited. An oral update in this respect will be necessary.

Whilst the detail of the drainage system is a matter for condition, the type of system (i.e. infiltration or attenuation) is fundamental to the layout of the development. It would not be appropriate to approve the current attenuation based layout until such time as an infiltration based system has been reasonably ruled out and the technicalities of the proposed attenuation system agreed.

Levels

It is most unfortunate that the applicant initially misjudged the levels and the need to import materials, however this cannot be held against the proposal which has now been clarified and acceptable levels proposed. This would ensure that the development sits comfortably in the landscape.

Heritage Assets

There are no affected listed buildings; however there are archaeological remains, principally a Roman villa to the west. It is considered that the proposed layout would safeguard this historic asset and an archaeology condition imposed at outline stage would ensure that it is properly protected.

Local Concerns

Many local residents remain concerned about the principle of the development of this site, the access arrangements and the wider traffic implications on the wider road network. These were weighed in the balance at the outline stage and not considered to justify withholding permission. It would not now be appropriate to seek to revisit these issues.

Concerns are raised about both the size of the properties and their gardens. These are not considered objectionable and given the scale of the development are considered appropriate.

A number of non-planning comments are made with regard to property values and views; these should not be afforded any weight in the balance.

Conclusion

It is accepted that this proposal continues to generate considerable local opposition,

RECOMMENDATION

That, subject to the drainage details being satisfactorily resolved, these reserved matters be approved subject to the following conditions.

Justification

The proposal is of a satisfactory layout, appearance, scale and landscaping that would have no adverse impacts on visual or residential amenity, ecology, flood risk, highways safety, heritage assets or landscape character. As such the proposal complies with the policies of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.

CONDITIONS

01. Except as required by other conditions attached to this approval, the development

hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the following plans:-

- 1250 001 Location Plan
- 1250 004 D Site Block Plan
- 1250 010 D Site Plan Boundary Treatments
- 1250 011 A Part Site Plan Roofs
- 1250 012 B Part Site Plan 1 of 8
- 1250 013 B Part Site Plan 2 of 8
- 1250 014 B Part Site Plan 3 of 8
- 1250 015 B Part Site Plan 4 of 8
- 1250 016 E Part Site Plan 5 of 8
- 1250 017 E Part Site Plan 6 of 8
- 1250 018 E Part Site Plan 7 of 8
- 1250 019 E Part Site Plan 8 of 8
- 1250 035 B Plot 1 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 036 B Plot 2 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 037 B Plot 3 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 038 B Plot 4 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 039 B Plot 5 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 040 B Plot 6 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 041 B Plot 7 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 042 B Plot 8 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 043 B Plot 9 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 044 B Plot 10 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 045 B Plot 10 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 046 B Plot 12 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 047 B Plot 13 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 048 B Plot 14 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 049 B Plot 15 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 050 B Plot 16 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 051 B Plot 17 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 052 B Plot 18 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 053 B Plot 19 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 054 B Plot 20 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 055 B Plot 21 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 056 B Plot 22 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 057 B Plot 23 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 058 B Plot 24 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 059 B Plot 25 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 060 B Plot 26 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 061 B Plot 27 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 062 A Garage Type G1
- 1250 063 A Garage Type G2
- 1250 064 A Garage Type G3
- 1250 065 A Plot 28-30 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 066 A Plot 31-32 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 067 A Plot 33-34 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 068 A Plot 35-37 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 069 B Plot 38-39 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 070 A Plot 40-42 Plans Sections & Elevations

- 1250 071 A Office 1 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 072 A Office 2 Plans Sections & Elevations
- 1250 075 C Road 1 & 8 Site Sections as Proposed
- 1250 076 C Road 1 & 8 Site Sections as Proposed
- 1250 077 C Road 4,5 & 7 Site Sections as Proposed
- 1250 078 C Road 4,5 & 7 Site Sections as Proposed
- 1250 079 C Site Block Plan with Levels
- 1250 SK-002 Site Survey
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
- Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal
- Addendum to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) submitted 15/07/16
- Amended LVIA Figure 24 – Landscape Masterplan submitted 20/09/16
- Amended LEMP Figure 2 – Landscape Mitigation Proposals submitted 20/09/16
- Amended LEMP Figure 3 – Planting Plan submitted 20/09/16

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

02. Prior to the construction of each dwelling hereby approved particulars of following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
- a. details of materials (including the provision of samples where appropriate) to be used for the external walls and roofs;
 - b. details of the recessing, materials and finish (including the provision of samples where appropriate) to be used for all new windows (including any rooflights) and doors;
 - c. details of all hardstanding and boundaries
 - d. details of the rainwater goods and eaves and fascia details and treatment.

Such details shall be generally in accordance with the material schedule submitted in support of the application. Once approved such details shall be fully implemented unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.

03. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the Landscaping Proposals as shown on the approved landscaping drawings shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the dwellings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority give written approval to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.

04. Prior to the commencement of the dwellings hereby approved details of measures for the enhancement of biodiversity, which shall include the provision of bat, swallow and swift boxes and a time scale for delivery of all such measures, shall be submitted to

and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The biodiversity enhancement measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: For the conservation and protection of species of biodiversity importance in accordance with policy EQ4 of the South Somerset local Plan 2006-2028.

05. Prior to the occupation of any dwelling a scheme of external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Once approved such scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details and not altered without the prior written agreement of the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the locality in accordance with policy EQ2 of the South Somerset local Plan 2006-2028.

06. With the exception of top soil, there shall be no importation of any material to achieve the levels shown on the approved drawings.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and highways safety in accordance with policies EQ2 and TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028

07. Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open inwards, shall be set back a minimum distance of 5.0m from the carriageway edge and shall thereafter be maintained in that condition at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety in accordance with Policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.

08. The drive of the proposed drives to the dwellings hereby permitted shall not be steeper than 1 in 10 and shall be permanently retained at that gradient thereafter at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety in accordance with Policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028.