

Officer Report On Planning Application: 11/01556/OUT

Proposal:	Outline application for the erection of new health park including new care home, GP surgery, parking and access. (GR: 348872/128722)
Site Address:	Land Adjacent The Pennards, Behind Berry, Somerton
Parish:	Somerton
WESSEX Ward (SSDC Members)	Ms P Clarke (Cllr) Mr D J Norris (Cllr)
Recommending Case Officer:	Adrian Noon Tel: 01935 462370 Email: adrian.noon@southsomerset.gov.uk
Target date:	21st July 2011
Applicant:	Close Care Homes (Somerton) Ltd
Agent: (no agent if blank)	Brewer, Smith & Brewer The Lions West Quay, Bridgwater TA6 3HW
Application Type:	Major Other f/space 1,000 sq.m or 1 ha+

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

This application is brought to Committee at the request of the Development Manager with agreement of the Chairman and Ward Members in light of the significance of the proposed development for Somerton and to enable the issues raised to be debated in public.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL



This 0.41 hectare site comprises level land to the northwest of the town centre car park, bounded by the railway cutting, Behind Berry and King Ina Drive. It currently comprises a two storey dwelling (25 Behind Berry, aka Pennards), and its curtilage, and a former abattoir (21 Behind Berry). Both structures are set back from the road. To the south is a 1970s bungalow (Hawthorns) and there is a footpath running along side the railway line. There are a number of trees and domestic shrubs on the site, including a protected (TPO) beech in the rear garden of no. 25, adjacent to the footpath.

Development along Behind Berry is characterised by 2-storey, detached dwellings on generous plots with a similar form of development, albeit of a slightly higher density in King Ina Road. Materials are predominantly grey reconstituted stone and tiles with some render and natural stone.

The site is part of an area of high archaeological potential within development limits. There are identified land contamination issues related to the abattoir use.

This is an outline application for the erection of a 55 bed care home, a 7 consulting room doctor's surgery and 51 parking spaces. Access and layout are to be considered at this stage with other matters (design, appearance, landscaping etc.) to be 'reserved' for subsequent consideration. Indicatively both buildings are shown at 3-storeys, both facing into the site, with the care home backing onto Behind Berry and the rear elevation of the surgery facing south to the Hawthorns. The layout shows areas of landscape planting which would retain the protected beech tree. There would be two accesses, with an entrance from Behind Berry and an exit onto King Ina Road.

The application is supported by a traffic assessment, a travel plan, a noise report, a flood risk assessment (FRA), an archaeological report, a land contamination report, a tree survey, a landscape masterplan, a statement of community involvement, an ecology report and a design & access statement.

The applicants have informally provided detailed elevations of the proposed care home.

RELEVANT HISTORY

There is a history of applications in relation to the existing uses. An application was submitted in 2006 for the erection of 14 flats on the abattoir site (06/03870/OUT), however this was withdrawn. Historically (early 1970s) residential development has been approved on land between the abattoir and 25 Behind Berry, however this was not apparently implemented.

POLICY

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 repeats the duty imposed under S.54A 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.

For the purposes of determining current applications the local planning authority considers that the relevant development plan comprises the saved policies of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review and the saved policies of the South Somerset Local Plan (adopted April 2006).

The policies of most relevance to the proposal are:

Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review

STR1 - Sustainable Development
STR2 - Towns
STR4 - Development in Towns
Policy 40 - Town Strategies
Policy 42 - Walking
Policy 48 - Access and Parking
Policy 49 - Transport Requirements of New Development

South Somerset Local Plan (adopted April 2006)

ST5 – General Principles of Development
ST6 – The Quality of Development
ST10 – Planning Obligations
EC3 – Landscape Character
EC8 – Protected Species
EP1 – Noise
EP3 – Light Pollution
EP5 – Contaminated Land
EP6 – Construction Management
EH12 – Area of Archaeological Potential
EU4 – Drainage
TP1 – New Development and Pedestrian Movement
TP2 – Travel Plans
TP4 – Road Design
TP5 – Accessibility by Public Transport
TP6 – Non-residential parking
MC6 – Location of Non-Shopping Key Town Centre Uses

Other Policy Related Material Considerations

National Guidance
PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS4 – Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
PPG13 – Transport
PPS24 – Noise
PPS25 – Flooding

South Somerset Sustainable Community Strategy

Goal 3 – Healthy Environments
Goal 4 – Services and Facilities
Goal 8 – High Quality Homes
Goal 9 – A Balanced Housing Market

The Somerton Community Plan

CONSULTATIONS

SOMERTON TOWN COUNCIL – have not provided a formal view, reporting instead the views of individual town councillors. Generally members of the town council support in principle as it is felt to be a good location for a new surgery. However the following concerns are raised:-

- Access and parking, particularly high traffic flows and need for parking control, including residents permits on surrounding roads
- Congestion at bridge over railway
- Need for new pedestrian bridge
- Height of buildings – 3-storey felt to be urbanisation
- Over development
- Lack of green space
- Lack of detail on design
- Reliance on cars to access site, bus link suggested

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY – accepts the findings of the road safety audit and considers that the access arrangements are acceptable subject to safeguarding conditions to ensure that the visibility splays to the King Ina road exit are delivered. A local aspiration for a crossing on Behind Berry is noted, however, given the location of the existing surgery and the low pedestrian numbers anticipated by the care home, it is not considered that this development would justify demanding a crossing.

Local concerns regarding increased pedestrian movements across the unadopted bridge over the railway line are noted. However it is considered that:-

“... pedestrian visits to the GP surgery will be transferred from one side of the bridge to the other. Residents from north and west of the railway line currently cross the bridge to visit the surgery and would not have to as a result of this proposal. Residents to the south and east of the railway line currently don't cross to reach the surgery but will have to in future. The number of pedestrians on this narrow bridge with poor visibility is likely to remain virtually the same.

“The care home has the potential to develop some pedestrian movements in the direction of the shops but this is very hard to quantify. There are a fair number of pedestrian movements across the bridge judging by my own observations and the anecdotal evidence of telephone conversations with local residents. It is unlikely that the care home will generate a large number of movements compared to those already using the bridge. There is no record of injuries involving pedestrians on the bridge and that is probably because vehicle speeds across the bridge are low on account of the poor forward visibility and the narrow width. There is no evidence to suggest that the development will make the situation any worse than at present..”

Consequently no objection is raised subject to appropriate conditions, including a requirement to agree a travel plan to promote sustainable alternatives to the private motor car.

COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGIST – no objection subject to safeguarding condition.

WESSEX WATER – No objection subject to technical agreement of connection to water services.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY – No objection subject to conditions to ensure compliance with the overall drainage strategy agreed on wider site.

NETWORK RAIL – No objection in principle subject to agreement of boundary treatments, drainage, levels and landscaping. In particular it is noted that:-

“The design and siting of buildings should take into account the possible effects of noise and vibration and the generation of airborne dust resulting from the operation

of the railway.”

AREA ENGINEER – requires details of surface water drainage scheme in accordance with recommendations of FRA to be submitted for approval.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION UNIT – supports findings of contaminated land investigation and recommends conditions to secure agreement of a remediation scheme and confirmation that it has been carried out. The findings of the noise report are also noted and supported subject to a conditions to agree noise mitigation measures to protect future occupiers from railway noise and to agree the detail of any plant (air-conditioning units, extraction units etc.) attached to the building. A condition to control external lighting to prevent light pollution is recommended.

ECOLOGIST – accepts findings of ecology report. Recommends conditions to agree detail of mitigation plan.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT – no objection subject to agreement of detailed landscaping.

RIGHTS OF WAY OFFICER – no objection.

CONSERVATION MANAGER – in response to the indicative elevations of the care home building officers the following:-

“The context is 2 storey detached houses in fairly generous plots - typical late 20th century suburbia - with a general pattern of buildings well set back from the road frontage. 2.5 and 3 storey development would be out of place, and if associated with building uncharacteristically close to the road frontage, highly intrusive. The suburban scattered disposition of buildings around the site could also render a single large block undesirably intrusive.”

REPRESENTATIONS

17 local residents have objected in writing to the proposal on the grounds of:-

- poor, potentially dangerous access due to limited width of King Ina Road and likely levels of traffic
- increased use of the Behind Berry/King Ina Road junction that a previous SSDC survey determined was substandard to accommodate additional town centre traffic.
- congestion in the town – this would exacerbate problems on Behind Berry
- increased use of narrow bridge over railway would be dangerous – a footbridge should be provided
- insufficient parking would result in increased on street parking
- the parking area would be open 24 hours a day
- bus travel and cycling are not realistic options for staff
- Impact upon tranquil nature of cemetery.
- Users would use lay-by created for visitors to the cemetery
- After the recent town centre improvements why are we seeking to relocate the surgery – this would have a serious effect on the town centre
- Visual impact of 3-storey buildings in context of 1 and 2 storey dwellings would be out of character and overly dominant.
- Visual impact of a building forward the building line established by Pennards
- The frontage of the care home should be onto Behind Berry

- Over development of small site not suited to both proposals
- Lack of open space
- Need for care home is debateable.
- The existing surgery should be extended to provide additional facilities
- We should not be forced to accept the care home when the existing surgery can be extended
- The size of the surgery has not factored in the additional houses at Northfields and 500 more in the core strategy
- There would be no room for the surgery to expand
- Internal layout of surgery with lift access to first floor consulting rooms and a lack of treatment rooms is not appropriate
- Is it possible for the authority to approve the surgery alone?

Further letters have been received from the owner of the Brunel Centre and the agent acting on behalf of the developers promoting the care home on West Street (currently subject to a public inquiry). They raise the following additional issues:-

- The highways officer's report is contradicted by evidence.
- The issue of the access over the railway bridge has been raised by the Somerton Community Plan
- The bridge should be widened
- The transport assessment should provide more information
- Double yellow lines will be required in King Ina Road to ensure adequate visibility.

5 letters of support have also been received making the following points:-

- the upgraded care home would be a great asset to meet the needs to residents
- the new surgery will be easily accessible
- it is a well chosen site with good access and parking, close to the town centre
- the proposal will regenerate a derelict site rather than impinging on Greenfield land
- Somerset Care are a non-for-profit company with strong community links
- There is an urgency due to the limited funding window before the PCT is abolished.

CONSIDERATIONS

Whilst local concern about the effect of the relocation of the surgery away from its current town centre location are acknowledged policy MC6 advises that edge of town sites that are reasonably served by public transport, such as this are appropriate in principle for such services. Accordingly the proposal is considered acceptable in principle, subject to consideration of its impacts. No objections have been raised on the basis of contaminated land, drainage, ecology or noise. Accordingly these aspects are considered acceptable subject to conditions as recommended by specialist officers and in this respect the proposal complies with policies EC8, EP1, EP3, EP6, EU4, TP5 and MC6.

It is therefore considered that the proposal falls to be determined on the basis of its impact on:-

- Highways/parking issues

- Visual amenity
- Level of development
- Residential amenity

Highways & Parking Issues

Whilst members of the town council and local residents have raised concerns about the level of parking to be provided the highways officer notes that the proposed 51 spaces are in excess of local plan requirements. It is not considered that there are any exceptional requirements that could warrant over-riding the highways advice the District Council has received or justify demanding higher levels of on site parking than sought by policy TP6.

Similarly the highways officer, after review of the traffic assessment, advises that the access proposals and impact on Behind Berry are acceptable. It is noted that local residents refer to a previous report that deem this junction inadequate to cater for additional town centre traffic should a new access to the town centre be promoted over the railway. The current proposal would only see exiting traffic using the existing Behind Berry/King Ina Road junction. All arriving vehicles would enter the site directly from Behind Berry thereby keeping increased use of the King Ina Road junction at a level acceptable to the highways officer.

With regard to concerns about increased on road parking, the highways officer accepts that this may be an issue in King Ina Road, particularly in relation to larger vehicles leaving the site. It is suggested that this could be addressed by suitable parking restrictions which could be achieved by the appropriate traffic regulation orders.

There are local concerns about increased parking stemming from this development. Given the over-provision of parking on-site and the availability of town centre parking it is not considered that it would be reasonable to pursue this as a reason for refusal.

Finally there is much local concern about any increase use of the narrow bridge across the railway. The highways officer has considered this point in detail and concludes that any significant increase in footfall is unlikely and notes that the proposal includes sufficient on-site parking. Whilst this position has been disputed by local residents it is not considered that there is any evidence to challenge the position taken by the highways officer which could sustain a refusal on the grounds of pedestrian safety.

Accordingly, although local concerns about parking and highways safety are noted, it is considered that there is no evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would not comply with policies ST5, TP1, TP4 and TP6, subject to the agreement of a travel plan as required by policy TP2.

Visual Amenity

It is to be noted that this is an outline application and matters of design, appearance, materials and landscaping would be considered at the subsequent reserved matters stage. Although the applicant has been vigorously encouraged to make a full application to enable all aspects of this important proposal to be considered they have firmly declined to do so and it has not been considered reasonable to reject the application simply on the basis that it is in outline form.

It is not considered that the proposed accesses and layout would have an unacceptable visual impact, subject to careful consideration of the detailed design and appearance at

the reserved matters stage. The landscape officer is supportive subject to agreement of the detailed landscaping with out come at the reserved matters stage and a condition in this respect is not therefore necessary.

The conservation manager is not supportive of the suggested full height, three storey building that has been suggested for the Behind Berry frontage and has reservations about the suggested form of the 2 ½ storey doctor's surgery to the rear. These concerns are noted, however it is accepted that this an outline application and design/appearance is reserved.

Whilst it may provide difficult to satisfactorily achieve full height 3 and 2½ storey structures for the care home and surgery respectively it is not considered at this stage that it would be reasonable to rule out these heights on part of these buildings, for example a small three storey feature on the corner of King Ina Road/Behind Berry, might create a visually acceptable focal point.

This outline application only seeks approval for development of up to three storeys and this might only be achieved on a small part of the site. On the basis of the size of the site, the varied and spacious nature of the surrounding development it is not considered reasonable to reject the principle of 3 or 2 ½ storey structures at this stage in the absence of a detailed design. If a satisfactory design is not forthcoming at reserved matters stage the proposal would be rejected. An informative is recommended to advise the applicant that the submitted illustrative proposal is considered wholly unacceptable.

On this basis, whilst local concerns are noted, it is not considered that the proposal could be rejected on visual amenity grounds at this stage when a full assessment against the criteria of policies ST5, ST6 and EC3 would be carried out upon submission of the reserved matters.

Level of Development

Whilst local concerns about the level of development are noted it is not considered that the site is incapable of accommodating both a care home and a surgery with adequate landscaping and parking. The ability to expand at a future date is not a planning matter and is for the operators to consider; they are confident that both facilities are sufficient to meet planned need.

As noted above the layout is considered acceptable and therefore the level of development is not considered objectionable and the objections received are not sustainable.

Residential Amenity

The submitted layout shows the proposed surgery in close proximity to the bungalow to the south ('Hawthorns'). At 2-½ storeys this would be a substantial structure, however as it is to the north of this dwelling it is not considered that the occupiers of the Hawthorns would suffer any undue loss of light and there is sufficient separation to mitigate any sense of over dominance. Furthermore the submission of reserved matters would allow the relationship, including details design, to be fully considered.

Nevertheless as the layout is to be considered at this stage it has to be acknowledged that the surgery will be sited in this part of the site and there is concern that any first floor windows could overlook the garden areas of the Hawthorns with a clear potential for an unacceptable loss of privacy. Accordingly it is considered prudent to impose a condition to preclude any first floor windows to this elevation of the surgery. Additionally a

condition to agree a construction management plan to safeguard residential amenity in the locality during construction is considered reasonable.

With regard to the amenities of future occupiers the submitted noise report states that the site is within Noise Exposure categories B and C where PPS24 advises that development is generally acceptable subject to appropriate protection and mitigation which can be achieved by condition. Network Rail have suggested such measures are necessary and the Council's Environmental Health officer is supportive of the proposal subject to appropriate conditions

Subject to these conditions it is considered that the proposal would have no undue impacts on residential amenity and would comply with policies ST6 and EP6.

Other Issues

Turning to the outstanding comments made by local residents and members of the town council, the following observations are offered:-

- Whilst the existing surgery might be capable of extension, that is not what is proposed;
- The need for the care home is not a material planning consideration; it is for the provider to decide whether or not there is a demand for it. As a planning application for development with development limits it should be determined on the planning merits.
- The possibility that visitors may park in the cemetery spaces is a matter for others to regulate;
- The internal layout of the surgery would be governed by the requirements of the building regulations and the needs of the operators.
- It is not possible to offer a split decision on this application and approve one element, whilst rejecting the other.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding the concerns raised by local residents and members of the town council it is considered that the proposed doctor's surgery and care home would be of an appropriate scale, with a suitable design and layout, parking and access arrangements, that would not be prejudicial to visual amenity, the character of the locality, highways safety, the archaeological potential of the site or protected species. Issues of drainage and land contamination can adequately be addressed by appropriate safeguarding conditions and relocation of the surgery would not be prejudicial to the vitality and viability of the town centre. The design, materials, appearance and the management noise from the railway line could adequately be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions.

Justification

The proposed doctor's surgery and care home in this edge of town location would be of an appropriate scale, with a suitable design and layout, parking and access arrangements, that would not be prejudicial to visual amenity, the character of the locality, highways safety, the archaeological potential of the site or protected species. Issues of drainage and land contamination can adequately be addressed by appropriate

safeguarding conditions and the relocation of surgery would not be prejudicial to the vitality and viability of the town centre. Matters of design, materials, appearance and the management noise from the railway line could adequately be addressed at the reserved matters stage. As such the proposal complies with saved policies ST5, ST6, ST10, EC3, EU4, EP1, EP3, EP5, EP6, EH12, EC8, TP1, TP2, TP4, TP5, TP6 and MC6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, 2006.

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Commencement No. 5 and Savings) Order 2005.

2. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is begun detailed drawings to an appropriate scale of the scale, layout, access, appearance of the building(s), and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The application was submitted as an outline application in accordance with the provisions of Article 7 of the Town and Country Planning General Development Order, 1988.

3. Application for approval of the reserved matters under (2) above shall be made to the Local Planning Authority within 3 years of the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

4. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced (including any demolition or site clearance) until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (or submitted with any subsequent full or reserved matters application), a 'protected species mitigation and biodiversity enhancement plan'. The plan shall detail measures for the avoidance of harm, mitigation and compensation in respect of legally protected species, and detail features that will be provided for the enhancement of biodiversity as required by PPS9. Measures shall be informed by further surveys as recommended in 'Ecological Impact Assessment' Ambios Ecology, April 2011, with particular emphasis given to:

- Reptile specific survey (between April and September) and mitigation.
- Bat activity survey(s) between April and September and mitigation as appropriate.
- Treatment of scrub/vegetation and methods to avoid harm to nesting birds and dormice.

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing of the plan, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: For the conservation and protection of legally protected species of recognised nature conservation importance in accordance with Policy EC8 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

5. A remediation Scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall detail the documents that will be submitted for verification to show that remediation has been completed. The development shall not be carried out unless in accordance with the details so approved. In the event of any unforeseen circumstances requiring additional or alternative measures to remediate the site, the Local Planning Authority shall be notified. The developer shall not proceed with additional/alternative measures unless written approval has been first obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the development from pollution in accordance with policy EP5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

6. Upon completion of works a Remediation Verification Report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority providing evidence that the remediation work has been completed, and it shall include a Remediation Certificate signed by the developer, confirming satisfactory remediation of the site. The care home shall be occupied (unless agreed otherwise by the Local Planning Authority) unless the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing its acceptance of both the Completion Report and Remediation Certificate.

Reason: To safeguard the development from pollution in accordance with policy EP5 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

7. No work shall commence on the development site until any land on the site boundary that is forward of the visibility splays has been laid to footway and dedicated to form part of the publically maintainable highway in accordance with a design and specification to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and to be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety in accordance with saved policies ST5 and TP4 of the South Somerset Local Plan and policy 49 of the Somerset and Exmoor Joint Structure Plan.

8. The proposed accesses shall be constructed in accordance with details shown on the submitted plan, drawing number 4307-5, and shall be available for use before the development hereby permitted is first occupied.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety in accordance with saved policies ST5 and TP4 of the South Somerset Local Plan and policy 49 of the Somerset and Exmoor Joint Structure Plan.

9. Vehicular entry shall only be via the new access from Behind Berry and all departing vehicles shall leave by the new exit to King Ina Road. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until such time as details of signage to ensure this one-way flow of traffic through the site have been installed in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety in accordance with saved policies ST5 and TP4 of the South Somerset Local Plan and policy 49 of the Somerset

and Exmoor Joint Structure Plan.

10. The area 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: To ensure that adequate parking is provided and maintained to meet the needs of the development in accordance with policy TP6 of the South Somerset Local Plan

11. The new development shall not be commenced until a detailed Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the new development shall be occupied prior to implementation of those parts identified in the Approved Travel Plan as capable of being implemented prior to occupation. Those parts of the Approved Travel Plan that are identified therein as capable of implementation after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied.

12. Before the development hereby permitting is first occupied details of plant to be installed (air-conditioning units, extraction units etc.) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. once approved such details shall not be varied without the prior written agreement of the local planning authority .

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity in accordance with saved policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, adopted 2006.

13. Before the use hereby permitted is commenced, the buildings shall be soundproofed in accordance with a scheme of noise mitigation to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of the locality in accordance with the advice of PPS24.

14. No development shall commence before an external lighting scheme has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall detail the location and type of lighting to minimise light spillage and pollution. Once agreed the approved lighting scheme shall be installed and maintained at all times thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The safeguard the amenities of locality and to prevent light pollution in accordance with saved policy EP 3 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

15. No development hereby approved shall be carried out until details of a sustainable surface water drainage system, including calculations, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall incorporate sustainable drainage techniques and interceptors to prevent are pollutants from the parking area entering the surface water drainage system and shall make provision within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway. Once approved such details shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the medical centre and shall be maintained in good working order at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is adequately drained in accordance with saved policy EU4 of the south Somerset local Plan.

16. With the exception of site preparation, no development hereby permitted shall be commenced until particulars of all relevant boundary treatments, retaining walls and hard surfacing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall include the use of porous materials to the parking and turning areas where appropriate. Once approved such details shall be fully implemented unless agreed otherwise in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason In the interests of visual amenity and to mitigate any flood risk in accordance with policies ST5, ST6 and EU4 of the South Somerset Local Plan, adopted 2006

17. No development shall be undertaken unless a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include details of the phasing of construction, hours of construction, routing for construction vehicles, parking for construction and contractors vehicles, measures to reduce noise and dust from the site together with other measures that will reduce the impact of the construction process on the locality. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with such details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard residential amenity in accordance with saved policies EP6 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

18. With the exception of high level rooflights, there shall be no windows above ground floor level to the rear (south) elevation of the doctor's surgery hereby approved.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity in accordance with saved policy ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan, adopted 2006.

19. No development hereby approved shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the archaeological potential of the site in accordance with saved policy EH12 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

Informative

You are reminded that this is an outline application with matters of landscaping, design, appearance and materials reserved for future consideration. Therefore the indicative drawing (4307-9) of the proposed care-home has not been considered as part of this proposal and you are reminded of our conservation manager's strong objections to this design and the prominence it would have in the street-scene. The submission of reserved matters should take these observations, which are available on the District Council's web-site, into account.