

Area North Committee – 22 February 2012

Officer Report On Planning Application: 11/04811/FUL

Proposal:	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)	Mrs P Clarke (Cllr) Mr D J Norris (Cllr)
Recommending Case Officer:	Adrian Noon Tel: 01935 462370 Email: adrian.noon@southsomerset.gov.uk
Target date:	22nd February 2012
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 suggestion 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

at 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 site 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 previous abattoir use.

This is a full application for the erection of a 3-storey (second floor partially with roof) 55 bed care home (with service yard) fronting onto Behind Berry. To the rear would be a 2-storey, 7 consulting room doctor's surgery, 48 parking spaces, cycle parking and associated landscaped areas to include the retention of a protected beech tree. There would be two points of access, 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.

RELEVANT HISTORY

11/01556/OUT - Outline permission granted for erection of a new health park, including a care home, surgery, parking and access (02/08/11). All matters apart from layout and access were reserved. Subsequently a minor amendment (11/03338/NMA) to reposition the buildings and change the parking provision was declined as it was considered to materially affect the approved scheme.

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
 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 declared a “corporate interest in the application” and 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 much needed new surgery. However the following concerns are

raised:-

- Surface water drainage
- Noise attenuation
- Provision of cycle parking for public
- Possible over development
- Access at junction of King Ina Road and Behind Berry
- Loss of parking
- Lack of alternative energy provision
- Just the surgery would be preferable, but the link to the care home is understood
- Materials should be carefully considered with the use of natural stone suggested
- Previous concerns have been addressed and scheme now mirrors wish of residents
- Need to ensure that the surgery is built, not just the care home
- The care home is not needed (other care facilities in the town are noted), the site should be for a surgery and park/open space
- A stand-alone surgery will not happen
- Delivery space limited
- 3-storey not supported – 2-storey favoured

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. The provision of 48 parking spaces is considered acceptable.

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.

The officer is aware of local concerns regarding increased pedestrian movements across the unadopted bridge over the railway line, 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.

Environment Agency – No objection.

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 of that it has been carried out. The findings of the noise report are also noted and supported subject to conditions to agree noise mitigations 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 a condition to agree detail of mitigation plan.

Landscape Architect – whilst expressing some concerns about the possible dominance of the 3-storey care home in an area characterised by 2 storey development, it is noted that the protected beech would be retained and the general planting proposal is supported. It is suggested that any additional scope to establish tree presence on the site, to soften the 3-storey form, should be taken, especially alongside the care home

Tree Officer – Initially concerned about the impact on the protected tree and the need to provide an undisturbed protection zone of 8.5m around it. Recommends that tree protection measures are agreed.

Conservation Manager – not supportive:-

“The context of this site is of 2 storey detached suburban houses in largish garden plots. As such it cannot be described as the most sensitive part of Somerton and the introduction of a larger building might not be something that would appear significantly out of place if it respected the height and roof form and relationship with road frontage characteristic of its context. However, in addition to the problem with a 2.5 storey height proposed, this area displays a local character devoid of gabled elevations and dormers and so the design of the proposal is entirely at odds with the characteristics of the area. I note the steps taken to reduce the appearance of bulk (lower elements at the ends, double pile roof form – and these are appropriate) but overall from the point of view of a design for this context I cannot recommend you supporting it in this form.

“Note that the drawings mislead by omitting to show the large number of rainwater pipes that will be required which will disrupt the long elevations.”

Climate Change Officer – recommends the inclusion of photovoltaic arrays on south facing roofs and a wood chip boiler to provide heating and hot water to both buildings.

REPRESENTATIONS

6 local residents have written objecting to the proposal of the grounds of:-

- three storey care home would be overly dominant and totally out of character with residential nature of locality and was objected to at the outline stage
- care home should be reduced in size
- the applicant is understood to own the adjoining bungalow, it would make sense for him to reduce the height of the care home.

- Increased parking in surrounding residential roads
- Additional care home facility not needed
- Limited delivery areas could lead to entrance becoming blocked
- Town centre is not the right place for a care home which brings no trade to the area
- Insensitive siting of care home opposite cemetery
- Is surgery sufficient for future needs of town?
- 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.
- increased use of narrow bridge over railway would be dangerous
- emergency access
- what guarantees are that the care home company are financially sound - a bond should be sought

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

- this is a much needed facility and will be an asset to the town
- local residents will have the opportunity to stay in the town
- scheme response well to restricted site;
- area is sufficiently open to cope with the height
- Wessex House is out of date; residents and staff need more space/facilities to meet modern requirements
- Somerton is growing and needs larger facilities such as this
- New surgery needed
- there is plenty of parking
- this is an ideal location close to the town centre
- would create jobs

One letter has been received raising no objection provided there would be no overlooking or overspill parking on Behind Berry.

CONSIDERATIONS

The approval of the previous application within the last year has demonstrated the acceptability of the principle of the proposed development. That outline approved agreed the points of access and the layout. Notwithstanding continued local concern about the access arrangements, it is not considered that there have been any changes in circumstance for policy that could justify rejecting the proposed accesses, which are identical to those previously approved.

The general layout and level of development is essentially the same, albeit with 2 fewer parking spaces. However the highways officer remains supportive, noting that 48 parking spaces remains an 'over provision'. Any additional parking requirements could be met by existing provision without detriment to the town centre or local amenities, and in any event other controls exist to regulate parking in public spaces. The proposed travel plan is considered acceptable in principle to subject to working up the detail. Whilst it is suggested this should be achieved by S106 agreement, a condition was previously considered adequate and could be re-imposed on any permission.

No technical objections have been raised on the basis of drainage, archaeology, ecology, land contamination, noise or light pollution.

On this basis it is considered that, in respect of the above issues and subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions, the proposal complies with policies EC8, EP1, EP3,

EP5, EH12, EU4, TP1, TP2, TP4. TP6 and MC6.

It is therefore considered that the proposal falls to be determined on the basis of the matters reserved by the previous approval, namely:-

- Design and Appearance
- Landscaping
- Scale

Design and Appearance

Whilst the comments of the Conservation Manager with regard to the design/appearance are noted it is not considered that this edge of settlement location is so sensitive that the new development should slavishly follow the design and general appearance of the existing buildings. The proposed materials (reconstituted stone, render and tiles) are considered acceptable, subject to the agreement of samples. Similarly sample of rainwater goods, windows, doors etc could also be agreed by condition.

The window arrangement is such that no undue impact on residential amenity through overlooking/loss of privacy would arise.

Accordingly it is considered that the design and appearance of the care home and surgery comply with the relevant parts of policies ST5 and ST6 and no harm to residential amenity would occur.

Landscaping

The landscape and tree officers are supportive of the proposal subject to appropriate conditions, including a requirement to amend the submitted landscaping plan to incorporate tree planting to the street-scene to mitigate the visual impact of the scheme, as such this aspect of the proposal complies with policy EC3 and the relevant parts of policies ST5 and ST6.

Scale

The proposed surgery is considered to be of an acceptable height/bulk, and would not have an unduly oppressive relationship, with the bungalow to the south. However, the Conservation Manager has raised a clear objection to the height and bulk and is concerned that the introduction of such a large building could appear significantly out of place in this locality. In particular it is considered to be a potentially harmful feature in the street-scene where development is typically domestic scale 2-storey detached dwellings at a relatively low density.

This concern was clearly articulated in the determination of the outline application; indeed an informative was added to the decision to remind the applicant of the Council's concerns over the impact of a substantial 3-storey structure.

The applicant has attempted to address this concern by lowering the of building and designing it to appear as a 2½ storey structure. Further attempts to mitigate the building's visual impact have been made by lowering it by about 1.5m relative to behind Berry and breaking up the street elevation with the incorporation of projecting gables, set-backs of building lines, dormer windows with balconies and a variation of materials. Whilst these steps are welcome it is considered that, at 12m high, .55m long and up to 21m deep, the care home remains an imposing structure and potentially contrary to

policies ST5 part 4 and ST6 (part 5).

Nevertheless such concerns need to be balanced against the benefits of providing a modern health centre that would be in the interest of the residents of Somerton. The applicant's planning agent, in a letter of 07/02/12, has implied that the size of the building is necessary to ensure that care provision is only economically viable and has further hinted that the economics of the development are such that without an economically viable care home the surgery may not happen.

Further clarification has been sought on this matter, particularly the applicant has been requested to consider a mechanism whereby an assurance is given on the delivery of the surgery to ensure that the care home is not developed in isolation. Confirmation has been provided (email of 10/02/12) that further information will be provided and that the applicant is willing to accept a reasonable obligation to ensure the delivery of the surgery. It has been suggested that this could best be achieved by the submission of a unilateral undertaking. The applicant's agent has indicated a willingness to do so, however an update will be necessary

It is considered that an undertaking to provide a much needed community facility as part of the development of this site, whilst not sufficient to over-ride an outright objection, should be balanced against concerns about the impact of the height/bulk of the care home, this being the sole area of concern.

It is noted that reasonable steps have been taken to mitigate the visual impact of the building as outlined above and that further mitigation could be achieved by additional tree planting as recommended by the landscape architect. Whilst the building would undoubtedly constitute a new element in the street-scene of Behind Berry any visual harm would be outweighed by the benefits to the local community of the new doctor's surgery. On the basis that this element will be delivered as part of a comprehensive development this aspect of the scheme is considered to meet the requirements of policies ST5 and ST6.

Other Issues

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

- It has been confirmed that the applicant owns the adjacent bungalow, whilst the inclusion of this site might enable the level of development to be 'relaxed' it would not be reasonable to insist it be included at this stage. Were the application to be refused on the basis of 'over-development' a re-submission could include the bungalow site to address any concerns.
- The financial status of the applicant is not a consideration. Furthermore, the need for the development does not need to be evidenced. The site is within settlement limits where development is accepted in principle and it would not be reasonable in this instance to question the need or whether this is the right location within the town.
- Any sensitivity over the relationship with the cemetery is not a material consideration.
- There is no planning requirement for this surgery to be 'future proof', however it is noted that there is potential to expand onto the adjoining bungalow site.

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 the relocation of surgery would not be prejudicial to the vitality and viability of the town centre. It is not considered that the design causes any demonstrable harm to visual amenity and any impact is considered to be outweighed by the benefits to the community of providing a new medical centre.

RECOMMENDATION

That, subject to the receipt of additional information to clarify the justification of the size of the care home and a suitable assurance that the surgery will be delivered as part of the comprehensive development of this site, planning permission be granted 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. 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 within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. 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 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.

3. A contaminated land 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.

4. 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.

5. Prior to implementation of this planning permission, site vegetative clearance, demolition of existing structures, ground works, heavy machinery entering site or the on-site storage of materials, a scheme of tree planting, a Tree Protection Plan relating to the retained tree(s), conforming to British Standard 5837: 2005, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Council and it shall specify the following details:
 - details of any required tree works so as to conform to BS 3998:2010 - Tree Works;
 - plans detailing root protection areas, construction exclusion zones and the installation of tree protection fencing;
 - layout plans showing the locations of required below-ground services
 - special tree protection and engineering measures for any approved installation of built structures, below-ground services and hard surfacing within the root protection areas of retained trees;
 - a scheme of arboricultural on-site supervision, monitoring and certificates of compliance relating to the tree protection measures.

Upon implementation of this planning permission, the measures as specified within the agreed scheme of tree planting, the Tree Protection Plan shall be

implemented in their entirety for the duration of construction, inclusive of any landscaping measures.

Reason: To secure the planting of new trees and to preserve existing trees in accordance with the objectives within Policy ST6 (The Quality of Development) of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006, the 2005 National Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development; Protection and Enhancement of the Environment [Sections 17 - 20] and those statutory duties as defined within the Town & Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).

6. No development hereby approved shall be carried out until particulars of following have been 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.

On 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 saved policies ST5 and ST6 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 4307-9G, 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.

Reason: To promote sustainable travel in accordance with policy TP2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

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. 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.

17. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until a landscaping scheme, which shall include details of the species, siting and numbers to be planted, including tree planting to the Behind Berry frontage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completely carried out within the first available planting season from the date of commencement of the development, or as otherwise extended with the agreement in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

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

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with saved policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

18. The development shall carried out in accordance with the following plans 4307-9H; 4307-20C; 4307-21D; 4307-22B; 4307-23B; 4307-25B; 4307-27B; HBHT10267/AT01

Reason: To define the development hereby approved.