Application Details	
Application Reference Numbers:	25/02769/REM
Application Types:	Reserved Matters Application
Extension of Time:	03/11/26
Description:	Reserved Matters application for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for Phase 1 comprising 109 residential dwellings and associated infrastructure and green space, excluding the main site access relating to planning application 22/00695/OUT (appeal ref: APP/E3335/W/23/3328322); for the erection of up to 252 dwellings, public open space (including community orchard and village green), woodland planting, ecological buffers, sustainable drainage systems, a biodiverse wetland habitat and other ancillary works.
Site Address:	Land Os 3400 Mudford Road, Yeovil, Somerset
Parish:	Mudford Parish
Conservation Area:	No
Somerset Levels and Moors RAMSAR Catchment area:	Yes
AONB:	No
Case Officer:	Rachael Moon (Principal Planning Officer)
Agent:	Copperfield Ltd.
Applicant:	Mr James Artingstall, Bloor Homes



Layout Plan - EXxxx-PD-801D (Colour Layout)

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the stated planning conditions and the obligations within the Section 106 Agreement (dated 15/02/2024) associated with the outline permission.

1.2 In accordance with the National Scheme of Delegation, this application falls within Schedule 1. Schedule 1 applications are required to be determined by officers under delegated powers and cannot be referred to the Planning Committee other than in prescribed circumstances. The proposal constitutes a Schedule 1 development because it relates to the following category of development:

‘reserved matters approval in respect of an outline planning permission other than a large outline phase permission (i.e. one which grants permission for development involving the provision of at least 500 dwellings or a building or buildings where the floorspace to be created by the development is 50,000 square metres or more) (applications under Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015)’

1.3 This application therefore must be determined under delegated authority.

2. Executive summary of key reasons for recommendation

2.1 The proposal would result in the delivery of 109 dwellings as Phase 1 of the wider residential development approved under outline planning permission 22/00695/OUT. The principle of residential development, the approved means of access, maximum development quantum for the wider site and broad development parameters were established through outline planning permission, which was subsequently allowed on appeal. This application therefore relates solely to the reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

2.2 The scheme would deliver much-needed market and affordable housing, with the affordable housing provision secured through the outline planning permission. The current Reserved Matters proposals provide an affordable housing proportion in excess of the 35% minimum requirement secured through the Section 106 Agreement, thereby ensuring that Phase 1 makes a positive and early contribution towards the delivery of the wider affordable housing obligations across the site. Officers are satisfied that the scheme remains capable of complying with the affordable housing requirements secured through the Section 106 Agreement for the development as a whole. Significant weight is afforded to the delivery of 43 affordable homes, having regard to local housing need and to Policy HO7 (Meeting the Need for Homes) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026).

2.3 The submitted layout, scale, appearance and landscaping have been amended during the course of the application in response to consultee comments. Officers are satisfied that the scheme delivers an acceptable form of development that responds appropriately to the site and its surroundings and the approved design principles established through the outline permission.

2.4 The scheme incorporates substantial areas of public open space, green infrastructure, biodiversity enhancement and ecological mitigation. Landscape, ecological and nutrient neutrality matters were considered through the outline planning permission and continue to be secured through the associated planning conditions and Section 106 Agreement. The submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy has been provided in accordance with the requirements of

the legal agreement and demonstrates how the wider development proposes to achieve the required biodiversity enhancements. The Council's Ecologist, Phosphate Officer and Natural England raise no objection to the proposal.

2.5 Technical statutory consultees have reviewed the application and, subject to the specified conditions on this application and the outline application, have raised no objection. Objections have been received from Mudford Parish Council, local community groups including Friends of Mudford Action Group (FoMAG), the Three Villages Flood Group the Monarch's Way Association and local residents. The principal concerns relate to landscape and visual impact, ecology and biodiversity, drainage and flood risk, highways and traffic impacts, the delivery of nutrient mitigation measures and the detailed design of the scheme. These are addressed in the relevant sections of the report.

2.6 The proposed reserved matters have been assessed against the approved Parameter Plan, the appeal decision, the relevant policies of the Development Plan, the NPPF 2026, and, having taken account of all material considerations, officers are satisfied that the proposed reserved matters accord with the approved outline permission, comply with the requirements of the accompanying Section 106 Agreement and would provide an acceptable form of development. There are no other material considerations that would justify withholding approval of the reserved matters or undermine the implementation of the approved outline consent. Accordingly, Reserved Matters approval is considered appropriate, subject to the conditions set out below.

3. Planning obligations, conditions and informatives

3.1 Obligations

Obligations are already secured by the Section 106 Agreement (dated 15/02/2024), attached to the Outline application.

3.2 Conditions

01. Approved Plans & Documents List
02. Lighting
03. Arboricultural Management and Tree Protection
04. Tree and Hedgerow Protection
05. Planting and Replacement Trees

3.3 Informatives:

01. Attenuation Basin Design
02. Watercourse Alterations and Land Drainage Consent
03. Existing Public Sewers

4. Proposed development, site and surroundings

Details of proposal

4.1 This Reserved Matters application seeks the approval of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for Phase 1 of the residential development at land off Mudford Road, Yeovil. It comprises 109 dwellings, associated highways infrastructure, public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage features, ecological mitigation and biodiversity enhancement measures.

4.2 The submitted scheme for Phase 1 includes a network of estate roads serving the residential development directly from Mudford Road, landscaping, areas of public open space and sustainable drainage infrastructure.

4.3 Ecological and biodiversity enhancements proposed as part of Phase 1 include the creation of areas of grassland, native scrub, species-rich native hedgerows, reedbed habitat, sustainable drainage habitats and tree planting, together with areas of landscaped open space. These features form part of the site's Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Strategy and are intended to contribute towards the delivery of the biodiversity enhancement requirements associated with the outline permission.

4.4 The application follows the grant of outline planning permission on appeal for a scheme of up to 252 dwellings, with public open space, woodland planting, ecological buffers, sustainable drainage systems, a biodiverse wetland habitat and other ancillary works, under application reference 22/00695/OUT granted on appeal on 18/03/2024. Access was approved as part of the outline consent and is not for consideration under this application.

4.5 The outline planning permission was approved subject to a number of planning conditions and a Section 106 Agreement. Relevant to the consideration of this application, the Section 106 Agreement requires the delivery of a minimum 20% BNG across the development, together with the submission and approval of a BNG Strategy, Phosphate Mitigation and Management Plan and a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) prior to commencement of development.

Site and surroundings

4.6 The application site is located to the north and west of Mudford Road, Yeovil. The surrounding area is characterised by agricultural land to the north, east and west, with the existing built-up area of Yeovil located immediately to the south.

4.7 The wider application site benefitting from outline planning permission comprises agricultural land with existing hedgerows, mature trees and areas of woodland habitat. Existing hedgerows subdivide the agricultural fields and

contribute to the landscape character of the area. Phase 1 generally occupies the south-eastern part of the wider outline site.

4.8 Directly to the south of the site lies the existing urban area of Yeovil, reflecting the expansion of the town during the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

4.9 The wider site slopes generally from south to north, with gradients varying across the site. The site faces outwards towards the open rural character of the Yeo Valley. The site lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at low risk of flooding from fluvial and tidal sources.

4.10 The site lies within the Yeovil Scarplands (NCA140) and occupies a visually sensitive location on the northern edge of Yeovil. The wider site is visible from surrounding public viewpoints, including sections of the Monarch's Way public footpath. There are no Public Rights of Way on the site but the western and northern boundaries both meet the Monarch's Way - a long-distance national route of historic and cultural significance.

4.11 The wider site lies in proximity to a number of designated heritage assets, including the Grade II listed Stone Farm House and Sock Hill Cottages.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 **Section 73 Application 25/01367/S73 – committee resolution to grant 29/07/2026 (decision notice pending)**

This section 73 application seeks to vary Conditions 5, 9 and 14 of outline planning permission 22/00695/OUT. The principal changes relates to the approved nutrient mitigation strategy, replacing the Constructed Treatment Wetland approach with an alternative Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) based nutrient mitigation strategy, together with consequential amendments to the approved drainage and landscape provisions. The application was resolved to be granted by the Planning Committee on 29 July 2026, subject to completion of a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement. The decision notice has not yet been issued.

For clarity, the existence of the Section 73 application does not alter the scope of the current Reserved Matters application. The Reserved Matters application is assessed against the extant outline planning permission (22/00695/OUT), under which nutrient mitigation is secured through the approved planning conditions and associated Section 106 obligations. The proposed amendments to nutrient mitigation are subject to separate consideration under application 25/01367/S73. Any amendments proposed through the Section 73 application do not affect the matters for determination under the current Reserved Matters application.

5.2 **Non-material Amendment 25/01485/NMA to approved application 22/00695/OUT seeking an amendment to Condition 9 allowed on 15 July 2025**

The amendment removed the requirement for details of the proposed Constructed Treatment Wetland to be submitted with the first Reserved Matters Application. The condition was amended to require the submission and approval of these details by the LPA prior to the commencement of development instead.

5.3 **Appeal APP/E3335/W/23/3328322 against non-determination (for application ref. 22/00695/OUT) allowed on 18 March 2024**

Outline planning permission was granted subject to conditions, including the Parameter Plan (190812 SK007 C) and the obligations set out in a Section 106 Agreement. The Inspector concluded that whilst the proposal would result in moderate adverse landscape effects and conflict with elements of the development plan, these harms were outweighed by the benefits arising from the delivery of market and affordable housing and associated economic, ecological and social benefits.

6. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

6.1 The outline planning application is EIA development and was accompanied by an Environmental Statement, determined in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations. The current application seeks approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to the approved outline permission and does not alter the scale, nature or extent of development previously assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment process. The proposals are consistent with the approved Parameter Plan. Therefore, there is nothing in the Reserved Matters that would change these conclusions or give rise to any new or materially different environmental effects.

6.2 In addition to this, the Section 73 application (25/01367/S73) was accompanied by an Environmental Statement Addendum. Officers are satisfied that the Reserved Matters proposals do not give rise to any new or materially different environmental effects beyond those previously assessed.

7. Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)

7.1 The application site lies within the catchment of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site / Special Protection Area (SPA), where increased phosphate loading has been identified as having the potential to adversely affect the integrity of the designated site.

7.2 As part of the outline planning permission, a nutrient mitigation strategy was secured through a Section 106 Agreement. The agreement requires the

provision of phosphate mitigation measures and includes obligations relating to a Constructed Treatment Wetland (CTW), BNG, Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and a Phosphate Mitigation and Management Plan.

7.3 The approved mitigation strategy provides for a Constructed Treatment Wetland to be delivered within the wider development site. The wetland is intended to reduce phosphate levels entering the Somerset Levels and Moors catchment and is required through the Section 106 Agreement to achieve a minimum phosphate offsetting requirement of 24.04kgP/year. The Section 106 Agreement also secures the long-term management, maintenance and monitoring of the wetland to ensure that the required phosphate reduction is achieved and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.

7.4 As the competent authority, the Local Planning Authority is required by Regulation 63(1) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, to undertake an Appropriate Assessment of the implications of the development in view of the Ramsar site's conservation objectives. The LPA may only agree to the proposal after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the Ramsar site.

7.5 The principle of development and the associated phosphate mitigation strategy were established through the outline planning permission and accompanying Section 106 Agreement. The current Reserved Matters application does not seek to amend the approved mitigation strategy.

7.6 Subject to compliance with the obligations secured through the Section 106 Agreement, including the delivery and ongoing management of the Constructed Treatment Wetland, it is considered that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site/SPA, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

8. Consultation and Representations

8.1 Statutory Consultees

8.2 It should be noted that not all statutory consultees are consulted on all planning applications. The circumstances for statutory consultation are set out in Section 18 of the Town and Country Planning (the Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

8.3 A summary of the latest/final comments is provided, the Council's website should be viewed to see the full representation and/or previous representations which have been superseded.

Statutory consultee	Consultee Comments and Officer Comment

Mudford Parish Council	*<u>29/10/26 – comments</u>* *Mudford Parish Council has reviewed the Reserved Matters and discharge of conditions applications and wishes to register its concerns regarding a number of outstanding matters, particularly flood risk and drainage, affordable housing provision, and the overall suitability of the scheme in addressing community needs.* *Flooding, Drainage and Watercourse Concerns* *Mudford Parish Council has reviewed the latest correspondence, including the Condition 11 comment matrix dated 27th October 2026, and welcomes the document as a helpful summary of the discussions to date.* *We note that a number of earlier concerns have been resolved. However, we understand that further information is still required before Condition 11 can be discharged, including:* *• Detailed drainage drawings showing pipe runs, dimensions, gradients, flow controls, basin and swale details.* *• Clarification of the basin design, including cross-sections, formation, stability and groundwater considerations.* *• Details of construction-phase surface water management and drainage phasing.* *• An impermeable area plan demonstrating that the drainage catchments correspond with the drainage calculations.* *• Further details of the outfall arrangements (including the details how the reed bed will outfall to the depression) and confirmation that there is no risk of overspill or increased flood risk.* *• Information demonstrating the capacity of the receiving system and any off-site works that may be required.* *• Finished floor level drawings.* *• Detailed exceedance routing plans showing how flood flows would be directed away from existing and proposed dwellings.* *• Clarification of any off-site drainage works necessary to ensure the satisfactory discharge of surface water.* *We note a number of matters that are proposed to be secured through conditions attached to the Reserved Matters application, and we await further details on:* *• A drawing identifying all drainage features, including watercourses, culverts, gullies, pipework and other drainage infrastructure, together with details of the party responsible for maintaining each feature and the associated maintenance schedule, including inspection,*

	cleansing and desilting requirements. *• Confirmation of the name of the management company.* *• Details of existing culvert crossings and any other infrastructure crossing watercourses, including evidence of how these features have historically been maintained. The Parish Council notes that the LLFA does not currently support the removal of these features and recommends that topographical survey data be used to determine their function within the wider catchment and drainage network. The Parish Council also notes the applicant's correspondence dated 28th October 2026 stating that Phase 1 does not involve the removal of existing watercourses. However, clarification is sought as to whether the proposed Phase 1 drainage arrangements are dependent upon infrastructure or alterations elsewhere within the wider development site, and whether any subsequent requirement to retain existing watercourses could affect the approved layout, landscaping or drainage arrangements.* *The Parish Council therefore looks forward to reviewing both the outstanding drainage information required under Condition 11 and the further details to be submitted pursuant to the Reserved Matters conditions before any relevant conditions are discharged.* *Affordable Housing Concerns (25/02769/REM)* *The Parish Council is also concerned by the comments of the Affordable Housing Officer dated 13th October, which indicate that although the proposal technically complies with the Section 106 Agreement, there are a number of deficiencies that remain unaddressed.* *The Affordable Housing Officer identifies a need for:* *• both 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom dwellings within both the First Homes and Shared Ownership tenures;* *• some larger 3-bedroom family homes suitable for five or six-person households;* *• a more integrated distribution of affordable housing throughout the site;* *• improved natural light and glazing within affordable dwellings;* *• private outdoor space for one-bedroom apartments; and* *• affordable homes that are genuinely indistinguishable from market housing.* *The Parish Council shares these concerns.* *In particular, we are concerned that:*

	1. The affordable housing mix does not adequately reflect identified local housing needs, limiting opportunities for a wider range of households seeking affordable home ownership. *2. Affordable homes appear concentrated in specific areas of the site rather than being fully integrated throughout the development. This risks creating distinct affordable housing clusters rather than a cohesive mixed community.* *3. Some affordable dwellings appear to suffer from poor natural lighting, with the Affordable Housing Officer noting a lack of glazing in plots 44-49 and an absence of windows in side and rear elevations compared with equivalent market dwellings.* *4. One-bedroom apartments are proposed without private outdoor space, which falls short of what residents would reasonably expect from modern housing design.* *The Affordable Housing Officer concludes that while the scheme complies with the Section 106 Agreement, "more could have been done to improve the proposal in line with current housing need." The Parish Council strongly agrees with that assessment.* *Accordingly, we request that Somerset Council seeks further engagement between the applicant and the Affordable Housing Officer before approval to address these shortcomings and improve the overall quality, distribution and suitability of the affordable housing provision.* *Conclusion* *Mudford Parish Council remains concerned that important flood mitigation, drainage and watercourse matters remain unresolved and that the affordable housing element fails to fully respond to current identified housing needs despite meeting the minimum obligations of the Section 106 Agreement.* *The Parish Council therefore requests that careful consideration be given to:* *• the retention and function of existing watercourses;* *• outstanding LLFA concerns regarding drainage, groundwater and basin design;* *• long-term drainage maintenance arrangements;* *• affordable housing mix and tenure balance;* *• distribution of affordable homes across the site; and* *• design improvements to affordable dwellings, including natural light and private amenity space.* *The Parish Council asks that Somerset Council addresses the outstanding matters relevant to the layout, landscaping and design of Phase 1 before determining the Reserved Matters*

	application, and confirms that any unresolved drainage and environmental matters will be appropriately secured through enforceable conditions or other statutory mechanisms before the relevant works proceed. *<u>25/08/26 – comments (addendum not included – see full submission on public access system)</u>* *Introduction and Parish Council Position* *Mudford Parish Council (MPC) submits these further comments following its representation of 28 May 2026 and the subsequent submission of revised plans, engineering information and consultee responses.* *The Parish Council is in complete agreement with the Three Villages Flood Group's (3VFG) "Reserved Matters Representation – Surface Water Drainage and Downstream Flood Risk" and the detailed "Consolidated Technical and Design Representation" prepared by Friends of Mudford Action Group (FoMAG) and therefore MPC is including 3VFG's representation (from page 5) and FoMAG's report (from page 8) as addenda to the Parish Council's response. MPC's submission does not repeat 3VFG's and FoMAG's work. MPC wishes to identify the matters of particular concern to the parish and its residents, and the matters on which it considers the Local Planning Authority should have clear assurance before determining the Reserved Matters application.* *MPC does not seek to reopen matters determined at outline stage. Its concern is whether the detailed scheme now proposed responds satisfactorily to its rural setting, operates safely and practically, and avoids unacceptable consequences for Mudford and the surrounding local road and drainage network.* *1. Drainage, Existing Ditches and Local Flood Risk* *Drainage remains one of the Parish Council's principal concerns because the consequences of any failure would not necessarily be confined to the application site. Parishioners already experience flooding locally, and MPC considers it essential that the detailed drainage arrangements do not increase flows or flood risk affecting Mudford or the wider Bearley Brook catchment.* *The applicant's drainage material identifies the existing field ditches as part of the present surface water drainage regime, with runoff following the natural topography towards those*

	ditches and ultimately towards Bearley Brook. The latest material now appears to propose the infilling of most of those ditches, whereas earlier information referred to culvert crossings. *From the Parish Council's perspective, the practical question is straightforward: for each ditch which presently receives or conveys water and is proposed to be removed or infilled, where will that water go after development?* *MPC therefore asks that the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is expressly consulted on the final ditch-infilling arrangement and confirms that the replacement drainage system safely accommodates the flows presently conveyed by those features, including exceedance flows. The Parish Council would also welcome confirmation that the receiving system has sufficient capacity and is in an appropriate condition to convey the proposed flows onwards.* *Condition 11 requires consideration of both runoff rate and runoff volume. MPC asks the LLFA to confirm that both elements have been demonstrated, rather than relying solely upon evidence concerning peak discharge rates.* *The Parish Council also notes uncertainty in the engineering information concerning existing sewer levels and the precise location of MH8. MPC does not suggest that this uncertainty is necessarily fatal to the application, but asks the Council to ensure that resolving it later will not require consequential changes to levels, drainage, highways, retaining structures, dwelling positions or landscaping after Reserved Matters approval.* *2. Rural Landscape Character and the Setting of Mudford* *The application site occupies a sensitive rural edge between Yeovil and Mudford. For the Parish Council, the important question is not simply whether the housing is acceptable as an urban design exercise, but whether the detailed development responds appropriately to the landscape and rural character experienced from Mudford and its approaches.* *MPC remains concerned that the proposed built form, materials, spacing, boundary treatments and streetscape have a standardised character which does not sufficiently reflect this rural setting. The Parish Council asks the Council to consider the development as it will actually be experienced from the surrounding countryside and local routes, rather than principally from within the new estate.*

	Particular attention should be given to the relationship of the development with Sock Hill and the external viewpoints considered at outline stage. MPC asks the Council to satisfy itself that the final levels, built form and landscaping preserve the landscape relationships which informed the Inspector's assessment. *3. Landscaping, Hedgerows and Long-Term Mitigation* *Landscaping is especially important to Mudford because it is relied upon to soften the transition from built development to countryside. MPC therefore considers that planting shown as mitigation must be genuinely deliverable and not simply illustrative.* *The Council should be satisfied that important planting can be accommodated alongside drainage infrastructure, sewers, service corridors, retaining structures and level changes, and that it can be established at an appropriately early stage. Clear arrangements should also be secured for establishment, replacement of failures and long-term management.* *MPC is concerned about the loss of existing hedgerow and the extent to which replacement planting will take time to perform the landscape and ecological functions of established vegetation. Particular care is also needed where important mitigation planting is located within private gardens and could subsequently be removed.* *The submitted visual material should therefore represent the final engineered scheme, including realistic finished levels, retaining structures and realistic stages of landscape establishment.* *4. Layout, Walking, Cycling and Practical Operation* *MPC's earlier representation raised practical concerns about pedestrian movement, refuse collection and parking. The Parish Council recognises that revisions have been made, but these matters remain important because poorly functioning estate arrangements can have consequences for surrounding roads and residents.* *The existing public footpath across the site is well used locally. MPC asks that the final layout provides safe, convenient and legible pedestrian routes and genuine connections beyond the site, rather than routes which are technically available but unattractive or difficult to use.*

	Active Travel England's response of 13 August 2026 records that it undertook a 'high-level review' and issued Standing Advice for Somerset Council to apply. MPC therefore asks the Council to demonstrate how that advice has been applied to the detailed layout, including gradients, shared surfaces, private drives and connections to the surrounding network. *The Parish Council is particularly concerned about the effect of additional traffic on Mudford and the A359/Mudford Road corridor. This concern should be considered against the already substantial level of traffic using the local highway network. Traffic monitoring for July 2026 to recorded approximately 257,914 vehicle journeys during July 2026.* *Residents regularly raise concerns with the Parish Council regarding the volume and speed of traffic through Mudford, together with HGV movements. These are existing local conditions into which the development will introduce additional vehicle movements.* *MPC recognises that the Reserved Matters application cannot be expected to resolve all existing highway problems within the parish. However, the detailed design should demonstrate that it encourages realistic alternatives to private-car use and does not unnecessarily exacerbate existing pressures. This makes the proper application of Active Travel England's Standing Advice particularly important.* *MPC asks Somerset Council, as Highway Authority, to have regard to the existing level and nature of traffic through Mudford when assessing the detailed scheme and to consider how the actual transport effects of the development will be monitored as occupation progresses.* *MPC also asks the Council to confirm that refuse collection arrangements are operationally acceptable and that parking provision and distribution will allow the estate roads, shared surfaces and private drives to function safely in practice.* *5. Appearance and Affordable Housing* *MPC's earlier concern about appearance remains relevant. The Parish Council wishes to see a development which has a coherent identity appropriate to its location rather than one which appears as a generic extension of the urban area.* *MPC recognises that changes have been made to the distribution of affordable housing. However, the Parish Council remains concerned that affordable homes should not be readily*

	distinguishable from market housing through materially inferior or conspicuously different external treatment. They should be integrated as an ordinary and successful part of the development. *6. Biodiversity, Ecology and Lighting* *MPC welcomes the principle of biodiversity net gain. Its principal interest is that the habitats and landscape features relied upon are actually delivered, established and maintained, particularly where they also contribute to landscape mitigation, ecological connectivity or drainage.* *The Parish Council asks the Council to be satisfied that the ecological and landscape benefits attributed to Phase 1 are sufficiently secured and are not dependent upon Phase 2 proceeding in precisely the form currently illustrated.* *MPC also notes Natural England's response of 21 August 2026 and asks that any re-consultation considered necessary by Natural England is completed before relevant ecological matters are treated as resolved.* *Lighting is a related local concern. The site lies on a rural edge and lighting must balance safety and crime-prevention requirements with neighbouring amenity, wildlife and the character of the countryside. MPC therefore supports the requirement for a coordinated lighting strategy, including appropriate lux information, before the detailed arrangements are treated as settled.* *7. One Coordinated and Deliverable Scheme* *The Parish Council's overarching concern is that the final approval should relate to one coherent and deliverable scheme. Layout, drainage, ditch arrangements, finished levels, retaining structures, highways, utilities, landscaping, ecology and visual material should all be mutually consistent.* *MPC therefore asks Somerset Council to ensure, before determination, that outstanding technical matters can be resolved without subsequent changes which would materially alter the scheme now being considered.* *Conclusion* *Mudford Parish Council acknowledges that the applicant has provided substantial additional information and has amended the scheme since May. The Parish Council's concerns are therefore focused on the matters which remain important to the*

	local community and to the successful relationship between the development and Mudford. *In particular, MPC asks for clear assurance on the replacement of the existing ditch drainage function and downstream flood risk; the development's relationship with the rural landscape and Sock Hill; the early delivery and long-term security of landscape mitigation; the practical operation of pedestrian, parking and refuse arrangements; the application of Active Travel England's Standing Advice; and the coordination of the final engineering, landscape and ecological proposals.* *Until those matters have been satisfactorily addressed, Mudford Parish Council does not consider that it has sufficient assurance to support the Reserved Matters application in its present form.* *<u>28/05/26 – comments</u>* *Mudford Parish Council submits the following comments in relation to the Reserved Matters Application.* 1. *Access* *Mudford Parish Council is concerned that the site notices were placed on the dangerous side of the road where there is no safe or easy access for residents to read them. They should have been positioned on the more accessible side of the road to allow safe viewing. There remain ongoing concerns regarding the traffic management plan. These concerns were previously raised by the Parish Council in its response to discharge of condition application 26/00856/DOC1 and remain unresolved. The existing footpath across the site is well used, particularly by dog walkers, and must be properly protected.* *It has also been observed that at school times minibuses queue near Fairmead School, with vehicles backing up beyond the proposed site access. In fact, as few as four minibuses are sufficient to reach the site entrance. This raises further concerns about safe access and traffic impacts.* 2. *Appearance* *The Parish Council notes that the affordable housing remains clearly distinguishable from the rest of the development. It is smaller in size and limited to terraced units, and therefore does not achieve proper integration. This concern has not been adequately addressed, particularly given that affordable housing should not be visually distinct from market housing.*

	More generally, the overall design of the development is uninspiring and appears similar to many other standard developments, failing to create a strong sense of place or reflect local character. *The Parish Council is concerned that the issue of lighting has not been properly addressed. There is no clear lighting strategy and insufficient detail on how lighting will affect nearby residents, the rural character, and local wildlife. This raises concerns about light pollution and the impact on the surrounding area.* *3. Landscaping* *The Parish Council seeks clarification on when tree planting will take place, and whether any trees that fail will be replaced within a five-year period.* *There are also concerns regarding the long-term maintenance of the proposed orchard and whether appropriate management arrangements will be in place once it is planted.* *As some trees are proposed within private property boundaries, there is concern that they could later be removed by homeowners. The Parish Council asks what safeguards will be in place to prevent this, including whether Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) could be used.* *4. Layout* *The Parish Council notes the response from the Somerset Waste Management Officer and their objection to the application dated 15 May, which concludes that the issues raised on 5 February remain unresolved and that the Waste Management Partnership cannot support the application. The Parish Council is therefore concerned that these matters have not been addressed, particularly in relation to the practicality and long-term reliability of the proposed refuse collection arrangements.* *The Parish Council also notes that, although parking provision has increased, it still does not meet Somerset Council's parking standards and remains insufficient given the likely level of car use and lack of public transportation.* *In summary, Mudford Parish Council considers that the above issues remain unresolved and require further consideration before the application can be supported.*

	<u>26/01/26 – no comments</u> *Mudford Parish Council has no comments at this time on the revised information for the above application* *<u>17/12/25 – Objects to the granting of permission</u>* 1. *<u>Overlooking, loss of privacy or overbearing/overshadowing nature of proposal:</u>* *MPC is concerned that the screening of the six properties on Mudford Road has not been adequately addressed. The council considers this a high priority and believes it must be resolved.* 2. *<u>Design & appearance, impact on public visual amenity</u>* *MPC has noted that the differences in housing proportions undermine the principle that affordable units should be indistinguishable from the rest of the development. The lack of glazing in affordable units is particularly noticeable and must be addressed.* 3. *<u>Layout & density of building</u>* *MPC has noted there is no information available on width of the roads, size of the garages and size of the building plots/ houses in square metres, and the size of the rooms.* 4. *<u>Effect on listed buildings and/or conservation areas</u>* *Effect on listed buildings and/or conservation areas The council would like to highlight the lost medieval village of 'Waindle,' which lies within the area designated for the second phase of development but is not mentioned in the archaeological survey. This village was abandoned during the Victorian period.* 5. *<u>Inadequate parking and/or servicing areas</u>* *Inadequate Parking for Visitors* *There are only eight designated visitor parking spaces. With one-third of the parking being stacked, there is an increased need for additional overflow parking. The council is concerned that vehicles may end up parked on the road. Since the road widths are unclear, it is uncertain how on-street parking would impact traffic flow and access for emergency services.* *Insufficient Bicycle Storage*

	There is a lack of adequate bicycle storage, particularly for the large number of houses without garages. 6. *<u>Access, highways safety or traffic generation</u>* *MPC is concerned about the single access point and the additional pressure this will place on the A359, which already experiences high traffic levels. The junction at Lyde Road is particularly dangerous, and there are no traffic lights planned until the first 100 homes are completed which raises serious safety concerns. Further congestion into Yeovil is anticipated, particularly relating to Fairmead School's drop-off and collection times, and the increased traffic generation will exacerbate existing congestion in the area.* *The council seeks clarification on whether traffic-calming measures will be implemented until the junction is fully developed, and raises concerns regarding the provision of safe pedestrian crossings.* 7. *<u>Noise, smells or disturbance from the scheme</u>* *PC is concerned about how the roads will cope with additional traffic during the construction phase, including the management of waste from the building process. Is there a clear provision for construction traffic? Mudford already experiences a high volume of traffic through the village, and this is a major concern for the Parish Council and parishioners.* 8. *<u>Flood Risk</u>* *It is a longstanding concern of Mudford Parish Council that flooding at the Mudford Sock/Yeovil Marsh junction will worsen. The Mudford Sock junction already experiences significant flooding.* 9. *<u>Further Comments</u>* *General Observations:* *Please note that the sewage farm adjacent to the proposed development discharges raw sewage, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall, and there are significant issues with odour and flies.*
Officer comment: The comments of Mudford Parish Council have been considered. Matters relating to design, landscaping, residential amenity, affordable housing integration, parking provision and flood risk have been concluded within the relevant sections of this report (Section 12 – material considerations).	

Issues concerning the principle of development, access arrangements, strategic highway impacts, construction traffic and nutrient mitigation fall outside the scope of this Reserved Matters application and were considered through the outline planning permission. Officers are satisfied that no matters have been raised that warrant refusal of the reserved matters submitted.

Yeovil Without Parish Council (YWPC) (adjoining Parish)	26/05/26 - Comments. General Observations: NOTED the amendments *22/01/26 – Comments only* *Access, highways safety or traffic generation* *Yeovil Without Parish Council (YWPC) notes the planning application for the Mudford Road site. As an adjacent parish, we wish to raise our main concerns regarding traffic flow and the potential impact of the proposed development.* *Mudford Road is heavily congested at peak times, and Fairmead School is located nearby. School pick-up and drop off periods already affect traffic flow, and YWPC is concerned about how the additional development traffic will be managed and mitigated.* *YWPC notes that the proposed road access for the site falls within our parish boundary. We have specific concerns regarding the impact of this access onto Mudford Road and the implementation of the four-arm traffic-controlled signalling. We are still awaiting further details about the phasing of these works, including when they are scheduled to be completed and the approximate time span for implementation.* *We are particularly concerned about potential changes to traffic flow at peak times and would like clarification on whether the traffic signals will be dynamically controlled based on traffic volumes. Additional details and modelling regarding expected traffic flows and any mitigation measures would be helpful in assessing the impact on our parish and the surrounding area.* *We would be grateful if these details could be provided so that YWPC can be fully informed of the impact of this development*

Officer comment: The comments of YWPC have been considered.

The concerns raised relate principally to the impact of the approved development on the local highways network and the delivery of the associated highway mitigation works. The principle of development, access arrangements and highway mitigation requirements were considered through the outline planning application and subsequent appeal, with the necessary highway works secured through the outline permission and associated S106 Agreement.

The current application seeks approval of the Reserved Matters only and does not propose any changes to the approved access arrangements or highway mitigation strategy. As such, Officers do not consider the matters raised to warrant refusal of the application.

Landscape & Placemaking	No objection, subject to conditions. The Landscape and Placemaking Officer has reviewed the revised submission and advises that significant improvements have been made in response to previous concerns. The revised materials palette, incorporating warmer and lighter tones, is considered to represent a positive response to the character of the Mudford Road area and creates a more bespoke and locally distinct development. Revisions to the street tree strategy, public realm planting and landscape framework are welcomed, with tree planting now used to shape and frame spaces and reinforce the site's relationship with the wider landscape. Additional play features integrated throughout the public open spaces are also supported. The officer recommends that details of the public realm tree planting, play trail infrastructure, street furniture and the final materials palette be secured through conditions.

Officer comment: The Landscape and Placemaking Officer's original concerns raised related to a number of aspects of the scheme, including the landscape-led design approach, materials palette, street tree provision, public realm and play infrastructure. Through ongoing discussion and several rounds of amendments, the proposals have been substantially revised to address these comments.

In particular, revisions were secured to the materials palette and materials distribution strategy, including increased use of lighter tones and reconstituted stone at key locations, together with enhancements to the public realm, street tree strategy and play provision. The consultee now raises no objection to the scheme.

Whilst the Landscape and Placemaking Officer suggested conditions relating to materials, public realm tree planting and play trail infrastructure, officers are satisfied that sufficient detail has been submitted through the approved plans package, including the Materials Layout Plan (EXxxx-SL-020D) and associated landscape drawings, to enable these matters to be fully assessed through the Reserved Matters application.

Regarding materials, the submitted details clearly identify the proposed facing materials and their distribution across the development. Officers are therefore satisfied that the appearance and landscape quality of the development can be appropriately controlled through the approved drawings.

In respect of landscaping, public realm tree planting, play trail features and associated street furniture, the submitted landscape plans identify the nature and location of these elements and formed part of the Landscape and Placemaking Officer's final assessment of the scheme. Refer to drawings EXxxx-LS-002f, EXxxx-LS-003f and EXxxx-LS-004f (Site Landscaping+Ph1). The consultee confirmed that the selected play equipment and its location were agreed and raised no objection to the revised proposals. Officers are therefore satisfied that these matters have been adequately resolved through the Reserved Matters process and that further approval conditions would unnecessarily duplicate details already secured through the approved plans and associated planning obligations.	
Conservation	No objection. The Conservation Officer notes that the principle of development has been established through the outline planning permission and subsequent appeal decision. The Officer advises that the Reserved Matters proposals would not result in any greater harm to the significance of nearby heritage assets than that previously assessed. A low level of harm to the setting of the historic turnpike road (a non-designated heritage asset) and Grade II listed Stone Farm House is identified through the erosion of their rural setting. The impact on Stone Farm House is considered to be partially mitigated by the existing tree belt and goyle separating the site from the listed building. Overall, the identified heritage harm is considered limited and should be weighed against the public benefits of the development.
Officer comment: The Conservation Officer raises no objection to the application. The consultee's assessment is consistent with the findings of the Planning Inspector at the outline appeal stage, who concluded that the development would result in less than substantial harm, at the lower end of the scale, to the setting of Stone Farm House and the historic turnpike road, but that this harm would be outweighed by the social, economic and environmental benefits of the scheme. It is concluded that the Reserved Matters proposals do not result in a materially greater level of heritage harm than that previously assessed and accepted through the outline permission and appeal decision. This identified low level of harm is considered in the heritage section of this report, and weighed in the planning balance.	

Highway Authority	No objection. Internal road layout considered acceptable in highway terms and suitable for adoption in principle. Detailed technical comments relate to estate road construction standards, surface water drainage arrangements, pedestrian crossing provision, visibility requirements and vehicle tracking. These matters do not amount to an objection to the development however and can be addressed through the detailed design and technical approval processes associated with delivery and adoption of the highway infrastructure. No further comments have been made on the amended plans since the first consultation round.

Officer comment: No highways objection has been raised. The principle of access and the delivery of off-site highway mitigation, including improvements to the Mudford Road/Lyde Road junction, were secured through the outline permission and associated legal agreements.

The Section 106 Agreement secures highway mitigation through Schedule 3. This includes a signalised junction arrangement, an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing and a new footway connection along Mudford Road, with delivery tied to occupation triggers.

The Reserved Matters application relates to the detailed internal layout, which the Highway Authority considered acceptable subject to the detailed technical requirements identified in the consultation response.

Highway considerations are addressed in detail in Section 12.

Natural England	No objection. Natural England reviewed the Reserved Matters application and noted that phosphate mitigation measures had already been secured through Condition 9 of the outline planning permission. On that basis, Natural England confirmed it had no further comments on the application. Following consultation on the amended plans, Natural England referred to its previous response and advised that it had no additional comments.

Officer comment: Matters relating to the effects of the development on designated habitats and nutrient neutrality were considered through the outline planning permission and associated Habitats Regulation Assessment, with appropriate mitigation secured through Condition 9 of the outline permission and the Section 106 Agreement. The current Reserved Matters application does not alter the mitigation strategy previously assessed and Natural England has raised no objection to the proposals.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	No objection, subject to the existing outline drainage conditions and informatives.

	The proposal complies with technical planning requirements, and is therefore in accordance with relevant local and national planning policy. Following further discussions regarding existing ditches and watercourses across the site, the applicant confirmed that no watercourse infilling works form part of the current Reserved Matters application. The LLFA subsequently confirmed that, on that basis, it maintains its no objection position to the application. The LLFA have advised that any future works affecting the cross-section of an ordinary watercourse would require separate Land Drainage Consent under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The LLFA have requested that a Land Drainage informative be attached to any planning permission granted. The LLFA initially raised concerns regarding various aspects of the drainage strategy, including attenuation basin design, exceedance routing, groundwater considerations, impermeable catchment areas, construction stage drainage and the proposed treatment of ditches/watercourses. Through the submission of additional information and technical clarification, relevant matters previously raised were addressed to the satisfaction of the LLFA. The LLFA advises that detailed attenuation basin design, groundwater monitoring, construction-stage surface water management and other technical drainage matters can be addressed through the discharge of Condition 11 attached to the outline planning permission.

Officer comment: The LLFA has confirmed that it raises no objection to the Reserved Matters application and is satisfied that the submitted information demonstrates that the drainage strategy can be accommodated within the proposed layout. Matters identified above are controlled through Condition 11 of the outline planning permission and the legal agreement.

Whilst the LLFA recommended a condition relating to long-term maintenance of the drainage system, officers note that equivalent provisions are already secured through the Section 106 Agreement attached to the outline permission. Given these existing controls a further condition is not considered necessary.

Officers have reviewed the LLFA's position regarding the proposed removal of ditches/watercourses. It has been confirmed that Phase 1 does not involve the infilling of any watercourses, albeit pipework will run beneath.

Therefore, officers are satisfied that drainage and flood risk matters are appropriately controlled through the existing planning framework and do not warrant refusal of the application.

Leisure and Open Space Officer	No objection. The Leisure and Open Space Officer advises that comments made during consideration of the outline application remain applicable. It is noted that play and recreational facilities will be delivered across the wider development, including both phases of the scheme.
Officer comment: The principle, quantity and delivery of open space and recreational provision were established through the outline planning permission and secured through the associated Section 106 Agreement. The current application includes public open space and play provision within Phase 1 and raises no concerns from the Leisure and Open Space Officer.	
Environmental Protection	No comments.
South West Heritage Trust (SWHT)	No objection. SWHT advises that archaeological matters associated with the development were considered at outline stage and are controlled through Condition 12 of the outline permission, which requires the submission an approval of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prior to the commencement of development. SWHT notes that supporting information submitted with the application confirms that archaeological excavation will be undertaken in accordance with a WSI. On this basis, no objection is raised to the Reserved Matters application.
Officer comment: Officers are satisfied that the appropriate mechanisms remain in place to secure archaeological investigation, recording and mitigation prior to the commencement of development, and that the Reserved Matters proposals do not conflict with those requirements.	
Environment Agency	No comments. The Environment Agency indicated that the application does not meet the criteria requiring their consultation and, therefore, has not provided a response.
Officer comment: Relevant material planning considerations have been referred to other relevant consultees and responses are provided in this report.	
Somerset Waste Partnership (SWP)	No objection. SWP raised initial concerns regarding the practical operation of waste and recycling collections within parts of the development, including vehicle manoeuvrability, collection arrangements from private drives. During the course of the application, the applicant submitted amended plans in response to these comments, including minor revisions to parking layouts, gardens and turning areas to

	provide additional manoeuvring space for refuse and emergency vehicles whilst maintaining compliance with the relevant design standards. Following review of the amended plans, SWP confirmed that it raises no objection to the proposals.
Officer comment: The comments of SWP are noted. The applicant engaged with SWP during the course of the application and submitted minor amendments to the layout in response to the issues raised. The applicant advised that these amendments were made to provide additional manoeuvring flexibility for refuse and emergency vehicles, rather than to fundamentally alter the layout, whilst avoiding encroachment on Tree T4's Root Protection Area. Following review of the amended plans, SWP confirmed that it had no objection to the proposals. Officers are therefore satisfied that acceptable waste and recycling collection arrangements can be achieved within the development.	
Public Rights of Way (PRoW)	No objection. The PRoW Officer advises that no recorded PRoWs cross the application site. In response to third-party representations referring to a historic route shown on a 1904 Ordnance Survey map, the Officer advises that the route is not recorded on the Definitive Map and Statement. Whilst separate statutory procedures exist to seek the addition of routes to the Definitive Map where appropriate, no recorded Public Right of Way would be affected by the proposal.
Officer comment: The PRoW Officer raises no objection to the application and confirms that no recorded public rights of way pass through the site. Officers have considered the consultee's comments regarding references made by Mudford Parish Council to a footpath crossing the site; however, no recorded public right of way is affected by the Reserved Matters proposals on the Definitive Map. Officers are therefore satisfied that the development does not adversely affect the Public Rights of Way network.	
Designing Out Crime	No objection subject to comments. The Designing out Crime Officer reviewed the proposals and raised a number of recommendations relating to community safety, including surveillance of public spaces, footpath alignments, boundary treatments, parking areas and external lighting. The applicant subsequently reviewed the comments and provided responses and amendments to the scheme. The Officer maintained recommendations regarding detailed lighting design and the need to ensure that public spaces and pedestrian routes are appropriately overlooked and feel safe to use.
Officer Comment: The Designing out Crime Officer has raised no objection to the application. Following amendments responding to the comments, the remaining	

comments relate principally to detailed design matters and the provision of an external lighting strategy, which is recommended to be secured by condition. Please refer to proposed Condition 2 – Lighting. It is considered that the Reserved Matters proposals provide an acceptable level of surveillance and community safety and accord with the principles of Secured by Design.	
Affordable Housing	Comments (neutral). Following discussions and revision to the scheme, improvements were made to the appearance and integration of the affordable housing. The Affordable Housing Officer raised comments regarding the affordable housing provisions within Phase 1, including the proposed tenure mix, noting in particular the absence of 2-bedroom social rented dwellings and concerns that the Phase 1 mix did not fully reflect the preferred affordable housing requirements.
Officer comment: The S106 Agreement (dated 15th February 2024) secures the provision of 35% affordable housing across the development and establishes the approved affordable tenure split for the whole development of 25% First Homes, 67% Social Rent and 8% Shared Ownership, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Development Enabling Specialist. The agreement also requires affordable housing to be indistinguishable in design and appearance from comparable market dwellings and restricts clustering of affordable homes. Whilst the Affordable Housing Officer has raised comments regarding the affordable housing mix and distribution within Phase 1, amendments have been made during the course of the application to improve the appearance and integration of affordable housing. Officers are satisfied that the Reserved Matters proposals accord with the requirements of the S106 Agreement and that the detailed affordable housing provisions remain acceptable within the context of the wider approved scheme. There is no evidence to suggest that approval of Phase 1 would prejudice the ability of subsequent phases to deliver the overall affordable housing requirements secured through the S106 Agreement for the development as a whole. Amendments were made during the course of the application in response to the Affordable Housing Officer's comments, including revisions to the appearance, materials and elevational treatment of the affordable housing units.	
Ecologist	No objection. The Ecology Officer raises no objection to the application. It is advised that ecological mitigation, biodiversity enhancement and nutrient neutrality matters were considered through the outline planning permission and are secured through the associated planning conditions, Section 106 Agreement and subsequent approval processes. Whilst a biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Strategy has been submitted, the Ecology Officer notes that this is not required for the determination of the Reserved Matters application itself. The submitted ecological information is noted

	and no additional ecological requirements are identified in relation to the Reserved Matters proposals.
Officer comment: The Ecology Officer raises no objection to the application. Ecological mitigation, biodiversity enhancement and nutrient neutrality matters were considered through the outline planning permission and are secured through the associated planning conditions and Section 106 Agreement, including Condition 9 relating to phosphate mitigation, which is currently the subject of a separate discharge of conditions application. Officers are satisfied that the Reserved Matters proposals appropriately implement the ecological framework established through the outline permission.	
Phosphates	No objection. The Phosphate Officer advises that phosphate mitigation is secured through the outline planning permission Condition 9 and associated S106 Agreement. The consultee notes that details relating to the phosphate mitigation, including the Constructed Treatment Wetland and associated management arrangements, are being considered through the relevant discharge of condition process and raises no objection to the Reserved Matters application.
Officer comment: The Phosphate Officer raises no objection to the Reserved Matters application. The details of phosphate mitigation, including the Constructed Treatment Wetland and associated management arrangements, are being addressed through the relevant condition discharge processes and associated S106 Agreement. Officers note that phosphate mitigation matters are also being considered through a separate Section 73 application. Phosphate mitigation therefore remains controlled through the relevant planning conditions and legal agreement, matters which sit outside the scope of the current Reserved Matters application. The current Reserved Matters application does not seek to amend the approved mitigation strategy and therefore no objection is raised.	
The Monarch's Way Association	Objection. Concerns are raised regarding the effect of the development on the rural character and setting experienced by users of the Monarch's Way, the potential for increased traffic along the route, which is used by walkers, and ecological impacts associated with the development. Advises that the amendments made to the scheme in subsequent revisions do not overcome its previous concerns.
Officer comment: The Monarch's Way Association's objection is considered and principally relates to the impact of the development on the surrounding rural character, users of the Monarch's Way and traffic associated with the approved development. These matters were considered and concluded at outline stage, with the Inspector specifically assessing the effects on walkers using the Monarch's Way.	

The current application relates to the reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, which are assessed in the relevant sections of this report and are consistent with the Parameter Plan (190812 SK007 C) approved at the outline stage.	
Active Travel England	Standing advice given. Active Travel England undertook a high-level review of the application and advised that its standing advice should be taken into account in the determination of the application.
Officer comment: The provision of pedestrian and cycle connectivity associated with the development was considered at outline stage. Officers are satisfied that the Reserved Matters proposals provide an acceptable level of internal pedestrian and cycle connectivity, consistent with the principles established through the outline permission.	
Wessex Water	No objection. Wessex Water advises that the site lies within the odour and fly consultation buffer zone for Yeovil Without Sewage Treatment Works and notes that the approved masterplan layout has been informed by odour assessment work undertaken at the outline stage. Wessex Water also identifies public foul sewers crossing the site, which must be protected or diverted by agreement where necessary. Wessex Water confirms that foul drainage from the development must discharge via a pumped connection to the public sewer network in Fairmead Road, draining to Yeovil Pen Mill Sewage Treatment Works. It advises that there is no capacity at Yeovil Without Sewage Treatment Works and that connection to sewers serving that treatment works is not permitted.
Officer comment: Wessex Water raises no objection. Matters relating to foul drainage, nutrient mitigation and the Constructed Treatment Wetland were considered at outline stage and are secured through Condition 9 and the Section 106 Agreement, while Condition 14 ensures an appropriate relationship between residential development and the wetland area. Existing sewers crossing the site will need to be protected or diverted by agreement with Wessex Water; which sits outside of the scope of planning.	
Education Section 106 Officer	No comments. The Education Officer advises that there are no comments on the Reserved Matters application from an education

	perspective. Education contributions and requirements were secured through the Section 106 Agreement associated with the outline permission.
Officer comment: No objection raised. The Reserved Matters application does not alter the scale of development approved and gives rise to no additional education-related considerations.	
National Highways	No objection. National Highways reviewed the application and confirmed that, as a Reserved Matters application, the impact of the development on the Strategic Road Network is not a matter for reconsideration. The principle of development was established through the outline permission and National Highways raises no objection to the proposal. Subsequent consultation on amended plans confirmed that its previous no-objection response remains unchanged.
Officer comment: The current application seeks approval of the Reserved Matters only and does not alter the scale or nature of development previously approved. Accordingly, no concerns have been identified in relation to the Strategic Road Network.	
NHS Integrated Care Board	No comments. The NHS Integrated Care Board notes that healthcare impacts arising from the development were assessed at outline stage and appropriate mitigation secured through the associated Section 106 Agreement. No further comments are made on the Reserved Matters application.
Officer comment: The Reserved Matters application does not alter the approved level of development and therefore does not give rise to any additional healthcare considerations.	
Devon & Somerset Fire and Rescue Service:	Devon & Somerset Fire and Rescue Service's original comments related to the provision of adequate fire-fighting water supplies and hydrants to serve the development, noting that appropriate flow rates will need to be achieved. Information on this should be sourced from the National guidance document on the provision of water for firefighting (3rd edition; Jan 2007). Following consultation on the amended plans, the Service confirmed that it had no additional comments and that its previous response remains applicable.
Officer comment: No objection has been raised. The consultee's comments relate to operational requirements which are matters of detailed implementation. Officers	

are satisfied that these matters do not affect the acceptability of the Reserved Matters proposals and can be addressed as part of the development's delivery.	
Tree Officer	No objection. Comments were provided throughout the application process regarding the relationship of development to Tree T4 (Copper Beech), tree protection measures, the Arboricultural Method Statement, Tree Protection Plan and long-term landscape management arrangements. Following amendments and further information, the Tree Officer advised that the remaining matters could be appropriately addressed through planning conditions and raised no objection to the development.
Officer comments: The comments of the Tree Officer are considered. No trees are proposed for removal as part of Phase 1, aside from the hedgerow proposed for removal (already approved at outline stage for access) and the Tree Officer raises no objection to the development, subject to conditions relating to tree protection and long-term management. Officers are satisfied that the layout appropriately responds to the site's arboricultural constraints.	

Local consultation and representation

8.4 In accordance with the Council's Adopted Statement of Community Involvement application 25/02769/REM was publicised by letters of notification to neighbouring properties. Several site notices were displayed and a press advert placed as part of the initial consultation and reconsultations.

8.5 Approximately 46 representations (accurate as of 03.11.26) were received, including objections and comments. These have all been considered and are summarised in the table below. The full representation plus enclosures can be viewed on the Council's website.

8.6 It is noted that some of the issues raised through consultation and third-party representations relate to the principle of development, access arrangements, nutrient mitigation and other matters approved already through the outline planning permission or are subject to separate discharge of condition processes. Such matters do not fall for reconsideration under this Reserved Matters application. The relevant feedback provided by local consultation and representation is summarised below and addressed within the relevant sections of this report.

Principle of development - Note that this is not a material consideration as the principle was established as part of the outline.
• Loss of agricultural land and encroachment into the countryside.

- Expansion of Yeovil beyond its existing edge and effects on the rural setting of Mudford.
- Perceived inadequacy of local infrastructure to accommodate further growth.
- Relationship between this development and other planned developments in the area (Primrose Lane development)
- Requests for the principle of development and site allocation to be reconsidered.

Design, Layout, Character and Residential Amenity

- Concerns that the scheme is overly suburban in character and does not respond appropriately to its sensitive edge-of-settlement location.
- Reliance on standard house types and repetitive architectural treatment.
- Limited reflection of local character and distinctive features of the surrounding area.
- Appropriateness of using Mudford Road as the principal design and character reference for the development.
- Affordable housing mix, distribution and integration across the development
- Building heights, finished floor levels, retaining walls, visual massing and the transition between the town edge and surrounding countryside.
- Accuracy and representativeness of submitted visualisations and landscaping assumptions

Landscape, Visual Impact, Green Infrastructure and Ecology

- Effectiveness of the proposed landscape framework and mitigation planting.
- Removal and replacement of hedgerows and existing vegetation
- Long-term establishment and effectiveness of landscape mitigation measures.
- Reliance on future planting to soften the appearance of the development.
- Visibility of the development from surrounding public viewpoints, including Monarch's Way and Sock Hill.
- Effects on the landscape setting of nearby heritage assets.
- Integration of the attenuation basin, wetland and other drainage features within the landscape framework.
- Delivery and long-term management of biodiversity enhancements and ecological mitigation measures.
- Concerns regarding the adequacy of ecological assessment, mitigation and statutory consultation responses (including Natural England's involvement in the assessment process).

Highways, Access and Transport

- Additional traffic on Mudford Road and the surrounding highway network.
- Timing and delivery of junction improvements and highway mitigation works.
- General traffic impacts associated with Fairmead School.
- Construction traffic and construction access arrangements, particularly in the vicinity of Fairmead School.
- Safety of pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users.
- Adequacy of walking, cycling and public transport connections.

• Parking provision, visitor parking and tandem parking arrangements. • Effects on users of Monarch's Way and other recreational routes.
Drainage and Flood Risk
• Potential flood risk impacts both on-site and downstream. • Treatment of existing ditches, watercourses and drainage features. • Capacity and resilience of the attenuation basin and drainage network. • Groundwater conditions, climate change allowances and rainfall modelling assumptions. • Capacity of receiving watercourses and cumulative impacts from nearby developments. • Long-term management and maintenance of drainage infrastructure. • Foul drainage capacity and wastewater infrastructure.
Waste Collection, Servicing and Estate Management
• Practicality of waste and recycling collection arrangements, including accessibility of collection points. • Refuse vehicle access and manoeuvrability within the development. • Collection arrangements serving private drives. • Future management and maintenance of public open space, landscaping and drainage features. • Long-term stewardship of communal infrastructure and ecological mitigation areas.
Lighting
• Extent and impact of proposed external lighting. • Light spill into the surrounding countryside and effects on wildlife. • Potential effects of lighting on landscape character and the rural setting of the site.
Community Infrastructure and Construction Impacts
• Capacity of local schools, healthcare facilities and other community infrastructure. • Construction impacts, including noise, disturbance and site management during the build process. • Timing and implementation of infrastructure required to support the development.

9. Relevant planning policies and guidance

9.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended ("the 1990 Act"), requires that in determining any planning application regard is to be had to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as is material to the application and to any other material planning considerations. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act") requires that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise

9.2 As a result of local government reorganisation Somerset Council was established on 1 April 2023 and the Council has started the preparation of a new local plan. The timetable for the plan is set out in an updated Local Development Scheme agreed in April 2026. The emerging Local Plan is not currently at a stage where any significant weight can be attached. However, where applicable up to date evidence-based studies which have been completed to support the preparation of the Local Plan will be taken into account in decision making. These can be found on the Council's website https://www.somerset.gov.uk/planning-buildings-and-land/evidence-base-and-monitoring/

9.3 Until the Somerset Local Plan 2045 is adopted, the pre-existing development plans of the former LPA areas remain the adopted local plans for their respective geographical areas within Somerset Council until they are replaced either wholly or in part by the Somerset Local Plan.

9.4 The site lies in the former South Somerset area. For the purposes of determining current applications the local planning authority considers that the adopted development plan comprises the policies of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 (adopted March 2015), saved policies from the South Somerset Local Plan 1991-2011, Somerset Minerals Local Plan (2015), and Somerset Waste Core Strategy (2013), plus the East Coker Neighbourhood Plan (made 2018).

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

Policies of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028)

EQ1 – Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset
EQ2 – General Development
EQ3 – Historic Environment
EQ4 – Biodiversity
EQ5 – Green Infrastructure
HG3 – Provision of Affordable Housing
HW1 – Provision of Open Space, Outdoor Playing Space, Sports, Cultural and Community Facilities in Development
TA5 – Transport Impact of New Development
TA6 – Parking Standards

Other Relevant Documents

Planning Practice Guidance
National Design Guide - September 2019
Place Making Principles for Somerset, adopted August 2024:

1) Reduce the need to travel via private car.

2) Facilitate modal shift through multi-modal travel measures.
3) Integrate car and bicycle parking in a way that prioritises pedestrians and public realm.
4) Create an attractive, high-quality environment, incorporating green infrastructure into streets and public spaces.
5) Improve road safety for all users through street design, appropriate to the context.
6) Facilitate car-free school transport
7) Enhance accessibility and attractiveness through materials, street furniture and fixtures.
8) Plan lighting, waste storage/collection and other service infrastructure at an early design stage.
9) Provide safe connectivity within rural communities.
10) Engage key stakeholders early

Somerset County Council Parking Strategy (SPS) - September 2013
Somerset Council 5YHLS Report 2026
South Somerset HELAA (Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment) 2018 and 2021
South Somerset Landscape Character Assessment (October 1993).

South Somerset District Council Environment Strategy 2019

The National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in August 2026 sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. Relevant national decision-making chapters of the NPPF include:

3. Decision-making policies
4. Achieving sustainable development
5. Meeting the challenge of climate change
6. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
12. Making effective use of land
14. Achieving well-designed places
15. Promoting sustainable transport
16. Promoting healthy communities
17. Pollution, public protection and security
18. Managing flood risk and coastal change
19. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
20. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

10. Commentary on Development Plan

10.1 The NPPF was updated in August 2026. The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. The latest published housing land supply position for the relevant area – South - is calculated at 3.03 years. In accordance with Policy HO7 of the NPPF, substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes which contribute towards meeting identified housing needs.

10.2 The principle of residential development has already been established through the outline planning permission and does not fall for reconsideration as part of this application.

10.3 To properly perform the S38(6) duty the LPA has to establish whether or not the proposed development accords with the development plan as a whole. This needs to be done even if development plan policies "pull in different directions", i.e. some may support a proposal, others may not. The LPA is required to assess the proposal against the potentially competing policies and then decide whether in the light of the whole plan the proposal does or does not accord with it. In these circumstances, the Officer Report should determine the relative importance of the policy, the extent of any breach and how firmly the policy favours or set its face against such a proposal.

10.4 Furthermore, the relevance of and weight given to material considerations is vitally important in assessing the ‘planning balance’.

10.5 The assessment of the ‘planning balance’ means there will inevitably be aspects of this proposal that do not strictly meet policy objectives set out a decade ago and so it is for the decision-maker to weigh up the positives against any actual or perceived negatives to reach a recommendation/decision in the public interest.

10.6 In accordance with HO3(1) and Annex D of the NPPF, local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites. This should be sufficient to provide a minimum of five years’ worth of housing, assessed against their housing requirement in the development plan, or against their local housing need (calculated using the standard method) where the development plan housing requirement is more than five years old.

10.7 Policy S5 supports development outside settlement limits where that site is allocated in the development plan and where development would address an evidenced unmet need including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

10.8 The NPPF directs decision makers to approve such applications unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework.

10.9 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was substantially revised and republished on 17 August 2026. The latest published housing land supply position confirms that the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply within the South area (formerly South Somerset

District area), with a housing land supply of 3.03 years. Whilst this remains an important material consideration and attracts weight in favour of proposals that would contribute to housing delivery, the revised NPPF has removed the former paragraph 11(d) 'tilted balance' approach and replaced it with a new presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within Policies S3 to S5.

10.10 The general requirement of the NPPF is that all planning decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan, unless materials considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of the development plan when taken as a whole, as will be demonstrated.

10.11 This report assesses policy compliance, reasons for non-accordance, the material planning considerations and the representations before reaching a conclusion.

11. Local Finance Considerations

Community Infrastructure Levy

11.1 The proposal comprises new residential development which is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The applicant has submitted the relevant CIL Additional Information Form identifying the proposed residential floorspace and affordable housing floorspace associated with the development.

11.2 As this application relates to the approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to outline planning permission 22/00695/OUT, any CIL liability will be calculated in accordance with the Council's adopted CIL Charging Schedule.

12. Material Planning Considerations

12.1 This application for Reserved Matters follows the outline approval for the development, which established the overall principle of residential development and access onto the site – this application seeks to confirm the size, scale design and detail of the development. The main planning issues relevant in the assessment of this application of the detailed proposals are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Layout, Scale and Appearance
- Residential Amenity
- Highways, Movement and Parking
- Landscaping, Ecology and Phosphates

- Drainage and Flood Risk
- Heritage

Principle of Development

12.2 The principle of residential development on the site was considered and established through the grant of outline planning permission 22/00695/OUT, which was subsequently allowed on appeal. This application seeks approval of the reserved matters for Phase 1 only and does not seek to revisit the principle of development or the amount of development previously approved.

12.3 A Section 73 application seeking amendments to the approved scheme remains under consideration and has resolved to grant permission subject to completion of a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement. Notwithstanding this, the extant outline planning permission continues to establish the principle of development on the site.

12.4 This Reserved Matters application relates to Phase 1 only and does not include the Constructed Treatment Wetland approved as part of the outline permission, which lies within a separate part of the wider site. The current proposals do not affect the location or delivery of the nutrient mitigation strategy secured through the outline permission. The separate S73 application is currently seeking to amend the approved nutrient mitigation strategy. The detailed design and implementation of any approved nutrient mitigation scheme would be secured separately through the relevant discharge of condition process.

12.5 That infrastructure lies within a separate part of the site and is not affected by the proposals currently under consideration. The separate Section 73 application is currently seeking to replace that mitigation strategy with a SuDS-based nutrient mitigation solution.

12.6 The submitted layout has been prepared in accordance with the approved Parameter Plan and does not preclude either the implementation of the extant permission or the scheme proposed under the Section 73 application.

12.7 Furthermore, the existing Section 106 Agreement remains capable of securing the relevant obligations and associated trigger points. The principle of development is not a matter for reconsideration through this application.

Layout, Scale and Appearance

12.8 The application seeks approval of the reserved matters relating to layout, scale and appearance. These matters are required to be assessed having regard to the approved parameter plan, the design principles established through the outline planning permission, and relevant development plan

policies. The outline permission established the principle of up to 252 dwellings on the site together with the approved means of access. The current application therefore considers whether the detailed design of Phase 1 accords with the approved development framework and represents an acceptable form of development. At the local level, Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (General Development) requires development to promote South Somerset's local distinctiveness, respecting the local area character, and create a high standard of design. Policy DP3 (Key principles for well-designed places) of the NPPF places significant emphasis on development responding positively to its context, creating attractive places, establishing a strong sense of place and contributing positively to sustainable development.

12.9 The proposed layout is in accordance with the approved Parameter Plan which responds to the physical characteristics of the site, including its sloping topography, the approved access arrangement from Mudford Road, surrounding development, the landscape and ecological frameworks and areas of green infrastructure. The Parameter Plan establishes the broad arrangement of development parcels and sets the development height across the site, including areas of two-storey and two-and-a-half-storey development in response.

12.10 The submitted layout for Phase 1 comprises 109 dwellings arranged in a hierarchy of streets and spaces served from the approved access onto Mudford Road, together with areas of public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage infrastructure and ecological enhancement. The development includes a range of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings, providing variety in built form and contributing to a varied street scene.

12.11 The appearance of the development has been informed and is shown by the Character Analysis, Design Response Document, Materials Layout Plan, Street Scene drawings and House Type Portfolio submitted with the application. The proposal incorporates a palette of brick, render, recon stone, boarding and roof tiles, as set out within the submitted materials strategy.

12.12 The application has also been informed by pre-application discussions and review through the Quality Review Panel (QRP) process during that stage. The QRP identified opportunities to strengthen the landscape framework, public realm, play provision, street tree planting, architectural character and material palette. These themes informed amendments secured during the course of the application.

12.13 The Council's Landscape and Placemaking Officer has been actively involved throughout the application process and sought a number of amendments to strengthen the overall design quality of the development. Particular emphasis

was placed on the landscape framework, public realm, street tree planting, play infrastructure, materials palette and the creation of a more distinct sense of place. Following successive revisions to the scheme, the Landscape and Placemaking Officer confirmed that many of the matters previously raised had been addressed. The revised proposals were considered to provide a more distinctive and higher quality placemaking response. The Landscape and Placemaking Officer therefore raises no objection to the revised scheme.

12.14 Officers are satisfied that sufficient detail has been submitted through the approved plans package, including the Materials Layout Plan and associated landscape drawings, to enable these matters to be assessed through the Reserved Matters application and therefore no further approval condition is considered necessary.

12.15 A significant number of third-party representations raise concerns regarding the suburban character of the development, the relationship of the layout with the surrounding countryside and the extent to which the proposals respond to local character. These matters have been carefully considered. Whilst the development will inevitably change the character of the site from agricultural land to residential development, this change was accepted through the grant of outline planning permission and subsequent appeal. The current application therefore considers whether the detailed layout accords with the approved development framework and approved design principles.

12.16 The Inspector concluded that the site could accommodate the approved level of development and accepted the development framework established through the Parameter Plan. Officers are satisfied that the submitted layout remains consistent with these conclusions and does not result in a materially different form of development to that previously assessed and accepted.

12.17 The Affordable Housing Officer raised comments regarding the affordable housing mix and distribution within Phase 1. During the course of the application, amendments were secured to the appearance and materials of the affordable housing units. Officers are satisfied that the proposals accord with the requirements of the Section 106 Agreement, provide an affordable housing proportion in excess of the minimum 35% requirement within Phase 1 and would not prejudice delivery of the wider affordable housing obligations across the development.

Whilst comments were raised regarding the distribution of affordable housing within Phase 1, officers note that the proposed affordable housing layout complies with the Section 106 requirements, including the provision of no more than 10 affordable dwellings within any individual cluster. The Affordable Housing Officer raised no objection to the application and acknowledged that the proposal accords with the requirements of the Section 106 Agreement.

12.18 Overall, the proposed layout, scale and appearance are considered to accord with the principles established through the approved Parameter Plan, respecting and responding to the key parameters established through the outline planning permission. The amendments secured during the course of the application have improved the overall quality of the scheme and addressed the principal concerns raised by the Landscape and Placemaking Officer. The development is therefore considered to comply with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

12.19 Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan requires that development should protect the amenity of both existing and future residents, promoting a high standard of living for all. This includes safeguarding privacy, preventing undue overlooking, and ensuring that the design of new development is sympathetic to its surroundings. Policy DP3 of the NPPF also seeks to secure well-designed places providing high-quality living conditions for existing and future occupiers. In the context of this Reserved Matters application, consideration is therefore given to the relationship between the proposed development, neighbouring properties and the living conditions of future occupiers, specifically considering the final siting and design of the houses.

12.20 A number of representations raise concerns regarding the urbanising effect of the development, its visual impact, its relationship with the surrounding countryside and the change in outlook currently experienced from neighbouring properties and surrounding public viewpoints. It is acknowledged that the development will alter the character of the site as a consequence of the change from agricultural land to residential development. However, the acceptability of residential development on the site, and the resulting change in character, were established through the outline planning permission and subsequent appeal decision.

12.21 The site occupies a predominantly edge-of-settlement location, sitting within agricultural land directly adjacent to the existing built form of Yeovil to the south. Directly to the east are six houses along Mudford Hill. A little further beyond these houses to the east lies land with outline permission granted for 765 dwellings, a 65-bed care home, employment land, retail units, primary school, community building and health care facility at Primrose Lane. Plots 49-53 and 24-28 (from north to south) front onto these existing residential properties. The minimum distance between the rear elevations of the existing dwellings and the front elevations of the proposed dwellings is approximately 32m.

12.22 Existing tree planting, a boundary hedge, along with areas of landscaped green space and private drives provide a substantial buffer between the proposed development and these dwellings.

12.23 Plots 29, 23 and 21 (from west to east) have side elevations and boundaries facing towards these existing properties, with a minimum separation distance of approximately 5.6m (from closest existing dwelling to plot 21). Of these dwellings, only Plot 23 contains a first-floor window within the side elevation, which serves a bathroom. Plots 29 and 21 have no side-facing windows within the elevations facing the existing dwellings. Given the limited number of side-facing openings, the non-habitable nature of the bathroom window and the separation distances achieved, officers are satisfied that the relationship would not result in unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy or harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring existing properties.

12.24 Situated immediately to the south along Mudford Road is existing residential development. Whilst the wider outline site extends along a greater length of the Mudford Road frontage, the current Reserved Matters application relates only to Phase 1. Officers are therefore satisfied that the relationship between the proposed development and these neighbouring properties would not result in unacceptable residential amenity impacts.

12.25 To the west of the wider site is an ancient woodland and a stream known as the 'Bearley Brook' forming the western boundary of the outline development. Further beyond lies the Grade II listed Stone Farm. The Yeovil Without sewage works lies adjacent to the north-western side of the site. However, these features do not directly adjoin the Phase 1 application area, which is generally located within the south-eastern part of the wider outline site. As such, the current Reserved Matters proposals do not result in any direct residential amenity relationship with these features.

12.26 Taking all matters into account, it is considered that the proposed development would provide an acceptable standard of amenity for both existing and future occupiers. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Highways, Movement and Parking

12.27 Policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan address matters of transport and accessibility, including the provision of safe and efficient access to the development, parking and the management of traffic impacts. These objectives are reflected within Policies TR3 (Locating development in sustainable locations) and TR4 (Street design, access and parking) of the NPPF and underlines the need to ensure patterns of movement are integral to

the design of schemes and contribute to making high-quality places that are safe and provide suitable access for all users.

12.28 The outline planning permission was granted with all matters reserved except for access. The principle of development, wider highway impacts and means of access from Mudford Road were considered through the outline planning application and subsequent appeal decision and do not form part of the current Reserved Matters Application. The approved access strategy and associated highway mitigation measures are secured through the outline permission and Section 106 Agreement.

12.29 Accordingly, the highways assessment of this application relates principally to the detailed internal layout of the development, pedestrian and cycle connectivity, parking provision, vehicle tracking and the suitability of the proposed internal movement network.

12.30 The submitted layout incorporates the approved access arrangement from Mudford Road and provides an internal network of estate roads, shared surfaces, footways and pedestrian connections throughout the development. Public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage features are integrated within the layout and contribute to the overall movement framework.

12.31 The Highways Authority has raised no objection to the application. The internal road layout is considered acceptable in highway terms and suitable for adoption in principle. Detailed technical comments were provided in relation to estate road standards, drainage arrangements, pedestrian crossing provision, visibility requirements and vehicle tracking. These matters do not alter the Highway Authority's overall acceptance of the proposed layout and are capable of being addressed through the detailed design and adoption process. Following the submission of amended plans, the Highway Authority confirmed that it had no further comments and maintained its no-objection position.

12.32 Somerset Waste Partnership initially raised concerns regarding refuse vehicle manoeuvrability, waste collection arrangements associated with private drives and the practicality of servicing some parts of the development. During the course of the application, the applicant worked with officers to review these matters and submitted amended plans, including revisions to parking layouts and turning areas. The applicant advised that these amendments were made to provide additional manoeuvring space and operational flexibility for refuse and emergency vehicles, despite the layout already achieving the applicable design standards. Following review of the amended plans and supporting information, Somerset Waste Partnership confirmed that it had no objection to the proposals.

12.33 The Public Rights of Way Officer confirms that no recorded Public Rights of Way crosses the application site and raises no objection to the proposal.

Whilst representations have referred to a historic route shown on a 1904 Ordnance Survey map, this route forms no part of the Definitive Map. Officers note that separate statutory procedures exist for the investigation and recording of Public Rights of Way where appropriate. In the absence of any recorded Public Right of Way being affected by the development, this matter does not affect the acceptability of the proposal in Public Rights of Way terms. The proposed layout incorporates footways and pedestrian connections throughout the site and remains consistent with the walking and cycling principles established through the approved outline permission.

12.34 A number of representations raise concerns regarding traffic generation, congestion on Mudford Road, impacts associated with Fairmead School and the operation of the approved junction improvements. These matters were considered through the outline planning permission and appeal process and are not revisited through this Reserved Matters application.

12.35 Taking all matters into account, the proposed development is considered to provide a satisfactory arrangement for vehicle movements, pedestrian connectivity and parking. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policies TA5 and TA6 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Policies TR3 and TR4 of the NPPF.

Landscape, Ecology and Phosphates

12.36 Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan seeks to ensure that development conserves and enhances the built and natural environment, reinforces local distinctiveness and creates quality places. Policies EQ4 and EQ5 seek to conserve biodiversity and ecological networks and secure appropriate ecological mitigation or enhancement. These objectives are reflected within Policies DP3 (Well-designed places), CC2 and CC3 (climate change) and N2 (Improving the natural environment) of the NPPF, which seek to secure good design, address climate change and conserve and enhance the natural environment.

12.37 Landscape, green infrastructure and ecological mitigation formed important considerations throughout the outline application and appeal process. The approved development framework established the principal landscape, ecological and green infrastructure parameters for the site, including areas of public open space, biodiversity enhancement, a biodiverse wetland habitat, sustainable drainage infrastructure and habitat creation. The detailed design and implementation of those elements now falls for consideration through this Reserved Matters application.

12.38 The submitted landscape strategy has evolved through the application process and has been informed by pre-application discussions, review through the Quality Review Panel process and ongoing engagement with the Landscape and Placemaking Officer.

12.39 Earlier consultation responses from the Landscape and Placemaking Officer raised concerns regarding the dominance of red brick within the scheme, the need for a stronger response to local character, street tree provision, planting strategy, play infrastructure, landscape integration and the overall placemaking approach. Through successive revisions, amendments were secured to the landscape framework, public realm, materials palette, street tree strategy and play provision. In particular, the materials palette and materials distribution strategy were revised, including the introduction of lighter tones and reconstituted stone in key locations. Following review of the amended plans, the Landscape and Placemaking Officer confirmed that matters previously raised have been addressed and raised no objection to the revised proposals.

12.40 Whilst the consultee suggested that certain matters could be secured through additional conditions, officers are satisfied that sufficient detail has been submitted and assessed through the Reserved Matters process. These elements are clearly identified on the approved plans and informed the consultee's final assessment of the scheme. As such, further approval conditions are not considered necessary and would duplicate details already secured through the approved drawings and controls set out in the S106 legal agreement.

12.41 A number of representations raise concerns regarding the landscape strategy, removal of hedgerows and long-term effectiveness of mitigation planting. Officers are satisfied that the submitted proposal appropriately implements the landscape framework approved at outline stage and provides suitable landscape mitigation measures.

12.42 In arboricultural terms, the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirms that no trees require removal to facilitate Phase 1 of the development. Limited sections of existing hedgerow are proposed to be removed where necessary to facilitate development, whilst the wider landscape proposals incorporate substantial new planting and habitat creation across the site.

12.43 Particular consideration has been given to the relationship between the development and Tree T4 (Copper Beech – Category A). During the course of the application, amendments were made elsewhere within the layout in response to Somerset Waste Partnership comments in order to avoid further widening of the adjacent private drive and potential impacts on the Root Protection Area of Tree T4.

12.44 The Tree Officer has reviewed the proposals and raises no objection, subject to conditions relating to tree protection and long-term management. Officers are therefore satisfied that these proposals will make a positive contribution to the landscape framework established through the outline permission. The Tree Officer raises no objection to the proposals and advises that matters relating to tree protection and long-term management can be appropriately addressed through planning conditions.

12.45 The application is supported by a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Strategy submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Section 106 Agreement. The submitted strategy has been provided to demonstrate how the wider development proposes to achieve the minimum 20% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement secured through the legal agreement. As the outline permission pre-dates the mandatory BNG regime, the development is not subject to the statutory BNG process, with biodiversity enhancements instead secured through the outline permission, associated planning conditions and legal obligations. The Ecology Officer advises that the BNG Strategy is not required for the determination of this Reserved Matters application, as biodiversity enhancement and ecological mitigation are secured through separate mechanisms established by the outline permission.

12.46 Matters relating to phosphate mitigation and the Habitats Regulations Assessment are addressed separately within Section 6 of this report. The principle of development and associated phosphate mitigation strategy were established through the outline planning permission and accompanying Section 106 Agreement and are not revisited through this application.

12.47 The Phosphate Officer confirms that nutrient mitigation is secured through the outline planning permission, with further details of the mitigation scheme continuing to be addressed through the relevant discharge of conditions process. Officers note that amendments relating to phosphate mitigation are also being considered through a separate Section 73 application, however, the principle of nutrient mitigation and the mechanisms for securing it remain matters outside the scope of the current Reserved Matters application.

12.48 Natural England similarly raises no objection, noting the requirement for phosphate mitigation measures under Condition 9 of the outline permission and relying upon the Council's specialist ecological and phosphate advice in respect of the mitigation proposals. Officers are therefore satisfied that nutrient neutrality has been appropriately secured through the outline planning permission and associated obligations, and that the development is capable of proceeding without adverse effects on the integrity of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site/SPA.

12.49 It is concluded that the proposed landscape, ecological and phosphate mitigation measures are acceptable. The development would protect ecological networks and protected species, deliver biodiversity enhancements across the site and, subject to the proposed mitigation measures and conditions, would not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Drainage and Flood Risk

12.50 Policy EQ1 of the South Somerset Local Plan requires development to mitigate and adapt to climate change through sustainable design, including measures to manage flood risk. In accordance with Policies F7 (Ensuring development is safe from flooding) and F8 (Sustainable drainage systems and watercourses) of the NPPF, proposals must be appropriately flood resilient and not increase flood risk elsewhere. The reserved matters application has therefore been reviewed with reference to both local and national policy requirements on surface water and flood management.

12.51 Drainage and flood risk matters formed an important consideration throughout the outline application and appeal process, with the principle of the surface water drainage strategy accepted through the grant of outline planning permission. The current Reserved Matters application therefore considers whether the approved drainage infrastructure can be appropriately accommodated within the detailed layout and whether sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that an acceptable drainage solution remains achievable.

12.52 During the course of the application, the LLFA raised a number of technical queries regarding attenuation basin design, exceedance routing, groundwater considerations, impermeable catchment areas, construction-stage drainage management and the proposed treatment of the ditches and watercourses across the site.

12.53 In response, the applicant submitted further drainage information, revised calculations, attenuation basin cross sections and supporting technical notes. Discussions also took place between the applicant's drainage consultants and the LLFA in order to review the submitted information and address the issues raised through the consultation process.

12.54 Following review of the additional information, the LLFA confirms that it raises no objection to the Reserved Matters application. The authority advises that matters relating to detailed attenuation basin design, groundwater monitoring, exceedance management, construction-stage drainage controls and surface water management continue to be capable of being addressed through

Condition 11 attached to the outline planning permission and the associated discharge of conditions process.

12.55 The LLFA noted that it did not currently support the removal of ditches and watercourses across the site. However, with regard to these comments, no watercourses are proposed for removal as part of this Reserved Matters application, therefore there are no grounds for concern. The LLFA maintains a no objection position in respect of the Reserved Matters application.

12.56 A number of representations raise concerns regarding flood risk, drainage capacity, attenuation basin design, downstream impacts, groundwater conditions, the proposed removal of watercourses and the cumulative effects of surrounding development on drainage infrastructure. These matters have been carefully considered. Having regard to the LLFA's final consultation response and the controls already secured through the outline permission, officers are satisfied that the remaining technical drainage matters can be appropriately addressed through the existing planning and consenting framework.

12.57 Officers are satisfied that the details submitted at this Reserved Matters stage demonstrate that an acceptable drainage strategy can be achieved. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy EQ1 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Policies F7 and F8 of the NPPF.

Heritage

12.58 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, states that in considering whether to grant planning permission or permission in principle for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

12.59 It is one of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that heritage assets should be conserved, in a manner appropriate to their significance, as set out in Chapter 20, HE4: Securing the conservation of heritage assets. NPPF policies HE4 - HE10 set out the assessment criteria for decision making in planning applications relating to heritage assets, and this assessment takes account of the relevant considerations in these policies.

12.60 Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment. This approach is consistent with Section 20 of the NPPF, which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment and requires heritage assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

12.61 The site lies in proximity to a number of designated heritage assets, including the Grade II listed Stone Farm House and Sock Hill Cottages. Heritage matters formed part of the outline planning application and subsequent appeal process.

12.62 In allowing the appeal the Inspector concluded that the development would result in less than substantial harm, at the lower end of the scale, to the setting of Stone Farm House and a section of the historic turnpike road through the erosion of their rural setting. The Inspector concluded that this harm would be outweighed by the social, economic and environmental benefits of the scheme.

12.63 The Conservation Officer notes that the principle of development has already been established through the outline permission and appeal decision. The Officer advises that the Reserved Matters proposals do not result in any greater level of heritage harm than that previously assessed at outline stage. Whilst a low level of harm to the setting of Stone Farm House and the historic turnpike road remains acknowledged through the erosion of their rural setting, no objection is raised to the Reserved Matters proposals. This is consistent with the conclusions of the appeal decision.

12.64 In accordance with Policy HE5 of the NPPF, officers are satisfied that the effect of the Reserved Matters proposals on the significance of the designate heritage assets has been appropriately assessed and that the degree of harm remains less than substantial, consistent with the conclusions reached through the outline application and appeal process.

12.65 Therefore, the proposal will result in harm to the significance of designated heritage assets. In line with policy HE6 (point 4) of the NPPF it is necessary to weigh this against any public benefit. In this instance the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets is outweighed by the public benefit identified and therefore, having due regard to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Development Policy 3 of the adopted Local Plan Part 1 (2014) and Chapter 20. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment of the National Planning Policy Framework, planning permission should not be refused on heritage grounds.

12.66 Accordingly, officers are satisfied that the Reserved Matters proposals do not result in any materially greater heritage impacts than those previously assessed and accepted through the outline permission and appeal decision. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Section 20 of the NPPF.

13. Assessment of Material Considerations and Summary

13.1 This report sets out the main planning considerations in respect of this Reserved Matters application for Phase 1 of the wider development, comprising 109 dwellings. The proposed development has been assessed against the approved Parameter Plan, the appeal decision, the relevant policies of the Development Plan, the NPPF 2026 and all other material considerations. The principle of residential development, approved means of access, maximum development quantum and broad development parameters were established through outline planning permission 22/00695/OUT and do not fall for reconsideration as part of this application.

13.2 The proposed layout, scale, appearance and landscaping have been amended throughout the application process in response to officer and consultee comments. Officers are satisfied that the submitted details accord with the approved parameter plan and provide an acceptable design response to the site and its surroundings and accord with the Development Plan.

13.3 Objections received from Mudford Parish Council, local community groups including Friends of Mudford Action Group (FoMAG), the Three Villages Flood Group, the Monarch's Way Association and local residents have been carefully considered and are addressed within the relevant sections of this report. However, officers conclude that the concerns raised do not warrant refusal of the reserved matters submitted.

13.4 Residential amenity, design quality and placemaking considerations have been carefully assessed. Officers are satisfied that the development would provide an acceptable standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers and that the submitted layout, scale, appearance and landscaping respond appropriately to the site, its surroundings and the design principles established through the outline permission.

13.5 Highways, movement and parking considerations have been reviewed by the Highway Authority, which raises no objection to the proposed development. The scheme provides appropriate internal movement routes, parking provision and pedestrian connectivity.

13.6 The scheme incorporates ecological mitigation, biodiversity enhancements, public open space, green infrastructure and sustainable drainage features. Subject to the recommended conditions and mitigation measures secured through the outline permission, the Council's Ecologist and Natural England raise no objection to the proposal.

13.7 Flood risk and drainage matters have been carefully considered. The Lead Local Flood Authority raises no objection to the Reserved Matters application and advises that detailed drainage matters remain capable of being addressed through the discharge of Condition 11 attached to the outline planning permission and, where necessary, through separate consenting regimes. Officers are satisfied that no drainage or flood risk concerns have been identified that would warrant refusal of the Reserved Matters application.

13.8 Heritage impacts were fully considered through the outline planning permission and subsequent appeal decision. The Conservation Officer advises that the Reserved Matters proposals do not result in any materially greater harm to the setting of nearby heritage assets than that previously assessed and accepted by the Inspector. The identified less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets has been weighed against the public benefits of the development, consistent with the heritage assessment set out in this report. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposals remain consistent with the conclusions of the appeal decision and comply with Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan and Section 20 of the NPPF. Special regard has been had to the desirability of preserving the setting of special architectural or heritage interest in reaching the planning conclusion below, in line with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

13.9 Overall, officers are satisfied that the proposed reserved matters accord with the approved outline permission and provide an acceptable form of development in respect of layout, appearance, landscaping and scale. Having considered the consultation responses, third-party representations and all material planning considerations, officers are satisfied that the proposed matters do not give rise to adverse impacts that outweigh the benefits. No material harm has been identified that would justify refusal of the reserved matters. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and approval can be issued subject to the conditions set out below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

01. RECOMMENDATION:

Approve application 25/02769/REM subject to the S106 agreement dated 15.02.2024 in place on the outline application and subject to the stated planning conditions set out below, for the following reasons:

The Reserved Matters submission is considered acceptable relative to the landscape, visual amenity, residential amenity, highway safety, flood risk/drainage, ecology/biodiversity and heritage. The proposal accords with the parameters established at the outline stage and has been refined in response to consultee feedback.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

01. APPROVED PLANS & DOCUMENTS LIST

The development hereby permitted for 109 dwellings & its new means of access from the site to Mudford Road shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

EX029-PD-030B (Existing Site Layout)
EXxxx-PD-040C (Street Scenes)
EXxxx-PD-801D (Colour Layout)
EXxxx-SL-001V (Site Layout)
EXxxx-SL-020D (Materials Layout)
EXxxx-SL-050B (Parking & EV Plan)
EXxxx-SL-060B (Means of Enclosure)
EXxxx-SL-070B (Refuse Plan)
EXxxx-SL-090B (Roof Plan)
MUDFORD ROAD_YEOVIL_HOUSE TYPE PACK 07.08.26
    Lawrence CLA Brick 301-1.PL-01
    Lawrence CLA Stone 301-1.PL-03
    Byron Brick 372_372-1.PL-01
    Byron Floor Plans 372_372-1.PL-01
    Byron RV Render 372_372-1.PL-02
    Byron Floor Plans 372_372-1.PL-02
    Riding Brick 374.PL-01
    Henley CLA Brick 385.PL-01
    Henley CLA Tudor 385.PL-03
    Henley CLA Brick 385-1.PL-01
    Wollaton Brick 401.PL-01
Wollaton Floor Plans 401.PL-05
Wollaton Render 401.PL-02
Wollaton Plans 401.PL-05
Wollaton Render 401-1.PL-02
Wollaton Floor Plans 401-1.PL-05
Wollaton Tudor 401-1.PL-03
Wollaton Floor Plans 401-1.PL-05
Wollaton RV Render 401-1.PL-04
Wollaton Floor Plans 401-1.PL-05
Bewdley CLA Brick 412.PL-01
Bewdley Floor Plans 412.PL-09
Bewdley CLA Stone 412.PL-03
Bewdley Floor Plans 412.PL-09
Bewdley CLA Brick 412-1.PL-01
Bewdley Floor Plans 412-1.PL-09
Bewdley CLA Render 412-1.PL-02
Bewdley Floor Plans 412-1.PL-09
Bewdley CLA Stone 412-1.PL-03
Bewdley Floor Plans 412-1.PL-09
Hallam Brick 470.PL-01
Harwood Brick 481.PL-01
Harwood Floor Plans 481.PL-05
Harwood Tudor 481.PL-03
Harwood Floor Plans 481.PL-05
Harwood Brick 481-1.PL-01
Harwood Floor Plans 481-1.PL-05
Harwood Render 481-1.PL-02
Harwood Floor Plans 481-1.PL-05
Harwood RV Render 481-1.PL-04

Harwood Floor Plans 481-1.PL-05
Peele Brick 482.PL-01
Peele Floor Plans 482.PL-04
Peele Render 482.PL-02
Peele Floor Plans 482.PL-04
Peele RV Render 482.PL-03
Peele Floor Plans 482.PL-04
Peele Render 482-1.PL-05
Peele Floor Plans 482-1.PL-04
Locke Brick 486.PL-01
Locke Brick 486-1.PL-01
Dawlish Render 496-1.PL-02
Dawlish Floor Plans 496-1.PL-04_
Lyttelton/Byron CLA Stone 807.PL-03
Lyttelton/Byron Floor Plans 807.PL-09
Lyttelton/Byron CLA Render 807-1.PL-02
Lyttelton/Byron Floor Plans 807-1.PL-09
Sorley Brick 3B5P.PL-01
Sorley Floor Plans 3B5P.PL-01
Sorley Stone 3B5P.PL-02
Sorley Floor Plans 3B5P.PL-02
Storer/Sorley Brick 868.PL-01
Storer/Sorley Floor Plans 868.PL-03
Storer/Sorley Stone 868.PL-02
Storer/Sorley Floor Plans 868.PL-03
Storer/Sorley RV Render 868-1.PL-01
Storer/Sorley Floor Plans 868-1.PL-03
Symons Brick NSS.1BF01-1.PL-01
Symons Floor Plans NSS.1BF01-1.PL-03
Symons Brick NSS.851-1.PL-01
Symons Floor Plans NSS.851-1.PL-03
Savage CLA Brick NSS.2B4P.PL-01
Savage Floor Plans NSS.2B4P.PL-01
Savage RV Render NSS.2B4P.PL-02
Savage Floor Plans NSS.2B4P.PL-02
Savage RV Render NSS.861.PL-01
Savage Floor Plans NSS.861.PL-08
Mynnitt Brick LX0038.PL-03
Mynnitt GF & FF Plans LX0038.PL-04
Mynnitt 2nd Floor Plan LX0038.PL-05
Single Brick GL01.PL-01
Single Brick GL01.PL-01
Double Brick GR02.PL-01
1850-02-ATR-1001-Rev D--Vehicle Movement Assessment-Fire-Sheet 1
1850-02-PDL-1001-Rev E-Drainage Plan Sheet 1
1850-02-PDL-1002-Rev F-Drainage Plan Sheet 2
1850-02-PDL-1003-Rev E-Drainage Plan Sheet 3
1850-02-PDL-1101-Rev E-Overland Flood Flow Routing Plan
1850-02-PDL-1301-Rev D-Basin Sections
1850-02-PDL-1501-A (Impermeable Area Plan - Sheet 1)

1850-02-PDL-1502-A (Impermeable Area Plan - Sheet 2)
1850-02-PDL-1601-A (Drainage Maintenance Responsibilities)
1850-02-PHL-1001-Rev E-Highway Surface Plan Sheet 1
1850-02-PHL-1002-Rev E-Highway Surface Plan Sheet 2
1850-02-PHL-1101-Rev E-Highway Levels Plan Sheet 1
1850-02-PHL-1102-Rev E-Highway Levels Plan Sheet 2
1850-02-PHL-1201-C (Road Profile Plan - Sheet 1)
1850-02-PHL-1202-C (Road Profile Plan - Sheet 2)
1850-02-PHL-1203-B (Road Profile Plan - Sheet 3)
1850-02-PHL-1204-C (Road Profile Plan - Sheet 4)
1850-02-PHL-1205-C (Road Profile Plan - Sheet 5)
EXxxx-LS-002f (Site Landscaping+Ph1)
EXxxx-LS-003f (Site Landscaping+Ph1)
EXxxx-LS-004f (Site Landscaping+Ph1)
EXxxx-LS-005f (Site Landscaping+Ph1)
2980 AIMS-MU Rev 5 dated 22.09.2026
2890-TPP-MU Rev 5 Tree Protection Plan 22.09.2026
289-TRP-MU Rev 4 Tree Retention Plan 05.08.2026

except in respect of parking spaces 68-70 and 82-83 which shall be constructed in accordance with details shown on approved plan 1850-02-ATR-1101-Rev E-Vehicle Movement Assessment - Refuse - Sheet 1.

Reason: As required by Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and in order to ensure compliance with the plans hereby approved.

02: LIGHTING

Prior to the installation of external lighting a detailed external lighting strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include the location, design, specification and lux levels of all external lighting. It shall demonstrate adequate illumination of streets, shared surfaces, private drives and parking areas throughout the development.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the provision of a safe and secure environment whilst safeguarding visual amenity and local character, in accordance with Policies EQ2 and EQ4 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028)

03. ARBORICULTURAL MANAGEMENT AND TREE PROTECTION

The protection of any existing tree to be retained in accordance with document 2980 AIMS-MU Rev 5 dated 22.09.2026 shall be achieved as follows:

a) tree protection fencing/ground protection that is broken or removed during carrying out the development shall be promptly repaired or replaced on a like for like basis;

b) tree protection fencing/ground protection shall be maintained in position until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been moved from the site;
c) within any area fenced in accordance with this condition, nothing shall be stored, placed or disposed of above or below the ground, the ground level shall not be altered, no excavations shall be made, no mixing of cement or use of other contaminating materials or substances shall take place, nor shall any fires be lit;
d) no construction equipment, machinery or structure shall be attached to or supported by a retained tree;
e) any tree shown for retention that is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies prior to completion of works will be replaced for a like for like tree within the next planting season.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure the development is constructed to give a high quality appearance in accordance with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

04. TREE AND HEDGEROW PROTECTION

Prior to commencement of the development, demolition of existing structures, groundworks, heavy machinery entering site or the on-site storage of materials, the pre-commencement requirements of the submitted scheme of tree and hedgerow protection measures, as set out in the scheme for the protection of the retained trees '2980 AIMS-MU Rev 5 dated 22.09.2026', shall be installed and made ready for inspection by a competent Arboriculturist, who shall confirm in writing to the Local Planning Authority that the approved tree and hedgerow protection measures (in particular, any required fencing, signage and ground-protection installations) have been installed to a satisfactory standard.

Reason: To ensure the protection, retention and proper management of existing trees on the site, which contribute to the character, visual amenity and biodiversity of the area. In accordance with Policy EQ5 - Green Infrastructure of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) and Chapter 19 of the NPPF - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

05. PLANTING AND REPLACEMENT TREES

All trees shall be planted in accordance with the details provided and in accordance with British Standard BS4428:1989—Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations (excluding hard surfaces) and BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape recommendations and maintained in accordance with the details approved. Thereafter any tree planted in accordance with this condition that is dead or dying within the first five growing seasons after planting shall be replaced in the first available planting season with an equivalent tree to that required (by size, species and variety) and planted originally and thereafter it shall be maintained for a further five years and subject to the same replacement requirement if dead or dying within that further period.

Reason: To ensure the planting of new trees and shrubs in accordance with the Council's statutory duties relating to The Town & Country Planning Act, 1990 (as

amended) and the following policies of The South Somerset Local Plan (2006 - 2028); EQ2: General Development, EQ4: Bio-Diversity & EQ5: Green Infrastructure.

Informatives:

01: ATTENUATION BASIN DESIGN

To discharge condition 11 on 22/00695/OUT, detailed cross sections of attenuation basins will be required, along with regular groundwater monitoring within the location of the basins. The formation of the basins should be shown within the cross sections, including stability and formation details and measures to manage groundwater, including a suitable depth of liner to prevent buoyancy of the liner, and measures to prevent groundwater impact.

02: WATERCOURSE ALTERATIONS AND LAND DRAINAGE CONSENT

Under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act there is a legal requirement to seek consent from the relevant authority before piping/culverting, infilling or obstructing a watercourse, whether permanent or temporary. This may also include repairs to certain existing structures and maintenance works. This requirement still applies even if planning permission has been granted.

03: EXISTING PUBLIC SEWERS

The applicant is advised that a number of existing public foul sewers cross the site. No buildings should be located within 3 metres of a public sewer and no major tree planting should be undertaken within 6 metres unless otherwise agreed in writing by Wessex Water. Any proposed diversion, alteration or protection works may require separate agreement with Wessex Water and should be discussed with the undertaker at an early stage.

Case Officer:	Rachael Moon	**Date: 03/11/2026**

By the authority delegated by this Council, I confirm that the decision notice in respect of the above mentioned application can be issued.

(For*) ~~Principal Planning Officer/~~Development Manager
*** Delete as applicable**

on behalf of Chief Manager:	Nikki Honan	**Date: 03/11/2026**