

PERSIMMON HOMES (SW) LTD & REDROW HOMES (SW) LTD

APPLICATION FOR RESERVED MATTERS FOR PHASE 1 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF 327 DWELLINGS, ASSOCIATED HIGHWAYS, LANDSCAPING INCLUDING PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, FIRST SECTION OF RELIEF ROAD AND ROUNDABOUT ON A38 BRIDGWATER ROAD AT LAND OFF BRIDGWATER ROAD, MONKTON HEATHFIELD

Grid Reference: 325935.126365

Reserved Matters

RECOMMENDATION AND REASON(S)

Recommended Decision:

Subject to the satisfactory resolution of the following issues:-

- Affordable Housing clusters
- Surface water drainage
- Public open spaces including children's play areas and playing fields
- parking

and the submission of the following details when considered acceptable:-

- Archaeological project design/ programme of works
- Affordable Housing plan which differentiates between social rented and shared ownership housing so that the proposed clusters can be properly assessed.
- Maintenance regimes maintenance arrangements for the
 - Foul drainage
 - Surface water drainage
 - Landscaping structural areas, community woodland
 - Public open spaces including children's play areas and playing fields
 - Acoustic fencing
- Revised house details for corner plots to be in keeping with the local area
- Full details of the Pocket park attenuation feature including cross sections and summary of max water depth and amount of time expected to have water in it.
- Revised plan showing wall/fencing details (including the replacement of fences used to separate parking courtyards)
- Re issue of design and access statement to reflect current proposals (details to follow)
- Revision of the design and access statement to correct the error in the title of Redrow homes affordable housing provision.
- Revision of design code (detail to follow)
- Details of parking, TDBC standard requires 1.3 spaces per dwelling as a maximum, current scheme is in excess of this.
- Material samples
- Cycle parking – TDBC require 1 space per ½ bedroomed unit and 2 spaces for 3+ units (see local plan for details)
- Details of the layout of the junction of the northern roundabout to serve this development before the remainder of the road is commenced (phase 1

provision)

The Chair/ Vice Chair be authorised to determine and to grant approval in consultation with the Growth and Development Manager and if details approved be subject to any conditions that may be deemed necessary arising out of the detailed information within the application.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION(S) (if applicable)

To be included on the update sheet at the meeting.

PROPOSAL

Outline planning permission was granted on appeal for the mixed use development of the Taunton Deane Local Plan T9 allocated site. There was a requirement to provide a design code for the whole of the site, prior to the submission of any reserved matters applications. In order to facilitate the timely development of the site, it has been agreed to consider the design code document at the same time as the details of the phase one development.

This application is for reserved matters approval of Phase one of the development. Phase 1 is sited at the south of the site and comprises the erection of 327 dwellings (including 35% affordable housing split between social rented and shared ownership as proposed in the approved Section 106 agreement).

The Secretary of State approved the details of the eastern relief road in the appeal decision but this application includes details of the other internal highway routes needed to serve the development and some minor alterations to the existing A38. The existing S106 agreement between the developer and Somerset County Council Highways agrees the provision of the eastern relief road, in full, prior to the erection/occupation of any of the units. Despite the fact that the outline application Traffic Assessment established that 301 houses could be occupied before the road was required. Due to the degree of pre-funding involved in constructing the whole road prior to any occupation the developer has therefore requested the County to consider an amendment of the S106 agreement to allow for the development to start at the south of the site and provide 301 dwellings, to be occupied, prior to the completion and commencement of the use of the whole Eastern Relief Road. As a result this application proposes to construct the first, southern section of the road from the roundabout on the A38 to the first roundabout to the east adjacent to Hyde Lane Cottages. This has necessitated some physical changes to the A38 to enable the development prior to the calming of the A38 through Monkton Heathfield.

The proposal also includes details of the strategic and internal landscaping proposals for the site including the retention of some existing trees and hedges; the drainage strategy for the whole site with detailed proposals for the current phase; acoustic fencing along the landscaped buffer to the Eastern Relief Road to ensure adequate noise levels for new residents; details of the proposed public open spaces and children's play area; details of a wildlife survey and management plan for this phase and details of all of the proposed layout, house types, boundary treatments, garages, bin stores and waste management for this phase.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

The application site is approx 3.5 km to the north east of Taunton. It lies within the Parish of West Monkton and is to the south and east of the village of Monkton Heathfield. The site comprises agricultural land to the north and south of the former Hatcheries site and to the east of the A38, which runs southwest to northeast from Taunton to North Petherton.

The site boundary excludes Hyde Lane Cottages where there is a row of 3 pairs of dwellings which back onto the site of the proposed Eastern Relief Road. Land to the South of the site includes part of the agricultural land lying between the canal and the former Hatcheries site. A number of hedgerows and existing trees dissect the site area, including "Green Lane", which is situated at the eastern side of the application site and runs parallel to the alignment of the next phase of the proposed Eastern relief Road.

The existing development on either side of the A38 including the former hatcheries, residential and commercial properties is excluded from the application site.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

48/2003/054 - Residential and employment development, associated access, public open space and landscaping on land between Bridgwater Road, Hyde Lane and the Bridgwater and Taunton canal, Monkton Heathfield. Permission was refused for reasons of insufficient information and the proposed road and roundabout are located on land within the Green Wedge separating Monkton Heathfield from Taunton, outside of the defined settlement limits and the allocated site boundary and would therefore be contrary to policy. Finally the proposal was in advance of a development guide for the site and did not provide a comprehensive development scheme for the whole allocation as required by the Local Plan.

48/05/0072 - Mixed Use Urban Extension Development Comprising Residential, Employment, Local Centre, New Primary School, A38 Relief Road, Green Spaces and Playing Fields at Monkton Heathfield.

48/2007/0061 - Mixed Use Urban Extension Development Comprising Residential, Employment, Local Centre, New Primary School, A38 Relief Road, Green Spaces and Playing Fields at Monkton Heathfield. (Local Plan alignment) Decision in abeyance

48/2007/0062 - Mixed Use Urban Extension Development Comprising Residential, Employment, Local Centre, New Primary School, A38 Relief Road, Green Spaces and Playing Fields at Monkton Heathfield. Decision in abeyance

Planning History of adjacent Hatcheries site

48/2007/019 - Construction of a roundabout and alteration of associated roads and highway structure at the former chicken hatchery, Bridgwater Road, Monkton Heathfield. Resolution to grant subject to S106 agreement.

48/10/0023 – Erection of 51 dwellings with associated access roads, footways drainage, parking and landscaping at the Hatcheries, Bathpool. (application currently awaiting determination)

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION RESPONSES

Consultees

WEST MONKTON PARISH COUNCIL - The assurance by developers and TDBC from the very first was that the relief road would be built in its entirety before any houses were built. It appears that this assurance has now been put to one side. The Parish Council notes that if this most basic assurance has been overturned without consultation, it is left wondering what other agreed assurances will be overturned in the interests of expediency. The Parish Council would like a copy of the revised conditions. The Parish Council requests that an undertaking will be made by TDBC and the developers that construction traffic will be kept to an absolute minimum on the A38 and be monitored for compliance during the building.

ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE

The Parish Council has concerns about congestion on the A38 at peak traffic times. Somerset County Highways has assured the Parish Council that the computer 'Saturn predicts that traffic flows will work. Councillors and local residents would suggest this is not the case, nor is it likely to be the case in the foreseeable future. It is a fact that, daily, traffic is at a standstill right through Bathpool back as far as the Landrover garage. More houses will mean more cars joining the A38 from the proposed roundabout to either join the standing traffic to go into Taunton or to try to cross the standing traffic to go to Bridgwater or up Milton Hill. The Parish Council anticipates that as the road from the roundabout into the site will be the only way in and out that traffic will be at a standstill through the development at peak times as well. Milton Hill already carries a significant density of cars, bicycles and pedestrians as it is a 'Safe Route to School, and so the junction is extremely busy and will become busier as the development progresses. The road line shown on the plans submitted for Reserved Matters would indicate that the road width is not sufficient to allow large vehicles to continue on towards Taunton whilst traffic is queuing to turn into Milton Hill. The Parish Council has very recently (July) commented upon the application by Strong Vox to build houses on the site of the chicken hatcheries opposite the Milton Hill junction. This area is designated employment land in the development plan, but it is not owned by the Consortium of Developers, Redrow and Persimmon. Much comment has been made about the shortage of employment land compared to the number of houses, and Strong Vox's application did not offer alternative employment land. It is very important that the Consortium of Developers adhere to the employment land provision on the site as without it a dormitory settlement will be the outcome. The Parish Council is very concerned that the road line shown for the proposed roundabout is very much at odds with the Strong Vox proposed road line and development, and would wish to draw this contradiction to the attention of the planning committee. The two plans are at odds with each other. If the Strong Vox application is granted permission, what will be the impact on the Consortium's detailed application for the road line, and the reserved matters application currently under consideration, and what

measures will TDBC put in place to ensure compatibility?

There appears to be footpath access onto the A38 from the site opposite the Old Forge development of 5 or 6 houses. The Parish Council wishes to state that it would be unacceptable to use this for vehicular access onto the site for construction traffic or other vehicles.

There is a once only opportunity to do something to relieve the traffic in School Road. The planning committee will be aware that School Road is a cul de sac. At the bottom end of the cul de sac there is the Primary School which will be relocated to the site mentioned above when the trigger point of 400 houses is reached. The primary school buildings will be absorbed into Heathfield School, which is also situated at the bottom of the cul de sac, and set to get bigger to accommodate children from the development. Recent other activities of the Parish Council in discussion with the Somerset County Council would indicate further development is planned by the school on the land at the bottom end of the cul de sac, formerly known and used as the Play Area. On the same campus is located the Tacchi-Morris Centre, and the Space. SCC has recently (August) granted itself permission to build an Autism Centre and Library, which will further increase the traffic down the cul de sac. One of the conditions of the Autism Centre permission was that the secondary school should produce a revised travel plan, the current one dates from 2007, in order to achieve sustainable transport. The Parish Council would suggest that the County Council needs to address this problem in considerably more depth than putting the onus on the school to produce another travel plan. During meetings of the West Monkton Community Engagement Panel* considering the outline planning application, separate meetings were held with the developers and with Richard Needs and Jeff Copp from SCC Highways. The Parish Council suggested to both parties and to TDBC that the permissive footpath across the Path Field at the end of School Road could be turned into a single width vehicle track with passing places to allow a one way system for vehicles coming down School Road and out onto the current A38 which in the proposed development will be traffic calmed and will serve the development only, its trunk road status having been transferred to the relief road round the outside edge of the development. All three parties agreed that they had no objection to this solution to the severe problems in School Road. In discussions with Richard Williams from Persimmon on 11th August 2010, he agreed that if some of the commuted sum for Highways could be used for the single width track, his company and Redrow would be able to build it at a time deemed appropriate by SCC and the Planning Authority. **The Parish Council strongly urges the Planning Authority to seize this once only opportunity to make a real difference to the success of this development which is set to more than double to size of the Parish.** Secondary advantages have been documented already, but for the sake of the record these would include increasing the accessibility and therefore success of the proposed retail centre (current plans show it accessible only on foot) and integrating the current settlement with the new development.

The detailed plans do not appear to show what is proposed for Hyde Lane crossing the new road. During discussions of the CEP at the outline planning stage a number of options were discussed. An underpass was dismissed as not acceptable as it would build in potential for crime and disorder. An agreed solution was a footbridge, with disabled ramps, and this shows on some of the plans put forward at the outline stage. The plans submitted in this reserved matters application do not

indicate what will be put in place. The route forms part of the 'Safe Routes to School' network, so a safe solution is needed. The Parish Council suggests that when the footbridge at Creech Castle is taken down when those junction improvements take place, that the footbridge could be reassembled to allow Hyde Lane pedestrians and cyclists to continue along the route to school.

STREET SCENE

The Parish Council considered the height of the buildings on the site. It notes that the three storey buildings appear to be well spaced throughout the site. It would disagree with the developers and TDBC that these buildings are 'iconic – they are not, they are blocks of flats, and other far more attractive buildings could occupy the iconic building site on street corners. Also, in general the building designs are bland and unimaginative and not what was discussed with the CEP.

One three storey building is placed on the top corner of the site and is adjacent to the school site. The Parish Council requests that the elevations of this building will be such that the school site is not overlooked by windows of this building. TDBC Planning committee will recall that the Parish Council recently objected to an application to build a chalet bungalow on a site on the other side of the school site for the same reason that the upstairs windows would overlook the school site. The application was refused. The school building now seems to be located towards the back of the site. Although the school build is not part of this application, the Parish Council wishes to place on record for future reference that the earlier designs showed the school building facing the A38 with car parking space in front and school fields behind, and this is the preferred option.

On the density of housing and the road layout including paved areas, the Parish Council would seek reassurances from TDBC Planners that access for emergency services to all properties has been checked and confirmed by the appropriate authorities, also access for refuse/recycling collection vehicles. There are a couple of places on the planned layout where the very large recycling vehicles may have trouble getting round. Due to recycling initiatives, every household will have three if not four recycling/refuse containers, the large grey wheelie bin, and then other recycling boxes. The Parish Council suggests that the Somerset Waste Partnership should be consulted to ensure access is achievable, and the plans should be checked to ensure adequate provision is made for the location of all waste containers.

OPEN SPACES

The Open spaces on the site could be improved. The triangular central Village Green is shown on the plans as a balancing pond with a drop of 4 foot from its edge to the lowest point. The Parish Council has experience of other balancing ponds in the Parish, some of which are successfully used as amenity space by local residents and some of which are not. To ensure full usage, the Parish Council suggests that the wavy edges indicated on the plan should be replaced by a smooth edge allowing a greater triangular area in the bottom for ball games and other play. The design of the Urban Park is too square and not appropriate to the nature of the Parish, so the Parish Council suggests that some curves should be included in the park. The best solution of all would be if the balancing pond function was transferred to the Urban Park, and the Village Green left as it was shown in earlier plans as a level central Village Green.

The Parish Council notes that some footpaths will have a gravel surface. This is a

very difficult surface for wheelchairs and pushchairs. The Parish Council suggests that an alternative surface should be considered as there is likely to be high usage of these walkways by people with pushchairs in particular in the vicinity of the public open spaces and play areas. If the gravel has to be retained then the Parish Council would require an undertaking from TDBC that an adequate and regular maintenance schedule would be put in place to ensure that there would be minimal spread of gravel onto the grass, and no bare patches of earth allowed to develop on the gravel paths.

VARIOUS OTHER COMMENTS

In respect of the various fences shown on the plan, the Parish Council seeks reassurance that those fences that will be conveyed to the care of TDBC will be regularly painted and maintained by the Authority. The Parish Council seeks a similar reassurance from TDBC in respect of grass cutting, plant and tree maintenance of the public open spaces and play areas.

In view of the ongoing experience in the adjoining Parish the Parish Council states that the adoption of the roads must take place as the development progresses, and certainly all of Phase 1 must be adopted before Phase 2 commences.

DESIGN GUIDE

The Parish Council is disappointed that the Monkton Heathfield Design Guide included in the plans has been changed from the original. Careful scrutiny by the Parish Council appears to show that only two photos of buildings in the guide are photos of existing buildings in the Parish. As such it is hard to relate the Design Guide to anything existing in the Parish at present. The street scene plans show buildings that could be anywhere in England, with nothing special to Monkton Heathfield. CEP discussions at the outline planning stage suggested that some bricks looking like the local Quantock Stone could be incorporated into buildings, perhaps on the edge walls. The Parish Council would wish to see some incorporation in the dwellings design of local Quantock stone. This is important to secure integration between the existing settlement and the new one, and to provide the new settlement with a sense of identity.

SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP - no objection in principle to the strategic or internal road works and layouts but detailed views awaited and to be included on the update sheet.

BRITISH WATERWAYS, PEEL' WHARF - raise a holding objection awaiting further clarification by the applicant on how the drainage may or may not affect the canal.

SOMERSET WATERWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE - A simple overview plan has now been provided establishing that the water run off will be controlled so that it does not exceed Greenfield run off rates and therefore our initial objection is withdrawn.

HERITAGE AND LANDSCAPE OFFICER - Concerns over some of the proposed species, the extent of the strategic landscape bund and planting to the rear of the bunds and acoustic fencing, attenuation areas within areas of open space, were not previously proposed or agreed and will compromise the use of the spaces. Other than swales the attenuation should be outside of areas required for open space. Details of the proposed maintenance regimes are required as the areas are unlikely to be transferred to the parks department to maintain. I will comment further when these details are provided.

CONSERVATION OFFICERS - No comment

FORWARD PLAN & REGENERATION UNIT - comments awaited

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH POLLUTION / NOISE comments awaited and to be included in the update sheet.

HOUSING STANDARDS OFFICER - No comments

DRAINAGE ENGINEER - comments awaited.

SCC - RIGHTS OF WAY - Hyde Lane is shown as stopped up for pedestrian and cyclist but will also need to be shown as stopped up to horse riders too. The new crossing will need to include a provision for riders and horses.

LEISURE DEVELOPMENT MANAGER - Public open space should be accessible 365 days of the year any flooding restricts its usefulness and could degrade its quality.

SCC - CHIEF EDUCATION OFFICER - The current section 106 is sufficient for the Education requirements.

DEVON & SOMERSET FIRE & RESCUE - Means of escape, access for Appliances and water supplies will all have to comply with the relevant Building Regulations and British Standards.

SCC - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ARCHAEOLOGIST - Subject to the submission of an acceptable archaeological programme of work as discussed and agreed with the Archaeological officer.

POLICE ARCHITECTURAL LIAISON OFFICER - no comments received

WESSEX WATER - Acting as the sewerage undertaker Wessex Water are seeking to agree a drainage strategy which includes the following points;

- suitable point(s) of connection to the existing public sewer system
- any phased arrangements necessary to deal with peak flows
- indicative or schematic layouts for proposed foul and surface water networks and any associated attenuation volumes
- suitable locations and arrangements for any ancillary apparatus ie pumping stations

It should be noted that the Environment Agency will be responsible for approving surface water disposal from the development to satisfy the provisions of PPS25.

Our engineers have confirmed that we have enough information to reach "agreement in principle" and we can advise that the submitted drawings are accepted and will form the basis upon which detailed design will be developed for approval under a future adoption agreement.

Please note the following comments for your attention

1. The main storage tank and flow diversion works are to be in place and operational prior to first occupations
2. Storm water drainage within the site is generally being specified by the Environment Agency and Taunton Deane technical staff.

Wessex Water have had limited opportunity to comment upon the proposal plans. The Flood Risk Assessment forming part of the application appears to show only a minimal provision for the proposed school site which may be inadequate. Planning conditions should require the developer of the school site to restrict discharge rates and make attenuation provision within the site to ensure compliance with the overall

developers master plan restrictions on output rates.

1. The final off site storm water sewer proposed below the Bridgwater Road storm storage basin is shown as 225mm which may be too small to provide adequate arrangements to direct flows to the land drainage system.
2. Storm water proposals and attenuation basin provision differ between submitted plans (CO12 issue 002 and 1348/DR/04 Rev E) for the phase 1 drainage such as for the Bridgwater Road basin.
3. Impermeable areas used for the Residential development are stated at 45% and should be agreed and confirmed by the Councils land drainage staff as adequate, as this maybe understated for modern residential areas. Any increase in density must be reflected in an increase in drainage provision.
4. Planners must be able to confirm acceptance of the principles and future ownership and maintenance of the proposed above and below ground storage provisions for the system to operate effectively. Flooding rights for the ponds to be reserved for the future owner / operator of the storm sewerage system.

Please note the proposed legislation below which will affect future sewer connections and approvals required under the proposed legislation.

Flood and Water Management Act 2010

The Flood and Water Management Bill became an act of parliament during April 2010 and central government intend to issue and implement detailed regulations and Codes of Practice some time after April 2011. This will follow consultation upon the new national build standard which will be implemented at the same time.

The developer should note that the provisions contained in the new Flood and Water Management Act 2010 will require that;

- a) sewers and off site lateral connections are subject to a compulsory signed adoption agreement before connecting into the public sewerage system
- b) new sewers and lateral connections are built in accordance with the proposed Government Mandatory Build Standard

National Standards for sustainable drainage

National Standards for the design, construction, operation and maintenance of SuDS are also being drafted.

Plans for the drainage system will need to be approved, before construction can start, by the SuDS Approving Body (SAB) which will be the Unitary or County Council for the area.

This will apply to both permitted developments and those that require planning permission. This will ensure that SuDS are also included in construction that may cover large surface areas, but do not require planning permission.

Where both planning permission and SuDS approval are required, the processes will run together. Applications for the drainage system and for planning permission will be submitted together to reduce burdens for the applicant. The planning authority should notify the developer of the outcome of both the planning permission

and drainage approval at the same time, including any conditions of approval.

Regulations will set out a timeframe for the approval of drainage application by the SAB, so the planning process is not delayed

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY - The drainage proposal split this up into 3 main attenuation areas and we have the following concerns:

- Details of flood risk at Pocket Park

- Post development discharge rates
- Overland flows
- Inclusion of SuDs train (specifically source control, conveyance)

Taunton Deane Borough Council (TDBC) have expressed a concern over the use of public space areas as storage facilities for storm water and have requested us to comment on the frequency / degree of flooding of these features.

We can only inform TDBC of the hydraulic use of these features, the decision will lie with TDBC if this is acceptable in terms of public space provision. Drainage Strategy Note Revision 4, 8th August 2010 includes the detail of Britton's Park, it is suggested that this feature would not flood in any event under a 1 in 5 year event, and only floods to a maximum depth of 400mm in an extreme flood event (1 in 100 year plus climate change).

The drainage statement does not provide similar figures for Pocket Park therefore we cannot advise on flood frequency / degree for this area. This should be provided by the applicants. The information at present shows this feature could flood to a depth of 1 metre which may have safety and design implications.

The drainage note dated July 2010 indicates that the inclusion of more attenuation areas will improve the SuDs train approach. We do not fully understand how this improves the SuDs features further than those originally proposed, it does not include further SuDs such as infiltration strips, swales and other source- pathway-receptor features which aid infiltration and water quality. The Brookbanks flood note states that sewers will collect unattenuated flows; this would not usually be expected from new development following sustainable drainage guidance. We would expect good SuDs to be employed which provide source control and conveyance not only attenuation.

The revised drainage note dated 8 August 2010 has corrected the run off rate to the agreed figure of 2.5l/s/ha for all storm events (up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus climate change) which was agreed for each parcel of development. This figure was based on the existing surface water and channel capacity issues known in this area and is a key part of the drainage strategy.

The Proposed Phase 1 Development Surface Water Drainage Strategy Drawing no 1348/DR/04 Rev F shows that the percentage of hard standing which will be contributing to the sewer network is 45%. This is a very low estimate for impermeable area within a residential development and we require justification as to why this figure has been used.

Following the Environment Agency request for clarity on the discharge points and receiving watercourses, the following drawing: Existing Surface Water Network, Development Run Off Outfalls and Flow Rates Drawing no 10059/DR/10 has been

submitted. This however did not show existing rates which are shown on Existing Surface Water Network, Development Run Off Outfalls and Flow Rates Drawing no 10059/DR/10 Rev A which has been submitted to the Internal Drainage Board.

This drawing indicates a sliding scale for run off over the storm events with the contributing hard standing reduced to 2.5l/s/ha. As stated above, we are concerned that only 45% is considered to be hard standing as this figure seems quite low, however assuming this and using the information from the Drainage Strategy we have calculated the below:

The proposed run off rates shown on Drawing no 10059/DR/10 propose a sliding scale (increasing run off with return period), which is confusing due to the set figure of 2.5l/s/ha. We believe this is for the 'developed area' however these calculations should be explained.

The existing run off rates shown on Drawing no 10059/DR/10 Rev A are the run off rates for the 'developed area' and not the entire catchment. Existing run off should incorporate the whole catchment to be truly representative.

The overall peak run off from each whole catchment is significantly higher than 2.5l/s/ha which is not very clearly described in the drainage statement which states each development parcel will restrict to 2.5l/s/ha in the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event.

This total figure is more useful to understand the reduction in run off rates in the overall catchment and the expectation of the watercourse capacity to ensure the flood risk is reduced. Obviously there is a reduction in run off rate from existing, however only 45% of each block has been reduced to 2.5l/s/ha. It would be helpful to understand the total reduction and as requested above, justification for the use of 45% hard standing.

We are happy that it is not possible to undertake full and detailed S104 design at this stage, the general approval of the design from Wessex Water (received in an email from Julie Moore dated 17 September 2010) is useful. Detailed design of surface and foul are required to discharge the planning conditions.

Proposed Development Overland Flow Flood Routing Plan Drawing no 10059/DR/11 Proposed Development Overland Flow Flood Routing Plan was submitted in response to our request for further information on overland flow routes. We require a drawing which matches up to the micro-drainage PN numbers to understand the volumes of water forming overland flow. This is especially important due to some of the high flood depths shown on the micro-drainage report for the 1 in 100 year plus 30% climate change (PPS25 guidance). This analysis should be undertaken by the consultants to understand where resilience and design may be needed such as raised kerbs and to ensure overland flows and flooding do not reach a dangerous level.

At this stage, no information has been provided on the maintenance and adoption of the surface water system, this information is vital and must be agreed. We would expect this to be detailed at reserved matters stage as the requirements of maintenance may affect layout. However, if TDBC are happy that this information can be satisfied under the outstanding planning condition for adoption and maintenance we are happy that it is dealt with at discharge of condition stage.

NATURAL ENGLAND - We have viewed the wildlife management report on your website following the results of the updated wildlife surveys carried out this year. The 2010 bat surveys have found that lesser horseshoe bats are not commuting or foraging across the site. Therefore, based on results of the bat surveys this proposal will not have a significant affect on Hestercombe House Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is roughly 2.4km from the phase 1 site.

We support the comments dated 26 July on your website by your Nature Conservation Officer, re conditions for a wildlife strategy that will deal with the impacts of this development on protected species, UK biodiversity priority species, and important habitat features.

NATURE CONSERVATION & RESERVES OFFICERS - Initial comments: - additional wildlife management sub plans are required. Wildlife sub management plan now submitted but detailed comments thereon awaited.

SOMERSET ENVIRONMENTAL RECORDS CENTRE (SERC) - No legally protected species have been recorded on the site but one or more legally protected species has been found within 1 km of the site.

SOMERSET DRAINAGE BOARDS CONSORTIUM - A simple overview plan has now been provided establishing that the water run off will be controlled so that it does not exceed Greenfield run off rates and therefore our initial objection is withdrawn.

SPORT ENGLAND SOUTH WEST - no observations received

SW REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY - no observations received

SW WATER - no observations received

RUISHTON & THORNFALCON PARISH COUNCIL - There is concern over the potential for increased traffic to go through Creech St Michael and traffic should be kept to the A38 and A358. Members support the numbers of affordable homes that are to be provided. ‘

SW REGIONAL ASSEMBLY - TAUNTON OFFICE - no observations received

SOMERSET PRIMARY CARE TRUST - no observations received

SW REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY - no observations received

SOMERSET & AVON CONSTABULARY - POLICE LICENSING OFFICER - no observations received

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH - NOISE & POLLUTION - no observations received

HOUSING ENABLING MANAGER - I am concerned that the affordable housing is in groups of more than 15 but I understand that the Shared ownership housing was excluded from the cluster numbers in the Section 106 agreement and therefore the proposal is acceptable.

SOUTH WEST DESIGN REVIEW PANEL - Our main comment is that the way the outline masterplan has been translated into detailed proposals seemed to be mechanical rather than creative, housing layout rather than urban design.

We did not meet a set of principles that are guiding you to make a special place. True, we did not see more than a tiny proportion of the material you will have submitted, but our experience tells us that when principles are clearly established and used then they will shine through even brief presentations. We see a level of detail that would have shown us exactly how this place will work and it was unfortunate that the one detailed portrayal displayed, a street view, that proved to be illustrative and not to be a guide to what was planned. The Council consider that it is important to set high standards for development of the whole site in terms of urban design and community and to set standards for the additional 3000 houses in future.

It is disappointing that your scheme so far is lacking in this ambition.

The spine road was shown as consistent when it would better respond to changes in character of the areas it connects — notably either side of the green lane, It was shown with unchanging carriageway and pavement widths when it would better give character and interest by having well designed planting, parking bays and so on The square — though a space is welcome in principle it needs to reflect nicer attentions about how each part will be used. A rigorous geometry may not be the right approach: a more informal green might better suit the scheme. But whatever the approach, the diagram needs to come to life through careful thought and detailed design. For the square, and the roads too, it is important that they are looked at in three dimensions and from eye level, O the housing itself, we have no objection to the density proposed but found it hard to judge how successful the scheme would be when we did not discern a clear vision about the form of living. The cul de sacs seemed accidental when they could be so disposed, for example, to help engender a sense of community.

We acknowledge that you are working in changed and uncertain market conditions and that it is challenging to develop one phase of a larger scheme (especially adjacent to a somewhat amorphous village). The panel is naturally concerned that there might be a delay before subsequent phases proceed or even that they might be dropped. The consequences would be more than a stump of relief road. However optimistic you are about the future we'd encourage you to have regard to a range of possible scenarios including phase I only. You might even ponder shifting a portion (the road at the northeastern edge perhaps) to a later phase to release money to strengthen community life in this phase. Although your application has been running for some time we'd ask you to take another look at this scheme and to see if you could draw more out of the outline consent. Our conviction is that you could deploy the same site, quantum, house types and spaces to form a more successful scheme and a better precedent for later phases.

SOMERSET WILDLIFE TRUST - no observations received

SOMERSET ARCHAEOLOGIST-The outline permission that this application relates to had a condition requiring archaeological investigation of areas of this site. This is because outline assessment indicated that a number of prehistoric settlements are located on the site. A full Project Design detailing these investigations must be submitted and approved before determination of this reserved matters application.

The Project Design should include further trial trenching and generic descriptions of the mitigation process (i.e. excavation). The combination of the outline assessment data and this trial trenching will enable areas of excavation to be defined.

This advice follows PPS5 and Local Plan Policy.

Representations

1 letter of representation has been received from Cllr Waymouth, (Ward member)

As one of the District Councillors for West Monkton I have been present at the Parish Council meetings over the past 14 years and know how much detailed consideration has been given to the proposed development within the Parish. The Parish Councillors have understood the needs for Taunton Deane to find the sites necessary for urban expansion and have taken a very responsible positive attitude during the process. I wholeheartedly support the views given in the Parish Council's response and hope Taunton Deane's planning conditions will give these matters full

support. As County Councillor for the area I will be pressing County Highway Officers that the solution proposed to the traffic chaos issues in School Road is an opportunity which will be hugely beneficial – without it I cannot see anything but angry residents in the future!

Two further issues which I realise are more commercial decisions, but hope we can deliver –

1. Each household will need a convenient place for 4 outside recycling containers plus 1 (optional) green waste bin. I have made this point to the Persimmon representatives and suggest they communicate with Somerset Waste Partnership to get a set of bins so that their Architects can factor this into the design at the plan stage.

2. Can we please have a variety of local stone, brick, tiles and roof angles and heights. I suggest Hillyfields and Cotford St. Luke are reasonable local examples where this has been achieved.

20 letters of representation have been received (including 1 joint letter with 5 signatures from residents in Britton's Ash) raising the following points:-

- Local schools are at capacity and will be unable to provide placements for additional children;
- the additional traffic will result in significant traffic congestion on A38 leading to the Creech Castle and M5 junctions;
- the access points to the A38 are poor and additional traffic will make this more dangerous;
- additional traffic using Milton Hill is unsuitable for the additional traffic that this proposal will generate, given the traffic volume at the moment especially at school start and finish times;
- the development will add to the growing amount of traffic on the A358;
- the proposed roundabout and other roads needed to help congestion should be provided before the houses are occupied, the construction vehicles will cause an unacceptable increase in the volume of traffic in any event;
- the new roundabout on the A38 is most welcome; the proposed density is too high for the low density area and will result in a cramped development with too much traffic trying to reach Taunton along the A38;
- the development will result in the loss of fertile farmland and result in a grid lock of traffic in Taunton;
- I support the vision of a future dual carriageway but the number of roundabouts will be difficult to negotiate by concrete supply lorries, livestock vehicles (which, since the loss of Taunton's livestock market, now have to go to Bridgwater via North Petherton);
- the entrance to the new housing will be opposite the Old Forge and will result in congestion it should be relocated further along the road opposite to existing field and avoiding the houses opposite;
- three storey dwellings are out of keeping with the area and should be kept to a minimum on the site; additional surface water run off will exacerbate the existing drainage problems at Hyde Lane;
- The green wedge is being eroded in bite size chunks resulting in the loss of a

wildlife buffer area between villages and Taunton the existing rural village life will be swamped and the loss of green fields is unacceptable;

- Taking into account the Nerrol's Farm and Maidenbrook proposals existing development is becoming hemmed in; any farmland that remains around the development site should be securely fenced;
- where is the employment for the occupants?
- What and when is the public transport to be provided?
- The plans do not provide any "core" to the development including facilities such as shops, health centres;
- Britton's Ash is an unadopted highway and is not suitable or wide enough for pedestrians, cyclists or additional vehicular traffic;
- the developer proposes to erect a gate at the bottom of Britton's Ash but a permanent barrier with planting must be erected on site;
- a stretch of hedge at the northern end of Britton's Ash is marked for removal which is unnecessary and it should be retained as shown on all previous correspondence;
- all measurements in relation to the existing dwellings in Britton's Ash should be adhered to;
- the narrowing of the open space adjacent to the eastern side of 14 Britton's Ash should be straightened out to provide a wide enough distance between new and old;
- the properties opposite the side of 14 Britton's Ash have windows overlooking the existing dwelling and garden and should be revised so that windowless gables are provided; plot 165 should be adjusted into a straight line;
- we are disappointed that the affordable housing is to be located so close to existing large detached dwellings and feel that they could have been sited slightly further east into the development site;
- the proposed 2.5 storey housing is out of character with the two storey houses in the area and should be replaced with a maximum of two storey dwellings;
- the works to provide a turning head at the top of Britton's Ash, block off Hyde lane and provide cycle and footpath links across Britton's Ash are supported but are concerned that vehicles may choose to turn using the private area of Britton's Ash lane, perhaps a sign No turning could be provided next to the lane and a circular turning area instead of the proposed fork?
- Arrangements should be put in place to stop vehicles parking in the turning head;
- support the new relief road and soil bunding/landscaping;
- ATS are concerned that any changes to the A38 which result in the restriction of vehicles using the road are likely to have a detrimental impact on the business and have a negative impact on the viability of the business and result in a loss of jobs;
- the proposed central refuge island along the A38 may restrict vehicle width and should not be allowed before the new eastern relief road is built;
- I oppose the development as it is a result of the Regional Spatial Strategy which

has been discredited as it proposes a need for new dwellings that does not exist;

- the houses will not provide sufficient affordable, low cost dwellings or dwellings of an acceptable environmental standard;
- the houses are not required and are not supported; there should be close boarded fencing along the eastern boundary of 134 Bridgwater Road to maintain security for the occupants following the adjacent development.

PLANNING POLICIES

T8 - TDBCLP - Monkton Heathfield Major Development Site,
T9 - TDBCLP Mixed-use Development Allocation (Monkton Heathfield),
S1 - TDBCLP - General Requirements,
S2 - TDBCLP - Design,
H9 - TDBCLP - Affordable Housing within General Market Housing,
C4 - TDBCLP - Standards of Provision of Recreational Open Space,
M4 - TDBCLP - Residential Parking Provision,
EN12 - TDBCLP - Landscape Character Areas,
EN13 - TDBCLP - Green Wedges,
EN22 - TDBCLP Dev Affecting Sites of County Archaeological Importance,
STR1 - Sustainable Development,
STR2 - Towns,
S&ENPP1 - S&ENP - Nature Conservation,
S&ENPP5 - S&ENP - Landscape Character,
S&ENPP9 - S&ENP - The Built Historic Environment,
S&ENPP35 - S&ENP - Affordable Housing,
S&ENPP42 - S&ENP - Walking,
S&ENPP44 - S&ENP - Cycling,
S&ENPP48 - S&ENP - Access and Parking,
S&ENPP49 - S&ENP - Transport Requirements of New Development,
PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development,
PPS3 - Housing,
PPS4 - Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth,
PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation,
PPS10 - Planning for Sustainable Waste Management,
PPS25 - Development and Flood Risk,
PPG24 - Planning and Noise,

DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Design Code – The Monkton Heathfield allocation T9 is for a mixed use development of circa 900 houses, playing fields, school, local centre and employment.

Development of the site will take several years and it is important to establish some overarching principles that will guide development of the area in a comprehensive manner. As a result a requirement of the outline permission was that a Design code document was to be submitted and approved prior to the submission of a reserved matters application. In reality it was the detailed design of phase 1 of the development which enabled the design code principles to be established and as a result, the current application includes a proposed design code document for the whole site. Comments from the SCCy on the proposals contained within the design code are still awaited and I anticipate that alterations will be required to ensure that

the details are acceptable and that those codes are reflected in the phase 1 development scheme. I anticipate that these details will be resolved before the Committee date and if so there will be an update to the committee on this matter and the recommendation will be amended accordingly.

Highways – The outline planning permission issued by the Secretary of State granted full permission for the construction of an Eastern Relief Road to bypass the existing settlement and enable the provision of a cohesive community that spanned the A38 without being divided by the large amount of traffic that uses it at the present time. The Transport Assessment that supported the outline permission established that circa 300 houses could be built and occupied before the ERR had to be constructed and the A38 calmed but as the Local Community had expressed a strong desire for the relief road and traffic calming, the Consortium agreed that the ERR would be constructed, in full use and the A38 traffic calmed prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings for which outline planning permission had also been granted (S106 agreement). The approved phasing plan for the development indicated that new build would commence on land at the north of the site working its way south to the final phase. With the downturn in the economy it has become increasingly difficult for developers to provide large up front works without the prior sale of properties to help fund it and the consortium have altered their phasing of development at Monkton Heathfield to minimise such costs. The development, as represented by this application, would commence at the south of the allocated site by building the first leg of the relief road to serve as an access for the construction vehicles and the first phase of housing. The application is for 327 houses, in excess of the 300 that would be allowed before the ERR is built in full and the developer's intention at this time is to continue to construct the road as soon as possible to enable the development of the allocated site to continue. Discussions are also taking place with Urban Initiatives to look at how the road might be adjusted to accommodate the greater level of development to be proposed at Monkton Heathfield through the core strategy.

The outline planning permission granted permission for the erection of a new roundabout at the south west of the site, linking with the A38. This was designed to be in use after the A38 had been traffic calmed, with the new phasing the roads leading to the roundabout have had to be adapted to ensure that traffic coming to and from the village via the A38 can be catered for. The County Highway Authority has now accepted the proposed details from a highway safety point of view.

The internal road system provides a spine road that will be the main bus and traffic route through the development site. This has been designed to avoid a carriageway with overlong stretches of straight road and clear visibility around/ across corners (that tend to encourage high traffic speeds and an environment which is highway dominated and forms a detrimental barrier and environment for residents and pedestrians). Car parking for this phase is a mixture of on plot and rear courtyard parking and there are generally 2 spaces per unit with an odd case of 1 space for some of the smallest units. The Taunton Deane Local Plan requires a maximum of 1.3 parking spaces per dwelling (0.3 parking space results in one visitor space for three dwellings) and the proposals are therefore in excess of this. I have requested the developer to amend their proposed car parking in line with current standards and am awaiting their response.

Housing – The proposal is for the erection of 327 houses of which 114 (35%) are “affordable” housing, a split of social rented and shared ownership. I am awaiting a plan clarifying the exact location of each type of dwelling to ensure that they are not arranged in clusters which are contrary to the requirements of the Section 106

agreement. The proposal comprises a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings and two larger blocks of three storey blocks of flats in focal point locations. The dwellings are generally two storey in height but there are a few three storey dwellings with rooms provided in the roof.

Site layout and design. The developer aims to produce a locally distinctive settlement which interprets the traditional use of local materials to create a recognisable development which is both of its time and place. This development of this site will have a lower density (35 dwellings per hectare) than the remaining, northern part of the site and would act as a transition from the green wedge to the core of the development around the local centre, which is expected to be a higher density.

This phase of the layout will provide the first part of an internal access road which loops around the site to provide a main route that enables a bus and transport link throughout the site that will be accessible to residents. The buses would not be provided into the development at this stage of the development but the existing bus route runs along the A38 and would be within 400m walking distance for the majority of the dwellings in this phase.

Persimmon Homes and Redrow Homes have split the site into 8 parcels of land and these are distributed around the site. Particular care has been taken to ensure that roads with different developers on either side have been treated in similar ways in terms of boundary treatment and vision to try to create a coordinated approach to the street scenes. This has been particularly important along the main route. The developer has submitted a number of street scenes so that the proposals can be fully understood and these will be shown at the committee meeting.

The developer has introduced some interesting areas of open space adjacent to the "internal access" road and these are welcomed. Plans will be shown to illustrate these areas.

The developers have selected standard house designs that suit the local area and I await samples of the proposed materials to ensure that they are suitable. Rear boundaries that are adjacent to public highway or open space would be walling and front boundaries are generally hedges as befits the rural/urban approach to this part of the site. Where houses are located on corner or focal points in the street scene care has been taken to ensure that all important elevations are detailed to provide suitable street scenes and overlooking of open space.

Residents have expressed concern over the proximity of the new dwellings to the old dwellings near Brittons Ash. The distances are approx 14m - 22m and I consider that these are adequate to preserve amenity of existing residents.

A brief summary of the proposals was presented to the South West Design Review panel. They were generally disappointed with the information they were shown and felt that a higher standard of urban design was required. Their detailed points have been considered by the developer and limited changes have been made to the "square" public open space area.

Drainage:- The foul drainage strategy that has been proposed would provide a series of storage tanks which flow into the sewers in a controlled manner to ensure that the sewers are not overloaded at peak times. The first of the tanks must be in place prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings as there is no capacity for additional flows until the tank has been provided. The Surface water proposals are not in accordance with the outline permission which indicated that surface attenuation basins would be provided on the outside of the new Eastern Relief Road. The developer has cited two reasons for the new approach; firstly the storage of surface water drainage in large closed pipes is contrary to government advice in Planning Policy statement 25,

where open water storage and natural treatment is preferred, and there is now a need to cater for an additional 20% water to cater for climate change so the scheme has to cater for larger volumes than before. The developer undertook a full review of the drainage for the whole site and the current proposal is acceptable in principle to the Environment Agency. I have two main concerns with the proposals that have been submitted. Firstly, the scheme requires the Britton's Ash area to be remodelled to form a dish, 1.5m deep with a base that will have a 30% chance of flooding in any one year. Whilst the applicant's assert that in reality when the land has water in it (up to a max 390mm) it will be raining so hard that no one will be outside any way and by the time the rain has stopped the water will have drained away . To date TDBC have objected to this and I am concerned that its provision on the site has resulted in a land form that is less suitable for informal public use and has too much land taken up by sloping surfaces that will be difficult to maintain. The applicants have produced a draft layout of the area and this is being considered by the Council's landscape and open space teams and I await their comments. I believe that it is possible to devise an alternative scheme but the consortium has so far been unwilling to negotiate over any alternative.

The submitted drainage scheme covers proposals for the whole of the allocated site and includes the provision of a significant surface water drainage feature which has been located at Pocket Park, further north on the site. In the masterplan this was shown as a green link between Green lane on the far east of the site and the centrally located School and play facilities. The submitted drainage scheme does not contain the finished design for that area but the submitted detail indicates that it would be more of a wet feature with the area filling up to 1m in depth with surface water in extreme events and may result in the loss of that important green link. I am concerned that if we approve the drainage scheme as submitted we would be unable to determine the best design and use of Pocket Park and would instead be left with an unwanted drainage feature. I am keen that the consortium should submit additional details of the drainage scheme in relation to pocket park so that the impact of their proposals can be fully assessed at this stage. I will include any update on these matters in the update sheet.

Details of the future ownership and maintenance of the foul and surface water drainage systems has been requested and must be approved prior to the commencement of works on site.

Landscaping – Full details of the strategic and internal landscaping for this phase have now been submitted. Whilst the proposed strategic scheme is acceptable in principle amendments have been requested in relation to appropriate species of plants for the area and the incorporation of planting on the western side of the noise bund and an extension of the landscaping bund further around the roundabout and into the access road. Revised plans are awaited which reflect these details. The Landscape Officer has also expressed reservations about the lack of planting within the residential areas. Discussions are currently taking place regarding the matter and any alterations will be included on the update sheet, .

Noise – An acoustic barrier (bund plus a high fence between 2.8 - 3.6 total height depending on the land form) is to be erected at the top of the proposed landscaped bund which runs along the west of the Eastern Relief Road to ensure that noise levels of the dwellings, which back onto the proposed road, fall within the guidelines contained within Planning Policy Guidance note 24. In order that this does not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the residents and the wider area, the masterplan shows landscaping on both sides of the fencing. The proposed landscaping scheme is limited to the road side of the fence and this is considered to

be unacceptable the properties will have a bund and fence at the bottom of their gardens that will be overbearing and liable to removal by future residents who may not be aware of its important function. Revisions have been requested and agreed in principle to provide a similar planting to both sides of the fencing. I am awaiting the views of the Environmental Health Officer to the noise attenuation scheme and will report these on the update sheet.

Archaeology – Previous developments in the vicinity of this site have had good archaeology and as a result a desk top study was undertaken at outline applications stage which identified the need for some pre-development investigations. Due to the ephemeral nature of the remains (in particular the potential Iron Age site) an Archaeological condition was placed on the outline planning permission, requiring a programme of archaeological work involving excavation in advance of development in accordance with a written scheme of investigation. The County Archaeologist has met with the developer's representative on this matter and a full project design has now been agreed in principle. The project design must be submitted and approved prior to any commencement of works on site and I have asked the developer to forward the design as soon as possible.

West Monkton Parish Council's concerns – The Parish council are concerned about the change in the proposals in relation to the provision of the Eastern Relief Road (ERR) and the traffic calming of the A38. The parish were previously assured that the ERR would be provided in full prior to any new dwellings. The Parish believe that additional traffic using the A38 and Milton Hill will create even worse traffic queues leading to traffic at a standstill. However, due to changes in economic circumstances the developers of this site have reconsidered their proposal. The Traffic assessment submitted with the outline application did indicate that 300 houses could be built and serviced off the existing road network before the ERR had to be provided and the Somerset County Council agreed this. Planning Authorities must be reasonable in their requirements of developers if much needed development is to come forward. I do not consider that it would be reasonable to insist on the provision of the whole road with its full construction in these circumstances. In addition the Parish council refer to their earlier request to provide a vehicular link from School road to the A38. This matter was considered by the planning committee when they considered the outline application and the Committee supported this objective. The developer was approached about this and agreed to look at the proposal when drawing up a scheme for the local centre. This application does not cover that area and details are not yet provided. I have reminded the developer of the need to honour this commitment when they begin to plan that area. The masterplan indicated that a footbridge was to be provided to enable the safe crossing of the ERR. The provision of a footbridge has three implications, firstly it involves long access ramps and a bridge constructed at a high level both of which allow for overlooking of any properties that are planned near to them having a detrimental impact on the amenity of residents; they are large and often unsightly structures that are often detrimental to the visual amenity of a development and finally they are extremely costly to erect. During the course of the outline application a strong case was put forward by Ruishton and Creech St Michael parish council for the replacement of the footbridges with an at level traffic light crossing of the road and this is now proposed by the consortium. The footbridge details are not part of this application as their location is outside of the boundary of the site. The parish council raise concerns over the design of the three storey blocks of flats and revised designs have now been received to overcome this issue. The Parish will be notified of these when they have been formally submitted, along with a change to some of the fenestration and

designs of some of the proposed houses. Regarding the drainage feature shown at Britton's Ash, I would also prefer this to be relocated but this matter is still under discussion and the developer is reluctant to alter the proposal. I am informed that these areas will be privately maintained and I have requested details of the maintenance regime and who is to be responsible for their upkeep.

Conclusion

The South West Design Review Panel's assessment that the scheme shows a housing layout rather than an urban design is accepted to some degree. However there is more information within the application than was presented to the panel and this does give more of a third dimension to the scheme. The Design Code needs to be revised in order to guide the future development of the whole allocation and I await this before being in a position to recommend that the details be approved. You will note from the report that there are still several outstanding matters to be finalised and I do not recommend that reserved matters approval be granted until these details and other outstanding matters have been satisfactorily resolved.

In preparing this report the Planning Officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1988.

CONTACT OFFICER: Mrs J Moore Tel: 01823 356467