

**Castle Cary Planning Application Consultee Comments Tracker
(19/01871/REM) Somerset Council – updated 7th February 2024**

Please note that the following comments are from the Case Officer received on 12th January 2024 and should be in read in conjunction with our consultee tracker previously submitted back in November 2023 which can be found at the bottom of this document for ease of reference.

Consultee	Comment	Persimmon Homes Response
<p>Case Officer (David Kenyon) 12.01.2024</p>	<p>First, to deal with the issue of phosphate mitigation, as you are aware the NNAMS by Stantec and the updated Ecology Verification report prepared by Environmental Gain Ltd, attached to your email of 15th November 2023, were forwarded to Natural England on the same day. Natural England replied to that consultation request on 12th December 2023. That response has been uploaded onto the website but, for convenience, it notes that, in order to mitigate the phosphorus budget for the development, it is proposed that credits will be purchased. These credits must be secured and their allocation sufficiently evidenced to the Local Authority, in order to demonstrate that there will be no likely significant impact on the Protected site. Natural England advises that it has no further comments to make at this stage but requests reconsultation once the LPA has received confirmation that the phosphate credits have been agreed and purchased.</p> <p>Thank you for copying me in to your correspondence with Megan Belanger at Somerset Ecology Services, culminating in the submission on 21st December 2023 of the Shadow HRA prepared by Environmental Gain Ltd. The shadow HRA has been uploaded onto the website. As requested, I have forwarded the sHRA to Natural England for review. Natural England has advised that it will provide further comments once it has received proof of credits. My consultation email to Natural England, and Natural England's reply have been uploaded onto the website for information.</p> <p>When I receive the requisite proof, I will forward said information to both Natural England and Somerset Ecology Services for further comment.</p>	<p>Noted – we will submit the proof of credits as soon as this has been received from our credit provider.</p>

	<p>Secondly, your email of 2nd January 2024 refers to discussions with the Ward Member about the PROW by Northcott and whether this should be closed off. I note your confirmation that Persimmon are happy for this to be closed off as and when the alternative route within the application site has been implemented. However you have pointed out that this is not a planning matter and should not hold up the application on that particular matter. I assume you are referring to Cllr Henry Hobhouse when you mention the Ward Member.</p> <p>I am aware that email exchanges took place between Raheel and I during November 2021 about this particular footpath that runs alongside Northcott. It was agreed that the provision of the new alternative path on the application site to Station Road would be beneficial and would be the most likely route that would be used. Persimmon had no intention to seek any diversions or terminations of the existing PROW. I made it clear to Cllr Hobhouse several months later of Persimmon's aim to provide a new footpath to Station Road and that it would be constructed to adoptable standards and be kept available for public use. Also, because the existing part of the PROW running alongside Northcott lies outside the application site and outside Persimmon's control, the argument is that it is not for Persimmon to apply for extinguishment of that part of the path and there is no planning reason why Persimmon should so apply for such an extinguishment or diversion. Persimmon are however ensuring that an adoptable alternate route on their land to Station Road is being made available for the public.</p> <p>There is nothing you mention in your email of 2nd January that seems to have changed from when I and Raheel communicated on this matter and the advice I subsequently relayed to Cllr Hobhouse, but if I am missing something please do not hesitate to enlighten me.</p> <p>Third, on the issue of the 'link' road connecting the application site to the existing road on the land to the north of the site referred to in my email of 6th November 2023. Thank you for confirming in your reply of 28th November 2023 that the 'link' roads in question do not line up and thus you would amend the layout to ensure there was such a connection. Subsequently, your email dated 21st December 2023 contained a link with an updated planning pack of drawings with two changes to the layout, viz. amendment to the 'link' road so it now ties up with the road to the north</p>	<p>That is correct – our position on the PROW remains the same as per your discussions with my colleague Raheel back in November 2021.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>of the site and the proposal for a second substation located opposite plot 1. Unfortunately, that link has now expired and I have been unable to upload these amended drawings onto the website. Should you wish to resend the link I will attend to them accordingly.</p> <p>Fourthly, however, you may decide not to resend the link bearing in mind brief correspondence has been exchanged between the Lead Specialist John Hammond and your Head of External Affairs (Wales and South West) in which John has opined that the proposed layout could be improved upon, particularly given the direction of travel the NPPF has applied to design matters post-dating the schemes original design when first submitted in mid-2019 and in its initial inception no doubt before then.</p> <p>The layout does not really show how the scheme is dealing with the changes in contour which will particularly impact upon the access from Station Road in terms of any retaining proposals for the road where its levels differ from the natural ground level through which it will run. It is presumed that the sharp right hand turn is in some way included to smooth out the relationship but it is difficult to interpret what this means in reality for the open space and its practical useability particularly for the area between the internal estate road and Station Road. Whilst recently plans have been received showing the gradient to the road and edge, it is hard to understand how this also relates to the wider natural ground levels.</p>	<p>The levels of the proposed road are detailed on the Engineering Layout (101 Sheet 2 – Rev K) and Road Contour Plan (670 Sheet 1 – Rev C). These show the site access road dropping from the existing level of Station Road into the site at a gradient of no steeper than 1 in 3 which is suitable for Highway Adoption. The access road will be above egl at the start and batter to a ground level around plot 1. The road will be supported by embankments rather than any retaining features. The embankments are battered at also 1 in 3. The embankments will be planted as per the submitted landscaping plans. Our landscape architects have confirmed that a 1 in 3 gradient is acceptable when it comes to landscaping maintenance.</p> <p>We have also provided cross sections which demonstrate the relationship between the proposed internal estate road and Station Road. See Entrance Road Cross Sections (128).</p>
--	---	---

	<p>In relation to the residential layout, mindful that South Somerset District Council no longer exists from when the current application was first submitted having been replaced by the new single council, the aim of this new Council is to increasingly put new housing layouts before a quality Design Review Panel. I understand that Persimmon South West has undertaken design review (using the SW Design Review Panel) for Ilminster whilst the West Monkton scheme in former Somerset West District Council has been before the Quality Design Review Panel.</p> <p>In both cases the impression is that Persimmon SW has undertaken a design led review of its approach to housing layouts, particularly at Ilminster where they have updated a scheme which previously had a resolution to approve to improve the appearance of perimeter blocks, reduce the impact of secondary roads, introduce meaningful numbers of street trees and create a sense of identity are key road intersections with good use of open space and layout to create understandable squares. The scheme limits the impact of on road parking, particularly where this is provided by way of parking at right angles to the pavement.</p> <p>By comparison, the Castle Cary scheme seems to have more loose edges and it is difficult to understand how the scheme is delivering good design. Particular concerns relate to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of planting along the road from plots 10 – 26 together with the dominance of on road parking for plots 27 – 36 • Similar parking domination of the road frontage and lack of greening between plots 139 – 144 and 128 – 132 • The block 38 – 45 which does not really address the open space to south and south west with the boundaries of gardens fronting into this space. In 	<p>As acknowledged this application was first submitted back in 2018 and was at a position where it had full officer support and no outstanding consultee objections, save for phosphate mitigation. As the Council and planning policy has evolved, the application clearly had not. In light of the above, we have addressed concerns relating to design as set out below:</p> <p>We have reviewed and amended this area to reduce the dominance of on plot frontage parking and increase tree and hedge planting in between parking spaces. Please refer to the amended Planning Layout and On Plot Landscaping Drawings for details.</p> <p>As above, on plot frontage parking are now broken up by tree/shrub planting softening the street scene.</p> <p>We have reviewed this block and note that there is limited scope to reorientate dwellings within this area to face the southern POS as there is an</p>
--	---	---

	<p>this respect, the approach used at Ilminster with a mix of in court and in plot parking may create a more successful and less road dominated context?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plots 149/50 that seem to sit outside the natural boundaries to the remainder of the block • The design for flats 133 – 138 that seem designed to respond to a traffic calming feature. Whilst the Flat block B does have the benefit of actual balconies to afford some outdoor amenity space for residents, unfortunately flat block A provides a Juliette only to the first floor so provides no useable amenity space. <p>Also, the latest drawings referred to in your email of 21st December may have covered this next point, but detailed drawings would be needed for both the 'indicative future highway links', preferably overlaid on a topographical survey so there is no ambiguity as to whether there will be a continuous linkage to a gap relating to ditch or watercourse that is not resolved, particularly if technical details of any bridging works over ditches or culverts are also required as part of the submission for appropriate consultation with for example the Highway Authority, LLFA and/or EA.</p>	<p>existing ditch course and retained vegetation which runs north/south through the centre of the site. Please refer to the engineering layouts and POS landscaping drawings.</p> <p>We have reviewed and amended block 140-160, creating a more integrated and regular block structure design. Corner turning units are proposed at plots 152 and 153 so there are still active frontages addressing the open space to the east and south.</p> <p>Flat Blocks A are designed so that it fronts the POS to the west where the pond is and is surrounded by additional open space to the south and north all of which are accessible and can be used by residents.</p> <p>Please see the Future Highway Link North Connection overlay plan (600) which demonstrates that the proposed highway and footpath link up with the as built highway and footpath on the adjacent development.</p>
--	---	---

**Castle Cary Planning Application Consultee Comments Tracker
(19/01871/REM) Somerset Council - 15th November 2023**

Comments received during consultation held in October 2023.

Consultee	Comment	Persimmon Homes Response
<p>Designing Out Crime Officer</p> <p>David Hinder</p> <p>19.10.23</p>	<p>No objection – subject to the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The layout shows a number of private driveways/access roads to dwellings and parking areas. A number of these are proposed as non-adoptable and as such may not have any illumination provided by the local authority. Please can the applicant provide any details of how this will be addressed? In numerous locations vulnerable side boundaries will have only a small amount of turf between them and public footpaths. I would recommend that these turfed areas are landscaped with appropriate planting to provide an added layer of protection to the boundaries. In places these turfed areas also have trees planted on them very close to the boundaries. The location of these trees could then provide a climbing aid to overcome the boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note that the number of non-adoptable private driveways has not changed from previous layout revisions. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that these are limited to specific locations mainly along the peripheral areas facing POS within the site and are necessary to serve the lower density areas. In terms of lighting, on plot security lighting can be installed. We have reviewed this comment and these instances are limited and we do not consider it would cause significant safety concerns. The majority of side boundaries do in fact have low level shrubs and hedging and these are shown on our updated plot landscaping plans (drawing ref: 23/309 sheets 01-05 Rev A). Tree planting in turfed areas to side boundaries have always formed part of the landscape proposal previously for this site and their locations have not changed as a result of the plot substitution. Notwithstanding the above, the boundary fences can be scaled even if there is no tree planting. It should be noted that the NPPF para 131 requires developments to provide tree-lined streets and locations are limited therefore it would not be reasonable to remove trees on these grounds.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would recommend that green space areas that abut roadways, driveways and footpaths have provisions in place to prevent unauthorised access by motor vehicles. For example further use of knee high post and rail fences which are used in other areas of the development. • It is not clear on the materials plan what rear boundary treatments will be in place for plots that back onto the proposed school site. Please can this be clarified. • Regarding the 2 apartment buildings I would recommend that a visitor door entry and access control system is installed. This should not include a 'tradesman' button. Subsequently thought should then be given to how mail can be securely delivered. Ideally this should be a 'through the wall' system. If this is not possible then externally surface mounted letter boxes should be used which have been tested and certified to TS 009. • Can clarification be provided for the cycle storage facilities for the apartment buildings. There are possible enclosures shown for refuse bins. The location of these in the grounds of the corner apartment building is a concern as they are shown close to the building itself. Depending on the construction method of these enclosures and the locking of the doors, these can be a target for ASB and wheelie bins have been known to be ignited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadways will have kerbing which demarcates the boundary of the highway and a deterrent for unauthorised access to POS areas. This is a standard arrangement used across all developments and in our experience, this has not been an issue widely reported. With regards to footways these are 2m wide and clearly not suitable for vehicular access. • These plots will have close board fencing to the rear which backs onto the school site, we will update the materials layout to reflect this. Once the school application comes forward it will have its own separate boundary treatment. • Visitors and trades people will use the front door as the main point of access into the apartments and an access control system will be installed as recommended. • The cycle and bin stores for the apartment buildings will be constructed using the same red brick to match that of the apartment block and will be fully enclosed and therefore not prone to ignition.
POS Officer	No objection – subject to the following:	

<p>Tamara McKay</p> <p>20.10.23</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the amended plans have not affected the provision of open space, our previous comments from 2020 remain largely unchanged. Since 2020, our requirement of POS per person has increased from 17.4 m2, to 26.7 m2, so the requirement for this site has now increased from 0.64 hectares to 0.97 hectares, which this plan still comfortably exceeds. Because of the minimal change and the overall provision, we have no objections to the progression of this application. We would like to reiterate that we would like more information regarding the degree of the slope of the green entrance on Station Road, and a detailed plan of the attenuation feature and the land surrounding it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted no objection on the overall POS provision. Regarding the degree of the slope of the embankment on Station Road, this will be a 1 in 3 gradient, please refer to the submitted s278 General Arrangement, Station Road (drawing ref: S278-SR2 Rev A). Note this has also been submitted as part of the DoC application (ref: 23/02817/DOC). <p>In terms of the detailed plan of the attenuation feature this will be completed at the technical detailed design stage. However please refer to Detailed POS Landscape Proposal (drawing ref: 23/309-06 Rev A) for landscaping details for the surrounding area.</p>
<p>County Ecologist</p> <p>Megan Belanger</p> <p>24.10.23</p>	<p>Objection.</p> <p><u>Phosphates</u> I don't see a Nutrient Neutrality Assessment and Mitigation Scheme (NNAMS) on the planning portal. Has one been submitted with this application? If so, please send over the report and I will have a look. If not, a NNAMS will have to be submitted before I can comment further on this application.</p> <p><u>Ecology</u> There is an updated badger survey (2023) on the planning portal. This report concludes that there are still badger setts on site and that the setts are used by badgers. A mitigation scheme and a NE licence will be required for this application.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As previously discussed, we are in the process of purchasing off-site credits to offset the phosphates issue. Please find enclosed the NNAMS prepared by Stantec.

	<p>I cannot find any other ecology related surveys on the portal – I assume there has also been an updated walkover survey and updated bat surveys for this site?</p> <p>If so, please send them over for review. If not, please see below. In April 2019, CIEEM produced an Advice Note titled 'ADVICE NOTE - ON THE LIFESPAN OF ECOLOGICAL REPORTS & SURVEYS' which outlines the validity of ecological data based on its age. For ecological data aged between 18 months and 3 years, as in this case, CIEEM in their Advice Note state that: 'A professional ecologist will need to undertake a site visit and may also need to update desk study information (effectively updating the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal) and then review the validity of the report, based on the factors listed below. Some or all of the other ecological surveys may need to be updated. The professional ecologist will need to issue a clear statement, with appropriate justification, on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The validity of the report; • Which, if any, of the surveys need to be updated; and • The appropriate scope, timing and methods for the update survey(s). <p>The likelihood of surveys needing to be updated increases with time, and is greater for mobile species or in circumstances where the habitat or its management has changed significantly since the surveys were undertaken. Factors to be considered include (but are not limited to): Whether the site supports, or may support, a mobile species which could have moved on to site, or changed its distribution within a site (see scenario 1&2 examples);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether there have been significant changes to the habitats present (and/or the ecological conditions/functions/ecosystem functioning upon which they are dependent) since the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see updated verification report which addresses these comments.
--	---	--

	<p>surveys were undertaken, including through changes to site management (see scenario 3 example);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the local distribution of a species in the wider area around a site has changed (or knowledge of it increased), increasing the likelihood of its presence (see scenario 4 example)' (CIEEM, 2019). <p>At present, the ecological data is over 3 years old.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> An updated ecological walkover survey will be required, to assess if there have been any material changes since the original survey was undertaken. The results of this update walkover survey should be presented as an update Ecological Appraisal, which may include recommendations for further surveys and mitigation, as required.</p>	
Care4Cary	<p>Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design: The design of the Persimmon homes should reflect the local vernacular and relate to the existing traditional buildings in the town. We do not believe the proposed houses reflect the design principles laid out in the Castle Cary & Ansford Neighbourhood Plan. We note that Michael Gove, Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, has made interventions of late when he has perceived developments undermining a sense of community and place. This site as per the proposed design would look like an urban cookie-cutter site with no relationship to its rural market town location. Torbay Road: The phasing of the development and subsequent vehicular access are in contravention of Condition 22 of the outline planning permission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in our covering letter, apart from updating the house type range to suit current Building Regulations, the overall design of each house types in terms of materials finishes and detailing has largely remained the same as per the previous house types which reflects the local vernacular of Castle Cary and its surrounding areas. Furthermore, there were no design comments objecting to the proposals previously. As shown on the planning layout, bollards are to be installed preventing more than 25 units accessing the site through Torbay Road, this location for the bollards has been agreed

	<p>Condition 22 addresses the serious concerns of local people re the local road network and in particular concerns about the inadequacy of Torbay Road to take more traffic – a situation that has only deteriorated since the original permission was granted. Condition 22 clearly states that...no more than 25 houses shall be constructed off the Torbay Road access, thereafter all residential traffic, including construction and occupiers' access will be solely via Station Road. The phasing diagram submitted makes no reference to the 25 houses. This limitation was key in gaining outline planning approval. We believed that Persimmon Homes had ceded this point in late 2019. Why have they backtracked?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While Persimmon Homes have agreed to the placement of lockable bollards, they would appear to be in the wrong place. Residents of the houses at the bottom of the development will have to enter and exit via Torbay Road as they are below the lockable bollards. Moving the bollards a few metres would remove this issue so that all residential ingress and egress is via Station Road and Condition 22 would be met. It would also avoid having residential and employment land traffic being in conflict on the estate road. Road safety and amenity are of paramount importance. We note that at this stage there has only been outline planning approval for the employment land, so it should be simple to do this. • Employment Land: Persimmon Homes propose to create two indicative highway links to the adjoining sites. In the absence of a master plan for the Station Road area these are helpful, as Employment Land access is crucial for the economic health of the area, although we question what Somerset Council has done to encourage the other developers to link to these roads and who would bear the cost. 	<p>with the Highway Authority and Planning Officer. In the interest of clarity there are only 8 dwellings which will be accessed off Torbay Road which complies with condition 22.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per above, the condition states no more than 25 dwellings shall be constructed off Torbay Road. We have not breached this limit as there are only 8 houses being accessed off Torbay Road. • Noted.
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The total number of houses has not changed and the layout design itself has largely remained the same as the previously submitted layout. The rationale for the amendments is that the proposed house type ranges have had to be updated to meet current building regulations. One of the key changes is the overall sustainability approach which includes the use of air source heat pumps, provision of EV charging points, improved heat loss prevention, and time, temperature and zone heating controls. We query though why there is no provision of solar panels on any of the houses in this development. It is good to see that affordable homes - social housing and shared ownership - account for about one third of the development and are 'pepper potted' across most of the site. We understand that Persimmon Homes will be addressing the phosphates issue by securing credits from a phosphate credit provider to satisfy their nutrient budget calculation. This will need to be included in the S106 agreement following consultation. Further details should be provided to the local community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be noted that the proposed renewable measures exceed current building regulations and are policy compliant. Please see submitted Sustainability Statement by FES for details. Noted.
Parish Council (06.11.23)	<p>Objection.</p> <p>On grounds of access, highways safety or traffic generation – increase in any traffic movements into Torbay road is an increase risk to residents and pedestrians.</p> <p>General Observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no change in the numbers and there are no arguments for a change in the reserved matters apart from a change in unit type which has no bearing on the access arrangements or previously 	

	<p>stated matters. Generic comments towards issues as sustainability lack enough detail do not allow a decision to be made. If the phasing of the site has altered why is there a need to access from Torbay Road a revision to the employment area access would remove this matter entirely, there is no detail to the school area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The original application was passed with conditions which cannot be subsequently ignored. Condition 22 says that there should be no vehicular access onto Torbay Road by residents. In short, the understanding was that the build would start with 25 houses closest to Torbay Road and that the construction vehicles would be allowed access from Torbay Road – but that on completion, bollards were to be installed and that all construction and residential traffic would enter and exit onto Station Road. Torbay Road is already congested and if the development of Foxes Run ever happens, and when the Employment land adjacent to the Persimmon site is occupied, it will become even more so. We ignore cumulative impact at our peril. Therefore the notional positioning of the entrance to the Employment land needs to be reconsidered along with the positioning of the bollards and condition 22 must be adhered to so that there is no residential vehicular access onto Torbay Road. • There are no specific standalone energy or sustainability assessments that would be commensurate with the requirements of a development of this (or any) size. A two page statement with vague commitments to using energy efficient lighting is utterly unacceptable and ought not to have been validated by the local authority. This application cannot be properly considered until sufficient detail is provided to allow a proper assessment of the applicant's energy and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see above as this issue has been addressed. • We disagree with this comment as the submitted sustainability statement outlines various other renewable measures and not just solely energy efficient lighting.
--	---	--

	<p>sustainability strategy and goals. The lack of any commitments in this respect places the application in contravention of the Local Plan, Neighbourhood Plan, NPPF, and Somerset County sustainability and net zero targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These dwellings do not reflect the design principles as set out in the Castle Cary and Ansford Neighbourhood plan. While opposed to pastiche, we expect new houses to respect the local vernacular. The lack of detail or specification for surface finishes does not allow a proper assessment to be made, and the materials that are referenced are not in accordance with NP policies and must be rejected. Plan arrangements, street layouts, building forms, and elevations pay no regard whatsoever to local vernacular and again are in contravention of acceptable design standards and LP and NP policies. In particular the use of three-story dwellings is incongruous and pays no respect to the scale and hierarchy of surrounding developments or the existing townscape. • There is concern that there is no indication of footpaths leading to the school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As mentioned above, the proposed design of the new house types is not dissimilar to what was previously proposed and there was no previous objection to these from the LPA. • Footpath by plot 46 (to the north) and footpath by plot 63 (to the south) are provided which leads to the school site. Please refer to the updated planning layout (100 Rev AE).
<p>Natural England (Sarah Slaughter) (14.11.2023)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further Information Required – Nutrient Neutrality Assessment and Mitigation Scheme (NNAMS). • The application does not include information that allows the effect of the proposed development with the catchment of Somerset Levels & Moors Ramsar Site and is likely to add to phosphorus loads. We note that the application has not provided any information regarding phosphates such as a phosphorous budget, but advise that as such, further information is required as set out below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As mentioned above, please see enclosed the NNAMS prepared by Stantec. It should be noted that the proposed mitigation strategy will be provided through the purchase of private credits.

	<p><u>Somerset Levels & Moors Ramsar Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The application site is within the fluvial catchment of the Somerset Levels & Moors Ramsar Site. The Somerset Levels & Moors is also designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The designated sites are considered to be in unfavourable condition or at risk due to high levels of phosphorus. If a development is identified as likely to add additional phosphorus to the catchment, planning permission should not be granted until a Habitats Regulation Assessment has been undertaken. Where there is a likelihood of significant effects (excluding any measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on the European site), or there are uncertainties, a competent authority should fully assess the implications of the proposal in view of the conservation objectives for the European site in question within the appropriate assessment. Appropriate assessments cannot have lacunae and must contain complete, precise and definitive findings and conclusions capable of removing all reasonable scientific doubt as to the effects of the works proposed on the protected site concerned. <p>Complete information is required to ensure that the proposal will not affect the integrity of the international site.</p> <p>The appropriate assessment should have regard to the implications of the CJEU case known as “Dutch N” (Joined Cases C-293/17 and C-294/17). The general principles of which are that where an internationally protected is unfavourable or at risk from elevated pollutants, in this case phosphorus, the possibility of authorising activities which may add to the pollutant or compromise the ability to restore the site is “necessary limited”. In order to avoid in</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>combination effects this ruling has been widely interpreted as requiring applications to demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. In this case the appropriate assessment should demonstrate through an agreed phosphorus budget that the proposals can achieve phosphorus neutrality through the implementation of appropriate permanent offsetting measures (e.g. establishment of treatment wetlands, woodland planting, upgrading of existing septic tanks, etc.).</p> <p>In order to complete these assessments the following information should be requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A phosphorus budget for the scheme. Guidance for calculating a phosphorus budget for residential development can be found here: https://www.somerset.gov.uk/planning-buildings-and-land/phosphates-on-the-somerset-levels-and-moors-ramsarsite/phosphate-budget-calculator/ • Details of the permanent mitigation measures that will be applied to secure phosphorus neutrality. The phosphorus budget and mitigation options should be prepared by suitably qualified parties. 	
<p><i>We have yet to see the latest comments from the below consultees following our resubmission in October this year, however it should be noted that most of them had previously had no objections and given the overall layout design is not dissimilar from that previously submitted it is not anticipated that their positions should change.</i></p>		
<p>County Highways (Adam Garland)</p> <p>15.12.2021</p>	<p>Objection removed on 15th December 2021.</p>	<p>RM Compliance conditions agreed via email dated 15th December 2022, see enclosed correspondence for ease of reference.</p>

Rights of Way Officer (Loren Eldred)	Objection removed on 11 th January 2021.	<p>We note the last comment on the portal from the PROW officer below dated 11th January 2021:</p> <p><i>‘The revised Planning Layout (rev AA) shows path arrangements which align better with the legal lines of paths WN 6/30 and WN 6/34. With regard to the alignment of the eastern end of footpath WN 6/34, we have not received a diversion application or a contribution from the developer to progress this further. Without a diversion application or a commitment to fund such, we will not commit to progress this further at this stage.’</i></p> <p>to which we provided a response on 3rd November 2021, see enclosed correspondence for ease of reference. In the interest of clarity there will be no diversions or extinguishments of any existing PROWs.</p>
County Education Officer	Noted no objection on 18 th March 2020.	
Lead Local Flood Authority	Noted no objection on 11 th November 2020.	
Housing Enabling Officer	Noted no objection on 22 nd October 2020.	