

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

Name of Parish Council:	Tatworth and Forton Parish Council
Application Ref No:	26/00984/REM
Address:	Land South Of Southmead Perry Street
Date of response:	12 th June 2026

1. Support the granting of permission	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Please explain below the main grounds on which you support the proposal:		
2. Object to the granting of permission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Please explain below the main grounds on which you object to the proposal:		

Material Considerations	Explanation of Grounds
1. Overlooking, loss of privacy or overbearing/overshadowing nature of proposal	
2. Design & appearance, impact on public visual amenity	<p>Whilst appreciating the developer's plan to reflect the diverse nature of the rest of the village there is one element that the proposal misses. Existing terraced houses in Tatworth have bay windows e.g. Springfield Terrace, opposite the development; the planned terraced houses do not. This disrupts the village vernacular and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Cycle storage is shown indicatively in rear gardens, but many of these do not have any means of access except through the property. If they are for cycle storage, they should be easily accessible from the roadway.</p>
3. Layout & density of building	<p>3.1 Plot 55 appears to have a garden, parking place and cycle shed, but no associated dwelling.</p> <p>3.2 The size and location of the leap is inadequate for the number of dwellings proposed, consider moving away from the road.</p>
4. Effect on listed buildings and/or conservation areas	
5. Loss of trees or ecological habitats	
6. Inadequate parking and/or servicing areas	<p>The provision of only 19 visitor spaces is inadequate for a development of this size, and will likely result in congestion through the development, or unsafe parking on the Fosse Way. The visitor parking spaces are not spaced equally through the development.</p>

<p>7. Access, highways safety or traffic generation</p>	<p>There are a number of concerns that have been expressed by residents due to the density of traffic using the Fosse Way, particularly HGV's going to and from the Chard Junction Estate.</p> <p>7.1. The distance from the start of the 30 mph zone to the access of the development needs to be increased to start where the current 40 mph section starts, and the 40 mph limit extended to the A358 junction.</p> <p>7.2. The pedestrian crossing needs to be formalised as a zebra crossing, not just a drop-down kerb.</p> <p>7.3. Parking on the Fosse Way will potentially become an issue as a result of the lack of parking provision within the development. Currently residents of the houses opposite use on-street parking as they have no other means of so doing. Without proper parking control measures in place the Fosse Way will become inaccessible.</p>
<p>8. Noise, smells or disturbance from the scheme</p>	
<p>9. Flood Risk</p>	<p>The Environment Agency figures for rainfall, and therefore calculation of flood risk significantly understate rainfall compared with local records. Therefore, the calculation of the size of the balancing pond is flawed. Local rainfall records should be used for this calculation to ensure that flood risk is minimised.</p> <p>Note also that the watercourse that the treated water from the package plant will discharge into has been blocked on a number of occasions in the last few years and work needs to be done to improve the flow downstream of the package plant to ensure that the footpath and access road to Greenend Farm do not get flooded.</p>
<p>10. Other reason – please explain</p>	<p>The developer has gone to great trouble to provide a comprehensive Landscape Management Plan: 2877-LLA-ZZ-XX-RP-L. Regrettably the detail contained within the plan has not been copied verbatim into the developer's own documents e.g. the Drainage Maintenance Plan. We support the requirements of the Landscape Management Plan and require that its contents are followed completely by both LiveWest and 3West Group.</p> <p>We can see nothing on the submitted plans about street lighting. Whatever is proposed must not create light pollution for either residents or wildlife who value the current dark skies.</p>

3. Comments only

General Observations: