



Committee Report

Planning Committee (North) – 20 January 2026

Application no. DC/25/3322/FUL

Location

Land To The Rear Of Larks Rising
Easton Lane IP18 6SS And
The Warren, Easton Lane
Easton Bavents
Reydon
IP18 6SU

Application type Full Application

Applicant Easton Bavents Ltd

Parish Reydon

Proposal 4 Residential Properties to be built to replace 3 cottages already lost to erosion and 1 house due to be lost in the next 20 years.

Case Officer Joe Blackmore – Planning Manager
Joe.Blackmore@eastssuffolk.gov.uk

1. Summary

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission for four (4no.) dwellings, proposed as replacement dwellings in regard to existing (1no.: The Warren) and previously demolished (3no.: The Cottages) dwellings on the applicant's wider landholding.
- 1.2 The application follows a dismissed appeal (see appendix A for a copy of the decision) and this amended scheme fully addresses the Inspector's reasons they dismissed the appeal. The application can therefore be supported and is recommended for approval.
- 1.3 Due to the objections from the Parish Council and Ward Member, the committee call-in notification was sent, but no member of the Planning Committee (North) requested the

application be referred to Committee in response to that notification email. The application was then referred to Committee by the Referral Panel.

2. Site Description

2.1 The proposed development site is located to the north-east of Reydon, outside of the settlement boundary, and within open countryside. It is wholly within the Suffolk and Essex Coasts and Heaths National Landscape, which is valued for its scenic qualities and tranquillity. The closest properties are located approx. 140m south and approx. 90m southeast from the site. The main site is predominantly agricultural land detached from and to the north of an existing group of development; access to the public highway is via Easton Lane and then a proposed private drive across land in third-party ownership (the applicant has correctly served notice on the landowner).

3. Proposal and Planning History

3.1 Three cottages at Easton Bavents have already been demolished due to the threat of erosion and this proposal seeks to replace those three dwellings on land within the applicant's holding. A further dwelling is proposed to replace The Warren, which is in-situ and used for holiday accommodation purposes as a C3 dwellinghouse. This brings the total development proposal to 4no. dwellings to replace dwellings previously lost and/or due to be lost to erosion.

3.2 This application is almost identical to a previous submission ref. DC/23/4736/FUL. That application was refused by the LPA for reasons (summarised) below:

1. The Warren is not located within the Coastal Change Management Area. Insufficient evidence to justify the pre-emptive replacement of this dwelling that is located outside of the CCMA and therefore likely to remain in-situ well beyond a period of 20 years, and potentially to the end of the shoreline management 100-year date of 2105.
2. The three dwellings proposed to replace the cottages are significantly larger. The proposed dwellings are tall, detached buildings with integral garages; outdoor raised decks/terraces; substantial garden areas; and, overall, a form of development far greater in scale than that which they would replace.
3. Whilst the architecture is interesting, the scale and form of this proposed development will cause harm to the National Landscape. The group of dwellings randomly located out on a limb in open countryside will be prominent in the landscape and attempts to screen the development / mitigate its impact will be unsuccessful, and in their own way will harm the landscape. For all of the reasons set out, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the National Landscape (AONB).

3.3 This decision was subject of appeal where the Inspector dismissed the appeal but, in principle, did not agree with the Council's finding of harms/policy conflict.

3.4 The only issue the Inspector identified (and the reason the appeal failed) is because The Warren was not included within the red line area of the site location plan. This was a technical failure in the submission on the applicant's part, that they have rectified in this re-submission. In all other respects the application is identical to the previous submission but

has been updated in regard to the suite of submission documents to reflect the extended site area and supporting information on coastal erosion projections.

4. Third Party Representations

- 4.1 One letter of support that identifies the significant erosion impacts; the threat to The Warren from erosion; and comments that the proposals are supported by policy in the Local Plan and supplementary planning documents.
- 4.2 Four letters of objection that raise the following key concerns (inter alia):
- Loss of agricultural land and biodiversity
 - No significant differences between this scheme and previous application
 - Harm to national landscape
 - Alternative options are available on plots at Copperwheat Avenue development
 - Poultry sheds site could be re-developed instead

5. Consultee Responses

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Reydon Parish Council	N/A	4 November 2025

The Reydon Parish Council Planning Committee remains fundamentally opposed to planning application DC/25/3322/FUL. Despite rectifying the technicality that led to the dismissal of the previous Appeal (AP/24/0071) concerning application DC/23/4736/FUL, the current proposal remains contrary to the Development Plan as a whole.

1. Fundamental unsuitability and unacceptable harm to the National Landscape The core objection is, and remains, the unsuitable location of the proposal in the open countryside within the National Landscape (formerly AONB). This was the fundamental and overriding reason for the previous Appeal’s dismissal.

- Conflict with the previous Appeal decision: The new application fails to overcome the primary, substantive reason for the dismissal of the previous Appeal: the unacceptable harm to the National Landscape. The Planning Inspector specifically concluded that the proposal would ‘result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and fail to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Landscape’ (Appeal decision 31). This was deemed a ‘strong reason for refusing the development’ given the site’s location within an ‘asset of particular importance’ (both quotes in Appeal decision 32).
- Adverse effects outweigh benefits: The Inspector further concluded that the adverse effects of the proposal ‘would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole’ (Appeal decision 33).
- Amendment insufficient: The applicant’s administrative correction – rectifying the technicality concerning the inclusion of The Warren within the red-line boundary – does not mitigate the fundamental environmental harm identified by the Inspector. Similarly, any conditions regarding the demolition of The Warren would not address the underlying issue of unsuitability and harm to the National Landscape.
- Impact and scale of development: The National Landscape Team also objects, confirming that the

site's suitability remains a major concern. They state the development would 'blur the boundary' between the Reydon settlement edge and the open countryside. Furthermore, the four proposed dwellings are 'considerably larger in scale and bulk' (Appeal decision 22) than those they are intended to replace, meaning they are not like-for-like replacements.

2. Direct conflict with the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan (RNP)

The proposal directly conflicts with the RNP's core objectives and policies for landscape protection.

- RNP purpose: The RNP was developed to allow the community to influence 'the way the countryside around the village is protected' (RNP 1.1). It confirms that the National Landscape is given 'additional protection against development' (AONB in RNP Glossary).
- RNP Policy RNP 5: This policy is fundamental to protecting the countryside and its qualities, including productive agricultural land. It explicitly mandates that 'Development outside the settlement boundary should protect and where possible enhance the natural beauty and special qualities of the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'. The Planning Inspector's prior finding of demonstrable harm to the National Landscape confirms that this proposal is in direct contravention of this essential policy.
- RNP Policy RNP 8: The proposed development's reliance on private motor vehicle travel – deemed unavoidable by the SCC Local Highway Authority due to the site's 'unsustainable location' – could create additional pressure on local roads, in particular Lowestoft Road. This directly violates RNP Policy RNP 8, which states: 'New developments should demonstrate the way in which they can safely be accommodated within the capacity of the local highways network. . . Developments that would cause an unacceptable impact on the capacity or safety of the local highway network will not be supported.'

3. Viable alternatives should be explored

The stated need to replace houses lost to coastal erosion is weakened by the existence of several viable alternative sites which should be fully explored.

- Copperwheat Avenue: Plots are already reserved specifically for replacing dwellings at risk from coastal erosion at Easton Bavents, though the applicants are not willing to consider this as a possible solution.
- Redundant poultry sheds (brownfield site): A better option is a brownfield area within the farm at Easton Bavents, currently occupied by little-used poultry sheds.

Redeveloping these sheds would be a significant aesthetic enhancement to the site, and this location has been the preferred site for ESC planners.

4. Loss of productive agricultural land

The proposed development would result in the irreversible loss of productive agricultural land outside the settlement boundary. RNP Policy RNP 5 is particularly relevant to this loss. As the site constitutes productive agricultural land outside the defined settlement boundary, it is an integral part of the countryside that this policy seeks to protect and which the Inspector found would be harmed. The loss of this land to permanent residential development is therefore contrary to the overall aims of the Development Plan to conserve the National Landscape.

Conditions if permission is granted

In the event that permission is granted, the RPC Planning Committee insists that the following issues be secured by condition as part of a measured response:

- Principal Residence requirement: New open market housing must include a restriction to ensure its occupancy as the Principal Residence of the occupiers, in line with RNP Policy RNP 4. This is to

prevent overdevelopment by second homes, which price local people out of the housing market.

- Prevent net gain: To prevent a net gain of one dwelling, The Warren must be fully demolished before any construction work begins on the four replacement properties.
- Design and scale requirement: A condition must be secured requiring the four replacement properties to be redesigned to be more 'like for like' replacements, addressing the Inspector's finding that the current proposal is for dwellings that are 'considerably larger in scale and bulk' than those they are intended to replace.
- Ecology and biodiversity: The ESC Ecology Team requires multiple stringent conditions.

A precautionary working method statement and an ecological enhancement strategy are needed prior to the start of development. Additionally, a 'lighting design strategy for biodiversity' must be submitted and approved prior to commencement, including a sensitive external lighting scheme to protect commuting bats. Furthermore, since it was noted in the Appeal decision (para 28) that the Inspector would have required further representations on the impact on European-designated habitat sites (SPA/SAC) had it been allowed, this also needs to be done.

- Highways: Conditions must ensure the provision of vehicular visibility splays at the access point for appropriate highway safety. It should also be noted that RNP Policy RNP 8 requires that 'Where necessary, new developments should incorporate more than one point of access', a requirement that must be fully addressed.
- Archaeology: Because the site lies in an area of archaeological potential, the SCC Archaeological Service recommends a planning condition that 'No development shall take place within the application area until a scheme of Archaeological Evaluation of the site has been submitted and approved'. A scheme for preservation in-situ/mitigation must also be secured.
- Fire safety: Conditions must be secured for the provision and installation of fire hydrants and a minimum hard-standing capacity of 15/26 tonnes for fire appliances.
- Contamination: A condition must be secured for unexpected contamination to be immediately reported, investigated, and risk-assessed if found during construction.

Summary

The merits of the proposal do not outweigh the fundamental reasons for objection. The core issue is the unacceptable harm to the National Landscape, which was the Inspector's overriding reason for dismissal. This proposal remains in clear conflict with the Development Plan as a whole, including the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan. We respectfully and strongly urge that application DC/25/3322/FUL be rejected

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Ward Councillor	N/A	10 September 2025

This seems similar to a previous application that was refused. My opinion has not changed. The applicants can have the option of plots on the Copperwheat Avenue development in Reydon to compensate for the loss of houses to coastal erosion. Further if they have to build on the farm, they should use the redundant turkey sheds not a greenfield site. We have permitted them quite a lot of holiday accommodation already to replace loss of income from the farmland, although it is the tenant who is actually suffering the loss.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Reydon Parish Council	9 September 2025	28 September 2025

Summary

The proposed development is in the wrong location, threatens the local farming economy, and harms the National Landscape and local ecology. While we acknowledge positive elements like the carbon-friendly and demountable construction methods, the barn-like form of the dwellings, and the landscaping scheme, these merits do not outweigh the fundamental reasons for objection. We urge the application's rejection.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
East Suffolk Environmental Protection	9 September 2025	22 September 2025
Summary of comments: No objections. Advice to case officer provided.		

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
SCC Highways Department	9 September 2025	30 September 2025
Summary of comments: No objections, but request for further details of visibility splays. *Officer note: the access from Easton Lane onto the public highway is existing and well-established, with this proposal replacing existing dwellings. Therefore, it was not reasonable or necessary to secure this information.		

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
East Suffolk Ecology	9 September 2025	22 September 2025
Summary of comments: <i>In conclusion, to ensure that the works do not impact commuting bats, a sensitive lighting scheme will be required for the works, and any external lighting fitted to the buildings. Furthermore, due to the confirmed presence of nesting birds using the site, it is recommended that any vegetation clearance is carried out outside of nesting bird season. If this is not possible, then a qualified ecologist should perform a nesting bird check immediately prior to the commencement of works. To ensure that the works do not impact potentially present hedgehogs, brown hare, and reptiles, a precautionary working method statement should be put in place prior to the commencement of works. Finally, to enhance the site for wildlife, an ecological enhancement strategy is required.</i>		

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Suffolk Coasts And Heaths Project	9 September 2025	1 October 2025
Summary of comments: <i>In summary the National Landscape team does not consider that the selected site is an appropriate location for the proposed replacement dwelling development. We do not consider that sufficient mitigations have been embedded into the design of the scheme to manage light spill and we do not</i>		

consider that all of the species being proposed in the landscaping plan are appropriate and typical of the AONB around Easton Bavents. For these reasons it is considered that the scheme as proposed, will erode tranquillity levels and negatively impact the landscape quality and natural heritage interest of the site and as such will fail to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
SCC County Archaeological Unit	9 September 2025	18 September 2025

Summary of comments:

There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 218), any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Natural England	9 September 2025	22 September 2025

No comments to make on the application.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
East Suffolk Services - Property And Facilities	9 September 2025	26 September 2025

The plans for this property have been reviewed. For waste collection, the vehicles currently collect from Easton Lane. The new properties are more than 30m from Easton Lane thus the vehicles would need access to the properties via the extended farm road. The road surface is required to be an adoptable standard to allow 32T trucks or the other option is to indemnify the council and its contractors from any damage caused by driving a collection vehicle from accessing the properties.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
SCC Fire And Rescue Service	9 September 2025	12 September 2025

Summary of comments:

Condition required to secure details and implementation of fire hydrants within the development area.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Essex And Suffolk Water PLC	9 September 2025	10 September 2025

Summary of comments:

No objections raised.

6. Site notices

Site Notice Type	Date Posted	Expiry date	Reason
General Site Notice	2 October 2025	23 October 2025	General Site Notice

7. Planning Policy

- WLP1.1 - Scale and Location of Growth (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP1.2 - Settlement Boundaries (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019) WLP7.1 - Rural Settlement Hierarchy and Housing Growth (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.7 - Small Scale Residential Development in the Countryside (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.9 - Replacement Dwellings and Extensions in the Countryside (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.21 - Sustainable Transport (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019) WLP8.24 - Flood Risk (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.25 - Coastal Change Management Area (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.26 - Relocation and Replacement of Development Affected by Coastal Erosion (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.28 - Sustainable Construction (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.29 - Design (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.34 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- WLP8.35 - Landscape Character (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019) WLP8.40 - Archaeology (East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan, Adopted March 2019)
- RNP: Reydon Neighbourhood Plan ('Made' May 2021)
- East Suffolk Council Coastal Adaptation Supplementary Planning Document (2023)

8. Planning Considerations

Policy and Legislative Context

- 8.1 All planning applications are to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the Development Plan comprises the East Suffolk (Waveney) Local Plan 2019 ["The Local Plan"] and the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan ["RNP"], and the key relevant policies are listed earlier in the planning policy section of this report. The East Suffolk Coastal Adaptation Supplementary Planning

Document 2023 (“The SPD”) is also a material consideration and should be read in conjunction with the key Development Plan policies. The NPPF is a further material consideration.

- 8.2 The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act (2023) amended section 85 of the CRow Act, to create a new duty on relevant authorities to ‘seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area’ when discharging their functions in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs, now known as National Landscapes). The new duty replaces the previous requirement for relevant authorities to ‘have regard’ to the purpose of AONBs and is intended as a more proactive and strengthened requirement. The duty is a statutory one and applies to all relevant authorities when discharging any function that affects an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; officers have this duty in mind in determining the application.
- 8.3 Officers have given full weight to the Neighbourhood Plan in determining this application; however, key relevant policies are primarily contained with the Local Plan in this particular case

Principle of Development and Adaptation to Coastal Erosion

- 8.4 The site is located within designated countryside and in usual circumstances there would be no prospect of the principle of development being supported. That is because the proposals would not meet the rural infill or exceptional affordable housing policies, nor any other general housing in the countryside policies derived from the Local Plan spatial strategy. However, the site context is not a typical countryside location. The applicant’s wider landholding partly falls within the Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA).
- 8.5 Policy WLP8.25 relates the CCMA and sets out that:

“The Coastal Change Management Area is identified on the Policies Map. Reputable and scientifically robust evidence that emerges over the lifetime of this Plan which effects the delineation of the Coastal Change Management Area should be considered when applying this policy.

Proposals for new, permanent residential development including conversion of existing buildings will not be permitted in the Coastal Change Management Area. In parts of the Coastal Change Management Area expected to be at risk from change within a 20 year time horizon, only temporary development directly related to the coast, such as beach huts, cafés, car parks and sites used for touring caravan and camping will be permitted.

In parts of the Coastal Change Management Area expected to be at risk from change beyond a 20 year time horizon, other commercial and community uses will be permitted providing they require a coastal location and provide economic and social benefits to the local community.

Essential infrastructure, including transport infrastructure, utility infrastructure and wind turbines will only be permitted in the Coastal Change Management Area where no other sites outside of the Area are feasible and there is a management plan in place to manage the impact of coastal change including their future removal and replacement.

All planning applications for development within the Coastal Change Management Area and 30 metres inland should be accompanied by a Coastal Erosion Vulnerability Assessment which demonstrates that the development will not result in an increased risk to life or property.

Planning permission for all development within the Coastal Change Management Area will be time-limited according to the risk identified in the Coastal Erosion Vulnerability Assessment.

Proposals for new or replacement coastal defence schemes will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the works are consistent with the management approach for the frontage presented in the relevant Shoreline Management Plan and there will be no material adverse impact on the environment."

- 8.6 Further to the CCMA policy, WLP8.26 sets out (in regard to the relocation/replacement of residential dwellings) that:

"Proposals for the relocation and replacement of dwellings affected by coastal erosion will be permitted in the Countryside where:

- The development replaces a permanent building which is within the Coastal Change Management Area as identified on the Policies Map and is forecasted to be affected by erosion within 20 years of the date of the proposal;*
- The relocated dwelling should be in a location which exhibits a similar or improved level of sustainability with respect to access to services and facilities as the original dwelling;*
- The relocated dwelling is outside of the Coastal Change Management Area as identified on the Policies Map; and*
- The existing site is either cleared and made safe or put to a temporary use beneficial to the local community."*

- 8.7 A fundamental criterion within WLP8.26 is that *"The development replaces a permanent building which is within the Coastal Change Management Area as identified on the Policies Map and is forecasted to be affected by erosion within 20 years of the date of the proposal"*.

- 8.8 Updated coastal erosion projections for Easton Bavents were published in January 2025 by the Environment Agency (EA) as part of their Shoreline Management Plan (SMP). These projections identify that 'The Warren' – albeit outside the CCMA – is highly likely to require demolition within 20 years as required by WLP8.26.

- 8.9 The three cottages have already been lost to erosion and, therefore, the principle of replacement is clearly established and supported by the Local Plan.

- 8.10 In the appeal decision, the Inspector reached the following conclusions on the principle of development:

"11. The development plan is clear that CCMA's are based on the area's likely to be impacted by coastal change within the next 100 years (using a 2005 baseline) as identified in the Shoreline Management Plans. When factoring in the new baseline and its predictions within 30 years, I find that The Warren should enjoy the same status as if it were within the CCMA."

“13. The speed of coastal erosion is not an exact science. Nevertheless, based on the evidence provided, I accept that it is highly likely that The Warren would be affected by coastal erosion within the 20-year timeframe set by Policy WLP8.26. I note one of the overall objectives in the Coastal Adaptation Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (SPD), which supports the development plan policies, seeks (at paragraph 5.7) the timely relocation and rollback of dwellings well before erosion becomes an imminent threat, which this scheme seeks to do. Furthermore, the overriding purpose of Policy WLP8.26 is to strictly control new development and provide for the appropriate relocation of existing development within those areas already evidenced to be especially vulnerable to coastal erosion, which I find to be the case here.”

- 8.11 Accordingly, based on updated coastal erosion projections and the conclusions of the Planning Inspectorate, officers accept that the principle of four dwellings is sound and compliant with the Local Plan.

Design and Landscape Impact

- 8.12 Out of context, the proposed dwellings are interesting contemporary buildings of architectural merit. However, the site context (and responsiveness of the proposals to that context) is critical to the decision on this application. The three dwellings proposed to replace the cottages are significantly larger. The proposed dwellings are tall, detached buildings with integral garages; outdoor raised decks/terraces; substantial garden areas; and, overall, a form of development far greater in scale than that which they would replace.
- 8.13 The previous application was refused, partly on the basis that the dwellings would be too large and bulky – and far in excess of the relatively modest cottages to be replaced (albeit with The Warren itself being a large, detached dwelling).
- 8.14 However, in the appeal decision, the Inspector concluded as follows:

“The four proposed dwellings are considerably larger in scale and bulk than those they are to replace. However, there is nothing within Policy WLP8.26 that limits the size of the replacement dwellings, a matter that the SPD acknowledges. Indeed, the SPD advocates that the size of any relocated dwelling can include a consideration of permitted development rights and should be considered alongside other landscape and design policies, in order to minimise the risk of unnecessarily larger homes impacting the undeveloped area, which is the approach that I have taken.

Whilst the four new dwellings are substantial in size, they are not excessively bulky. Moreover, the proposed layout would appear as a modern interpretation of a farmstead, which I find to be appropriate for its site context and would provide for an interesting contemporary design.”

- 8.15 Policy WLP8.35 (Landscape Character) of the East Suffolk (Waveney) Local Plan sets out that proposals for development should be informed by, and be sympathetic to, the distinctive character areas, strategic objectives and considerations identified in the Waveney District Landscape Character Assessment (2008), the Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Study (2016), the Broads Landscape Character Assessment (2016), the Broads Landscape Sensitivity Study for Renewables and Infrastructure (2012) and the most current Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan. Development

proposals will be expected to demonstrate their location, scale, form, design and materials will protect and where possible enhance. Section 85 of the CRoW Act places a duty on relevant authorities to 'seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area' when discharging their functions in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now known as National Landscapes).

- 8.16 In the previous application, informed by comments from the Senior Landscape Officer, the LPA considered there would be unacceptable harm arising – in landscape terms – as a consequence of this development proposal. However, the applicant provided an updated landscaping strategy in the appeal process which the Inspector considered, reaching the following conclusions:

"The farmstead would be set further north than the adjacent farm and extend development further into the open countryside away from the existing cluster of built form, which counts against the scheme.

However, the revised landscape plan indicates a robust and meaningful strategy to provide woodland blocks of large deciduous trees to screen the development, which I find would, over time, largely be in character with the surrounding landscape. Their placement would allow for retained and important glimpses of the landscape when viewed across the site towards farmland at the south-east, such that it would assist in preserving the landscape character. It is noteworthy that the location of the proposed dwellings closely follows the pre-application advice given by the Council.

I am mindful that any site to accommodate replacement dwellings would, by necessity, be located within the National Landscape and that Policy WLP8.26 is supportive of replacement dwellings in principle. In this case there would be an encroachment of development away from built form, albeit landscaping mitigations proposed would help to offer visual relief to the effects of this over time to such a degree that this would largely preserve the landscape character."

- 8.17 The only issue for the Inspector in this regard was that The Warren was outside of the application site and therefore it was not possible to secure its timely demolition – with the concern, therefore, that the four dwellings could be built *in addition* to The Warren. As this matter has been addressed within the submission, officers therefore reluctantly accept that it would be fruitless to maintain a refusal position on landscape impact when this failed at appeal stage.
- 8.18 Likewise, the Inspector did not agree with the findings of harm in design terms and accepted the scale of development as acceptable. Again, officers consider that with this recent appeal conclusion, it would not be sound to maintain a refusal position on design grounds.
- 8.19 Accordingly, officers conclude that the scheme is – giving substantial weight to the recent appeal decision – acceptable in design and landscape terms and arguably in compliance with the relevant Local Plan policies cited. Even if one were to still conclude some harm and policy conflict in that regard, the benefit of replacing homes lost and at threat of erosion is a material consideration of significant weight in the planning balance.

Other Matters

- 8.20 No objections are raised by the Ecology Team and the information provided is acceptable, subject to standard ecological conditions and the mandatory BNG condition.
- 8.21 The scheme utilises an existing vehicular access (Easton Lane) and, as replacement dwellings, this is acceptable in highways safety terms.
- 8.22 The dwellings are well spaced out and separated from neighbouring property and as such no material impact on amenity/living conditions.
- 8.23 The dwellings are located in a low-risk flood zone and will be safe for future occupiers without causing any increased flood risk elsewhere.

Conditions

- 8.24 It is necessary to condition the demolition of The Warren in a timely manner to ensure that it has been fully removed prior to any occupation of its replacement dwelling. This will also require the appropriate ecological surveys of The Warren and a demolition method statement prior to such work taking place.
- 8.25 A principal residence restriction (as normally required by the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan) would not be appropriate or reasonable in this case. That is because the dwellings to be replaced were unrestricted, and this scheme should be treated as replacement homes, not entirely new dwellings.
- 8.26 It is necessary to remove permitted development rights in respect of dwelling extensions and works within the curtilage. This is due to the highly sensitive landscape context.
- 8.27 Further conditions are summarised at the end of this report, but the list is not exhaustive and will be updated in full via the Committee Update Sheet.

9. Conclusion and Recommendation

- 9.1 This application is an unusual situation with several key considerations and competing issues requiring a careful planning balance. The recent appeal decision and Inspector conclusions are particularly weighty and influential here and must be borne in mind when considering this revised application. This application has addressed the key issue regarding The Warren and planning conditions can make the scheme acceptable. Whilst officers maintain that there would be a degree of landscape harm, and conflict with design policy, on balance it is judged that there are material considerations that lead to a positive recommendation. The replacement of homes lost to, and at threat of, erosion is a significant benefit of the scheme and should weigh heavily in favour of the proposal. Accordingly, planning permission should be granted.

- 9.2 Approve.

10. Conditions (summarised):

- 1. Standard 3-year time limit

2. Plans compliance / development to be in accordance with approved details
3. Demolition of The Warren to take place prior to first construction works on its replacement dwelling
4. Demolition method statement of The Warren to be approved
5. Details of fire hydrants and implementation prior to first occupation
6. Standard archaeological conditions re. investigation and post-excavation reporting
7. Biodiversity net gain condition
8. Ecology – compliance with preliminary ecological appraisal
9. Ecology - lighting design strategy for biodiversity
10. Ecology – ecological enhancement strategy
11. Ecology – survey of The Warren prior to its demolition
12. Standard condition requiring action should unexpected contamination be encountered
13. Waste storage and presentation areas
14. Cycle storage
15. Parking/turning areas to be delivered pre-occupation
16. Landscaping implementation and ongoing maintenance
17. All external facing material details to be approved
18. Removal of PD rights for extensions and development within the curtilage of the dwellinghouses

11. Background information

See application reference DC/25/3322/FUL on [Public Access](#)