
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by **L Francis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/W/24/3358090

Timber Top, Sizewell Gap, Sizewell, Leiston, Suffolk IP16 4UH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Waterwood Homes against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/1956/FUL.
 - The development proposed is “new 2-bed single family dwelling with associated amenity space, parking and landscaping, following demolition of outbuildings within existing residential garden”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new 2-bed single family dwelling with associated amenity space, parking and landscaping, following demolition of outbuildings within existing residential garden, at Timber Top, Sizewell Gap, Sizewell, Leiston, Suffolk IP16 4UH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/24/1956/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. In 2023, designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty in England and Wales became “National Landscapes”. The appeal site falls within the Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape (NL) and Heritage Coast.
3. Section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 (LURA) amended the duty on relevant authorities in respect of their interactions with statutory purposes of National Landscapes, as set out in Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended) (CRoW Act). In so far as it relates to this appeal, the amendment now requires relevant authorities “in exercising or performing any function in relation to or so as to affect land in an AONB... to seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB”. As such, it is incumbent on me to evidence consideration of ways to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the NL.
4. The appeal site falls within the Zone of Influence of European designated sites scoped into the Suffolk Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance Mitigation Strategy (RAMS). Although not forming part of the Council’s reasons for refusal, it is incumbent on me as competent authority to consider whether the proposal would be likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of the SPA and Ramsar sites. It is necessary to consider this matter as a main issue.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal on:
- the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the landscape, scenic and natural beauty of the NL;
 - highway safety; and,
 - the integrity of the European sites.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. Timber Top is a 20th Century detached single storey dwelling with outbuildings set in an elevated position to the south of Sizewell Gap. It forms part of a group of buildings set to the rear edge of the beach and vegetated dunes, served by an unmade access track. The Vulcan Arms Public House (PH) is located to the west of the appeal site, alongside a small camping/caravan field which is adjacent to the rear garden of Timber Top. The terrace known as Coastguard Cottages is located to the south of the appeal site. These cottages form a prominent landmark on the skyline and are highly visible from the surrounding area due to their distinctive black weatherboarding and their position on elevated land, set higher than the appeal site. The Grade II listed Watch House is located between the appeal site and the beach. A group of fisherman's huts sits alongside the Watch House.
7. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) refers to the relevance of management plans for National Landscapes for assessing planning applications. Whilst these do not form part of the development plan, they help to set out the strategic context for development and provide evidence of the value and special qualities of these areas. The Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths AONB Management Plan 2023-2028 (Management Plan) is therefore a material consideration.
8. The NL is characterised by sparsely settled gently rolling arable land with pockets of heath and woodland. The coastal areas feature marshland, mudflats and reed beds as well as shingle and vegetated dunes. The area local to the appeal site is characterised by low cliffs and vegetated dunes which run into shingle beaches, contributing to the open character of the area. The Council identify that the site sits on the boundary between the Estate Sandlands and the Coastal Dunes and Shingle Ridges landscape character types. To the north of the settlement the coastal landscape is dominated by the Sizewell power station buildings.
9. The appeal proposal would divide the existing plot, retaining Timber Top and replace the single storey outbuildings with a 1.5 storey, 2-bedroomed chalet style dwelling with a rear garden. The existing access would be shared between both dwellings with parking to the front of the proposed dwelling.
10. Policy SCLP5.4 of the East Suffolk (Suffolk Coastal) Local Plan (Local Plan) works to support, amongst other things, up to 3 new dwellings in clusters of at least 5 existing dwellings, where such development would not have an adverse impact upon the natural or historic environment or the landscape, but instead can integrate within an existing cluster of houses to boost rural housing supply. Additional guidance is contained within the 'Housing in Clusters and Small Scale

Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document 2022 (SPD). The SPD indicates that in rural areas with no settlement boundaries, the 'cluster' policy potentially enables a small amount of development that may help to meet local housing needs, enable people to stay within rural communities and help to sustain these rural communities and any services and facilities that exist within them.

11. The reason for refusal specifically refers to part (d) of SCLP5.4. This requires that new dwellings within a cluster should not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the cluster or, result in any harmful intrusion into the surrounding landscape. The main parties agree that the site would form part of an existing 'cluster' of dwellings.
12. Whilst the Council states that the landscape has 'little changed' in the past 150 years, there are numerous modern interventions in the local landscape including car parking, telegraph poles, pylons and various built structures, not least the host property and the power station. In views from the beach, the ridge of the proposed pitched roof would sit higher than that of Timber Top, but it would still be significantly lower than that of Coastguard Cottages. The position of the proposed dwelling, set back from the building line of Timber Top, would also assist in reducing any perception of visual prominence in the landscape. The view of the skyline from the beach is already punctuated by the rooflines of Coastguard Cottages, Timber Top and houses to the north. Telegraph poles and distant pylons are also apparent in this view.
13. The proposed dwelling would also be visible from the road running east into Sizewell, particularly in views across the car park of the Vulcan Arms PH. Due to the elevation of the land and vegetation these views would diminish closer to the appeal site. In any event, the dwelling would be viewed in its setting adjacent to Timber Top and consequently, would not appear incongruous or overly dominant.
14. The use of black metal cladding would reference the black cladding characteristic of the surrounding buildings. The extent of glazing would be reasonably modest, and the overhanging roof to the front elevation, along with the use of low transmission glazing, would reduce light spill. The retention of the boundary hedges and the use of post and rail fencing would retain the existing open character. The use of gravel and drought resistant planting to the forecourt would be consistent with the shingle ridge and vegetated dunes surrounding the site.
15. When viewed from both the beach and from viewpoints to the rear therefore, I find that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the cluster and would not harmfully intrude on the surrounding landscape, in line with the expectations of Local Plan Policies SCLP5.3 and SCLP5.4(d) regarding housing development in the countryside.
16. The effect on the NL would be highly localised and the key characteristics of this part of the NL in terms of the low cliffs and vegetated dunes which run into shingle beaches, would be conserved. The proposals would not harm the visual qualities of the NL. Given the proposal's proximity to other dwellings, there would not be a noticeable effect upon the dark skies of the NL. As such, the landscape, scenic and natural beauty of the NL would be conserved and the proposal would accord with Section 85 of the CRoW Act, as amended by LURA.
17. The proposed development would be in accordance with the statutory and policy objective of conserving the natural beauty of the protected landscape. It would be

in line with the Council's aims regarding the built and natural environment, particularly to the NL, as expressed in Local Plan Policy SCLP10.4 and National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) paragraph 189.

Highway Safety

18. The access track is used by vehicles accessing Timber Top and the Coastguard Cottages; it also forms part of a Public Right of Way (PRoW). Although it joins the main road through the village at a sharp bend in the road, there is a clear line of sight in both directions for drivers exiting onto the road from the track. There is a wide opening where the track meets the road, and an area which could be an informal passing place approximately outside the driveway for Timber Top. The openness of the track means that any vehicles on it would be visible to other road users.
19. Whilst I appreciate that interested parties have concerns regarding safe access and visibility, I note that the Highway Authority has not raised any objection to the proposed arrangement. I attach significant weight to the view of the Highway Authority that the proposed arrangements would be acceptable. It would be a reasonable assumption that vehicular speeds would necessarily be slow in any event due to the nature and configuration of the road, and drivers would need to exercise caution due to the track being shared with the PRoW. There is limited evidence before me that the additional dwelling would intensify the use of the track to a degree that would cause harm to highway safety.
20. For the reasons given above, any increased use of the track arising from the proposed dwelling would not cause unacceptable harm to highway safety, with particular regard to vehicles standing or reversing onto the highway, or through conflict with the PRoW. I note the reason for refusal in relation to the track does not specify a development plan policy with which the proposal would conflict. The proposal would be consistent with the Framework insofar as it seeks to ensure safe and suitable access to development sites, and prevent unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

Integrity of the European Sites

21. The appeal site falls within the zone of influence of European designated sites scoped into the Suffolk Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigations Strategy (RAMS Supplementary Planning Document dated May 2021) including the Minsmere/Walberswick Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, the Minsmere/ Walberswick Heaths and Marshes Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Sandlings SPA.
22. The sites are designated due to the internationally important numbers of breeding and non-breeding birds and their habitats. The qualifying features of the Minsmere/Walberswick SPA include avocet, teal, marsh harrier, European nightjar, and bittern, whilst the Sandlings SPA includes European nightjar and woodlark. The Minsmere/Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC is designated for its European dry heaths, as well as the annual vegetation of drift lines and perennial vegetation of stony banks. The Minsmere/Walberswick Ramsar site contains a mosaic of marine, freshwater, marshland and associated habitats, with the largest continuous stand of reedbeds in England and Wales. The Ramsar site supports scarce plants and invertebrates and is a location for an important assemblage of rare breeding birds associated with marshland and reedbeds.

23. It would be a reasonable assumption that occupiers of the proposed dwelling would be likely to visit local European protected coastal areas for recreation. Any increase in visitor numbers to these sites would result in recreational pressure requiring mitigation. I therefore consider that the effects of the proposed dwelling, both on its own and in combination with other development projects, is such that it would be likely to have significant effects on the integrity of the sites. I am therefore required to carry out an appropriate assessment pursuant to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Habitats Regulations). This responsibility falls to me as the competent authority in the context of this appeal.
24. I must therefore consider whether measures could be put in place to avoid or mitigate the impacts of increased recreation pressure arising from the proposed development. The RAMS details mitigation measures that would be funded by financial contributions at a specified tariff per dwelling, which increases with indexation each financial year. These include a range of measures such as education, communication, monitoring and dog related measures as well as site specific projects. This approach is supported by Natural England and I am satisfied that the measures would adequately overcome any adverse effects of the appeal schemes on the SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites.
25. The appellants have provided a receipt from the Council confirming that they have made a contribution of £374.29 for the single additional dwelling proposed. This approach can be problematic as there is no obligation on the Council to spend the money as envisaged and in a particular timescale. However, the evidence before me indicates that the funds have been received by East Suffolk Council, which is the organisation responsible for administering the mitigation strategy. Therefore, I am satisfied that the mitigation measures have been secured and would be used for their intended purpose.
26. The contribution would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. As such, the contribution toward the mitigation schemes would count as mitigation toward maintaining the integrity of the sites.
27. I am therefore satisfied that with the funding for the proposed mitigation measures in place, the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites identified. The proposal would therefore comply with the Habitats Regulations and would be consistent with the biodiversity and conservation aims of Local Plan policy SCLP10.1.

Other Matters

28. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCAA) requires me, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features or special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The Framework sets out when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

29. The Watch-House is a Grade II listed, former coastguard watch house dating from the 1820s. Its significance is derived from its historic use and architectural interest, primarily from the form of the building with its 2-storey watchtower, triangular bay window and surviving internal features. Its materials reflect its close relationship with the Coastguard Cottages to the southwest. It has a strong connection to its coastal setting. The openness of the beach and interrelationship with the prominently-sited Coastguard Cottages contributes to the significance of the building through its setting.
30. The proposed dwelling would be visible within the listed building's wider setting. Looking west from the beach, the pitched roof of the proposed dwelling would protrude to the skyline, but it would be significantly lower than the Coastguard Cottages. Due to its height, form and position within its plot, the roofline of the dwelling would not be a dominant visual presence, and nor would it intrude on the interrelationship between the listed building and Coastguard Cottages.
31. I conclude that the appeal proposal would not harm the significance of the designated heritage asset though development within its setting, such that its setting would be preserved. The proposal would be in line with the aims of Local Plan Policies SCLP11.3 and SCLP11.4 which, taken together and amongst other things, reflect the statutory duty and the aims of the Framework and seek to ensure that where possible development makes a positive contribution to the historic environment.
32. I note the interested parties' detailed documentation of the history of the settlement at Sizewell, and their view that Coastguard Cottages should be considered as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). This is a matter for the Council as local planning authority or for a 'plan making body' as set out in the Framework paragraph 216 and the PPG (Reference ID: 18a-040-20190723). Nevertheless, even if I were to consider the cottages as a NDHA, in line with the Framework I am required to exercise a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Any significance of the cottages is derived from their historic function, elevated position and relationship with the Watch House. As set out in my reasoning above, the proposal would not disrupt this relationship or harm the historic significance, appearance or elevated position of the cottages.
33. Although the main parties agree that the appeal site is located in a 'cluster' for the purposes of SCLP5.4, interested parties dispute this. The appeal site is adjacent to Timber Top to the north, with Coastguard Cottages running to the south. Although there is separation between Coastguard Cottages and the appeal site, the distance is not significant. I note the SPD refers to dwellings not being within a cluster where they would be separated by open fields or 'other extensive open spaces', neither of which could be said of the position of the appeal site relative to surrounding buildings. The linear group of dwellings facing the beach to the south of Sizewell Gap Road in my view forms a loose cluster.
34. The SPD sets out that the highway is considered to be any route in which the public has a right of way. I am satisfied that the appeal site is adjacent to an existing highway, in the form of a PRoW. Whilst the access arrangements to Coastguard Cottages are via a shared private driveway, this is itself accessed from the PRoW. I do not consider that this arrangement would mean that the dwellings in this area south of Sizewell Gap would not form a 'cluster' for the

purposes of Policy SCLP5.4. Additionally, the proposal would not extend built development into the open countryside since it would be replacing outbuildings and there are dwellings to the north and south of the site. Given my conclusions above, I am satisfied that the proposal falls to be considered as part of a cluster of existing dwellings for the purposes of SCLP5.4 (parts a to c). The proposal would be in line with the overall aims of this policy to enable small amounts of development in the countryside that may help to meet local housing needs without harming the natural or historic environment or the landscape.

35. My attention has been drawn to an appeal decision from 1989 (reference T/APP/J3530/A/89/121656/P8) for a dwelling in a plot to the south of the appeal site. The Inspector judged that the access track was unsuitable to serve an additional dwelling, as there were insufficient opportunities for passing, which could lead to vehicles standing or reversing onto the village road at a point where visibility is restricted. Neither did the Inspector consider the site to be within the main cluster of dwellings and would be prominent from shoreline views. As set out in my reasoning, my views do not align with those of the previous Inspector. The legislative and policy context has evolved since this decision, and other matters may also have materially changed since this time. The previous refusal of residential development in a similar location does not in itself indicate that the appeal should be dismissed.
36. The appeal site shares a boundary to the rear with the camping and caravan site of the Vulcan PH. The post and wire fence and hawthorn hedge would be retained, providing screening at garden level. The rear first floor window would be sufficiently set back from the boundary to protect the privacy of users of the campsite. There is limited evidence that the presence of an additional dwelling adjacent to Timber Top, which would have a similar relationship with the campsite to the rear, would prejudice the operation of the campsite or PH.
37. The proposed dwelling is of an acceptable layout and floorspace. There are no windows to habitable rooms which would cause an unacceptable loss of privacy to dwellings either side of the appeal site. The provision of 2 off street parking spaces for the proposed 2-bedroom dwelling would be appropriate and in line with the aims of SCLP7.2.
38. East Suffolk Council cannot demonstrate that it has sufficient allocated housing land to achieve a 5-year housing land supply, with the Council's position currently equivalent to 3.38 years' supply. I have also been referred to the Leiston Neighbourhood Plan (made in 2017) which sets out that the demand for housing within the plan area is primarily for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings. I am therefore satisfied that there is a clearly demonstrated need for housing.
39. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal submitted with the appeal identifies some features of the site as providing suitable habitat and refuges for reptiles, as well as a variety of suitable habitats for nesting birds and bats. The PEA did not identify any bat roosts within the outbuildings to be demolished. Subject to appropriate conditions requiring mitigation measures to be carried out in accordance with the PEA, the scheme is acceptable.
40. I note interested parties' concerns regarding any precedent set by a new dwelling in this location. Each proposal must be considered on its own merits and given that this appeal turns on site specific circumstances, I do not consider that a

dwelling allowed in this location would mean that other residential schemes would necessarily be acceptable.

41. My attention has been drawn to a planning condition restricting the occupation of Timber Top to agricultural workers. This is a matter regarding the occupancy of the host dwelling and is not a matter pertinent to the proposed dwelling.
42. I have also been referred to matters of electricity supply, water pressure and suitability of the site for a septic tank. These matters fall to be controlled under other regulatory regimes.

Conditions

43. The Council has provided some suggested conditions which I have considered against advice in the Framework and PPG. Consequently, I have amended or omitted some of the suggested wording. I have attached the standard commencement time limit condition and plans condition (1 and 2) as this provides clarity.
44. Condition 3 requires the submission of a construction management statement and is necessary to maintain highway and pedestrian safety and safeguard the living conditions of nearby residents. Condition 4 is necessary following the submitted contamination assessment's identification of an inspection pit in one of the outbuildings which may have introduced localised contamination. The condition will ensure any contamination on site is identified and treated so that it does not harm anyone who uses the site in the future. Conditions 3 and 4 are pre-commencement conditions to which the appellant has agreed.
45. Condition 5 is necessary to ensure that sufficient space for on-site vehicle parking is provided, and in the interests of highway safety. The cycle storage required by condition 6 is necessary to extend sustainable transport options and ensure appropriate living conditions for future occupiers; condition 7 is necessary to ensure appropriate living conditions for future occupiers.
46. Conditions 8 and 11 regarding lighting are necessary in the interests of mitigating the effects of lighting on biodiversity and on the landscape. Condition 9 requiring details of materials is necessary to ensure the external appearance of the dwelling is acceptable.
47. The landscaping details required by condition 10 are necessary in the interests of securing an appropriate landscaping scheme in the context of the character and appearance of the NL. This is a pre commencement condition to which the appellant has agreed. Condition 12 is necessary to ensure ecological receptors are protected and enhanced.
48. Condition 13 restricting permitted development is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area given the sensitive location of the appeal site. Whilst the advice in the Framework states that conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights, there is a clear justification in this case for restricting alterations at roof level, extensions, hard standing, outbuildings, fences, and external finishes. Condition 14 is necessary to ensure water efficiency. Condition 15 is necessary in the interests of protecting the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

49. I have not included the Council's suggested condition regarding electric vehicle charging since this is controlled by Building Regulations. Neither have I included the suggested condition regarding the submission of a photographic condition survey of the PRow. The suggested condition as drafted would not meet the test of necessity since the provision of a photographic survey in itself would not ensure the safety or condition of the highway would be maintained.

Conclusion

50. I have found that the proposal is in line with the development plan read as a whole, and the material considerations in this case do not indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

L Francis

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers P363_LP_0.00 rev P.01; P363_BP_0.01 rev P01; P363_SP_0.01 rev P01; P363_GA_0.00 rev P01; P363_GA_0.01 rev P01; P363_GA_0.02 rev P01; P363_GA_0.03 rev P01; P363_GA_0.04 rev P01; P363_GA_0.05 rev P01.
3. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i. the proposed route for access to the site by plant, operatives and delivery vehicles;
 - ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iii. parking for construction workers and visitors;
 - iv. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - v. wheel washing facilities and measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - vi. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - vii. delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

4. No development shall take place until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination, carried out in accordance with British Standard BS 10175: Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice and the Environment Agency, Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) (or equivalent British Standard and Model Procedures if replaced), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If any contamination is found, no development shall take place until:
 - i. a report specifying the measures to be taken, including the timescale, to remediate the site to render it suitable for the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority;
 - ii. the site has been remediated in accordance with the approved measures and timescale; and
 - iii. a verification report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been previously identified, work shall be suspended until:

- i. additional measures for the remediation of the site have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and
 - ii. a verification report for all the remediation works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
5. The dwelling shall not be occupied until the parking area shown on drawing P363_SP_0.01 rev P01 has been completed and made available for use. It shall thereafter be permanently retained only for the parking of vehicles of the occupiers and visitors to the new dwelling.
6. The cycle storage area shown on drawing no. P363_SP_0.01 rev P01 shall be provided in its entirety before the dwelling is first occupied and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.
7. The areas to be provided for the storage and presentation for collection/emptying of refuse and recycling bins as shown on drawing no. P363_SP_0.01 rev P01 shall be provided in their entirety before the dwelling is first occupied and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.
8. All glazing within rooflights must have a Visible Light Transmission (VLT) value of 0.5 or lower and all other glazing a value of 0.65 or lower. Evidence that this has been achieved is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to first occupation of the dwelling.
9. No development above ground level shall take place until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - a) details of the materials and finishes to be used in the construction of the external surfaces
 - b) manufacturers details of the fenestration and doors, including colour.

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

10. No development shall take place until details of a scheme of landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscape works shall include tree and shrub planting, grass, earthworks/redistribution of soil and other operations as appropriate. The works shall be carried out as approved prior to the first occupation of the dwelling or in the first available planting season following such occupation (whichever is sooner). Any new planting which dies, is severely damaged, becomes seriously diseased or is removed within five years of planting shall be replaced by planting of a similar size and species to that originally planted, within the first planting season thereafter.
11. Prior to the installation of any external lighting, a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall:

- a) identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for biodiversity likely to be impacted by lighting and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
- b) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy.

- 12. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the ecological avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures identified within the Preliminary Ecological Assessment (DCS Ecology, 2024).
- 13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development permitted by virtue of Classes AA, A, B, C, D, E, F of Part 1 and Classes A, B and C of Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the Order shall be undertaken.
- 14. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the Building Regulations optional requirement of a water consumption rate of no more than 110 litres per person per day has been complied with.
- 15. Prior to the installation of any air source heat pump, a noise assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The assessment shall include all proposed plant and machinery, based on BS4142:2014+A1:2019. A noise rating level (L_{Ar}, T_r) of at least 5dB below the typical background sound level (L_{A90}, T) should be achieved at the nearest noise sensitive receptor, with details of any necessary noise mitigation measures provided within the noise assessment. The plant shall not be operated until any necessary mitigation measures have been installed.