#### Walberswick Parish Council Planning Response

### DC/25/0481/DRC

#### Seacroft Millfield Road Walberswick Southwold Suffolk IP18 6UD

"DISCHARGE OF CONDITION NO. 10 OF DC/23/3115/FUL - PART DEMOLITION, REFURBISHMENT AND EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOME -LANDSCAPING".

#### 27.03.25

#### 1. Opinion

In the opinion of the Parish Council, efforts should be made tos contact East Suffolk to enquire why the application was approved without the information detailed within the condition having been provided. The Parish Council OBJECTS until this explanation is forthcoming.

#### 2. Description

The below is a screenshot the approval for this Discharge of Condition application issued on 26 March 2025. The deadline for the decision was 03 April 2025.

### Approval of Details Reserved by Condition

#### **Town and Country Planning Act**

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Our reference	DC/25/0481/DRC
Date valid	6 February 2025
Site	Seacroft, Millfield Road, Walberswick
Parish	Walberswick
Proposal	Discharge of Condition No. 10 of DC/23/3115/FUL - Part demolition,
	refurbishment and extension of an existing single family home - Landscaping

The following conditions are discharged:

 This is to confirm that the amended landscape plan, reference 2214\_IFDO\_XX\_00\_DR\_A\_101 Rev T03, received 13/03/2025 in respect of condition 10 of DC/23/3115/FUL are acceptable and, subject to the work being carried out in accordance with the submitted plans, condition 10 of the above consent will have been complied with to the local planning authority's satisfaction.

N.B. This application only relates to the approval of the details associated in connection with the discharge of condition 10, which in this instance is the additional planting. This is not confirmation if planning permission is required for the other works shown on the approved drawing.

# 3. Comment:

Condition 10 states the following:

10. No development shall take place until full details of soft landscape works (including replacement planting) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed number/densities where appropriate; implementation programme. The approved landscaping scheme shall be completed within 6 months from the completion of the development, or such other date as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which die during the first 5 years shall be replaced during the next planting season. Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design.

Previous comments made by the Planning Advisory Group in February 2025 advised that no details of the soft landscaping scheme had been shown on the now superseded site plan. The Landscape officer agrees in his response '*I note that the applicant has elected to supply no soft landscaping proposals.*'

Following comments from East Suffolk Landscape Team and neighbours,

Drawing 2214\_IFDO\_XX\_00\_DR\_A\_101 T02 was revised to T03. The only change was the removal of the air source heat pump (not a soft landscaping proposal) and the addition of 3 No trees. The Landscape officer suggested 3 No Birch trees should be planted, however 2 No Hornbeam and 1 No Caucasian Limes have been proposed. These trees will only reach a maximum height of 3.5m as noted on the drawing, which will do little to screen a large two-storey property. Although contrary to his advice, it is presumed that the Landscape officer is satisfied himself that these are suitable species for this exposed coastal location.

The Landscape officer goes on to say:

'Whilst I accept that the applicant has every expectation that their redevelopment of the property will achieve enhanced coastal views, there should also be an acceptance that the protected landscape setting of the site should be acknowledged and respected.'

The views of the occupant are not a planning consideration and therefore this should be disregarded as a factor in the decision-making process.

It is peculiar that although East Suffolk felt it important enough to include a detailed condition relating to soft landscaping, they have not imposed the majority of the items identified within it. Specific items of importance noted in the condition are:

- No development shall take place until full details of soft landscape works (including replacement planting) has been submitted...
- The Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed number/densities where appropriate; implementation programme.

In response to the above:

• It is not considered that 3 No small trees are a replacement for the loss of 7 No trees identified for removal within the original application.

- No replacement planting has been proposed along the boundaries with neighbouring properties.
- No planting plans have been submitted.
- No written specification or details of other operations associated with plant establishment have been included.

It is therefore inexplicable why this condition has been discharged when the information included is incomplete and why the decision was made over a week in advance of the determination deadline.

In addition, a number of items have still been included in this application and on the drawings which do not form part of the soft landscaping scheme, but should be considered by East Suffolk:

- Sunken paved terrace
- Paved deck
- Gravel drive (North parking)
- New gate for North parking
- New slatted fence

## 4. Summary

This application has been poorly detailed and the condition does not appear to have been given due consideration by either the applicant or East Suffolk Council. If East Suffolk do not intend to uphold the details of the conditions they have imposed on approvals, they should reconsider their inclusion.