

Delegated or Committee Planning Application Report and Report of Handling as required by Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 relative to applications for Planning Permission or Planning Permission in Principle

Reference No: 23/00652/PP

Planning Hierarchy: Local Application

Applicant: Ms Gail Crawford

Proposal: Alterations and extensions

Site Address: 4 West Lennox Drive Helensburgh Argyll And Bute G84 9AD

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT NO. 1

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

This report provides Members with an update following their decision at the 18th October 2023 PPSL meeting to continue the application for a pre-determination hearing and site visit.

The purpose of this report is to update members on various matters that have arisen subsequent to the PPSL meeting as follows;

- 1) Update members that the proposed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for the copper beech tree within the garden grounds of 2a Upper Colquhoun Street, Helensburgh (the neighbouring property to the application site), which PPSL members recommended approval for on the 18th October 2023 will be the subject of a provisional TPO as of the 08.02.2024.

- 2) Advise members that additional information has been submitted by the objectors in the form of an arboricultural report which was submitted on the 30.01.2024. The arboricultural report submitted by objectors was commissioned to survey and assess the copper beech tree which lies in the garden grounds of 2a Upper Colquhoun Street. This report is based on the BS (British Standard) 5837 (2012) – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction, and uses the standard calculation for determining a tree's root protection area. It is noted within this report that the copper beech tree has been assessed within its current context and without regard to proposed development.

This report includes a drawing based on the BS calculations which shows that the root protection area of the neighbouring copper beech tree would include areas within the footprint of the proposed extension and areas where it is proposed to demolish the existing single story element. In theory the root protection area represents a

construction exclusion zone which could therefore, effect the ability of the applicants to undertake the proposals. It is noted that under section 4.6 of the BS 5837 for single stem trees, the root protection area should be calculated as an area equivalent to a circle with a radius 12 times the stem diameter. The diameter of the copper beech tree has been measured as 1.2m which would equate to a circular root protection area of 14.4m centred on the base of the stem as shown on the arboricultural report supplied by the objectors.

This report also goes into specifics about the copper beech tree and summarised that the tree is a mature and healthy tree and that older trees such as this tree are more vulnerable to harm and that the root system of the tree would be damaged by the proposed development which would encroach heavily into the root protection area.

Note: Full details of the report can be view on the Council's website at www.argyll-bute.gov.uk

- 3) Advise members that further information has been submitted by the applicant by way of a further arboricultural report received on the 05.02.2024. This report was commissioned by the applicants to add more detail, site specific information and to assess the impact the specific development would have on retained trees. This report is in line with the report provided by objectors in terms of the tree's location and size. When explaining the standard method to calculate a trees root protection area within section 2 of this supplementary report it is noted that the BS, goes into more detail and notes that where pre-existing site conditions or other factors indicate that rooting has occurred asymmetrically, a polygon of equivalent area should be produced in lieu of a standard circular root protection area. The BS then notes that modifications to the shape of the root protection area should reflect a soundly based arboricultural assessment of likely root distribution. Within the arboricultural report submitted by the applicants the root protection area has been adapted to reflect this which has been plotted on the submitted tree constraints plan (contained within this report).

During the survey for this report it was found that through probing and some limited excavations in and around the proposed development area, a number of small roots were discovered. One in particular was noted in a position that suggested its enlargement was being promoted by the presence of water from a leaking or defective drain. The report then notes that in the absence of any development proposals it is recommended that the soil volumes around the service runs (of which there are several in this area) be excavated and all roots of any size be cleanly severed. As the discovered roots did not exceed 35mm diameter and were generally less the report notes that in these circumstances the adverse effects on the tree would be minimal.

This report also observed that recent works to the tree have resulted in an over 10 branch removal wound on the tree between a height of about 4 metres and 12 metres and that none of these wounds have occluded, and in a tree of this age and species they might never do so. In such situations a tree that is still growing is stature will normally use its full rooting area to muster reserves and water supplies to rapidly replace the lost areas of crown. However, for the surveyed tree the vigour is limited and no increase in stature can be expected. The converse is therefore to be expected, namely that the tree's reliance on the roots in the quarter where significant crown reduction has been done will reduce. For these reasons it can reasonably be foreseen

that any roots within the development area, over 4 metres from the edge of the crown spread, are of secondary importance to the vitality of the tree.

The report then goes on to note that notwithstanding the root protection area that is represented on the tree constraints plan it is the arborists opinion that the roots within the development area can and should be severed without significantly damaging the vitality of the tree. It is also noted that this area is expected to comprise of less than 5% of the root protection area and less than 2% of the total rooting area of the tree and as such, no significant damage to the vitality of the tree can be foreseen. This report then summarises that regardless of the development proposals, it is recommended that all roots in and around and interfering with services in the area adjacent to the existing house be severed. And notes that this can be done using statutory exemptions from conservation area or tree preservation controls.

Note: Full details of the report can be view on the Council's website at www.argyll-bute.gov.uk

- 4) Advise Members of officer's response to the above additional tree information – the two arboricultural reports described above. It can be confirmed to members that exemptions apply to works on a tree protected by a TPO and that these works can be undertaken without consent from the planning authority. For reference, the statutory exemptions are contained under The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 Section 160 part (6)(B) for trees with preservation controls and, The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order and Trees in Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Regulations 2010 Section 8 part (K)(ii) for trees in conservation areas.

Based on the above it has been confirmed that the proposed development would encroach on the copper beech tree's root protection area as detailed using differing methods within both arboricultural reports. The tree protection area is larger than that shown on the original site plan provided by the applicant. This has implications for how to assess the matter of the tree roots in relation to the proposal. The report provided by the applicants has gone into a more detailed assessment and has identified that roots within the development site are effecting services within the site and that these roots require to be cut back and can be cut back without consent. Within this report it has been further noted that due to the historical works to the copper beech tree it is considered that tree's reliance on the roots where the crown reduction has been undertaken will reduce and for these reasons it can reasonably be foreseen that any roots within the development area, over 4 metres from the edge of the crown spread, are of secondary importance to the vitality of the tree. This coupled with the report's findings that the roots should be cut back due to impact on drainage/services via an exemption and the area that is expected to be comprised (by either the development, or root cutting via an exemption) would be less than 5% of the root protection area and less than 2% of the total rooting area of the tree.

Based on the above the authority is satisfied that the copper beech tree will not be adversely effected by the proposals and therefore our recommendation remains one of **approval** but subject to the amended recommended conditions as appended to this supplementary report. These conditions can now be tied more closely to the recent arboricultural report and tree constraints plan. To summarise officers have removed condition numbers 8 and 9, and have replaced these with a single condition (now

condition 8) that provides protection to all trees and references the tree survey and arboricultural method statement provided by the applicant.

- 5) Advise Members that further additional information has been submitted by the applicant on the 05.02.2024. The additional information submitted includes updated plans and elevations to provide clarity on the extent of proposed development. The only changes to the plans is a change to the yellow hatch to show the extent of the proposed developments footprint and the updated location and root protection area of the copper beech tree, there have been no physical alterations to the design of proposals. Further to the above the applicants have also submitted an updated design & access statement and an updated drainage drawing. The only change to the design & access statement is that a section has been added to include an analysis of built form to open space on sites within the Hillhouse, Helensburgh Conservation Area and also a section including examples of two storey side extensions, the conclusions within this statement have also been updated to reflect this. The updated drainage drawing is to reflect the root protection area as shown on the tree constrains plan provided within the applicant's arboricultural report so that the proposed drainage alterations are out with this area. The updated drawings are as follows;

Proposed location / block plans Ref: RDH.AR(PL)010 REV E

Proposed ground floor plan Ref: RDH.AR(PL)011 REV D

Proposed first floor plan Ref: RDH.AR(PL)012 REV D

Proposed roof plan Ref: RDH.AR(PL)013 REV E

Proposed south elevation Ref: RDH.AR(PL)014 REV E

Proposed west elevation Ref: RDH.AR(PL)015 REV D

Proposed north elevation Ref: RDH.AP(PL)016 REV E

Proposed east elevation Ref: RDH.AP(PL)017 REV E

Proposed drainage drawing Ref: 2302-07-900 REV D

Design & access statement REV C

Note: Full details of the revised drawings can be view on the Council's website at www.argyll-bute.gov.uk

- 6) Advise Members for clarity during the PPSL presentation on the 18th October 2023 it was noted by officers that there was an error within the main report of handling in regards to the total built element on the site resulting from the proposals. This has been double checked and the main report of handling as published is correct. To confirm:

- the existing house has a foot print of approximately 161sqm,
- the existing single storey element which is proposed to be demolished has a footprint of approximately 55sqm,
- the existing garage which is proposed to be demolished has a foot print of approximately 30sqm and
- the existing sheds which are proposed to be demolished have a combined foot print of approximately 18sqm.

This equates to a total existing built element of approximately 264sqm which represents 12% of the overall plot.

In comparison the proposals seek to:

- remove the existing single storey element and replace this with a larger 2 storey extension which has a footprint of approximately 90sqm,
- replace the existing garage with a larger garage/gym which has a foot print of approximately 70sqm and
- lastly the proposals seek to erect a new external link canopy between the new extension and garage/gym which has a foot print of approximately 25sqm.

The proposals therefore, equate to the resultant proposed built element on the site as being approximately 346sqm which represents 16% of the overall plot, an **increase of 82sqm** / 3.8% to the overall built footprint on the site.

- 7) Advise Members that following the publication of the main report of handling, officers have received further representations. Two of these were verbally addressed during the 18th October 2023 PPSL presentation by officers. However, we have since received two further objections. This has resulted in a total of 30 (29 objections and 1 representation). The main report of handling summarised that there were a total of 29 representations (28 objections and 1 representation). Out of the 4 subsequent representations 1 was from a new party and the remaining 3 were from existing objectors. Details of the contributors and comments **not** addressed within the main report are as follows;

Objection comments were received from:

Fiona Baker Hillcroft Station Road Rhu Helensburgh G82 8LW 09.10.2023
 Further objection from; Suzanne & Scott Hamilton Whincroft 2A Upper Colquhoun Street Helensburgh 09.10.2023
 Further objection from; John Shelton 3 West Douglas Drive Helensburgh Argyll and Bute G84 9AL 31.01.2024
 Further joint objection from; David Henderson, Corinne Henderson, Alistair McLuskey, Liliana Sheychenko, John Butt, Sally Butt, Max Carruthers, Lesley Carruthers, Fiona Baker, Alastair Wilson, Suzanne Hamilton, John Shelton, Sally Shelton 31.01.2024

Summary of points raised:

- Objector notes that the local authority have failed to refer to the Helensburgh conservation area appraisal which is a material consideration and that the authority have neglected this documents recommendations.

Comment; this is a key document which the design and conservation officer has taken into account and specifically mentions within their consultation responses. The consultation responses from the design and conservation officer are a material consideration which has been taken into account when determining the application.

- Objector notes that the computer generated images, as presented at PPSL, are inaccurate and that the scale is wrong and therefore minimises the impact.

Comment; please note that these images have been provided by the applicants to best show the proposals massing in 3D, computer generated images do not have a scale as they are 3D and use perspective. The images have been submitted as part of the

application package along scaled 2D plans, elevations and sections to help officers best understand the massing of the design and how this relates to the existing property.

- Objector notes that the copper beech tree within the neighbouring garden is shown on the applicant's drawings is shown in different positions on different plans.

Comment; this is noted, however, as we now have a arboricultural report available provided by objectors which shows the trees correct location and size, and a further arboricultural report from the applicant which correlates this. The local authority is satisfied that the tree has been correctly located on the amended plans.

- Objector notes that photographs taken by the design and conservation officer where taken from obscure positions which minimise the impact of the proposals.

Comment; it is noted that the planning officer, the area team leader and the design and conservation officer where involved in the site visit when these photographs were taken and that the photographs taken were the best available shots and they were in no way taken from obscure positions but from the best available positions at that time to best show the site/context.

- Objector notes that the applicant's drawings are not to scale and this was not addressed within the main report of handling.

Comment; this is noted however the original drawings submitted include the required scale bar, scale notation and format size as do the amended ones.

- Objector notes that at the PPSL meeting officers incorrectly stated that there had been no objections to the proposed external finish colours and materials

Comment; this is noted however, within the main report of handling within section F specific mention under section 'the summary of issues raised' explained that this had been raised in regards to the concerns over the proposed external finishes.

- Objectors request the local authority ensure that BS 5837 (2012) is applied in full as a condition on any approval.

Comment; this is noted and due to the findings as described within the initial section 4 of this report alternative conditions have been recommended which are appended to this report and these ensure compliance with BS 5837.

- Objectors note that a tree protection plan including root protection area and tree survey by a qualified person should have been submitted as part of the application to ensure the protection of the neighbouring copper beech tree's to the standards as set out in BS 5837 (2012).

Comment: this is noted however, the drawings submitted with the application indicated that the proposed development was located out with the copper beech trees canopy and could comply with tree and root protection measures as per the BS within the recommended conditions. Given this and the element of separation the authority did not challenge this. Having been presented with further info, we acknowledge that the original tree protection area was incorrect and we have reassessed this and have suggested revised conditions in relation to tree protection.

- Objector notes that planning officers should have requested the above information to best inform their recommendations prior to determination.

Comment; as above

- Concern that objectors comments in relation to the neighbouring copper beech tree were not fully taken into account by officers within the report of handling (the objector has provided a summary of the combined points raised by all objectors within their representation)

Comment; this is noted however, it is confirmed that the full comments are made available to members and public on the councils website, furthermore, these comments have been summarised and addressed within the report of handling. Please also note that the authority's biodiversity officer was consulted in regards to the proposed tree protection order for the Copper Beech tree which was progressed within the context of this application

- Concern that the applicants have not accurately surveyed the copper beech tree and therefore, their measurements and drawings are incorrect. The applicants have shown the root protection area as being 12m however, the objectors arboricultural report notes this dimension as 14.4m. This under sizing could lead to implications in terms of the ability to implement the proposals as the development could be within the copper beech tree's root protection area

Comment: this is noted and as above we acknowledge there was an error in the original submission but subsequently the applicants commissioned a further arboricultural report the details of which have been summarised in section 4 of this report. These findings have informed officer's recommendations as contained within this supplementary report.

- Objector notes that the applicants submitted drawings do not correctly show the; size, location and root protection area of the copper beech tree within the neighbouring garden. Another objector notes a similar point, that the position of the copper beech tree is not correct on the applicant's submission and is in fact 3.5m out south & west of the real location of the tree.

Comment; we now have two arboricultural reports which show the size, location and root protection area for the copper beech tree, this has been taken into account within the recommendations of this supplementary report and we acknowledge that the original plans had some errors that were missed.

- Objector notes that the root protection area of the neighbouring copper beech tree extends into the construction zone for the proposals which would negatively affect the tree and no building works should be undertaken within the root protection area of the copper beech tree.

Comment: this is noted and subsequently the applicants commissioned a further arboricultural report the details of which have been summarised in section 4 of this report. These findings have informed officer's recommendations as contained within this supplementary report.

- Objector note that the other trees within the site and on neighbouring properties have also been shown incorrectly on drawings in terms of location, size and root protection areas

Comment; The applicant's arboricultural report notes that even though there are other neighbouring trees and shrubs, either none are within the distance where roots would be affected or they have such a small stem diameter that they do not require to be protected. The report states "there are no other offsite trees that overhang the development area or are located beyond it within a distance of up to 12 times their estimated stem diameter. Several shrub species were noted but generally considered not to come within the remit of the British Standard and individuals would only be recorded if they had the stature of what one would ordinarily call a tree."

- Concern that the recommended safeguarding conditions contained within the report of handling are insufficient to protect the copper beech from harm.

Comment; at the time of issuing the main report of handling officers assessed the information that they had before them and recommended the conditions as contained within the main report of handling, subsequently the applicants commissioned a further arboricultural report the details of which have been summarised in section 4 of this report. These findings have informed officer's recommendations as contained within this supplementary report.

- Objector notes that the potential impact on the neighbouring copper beech tree should be a material planning consideration.

Comment; the original report of handling makes it clear that this is a material consideration and it remains a material planning consideration.

Note: *All other comments are addressed in the main body of the report. Full details of all representations can be view on the Council's website at www.argyll-bute.gov.uk. It is considered that the points that have been made are addressed appropriately above and within the main report of handling.*

8) **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the revised list of conditions and reasons appended to this report.

REVISED CONDITIONS AND REASONS RELATIVE TO APPLICATION REF. NO. 23/00652/PP

Standard Time Limit Condition (as defined by Regulation)

Standard Condition on Soil Management During Construction

Additional Conditions

1. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the details specified on the application form dated **23/04/2023**, supporting information and, the approved drawings listed in the table below unless the prior written approval of the planning authority is obtained for an amendment to the approved details under Section 64 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

Plan Title	Plan Ref No	Version	Date Received
(PL)001 Existing location plan & Block plan	1 of 33	B	28.07.2023
(PL)002 Existing ground floor plan	2 of 33	A	30.03.2023
(PL)003 Existing first floor plan	3 of 33	A	22.05.2023
(PL)004 Existing roof plan	4 of 33	B	18.09.2023
(PL)005 Existing South elevation	5 of 33	B	18.09.2023
(PL)006 Existing West elevation	6 of 33	B	18.09.2023
(PL)007 Existing North elevation	7 of 33	B	18.09.2023
(PL)008 Existing East elevation	8 of 33	B	18.09.2023
(PL)010 Proposed location plan & Block plan	9 of 33	E	05.02.2024
(PL)011 Proposed ground floor plan	10 of 33	D	05.02.2024
(PL)012 Proposed first floor plan	11 of 33	D	05.02.2024

(PL)013 Proposed roof plan	12 of 33	E	05.02.2024
(PL)014 Proposed South elevation	13 of 33	E	05.02.2024
(PL)015 Proposed West elevation	14 of 33	D	05.02.2024
(PL)016 Proposed North elevation	15 of 33	E	05.02.2024
(PL)017 Proposed East elevation	16 of 33	E	05.02.2024
(PL)018 Proposed section A-A	17 of 33	A	28.07.2023
(PL)020 Existing window schedule	18 of 33	A	22.05.2023
(PL)021 Proposed window replacements	19 of 33	A	24.04.2023
(PL)030 Existing door schedule	20 of 33	A	22.05.2023
(PL)040 Images of areas for demolition	21 of 33	A	24.04.2023
(PL)050 Existing section A-A	22 of 33	A	18.09.2023
(PL)051 Existing section B-B	23 of 33	A	18.09.2023
(PL)052 Proposed section C-C	24 of 33	A	18.09.2023
(PL)053 Proposed section B-B	25 of 33	A	18.09.2023
(PL)054 Proposed section C-C	26 of 33	A	18.09.2023
(PL)055 Proposed section D-D	27 of 33	A	18.09.2023
(PL)056 Proposed section E-E	28 of 33	A	18.09.2023
Proposed drainage drawing	29 of 33	D	06.02.2024
Windows design & access statement	30 of 33	A	24.04.2023

Design & access statement	31 of 33	C	06.02.2024
Visual impact assessment	32 of 33	A	22.09.2023
Tree survey report	33 of 33	-	05.02.2024

Reason: For the purpose of clarity, to ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the approved details.

2. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Prior to work starting on site samples of the proposed materials to be used for the external finishes of the development hereby granted consent shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to any work starting on site. Samples to include; canopy finishes, render finish to external walls, retaining wall finish, garage door finish, perforated 'scalloped' powder coated aluminium cladding finish, roof finish, window frame finish and flashing finish.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in order to integrate the proposal with its surroundings.

3. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Prior to work starting on site full details of the design of doors/windows to the proposed extension and garage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority in the form of drawings at a scale of 1:20.

Reasons: To ensure appropriate detailing and to maintain the overall quality and character of the development and the surrounding environment.

4. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Prior to work starting on site samples of the natural stone proposed to be used for window infills and repairs to the existing building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the existing building match the existing building.

5. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans the window replacements to the existing building shall be vertically sliding timber sash and casement windows. Details of all the windows, including the size of windows, size of mullions, number of astragals, which shall physically divide the window into separate panes, method of opening, depth of recess and colour shall be submitted in the form of drawings scale 1:20 and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to work starting on site.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the proposals do not adversely affect the architectural and historic character of the building.

6. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Prior to work commencing on site full details of the proposed reconstruction of the wall ends and any piers or gate posts and gate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: *To ensure that the development is undertaken in a manner which minimises the visual impact of the alterations in the streetscape and preserves as far as possible the integrity of the boundary wall in question.*

7. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Development shall not begin until details of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Details of the scheme shall include:

- i) location and design, including materials, of walls, fences and gates
- ii) Existing landscaping features and trees/vegetation to be retained;
- iii) soft and hard landscaping works, including the location, type and size of each individual tree and/or shrub
- iv) programme for completion and subsequent on-going maintenance.

All the hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the scheme approved in writing by the Planning Authority. All planting, seeding or turfing as may be comprised in the approved details shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the commencement of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Any trees or plants which within a period of ten years from the completion of the development die, for whatever reason are removed or damaged shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of the same size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Please note that any hard landscaping proposed shall be permeable as to not impact on the surface water drainage for the site.

Reason: *To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping.*

8. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; all trees within and overhanging the application site, must be protected in accordance with methods as set out in BS5837/2012 including the erection of appropriate fencing during and until completion of all site operations and building works. A lesser protection zone will be allowed in relation to the neighbouring copper beech tree as per the approved tree protection plan contained within the Tree Survey Report dated February 2024 prepared by Julian A Morris (doc ref; Issue 240205). The Arboricultural Method Statement as contained within the Tree Survey Report dated February 2024 prepared by Julian A Morris (doc ref; Issue 240205) shall be adhered to in full, subject to the pre-arranged tree protection monitoring and site supervision, by a suitably qualified tree specialist.

Reason: *To safeguard and enhance the character and amenity of the site and locality and to avoid any irreversible damage to retained trees.*

9. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Prior to work starting on site, full details of any external lighting to be used within the site or along its access shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Such details shall include full details of the location, type, angle of direction and wattage of each light which shall be so positioned and angled to prevent any glare or light spillage outwith the site boundary.

Reason: *In order to avoid the potential of light pollution infringing on surrounding land uses/properties.*

10. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; The first floor glazing to the North elevation (shower room window) and the first floor glazing to the West elevation (behind the proposed screening) of the proposed extension shall be of obscure glass and maintained in perpetuity in obscure glass to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

Reason: *In order to protect the privacy and amenity of adjacent properties.*

11. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Prior to work starting on site details of the replacement chimney pots to the existing building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: *In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the proposals do not adversely affect the architectural and historic character of the building.*

12. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; Prior to work starting on site identification and assessment of all potential sources of nuisance, including noise/ vibration, dust, and any temporary lighting provided, which may cause disturbance to nearby residents during the demolition / construction process should be undertaken by the applicant. This should include consideration of intended hours of operation, movement of vehicles, use of plant and storage of equipment and materials on site.

For all potential sources of nuisance the applicant will be required to provide a management plan with details of suitable control measures to be put in place so as to ensure that construction does not cause loss of amenity to local residents and/or statutory nuisance.

Reason: *In order to avoid sources of nuisance in the interest of amenity.*

13. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; In order to minimise, as far as necessary, the level of noise and/or vibration to which nearby existing residents will be exposed during the construction process the hours of operation of the site should be restricted to 08.00 to 18:30 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays. There should be no operation on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: *In order to avoid sources of nuisance in the interest of amenity.*