

DARLINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE: 19 November 2025

APPLICATION REF. NO:	25/00255/FUL
STATUTORY DECISION DATE:	19 th May 2025 (Extension of Time until 20 th November)
WARD/PARISH:	Hurworth / Hurworth Parish Council
LOCATION:	2 Meadowbank Close, Hurworth Place, Darlington
DESCRIPTION:	Erection of part single storey, part two storey extension to front elevation
APPLICANT:	Mr Nigel Jeffries

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

Application documents including application forms, submitted plans, supporting technical information, consultations responses and representations received, and other background papers are available on the Darlington Borough Council website via the following link:

<https://publicaccess.darlington.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=SSR6TPFPG9W00>

APPLICATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

1. This application site relates to a detached dwelling located at 2 Meadowbank Close, Hurworth Place within Darlington. Adjacent to the North is 1 Meadowbank Close and adjacent to the South is 3 Meadowbank Close. The frontage of this application site faces Westward, onto the shared access for the properties located on Meadowbank Close. Furthermore, the application site is located within flood zones 2 and 3.
2. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part single storey and part two storey front extension. The current frontage has an existing projecting element, from which the proposed two storey extension would project 3m from this part of the building. The proposed single storey extension would also project 3m from the main front elevation, but the canopy section to go over the new front door, would tie in with the front aspect of the two storey element.
3. It should be noted that the drawings have been revised to omit a previously approved loft conversion which was shown on the plans. However, this loft conversion and associated

dormer windows were not implemented, and the period of time in which to carry out these works has expired. Therefore, the plans have been updated for accuracy purposes, as it is understood that the loft conversion shown on the original submission was an error. In addition, the applicant also decided to update the style of the proposed bi-fold doors to double doors. The design of which is considered very similar to the previous submission. The plans were also recently updated to remove the two ground floor side windows serving the lobby area, in order to address neighbour concerns.

SITE HISTORY

Application Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20/00126/FUL	Conversion of integral garage into a habitable room including replacing garage doors with bi-folding doors	Granted with Conditions	09.04.20
20/00862/FUL	Erection of single storey garden room/gym extension and single storey store extension to rear elevation and relocation of existing pergola (as amended by plans received 18.11.20)	Granted with Conditions	03.12.20
21/00619/FUL	Conversion of loft into habitable accommodation including the insertion of dormer and velux windows	Granted with Conditions	16.07.21
21/00798/CU	Change of use from open space to domestic curtilage with erection of 1.8m high boundary fence to rear of property (Retrospective Application)	Granted with Conditions	29.10.21

4. Further to the change of use application (Ref; 21/00798/CU), it is noted that the additional land that was approved as domestic curtilage is not included in the red edge for this application. However, as the works relate to the frontage of the property, the red edge on this occasion is considered suitable to demonstrate both the application site and where construction access can be obtained from. Therefore, in this instance, it was not considered necessary to revise the red edge for this application.

MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

5. The main planning issues are whether the proposed works are acceptable in terms of their impact on:
 - (a) Character
 - (b) Amenity
 - (c) Highway Safety
 - (d) Flood Risk
 - (e) Residual Matters

PLANNING POLICIES

6. The application has been considered in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and relevant policies of the Darlington Local Plan, which seek to ensure that new development:

- Reflects the local environment and creates an individual sense of place with distinctive character (*Policy DC1*).
 - Has a detailed design which responds positively to the local context, through scale, form, height, layout, materials, colouring, fenestration and architectural detailing (*Policy DC1*).
 - Provides suitable and safe vehicular access and suitable servicing and parking arrangements in accordance with Policy IN4 (*Policy DC1*).
 - New development will be focused in areas of low flood risk (Flood Zone 1). In accordance with National Policy a site specific flood risk assessment will be required. Development proposals will be expected to mitigate and adapt to climate change, designed to ensure they are safe over the lifetime of the development and to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere (*Policy DC2*).
 - Is sited, designed and laid out to protect the amenity of existing users of neighbouring land and buildings and the amenity of the intended users of the new development (*Policy DC4*).
 - Will be suitably located and acceptable in terms of privacy and overlooking, access to sunlight and daylight as well as any visual dominance and overbearing effects (*Policy DC4*).
 - Adheres to the separation distances within the guidance set out in the Design of New Development SPD (*Policy DC4*).
 - Will provide safe and secure vehicle parking and servicing. The number of spaces required will depend on the nature of the proposal as well as the local circumstances and standards set out within the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide (*Policy IN4*).
7. The application has also been considered alongside the Darlington Design of New Development SPD.

RESULTS OF TECHNICAL CONSULTATION

8. No objections have been raised by the Council's Highway Engineer as the proposed development is not considered to create additional parking demand or impact upon existing parking arrangements.
9. No objections were raised by the Parish Council.

RESULTS OF PUBLICITY AND NOTIFICATION

10. Multiple objection comments have been received by three neighbouring properties and a further three properties within the wider area have also submitted objection comments; a total of six properties raising objection comments.
11. These comments have been reviewed and summarised below. These comments and their associated documents and photographs can be viewed in full online at the link given at the start of this officer report. It should be noted that the applicant also submitted two response letters which are available for public viewing.
12. A total of three objectors raised the following concerns on the originally submitted scheme:

- Impact upon character
 - Overdevelopment
 - Overbearing and overshadowing impacts
 - Impact upon light
 - Loss of outlook
 - Impact upon privacy
 - Increased noise levels
 - Impact upon views
 - Restrictive covenants / Housing management company restrictions
 - Construction noise, dust and general disturbance
 - Construction safety concerns
 - Construction could damage neighbouring driveways/ properties
 - Additional construction traffic creating a nuisance
 - Impacts to a nearby protected tree
13. Revised plans were submitted in May to show the correct onsite situation i.e. no loft conversion or associated dormers. The revisions also showed a change in style of the proposed doors to the front of the extension; from bi-fold doors to double doors. A re-consultation was carried out on these revised plans and in response, five objectors sent letters of objection which highlighted some of the above issues as well as raising the following additional issues:
- Consultation to the wider area should have been carried out
 - Flood/ Drainage impacts
 - Development would set a precedent
14. In August revised plans were submitted to show the removal of the proposed two ground floor side windows serving the lobby area of the proposed extension. A re-consultation was later carried out and in response, three objectors provided further objection comments. These again raised issues previously highlighted above, with further comments raising the following additional issues:
- The approved plans and design and access statement of the original planning approval for this housing site (Ref; 13/01001/FUL) should be taken into consideration (documents attached / referred to within the objection comment). The comments state that the development breaches these character and design principles.
 - The Flood Risk Assessment and Environment Agency conditions from planning approval 13/01001/FUL and 21/00288/FUL (to create a gated access at this housing site along with other associated works) should be taken into consideration (documents attached/ referred to within the objection comment)
 - Permitted development rights are limited.
 - 45 degree rule would be breached.

PLANNING ISSUES/ANALYSIS

(a) Character

15. Local policy DC1 seeks to secure good design and that proposals reflect the local environment and creates an individual sense of place with distinctive character. Detailed

design should respond positively to the local context, in terms of its scale, form, height, layout, materials, colouring, fenestration and architectural detailing.

16. The scale of the development is considered to be proportionate to the main dwelling, and the materials are to be of a similar appearance as the host dwelling. The roof would be of a pitched roof design and would remain at a lower height than the main ridgeline. Whilst the proposed fenestration would be different to the existing situation, it is considered to generally follow the character of the main front dwelling. The proposed front fenestration would also not appear significantly out of context for a modern domestic dwelling. Therefore, on balance, the proposed works are not considered to significantly harm the character of the building or wider area and it is thereby in accordance with local policy.
17. Objections have been raised regarding the impact upon the character of the plot and wider street scene. Such comments have stated that the development would not follow the character of the area and it would re-position the host dwelling to the front by creating a significant forwards projection, thereby impacting upon the uniform design of the application site and neighbouring dwellings. A concern was also raised regarding the reduced front garden area and that further information should be submitted to assess this impact.
18. However, the submitted scaled drawings are considered sufficient to make an informed judgement on these proposed works. Whilst the front extension is of a notable scale, it is noted that the host dwelling and surrounding properties are large in nature and so it is considered that these properties are capable of accommodating large extensions where appropriate. Nevertheless, the frontage of the host dwelling is not being re-positioned, it is being extended via a forward projecting extension. This proposed extension would not extend beyond the main building line of this street and therefore the development is not considered to appear overly prominent.
19. Objections have stated that the proposed extension would create an L-shaped design, which would be out of character for this housing site. They consider that the two end properties are L-shaped in design and it would therefore be inappropriate to introduce this design to this host dwelling. However, it is noted that the extension would not go beyond the main building line for this street and the extension is considered to be of a suitable scale. As such, the proposed extension is not considered to appear significantly out of character in this regard.
20. Objection comments go on to say that the host dwelling is in a recessed position and has been designed in that way as part of the original housing site design. They consider that anything beyond these design principles should be refused due to an impact upon character for the area. However, the Design and Access Statement to which the objectors refer, was submitted with a previous planning application (Ref; 13/01001/FUL), to inform a planning decision at that moment in time. It does not therefore set a 'blueprint' for future developments; any future development proposals are assessed against relevant planning policies in force at that time and this development has been assessed accordingly.

21. The overall design of the proposed development is considered to be reflective of the host dwelling character and wider street scene. It is also noted that the properties on this street do vary in design slightly. Consideration is had for the Northern neighbouring property which does have a projecting element. Whilst it is noted that this is situated within a cul-de-sac setting, the application site is the next property adjacent to this and therefore is considered to be set in a location that is not highly prominent. Nevertheless, the proposed front extension does not project beyond the main building line for this housing site and is not therefore considered to result in a prominent form of development that would be out of character for both this plot and street scene.
22. Concerns have been raised regarding the window/ door design to the frontage as they have been increased in width. However, the proposed openings are considered proportionate to the main dwelling and would generally follow the character of the main dwelling. It should also be noted that there are no permitted development rights removed from the property, so the existing front openings of the host dwelling could be changed to full height openings. As such the frontage of this application site could be altered, regardless of this planning application. This change is not considered to appear so out of character as to warrant a reason for refusal.
23. Reference was made about the development resulting in overdevelopment of the site. It is noted that there have been various planning works at this application site over the years. However, given the extent of the previous works and the nature of this scheme, it is not considered to result in overdevelopment of the site. The previously proposed loft conversion approval has since expired and cannot therefore be implemented in conjunction with this application. In addition, it should be noted that the front garden area would be reduced, but would not need to be completely removed, thereby retaining a degree of openness to this front elevation. The development is also situated within the application site and no encroachment onto third party land would occur.
24. With regards to the proposed extension and its proximity to No. 3 Meadowbank Close, the driveway of 3 Meadowbank Close creates a separation between this neighbouring property and the host dwelling. As such, upon completion of the proposed front extension, there would be an approximate remaining separation distance between the two properties of about 3.8m. This is considered a sufficient distance to not create a terracing impact between the two properties. And as the development would be roughly in line with the front of this neighbouring property, it is not considered to significantly 'close-off' of this area of street scene, to the detriment of the character of this area.
25. Concerns were raised that this development would set a precedent for other properties to extend their frontages. In the event of such development requiring planning permission, any proposals would be treated on their own merits in light of the situation prevailing at that time. However, this application is being considered on its individual merits with regard to the relevant planning policies and material planning considerations.

26. Concerns have been raised regarding an adjacent protected tree and any associated damage from the development. However, whilst the nearby tree is formally protected via a TPO, it is located approximately 20 metres away from the proposed development. Also the tree canopy of this tree does not overhang onto the application site. Overall, it is not considered that further information needs to be provided on this occasion to assess the impact of the tree or to provide tree protection measures, as this can be sufficiently conditioned.

(b) Amenity

27. Local policy DC4 has regard to protecting the amenity of existing users of neighbouring land and buildings and the amenity of the intended users of the new development. New development will be supported in regard to amenity, where it is suitably located and is considered acceptable in terms of impacts on amenity and privacy.
28. The development is not considered to create an adverse overbearing or overshadowing impact due to the siting of the development in relation to the siting and orientation of neighbouring properties. This argument is also applicable when assessing privacy and loss of outlook impacts, which will be discussed in more detail below. But in summary and on balance, the proposed works are not considered to significantly harm residential amenity levels, and the development is therefore considered to be in accordance with local policy.
29. Objections have raised concerns in regard to overbearing and overshadowing impacts. The development would be sited approximately 3.8m away from No. 3 Meadowbank Close and the development would be sited approximately 7.4m away from the nearest part of the building of No. 1 Meadowbank Close. These distances are considered sufficient to not create an adverse overbearing and overshadowing impact, especially taking into account that the development is set to the front. As such, front garden areas and driveway areas of these neighbouring properties are not considered to be areas whereby private amenity space is used, and therefore, it is not considered to create an impact upon amenity in this regard. The development is considered to be situated at a sufficient distance to both of these neighbouring properties to not create an adverse overbearing / overshadowing impact to the external areas of these neighbouring dwellings.
30. It is noted that No. 3 Meadowbank Close has a ground floor side window facing over the driveway area. Upon a site visit to this property, it can be confirmed that this ground floor side window looks onto part of the host dwelling of the application site and its front garden area. This ground floor window serves as a secondary room window, for a living room area. The window design and size is narrow in nature.
31. Again, it is considered that the distances would be sufficient to not create an adverse overbearing impact. With regards to overshadowing, due to the sun's orientation, it is not considered that the development would create an overshadowing impact. Nevertheless, any overshadowing that may occur, is already present from the positioning of the host dwelling, in which this proposed extension is not considered to significantly worsen this current impact, as to warrant a reason for refusal.

32. Further objection comments regarding No.3 have stated that the proposed extension would breach the 45-degree guidance and they have applied this calculation to their secondary ground floor window. This is not considered to be applicable as this calculation within the guidance is used to assess the scale of the development rather than any impact upon outlook. Therefore, their calculation suggests no breach for this side window, when applying the guidance for its intended purposes. For the avoidance of doubt, when applying the 45-degree rule from the centre of the front window at 3 Meadowbank Close the extension does not breach this 45 degree angle.
33. With regards to this ground floor neighbouring side window (at No.3), it is acknowledged that viewpoints from this window would change. Whilst their view over their own driveway would remain, their view over the applicant's front garden/ driveway and then street scene, would be altered upon the completion of this front extension. But it is considered that due to the siting of this neighbouring window, that it would achieve oblique views over the wider frontage of this street scene. However, whilst the proposed extension would block some viewpoints as described above, it is not considered to result in a harmful loss of outlook. This is taking into account the viewpoints that can still be achieved and that this window serves as a secondary window. The primary window is not considered to be impacted by this development and overall, it is not considered that a significant impact upon a loss of outlook would occur.
34. No. 3 Meadowbank Close has stated that their outlook from their rear garden area would be impacted upon. It is agreed that when stood within their rear garden, looking towards the frontage/ driveway area, that the extension would be visible. However, it is not considered that this front extension would significantly impact upon the loss of outlook from the rear garden, because viewpoints and openness is still achieved to the North, East and South of that garden. Therefore, the development is not considered to adversely impact upon a significant loss of outlook for the rear garden area of this neighbouring property.
35. In regard to the concerns for right to light, this is not a material planning consideration and cannot be considered under this planning application because it is a matter for property law. However, impacts through overbearing, overshadowing and loss of light and outlook are material and have been assessed in full as detailed above.
36. Neighbouring objection comments have also raised privacy concerns as being another potential impact of the proposed development. However, viewpoints can already be achieved from the existing host dwelling frontage and the proposed openings are considered to achieve similar views as the existing. Notwithstanding, the implementation of the front extension would create oblique angles from the new openings, thereby resulting in views to these neighbouring frontages becoming more oblique as opposed to direct vantage points. Nevertheless, these are front garden areas and driveways, which as already noted are not considered to be main private amenity spaces.

37. Whilst there is a balcony at the front of No. 1 Meadowbank Close, it is considered that sufficient distances would remain, along with the fact that a degree of overlooking already occurs from the existing frontage of this host dwelling.
38. A concern was raised regarding the proposed ground floor side windows creating an impact upon privacy for No. 1 Meadowbank Close. The drawings have been amended to remove these two ground floor windows, which is considered to negate any privacy concerns in this regard.
39. Overall, the development is not considered to create an adverse impact upon privacy as to warrant a reason for refusal.
40. A comment was raised that larger openings within the development will increase noise levels from the main property. The new openings are considered to achieve a similar situation as the existing and not necessarily exacerbate existing noise levels from this current host dwelling.
41. With respect to the comments received regarding construction noise, dust and general disturbance from these activities, it must be recognised that the potential for noise and disruption during construction work is inevitable whilst works are being carried out. A request was also made to ask that the hours of construction be controlled by way of a condition. Whilst understanding, this is not normally controlled by way of planning conditions for domestic applications because there is separate legislation to monitor and enforce noise occurring at unsociable hours. However, given the domestic nature of the works it is not expected that there would be a need to work during unsociable hours.

(c) Highway Safety

42. Local Planning Policy IN4 seeks to ensure that new development will provide safe and secure vehicle parking. The number of spaces required will depend on the nature of the proposal as well as the local circumstances and standards set out within the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide.
43. The development has been reviewed by the Council's Highway Engineer, and it has been considered that the proposed development would not create additional parking demand or impact upon existing parking arrangements for this dwelling. Therefore, the proposed works are not considered to create a highway safety issue.
44. Objections have been raised regarding additional construction traffic creating a nuisance and that there is insufficient space for construction materials and construction vehicles. Given that the proposed works are for a domestic extension, it is considered that this will be managed via the applicant/ construction company. As such, the planning department cannot control where vehicles park.

(d) Flood Risk

45. Local policy DC2 states that new development will be focused in areas of low flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and that in accordance with National Policy, a site-specific flood risk

assessment will be required. An objection comment has requested that an exception test be carried out for this development in regard to flood risk. However, whilst local policy DC2 does reference the Sequential and Exception Tests, paragraph 176 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), states that minor developments are not subject to the sequential test nor the exception test, but they do require a site-specific flood risk assessment where appropriate.

46. The application site is located within flood zones 2 and 3, but as the development is considered minor and based on the Environment Agency's (EA) standing advice, there is no requirement to consult the EA on householder applications. Instead, the Local Planning Authority are expected to use the EA's standing advice based on the applicants submitted flood risk information.
47. A Flood Risk form has been submitted in conjunction with this application. It states that the application site is set at a higher ground level than the street scene/ access into this estate. In addition, it sets out that the proposed extension floor levels will be set at the same height as the existing dwelling and will use the same construction methods to protect and prevent the house from flooding. This is considered to be in line with the EA's standing advice. This information is considered sufficient to demonstrate that the development will not be at risk of flooding and neither will it result in an increased risk of flooding elsewhere.
48. Notwithstanding the above assessment, it is understood from the objections that there is a concern that the extension (along with past historic building works) will displace surface water and flood water, to the detriment of the wider community. Therefore, in an attempt to address this matter further, the Local Planning Authority contacted the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for further advice. In summary they raised no objection regarding flood risk of the proposed development.
49. The LLFA commented that currently, in the area where the extension is proposed, rainwater will run off block paving, run off into garden areas or find its way into the site drainage. But, if the extension is to be built, it will have gutters and downpipes that will lead rainwater into the sewer. As such the LLFA argue that there would be no difference in surface water flood risk and that there is likely to be an improvement in terms of creating 'positive drainage'.
50. In addition to the above assessment, paragraph 182 of the NPPF states that applications which could affect drainage, should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. As this is a domestic extension, the use of gutters and downpipes are considered to be proportionate for the extent of this development.
51. On balance, it is considered acceptable for the Local Planning Authority to use the standing advice which has been deemed acceptable for this development. Notwithstanding, further advice has been sought from the LLFA who have confirmed that it is unlikely to create a flood risk to the wider community as to warrant a reason for refusal.

52. Furthermore and as noted, no permitted development rights were removed at the time of the approval for this housing site (Ref; 13/01001/FUL). As such, had it been necessary in terms of wider flood risk, the permitted development rights to extend the buildings or carry out hardstanding would have been removed as part of that planning decision. As this has not been done, it suggests that flood risk for this area was not such a concern as to prohibit future domestic building works. Whilst it is accepted that this proposed extension does not benefit from permitted development rights, it is considered to be a helpful indication, in that it was not considered necessary to remove any future building capability in the interests of wider flood risks.

(e) Residual Matters

53. The numerous comments submitted raise a number of matters that are not planning matters and cannot therefore be considered or assessed as part of this planning application. Such matters are not material to the determination of the application, but for completeness, these matters are set out and responded to as follows:
54. In relation to those concerns about the impact upon views, this is not a material planning consideration and has not therefore been considered as part of the determination of the application.
55. Concerns have been raised, stating that there are restrictive covenants/ a local housing management restriction regarding the types of works that can be carried out on these properties. However, covenant issues and private housing restrictions are not a planning matter and therefore cannot be considered further as part of this application.
56. There is no evidence to suggest that the construction or completion of this domestic development would result in damage to neighbouring driveways or properties. It should be noted that the proposed works will need to be built to current building standards and so it is considered that the development can be built to appropriate standards without having to impact upon third party properties.
57. Concerns were also raised regarding the safety of construction, but this is not a planning matter and cannot be considered further. It should also be noted that scaffolding cannot be erected onto third party land without that landowner's consent.
58. A comment was raised asking for details of the construction and length of time of construction. This is not a matter that is assessed or controlled by the planning department and so these details have not been requested. Likewise, it should be noted that whilst planning permission is granted for 3 years (for the works to be implemented), once works have started, the planning department cannot control how quickly the development is completed.
59. A comment stated that wider consultation to the area should have been carried out. However, under the planning processes, only neighbours that adjoin the site are required to be consulted for domestic works.

THE PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

60. In considering this application the Local Planning Authority has complied with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 which places a statutory duty on public authorities in the exercise of their functions to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. There is no overt reason why the proposed development would prejudice anyone with the protected characteristics as described above.

SECTION 17 OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

61. The contents of this report have been considered in the context of the requirements placed on the Council by Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, namely the duty on the Council to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. It is not considered that the contents of this report have any such effect.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

62. The development is considered to be acceptable with regards to any impacts upon character, amenity, highway safety and flood and drainage matters. The development is considered to be acceptable in regard to these matters and would comply with both national and local planning policy. Therefore, it is recommended that the application be approved with conditions for the reasons specified above.

THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS

1.

Time Limit

The development hereby permitted shall be commenced not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended).
2.

Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as detailed below:

Plan Reference Number	Date
914-01	20 March 2025
914-02 A	6 May 2025
914-04 A	6 May 2025
914-05 A	6 May 2025
914-03 D	8 August 2025

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the planning permission.

3. Materials

The materials used in the construction of the external walls and roof of the development, hereby approved, shall match those within the existing main dwelling unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory form of development.

4. Adjacent Protected Tree - Prohibited Works

There shall be an exclusion zone in the form of a 5m radius around the adjacent existing mature tree (T4), in which the following shall not be permitted within this exclusion zone;

- No construction activity is to take place which may cause compaction or contamination in the rooting areas near the tree
- No equipment, materials or machinery shall be placed within this 5m radius and shall not be attached to or supported by the mature tree
- No mixing of cement or use of other materials or substances shall take place within this 5m radius or within proximity where seepage or displacement of those materials or substances could cause them to enter this zone.
- No unauthorised trenches shall be dug within the 5m radius

Reason: To protect the existing tree adjacent the application site, which the Local Planning Authority consider provides important amenity value in the locality.