Statement of Explanation for Non-Material Amendments

August 2017

Introduction:
This is a statement to accompany a planning application for a non-material amendment to the above planning permission. The planning permission has been built out with modest and inconsequential changes to the approved design. Within this statement we intent to submit a viewpoint that there are several enhancements to the design, some changes that are benign to the design and some misunderstanding of the approved information.

Each alteration to the design will be explained point by point in order of importance starting with the least important so, we hope, the Local Authority can see that by narrowing the items of concern, the houses as built are of a good quality construction and worthy of the area.

Landscaping and Trees
The approved drawing shows 2 trees to be retained. 1 in the south-west corner and 1 in the north-east corner. The south west corner tree is identified in the Arboricultural report that accompanied the planning application as being in poor health and recommended for removal and replacement. This tree is to be replaced with a ½ standard strawberry tree.

The tree in the north-east corner of the site will have the ivy removed.

The trees to the front elevation will be planted as shown on drawing 364/ planning 03 revision B

Planting season
The planting of 5 trees as shown on drawing 364/planning 03 revision B will be carried out within the month of September 2017.

Window to the front elevation
The approved drawing showed a long window to the WC. This has been changed to a high level square window for privacy. In email correspondence Local Authority: Bramber Construction of 28 July 2017 at 16:43 the Local Authority has confirmed (paragraph3) no further action on this is sought.

Fencing
The approved planning drawings shows a 1m high fence between the 2 houses. The fence has been built slightly higher but only marginally higher. The Local Authority has suggested an open railing (email correspondence of 28 July 2017).

A fence is commonly of 'timber' construction. A railing is commonly of 'metal' construction.

Planning condition 6 refers to '*boundary **wall** and or fencing'.*

My recollection is that the purpose of the planning condition was to protect a historic wall to the south boundary of the development which is built in an attractive fletton brick. This wall has been maintained and repaired and remains the boundary wall today, therefore the intention of the planning condition has been adhered too.

Planning Condition 6 was not intended to be used as a means of introducing a metal railing and the suggestion of this is contrary to the approved information.

Reducing the height of the dividing fence by less than 100mm to be 1m high is arbitrary and would have a benign effect on the character of the area. With respect to the Local Authority and having kept and protected the historic fletton wall through the construction process; we do not intend to carry out any alterations to the dividing fence.

Lead roof to dormer windows
Email correspondence of the 28th July 2017 would suggest that the Local Authority has misunderstood the approved planning information. Please refer to the design and Access Statement of November 2017 which was submitted as part of the Application information. I refer to the following extract:

The materials are chosen to compliment neighbouring buildings and the wider area.
Materials are:
Roof: Eternit composite slate.
Dormer windows: GRP roofs and cheeks to have timber boarding.
Façades to be clad in a coloured weather boarding.
Windows are white upvc.
Rainwater goods will be white upvc.

The roof as built is GRP and therefore the Local Authority has no basis to insist on lead dormer roofs.

Lead cheeks to the dormer windows
Contrary to the approved drawings, the dormer cheeks have been built with lead, not timber weatherboarding. Lead is commonly regarded is a superior material to timber in external construction and its appearance is of a higher quality when used for dormer windows. The use of lead for the dormer cheeks should be considered an upgrade in the quality of construction and appearance and should be supported by the local Authority.

Roof Materials

I would refer the Local Authority to the Design and Access Statement dated November 2015 which accompanied the approved information. Roof material is listed as 'Eternit composite slate'.

As built, the houses have natural slate roofs.

Natural slate is vastly superior to composite slate and therefore this should be regarded as a huge uplift in the quality of the houses.

Chimney

The chimney has been omitted because the wood burner within the living room was omitted.

The relative size of the house and amount of insulation within the external envelope did not warrant the use of a wood burner. Under floor heating was considered a better form of heating.

The internal arrangement of the house is not a planning consideration. Introducing a wood burner at this stage is not practical or necessary.

Our options with regard to the chimney is to either build in a GRP 'fake' chimney or omit the chimney altogether.

My view is that a 'fake' chimney is not an honest architectural expression. The end user of the building may also consider this unusual: a chimney with no fireplace on a brand new house!

Summary:

In terms of landscaping; we intend to implement the design as set out on drawing 364/planning03C. This will negate the Local Authorities concerns regarding the landscaping design.

The lead roof to the dormer window is a 'red herring' as the approved design did not include a lead roof.

The loss of the chimney, is compensated by the use of natural slate on the roof which is infinitely more attractive than a fibre cement tile.

Conclusion:

We would ask that the Local Authority accept and support these non-material amendments

We also ask that by approving this application and by inspection of the built works on site that planning condition 3 (materials) and 6 (boundary fences) and 8 (soft landscaping) of planning permission AWDM/0236/16 are complied with once these works have been implemented.

JAMES BRECKELL – member of the Royal Institute of British Architects