

## **Planning Applications Committee: 29 October 2015**

### **Updates to reports**

#### **Application no: 15/00689/F – Car park adjacent to Albion Way**

##### **Item 4 (B) Page 33**

##### **Amendment to conditions**

Condition 7 no longer required – evacuation plan not required given scale of floor space and level of risk.

---

#### **Application no: 15/01381/F – Aldwych House**

##### **Item 4 (E) Page 71**

##### **Amendment to informative**

##### *Currently reads:*

The planning permission relates only to the changes to the entrance canopy and the western boundary wall as shown on the submitted plans. This permission does not infer approval for those other potentially unauthorised elements, for instance the works to the projection adjacent to the stair tower, assumed to be the lift motor housing. This also applies to the various apparent discrepancies on the plans, including on the front elevation: the two windows in the mansard on the north east corner; the changes to the stair tower, including the different design and position of the windows (as well as those on the adjacent side elevation); and the large distance shown on the section projecting from the east elevation. None of these elements are shown on the plans approved through 14/00630/F and given they are not included in the description of this particular proposal no assessment has been made of their acceptability. For the avoidance of doubt the approved drawings on this decision notice will explicitly delete these elements and focus solely on what has been applied for.

---

##### *Amended to:*

The planning permission relates only to the changes to the entrance canopy and the western boundary wall as shown on the submitted plans and specified in the conditions.

This permission does not infer approval for those other potentially unauthorised elements, for instance:

- the works to the projection on the flat roof adjacent to the stair tower (assumed to be the lift motor housing);
- the two windows in the mansard on the north east corner

This also applies to the various apparent discrepancies on the plans, including on the front elevation:

- the changes to the stair tower, including the different design and position of the windows (as well as those on the adjacent side elevation)

These elements listed are not shown on the plans approved through 14/00630/F and given they are not included in the description of this particular proposal no assessment has been made of their acceptability. For the avoidance of doubt the approved drawings on this decision notice will explicitly delete these elements and focus solely on what has been applied for.

**Additional information:**

The agent has explained that some of the changes to the stair tower appear different to the approved plans and this is likely to be attributed to the built scheme not implementing parts of the approved plans, for instance the stair tower is no longer being lowered in height as previously intended and the ridge height of the front section is no longer being raised.

A revised elevation has been submitted to show the wall as described in the recommendation, i.e. the 2m extending from the rear of 12 Chapel Field North rebuilt to its original height. This is on the presentation.

---

**Application no: 15/01382/F – Aldwych House**

**Item 4 (F) Page 87**

**Amendment to informative**

*Currently reads:*

The planning permission relates only to the 5No. rooflights as shown on the submitted plans. This permission does not infer approval for those other potentially unauthorised elements, for instance the works to the projection adjacent to the stair tower, assumed to be the lift motor housing. This also applies to the various apparent discrepancies on the plans, including on the front elevation: the two windows in the mansard on the north east corner; the changes to the stair tower, including the different design and position of the windows (as well as those on the adjacent side elevation); and the large distance shown on the section projecting from the east elevation. None of these elements are shown on the plans approved through 14/00630/F and given they are not included in the description of this particular proposal no assessment has been made of their acceptability. For the avoidance of doubt

the approved drawings on this decision notice will explicitly delete these elements and focus solely on what has been applied for.

---

*Amended to:*

The planning permission relates only to the 5No. rooflights as shown on the submitted plans.

This permission does not infer approval for those other potentially unauthorised elements, for instance:

- the works to the projection on the flat roof adjacent to the stair tower (assumed to be the lift motor housing);
- the two windows in the mansard on the north east corner

This also applies to the various apparent discrepancies on the plans, including on the front elevation:

- the changes to the stair tower, including the different design and position of the windows (as well as those on the adjacent side elevation)

These elements listed are not shown on the plans approved through 14/00630/F and given they are not included in the description of this particular proposal no assessment has been made of their acceptability. For the avoidance of doubt the approved drawings on this decision notice will explicitly delete these elements and focus solely on what has been applied for.

**Additional information:**

Some of the changes to the stair tower appear different to the approved plans and this is likely to be attributed to the built scheme not implementing parts of the approved plans, for instance the stair tower is no longer being lowered in height as previously intended and the ridge height of the front section is no longer being raised.

---

**Applications no: 15/01156/F and 15/01157/L – 31 St Stephens Square**

**Item 4 (G) Page 103**

**Follow-up letters of representation from adjacent neighbour (No.29)**

1) Room described in report as dining room is in fact a dining kitchen; the extension functions as a utility room where washing up is carried out. Both require sufficient light. The plans also do not show our ground floor window which is misleading.

---

- 2) Confused by references to boundary wall. Conservation insisted much of the section apparently affected by proposals is of historic value (see retained bricks closest to house), not just the first few courses.
- 3) The neighbour has confirmed the intention to build on top of the wall, contrary to what report says.
- 4) The report's conclusion that light will only be affected towards the end of the day is disproved by the photographs on the objection letter. Can you please confirm whether you have carried out a shadowfall calculation and if so what are the results?
- 5) There is no mention made on reflected light from the extension into our kitchen/diner.
- 6) Concerned about the OS map used in the report as it shows earlier extensions and scales than are the current case, e.g. No.25 demolished their original extension shown on the map 3-4 years ago. You also incorrectly describe our extension as half-width; it is much narrower. Can you please confirm the date of the OS map?
- 7) The plans show the boundary walls as the same height which is misleading. The boundary between 31 and 33 is actually significantly lower than that between 33 and 29.
- 8) According to measurements taken at our house a two brick gap between the upper sill and the ridge would result in the extension being far larger than the measurement of 3.075m shown. 3m would result in a six brick gap. The boundary wall measures 2.5m adjacent to our house and the eleven bricks estimated to reach the ridge would be in excess of 3m from ground level.

**Response:**

- 1) Noted. Both are assessed in the report as being habitable rooms.
- 2) The wall appears to have been rebuilt recently with three clearly different ages of brick – the clearly oldest first few courses, the clearly newer brick in the majority of the wall and the section extending from the rear elevation which is in-between. The report remains accurate in its assessment of the wall's significance and it should be stressed that this is a minor side note – speculation on the structural impact on the wall is not a significant planning concern here and should be left to Building Control and Party Wall negotiations
- 3) Informal discussions have not factored into this assessment. The report is based on the submitted plans which show the height of boundary wall as 2.25m on the existing elevation and 2.25m on the proposed elevation. The ridge extends 0.83m above the top of the boundary wall, which then tapers down away from the house. This section will have to be filled in to form the

gable end of the extension and although this will be on the boundary wall, this is set out in the design and access statement. As per paragraph 28, the report avoids in-depth discussion about the structural capacity of the wall given this is a matter for Building Control and Party Wall negotiations. On the plans the extension has always been visible above the top of the boundary and the amenity impact is clearly addressed in main issue 2: 'the proposed extension will be clearly visible as a wedge-shaped addition above the height of the boundary wall'.

4) The light reaching habitable rooms is an important consideration, as noted in the report. It does not state that daylight (i.e. the amount of visible sky available) is only affected towards the end of the day, just that direct overshadowing would only factor primarily towards the end of the day, particularly in winter months. The report acknowledges there may be amenity issues but is keen to stress that the fallback position of what can be built without planning permission is a significant factor in the assessment. Given this fact, asking the applicants to submit a sun-path analysis or daylight study would be disproportionate, so this has not been carried out.

5) Reflected daylight can play a role in the amount of daylight reaching a window but as per above this does not undermine the conclusions of the report.

6) This is the most up-to-date version of the OS map that the council has. The presentation includes a satellite image and a number of site photographs which should give a reasonably accurate enough representation of the context. The reference to 'half-width' was only intended to briefly describe the extension. If the report has assessed No.29's extension as being wider than it is in reality then this only serves to overestimate the potential amenity impact. This is marginal and does not affect the conclusions of the report.

7) The top of the flat roof extension forming the boundary of No.33 is shown on the plans as being higher than the boundary wall between 29 and 31. This appears correct.

8) The proposed elevation shows a gap on roughly one brick between the ridge and the bottom of the first floor sill. It is important to note that the limitations of a permitted development extension are 4m to the ridge and 3m to the eaves. If these plans are approved and it comes to light that there are inaccuracies which mean they cannot build what they have permission for, then the approved extension may not be implementable. The report has assessed an extension based on the dimensions shown on the plans.

---