

RUSSELL ASSOCIATES
A R C H I T E C T S

ARCHITECTURE:INTERIORS:PLANNING

ADDENDUM TO SUPPORTING STATEMENT

To previously approved application for Demolition of existing rear projection and construction of a single storey rear extension with a flat roof, 3 panel sliding door and 3 roof lights with other associated alterations.



AT

**72 EARLSHALL ROAD
ELTHAM,
SE9 1PR**

PREPARED BY:

RUSSELL ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS
UNIT 4, HOPYARD STUDIOS,
13 LOVIBOND LANE,
GREENWICH,
LONDON, SE10 9FY

Ref: 1448/E

Date: February 2024

1.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENTS

3.0 SUMMARY

APPENDICES

Appendix 1.0	1448.01	Location Plan
Appendix 2.0	1448	Decision Notice Consent
Appendix 2.1	1448.10	Approved Plans
Appendix 2.2	1448.11C	Approved Elevation and Section
Appendix 3.0	1448.30	As-Built Plans
Appendix 3.1	1448.31	As - Built Elevation and Section
Appendix 4.0	1448.	Site Photographs P01-P05
Appendix 5.0	1448.	Email of 19 February from Mr Parker
Appendix 5.1	1448	Email of 20 February from Mr Parker

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Statement has been prepared by Russell Associates Architects on behalf of our clients Mr & Mrs Richardson to support a Non-Material Amendment application, prepared for an approval for amendments to previously approved plans for *'Demolition of existing rear projection and construction of a single storey rear extension with a flat roof, 3 panel sliding door and 3 roof lights with other associated alterations.'* at 72 Earls Hall Road, Eltham, SE9 1PR, under Council Ref: 22/1383/HD. The application was submitted on 14 April 2022 and was approved on 01 July 2022 (See Appendix 2 for Consent and Approved Plans).

Russell Associates Architects were involved in obtaining the above Planning Consent and also prepared Building Regulations drawings for the rear extension at 72 Earls Hall Road, but were not involved in the construction stage. We were recently contacted by our clients, who advised that as a result of a complaint by a neighbour, they had been contacted by Mr Michael Parker, a Planning Enforcement Officer for Greenwich Council on the basis that the extension had not been built in accordance with the approved drawings. Mr Michael Parker initially visited the site on 6th December 2023 and then wrote to our client on 19 February 2024, advising that they should either reduce the height of the extension to that as approved, or submit a Material Amendment application, which should be submitted by midday on Friday the 22nd of February 2024. This timescale caused a degree of panic but in a follow up email of 20th February the date was corrected extended to 22nd March.

Furthermore there does not seem to be a facility for a material amendment to an existing consent, it appears to be necessary to either make an application for a non-material amendment or if it is a material amendment then a full planning application, which in this case would be a Householder Application. As set out below we do not believe that the difference is material so an application for a non-material amendment is being made.

Our clients have explained that after the original planning consent and Building Regulations submission, it was necessary to increase the thermal insulation to comply with the latest Building Regulations. As a result the rear extension was not completely built in accordance to the approved plans, as the contractor had to increase the height of the parapet by 150mm to accommodate the built up in roof.

We believe that the change on site is minimal and is not materially different to the approved design. We would therefore be grateful if this non-material amendment application could be approved.

2.0 NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENTS

The email from Mr. Parker specifically requires an application for only the increase in height. The main non-material amendment we are seeking consent for is therefore:

i) Increase in height

After the original planning consent and Building Regulations submission, it was necessary to increase the thermal insulation to comply with the latest Building Regulations. This increased the roof thickness and in order to retain the internal floor to ceiling height and correct flashing detail the parapet upstand could not be reduced, so overall the height of the rear extension is accordingly increased in height by 150mm to the approved plans.

The approved height was 3,050mm from ground floor finished floor level, and as shown on the attached as-built drawings it is 3,200mm. This is an increase of just 5%. We believe this increase in the height is minimal and is within the normally acceptable percentage increase for alterations on site.

There does not appear to be any definition of non-material in the planning legislation however the increase is not sufficient to have any material effect on the character or appearance of the extension and is not sufficient to have any material effect on the amenity of the neighbours. It is therefore our view that this is a non-material change.

ii) A raised patio to the rear.

On the original planning drawing, no new patio was shown as there was an extensive existing patio, and it had not been anticipated that the patio would exceed 0.3m in height, above ground level, and as such consent was not required. At Building Regulations stage a patio of 2m depth was added and this was shown with a step down of 150mm from finished ground floor level, which did not require planning consent. When on site it was decided to retain the patio at ground floor level to retain a level access as preferred by part M of the Building Regulations and to improve access generally. In addition it was decided to extend the depth of the patio to 3m. None of this in itself requires planning consent, however the ground falls away from the rear of the house, and as a result at the furthest extent of the patio there is lower level. This difference was further increased as the area directly in front of the patio has been levelled out a little directly in front of the patio i.e. reduced in height. Overall this gives a step down of approx. 450mm, which is just 150mm above that allowed under permitted development.

Again this makes no material difference of the character of appearance of the extension, and again does not have any material effect on the amenity of the neighbours. It is therefore our view that this is a non-material change.

3.0 SUMMARY

As explained above, the change in the height of the extension was a site alteration that was necessary to accommodate the extra built up in the roof because of thicker insulation required to comply with the latest Building Regulations, and to retain the flashing detail over the roof. The rear extension is increased in height by 150mm to the approved plans which is just a 5% increase to the approved height. It is within an allowable percentage for alterations on site, we therefore consider this to be acceptable.

The raised patio is built at the level of the internal finished floor to improve accessibility and give a better flow, and a better connection between inside and outside space. Although this is no more than 300mm at the end of the extension, because of the ground gradient which has a gradual drop towards the rear garden, at the end of the patio there is approx. 450mm from the external ground level.

These minor changes occurred as a result of the construction process, and have no material effect on the character or appearance of the building or of the area or of the amenity of neighbours. We would therefore be grateful for consent. Please let us know if you need further information.

Russell Associates Architects