

Simon Davis

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 06 November 2013 11:37
To: Charlotte Hardy
Cc: Joanna Allatt
Subject: FW: 3 Marine Drive West, Bognor Regis; BR/201/13/DOC
Attachments: Roofing Report.pdf

Hi Charlie,

What would be your opinion on the second part of the below email (beginning: A further matter pertains to the renewable energy condition 6). I think I had a quick conversation with you about this – i.e. they want to know if we would consider the 10% saving to come from non-energy sources?

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI, Senior Planning Officer, Development Control
Arun District Council (First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF)

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk

P Save the environment - think before you print.

From: richard lowe
Sent: 31 October 2013 10:44
To: Simon Davis
Subject: 3 Marine Drive West, Bognor Regis; BR/201/13/DOC

Dear Simon,

Further to our recent telephone conversation I am pleased to attach a copy of a report prepared by Romans Surveyors following an inspection of the existing roof in September. The report records the poor state of repair of the existing slate covering and recommends that they are re-covered in a riven artificial slate. This is contrary to our understanding at the time we sought the discharge of the external materials condition 3 of the planning permission.

It is therefore proposed to use Cembrit *Westerley* artificial riven slates to re-cover the whole roof, instead of the natural slates that we were proposing to use for making good the existing roof areas disturbed in the process of construction. I trust this will be acceptable to you.

Unfortunately, the roofing sub-contractor has proceeded to re-cover the rear roof with Cembrit *Jutland* artificial slates. These are the same size and colour but have a plain finish rather than a riven one. The rear roof cannot generally be seen and so I trust it will not be necessary to remove the tiles and re-cover the roof a second time. It is proposed that the front part of the roof, which is, of course, visible (although there is not a lot of it given the extent and scale of the approved dormers) will be re-covered in the riven slate.

You may well consider that it would be better if the whole of the roof were to be re-covered in a the same slate, in which case the front roof would be finished with the *Jutland* slate.

I would appreciate your comments.

A further matter pertains to the renewable energy condition 6. As matters currently stand, the developers consultants OG Energy are still, it would appear, locking horns with your own consultants. I would, however, prefer to consider an alternative approach.

If the intent of NPPF is to save energy and reduce carbon emissions – and I believe it is - then the use of renewable sources is only one method of achieving that. It will not in every instance be the best one. Not the slightest account, for example, is taken of the significant, additional carbon footprint of manufacturing, shipping and/or installing equipment from (largely) Japan or Belgium and this seems to me a glaring omission. Indeed, if this were to be somehow factored into the SAP2009 calculations the results would be hugely and excoriatingly different. Rather like going out for a meal and setting aside the cost of the food.....

The installation costs alone of providing, for example, air source heat pumps are in the order of 4-5 times the cost of a more traditional (non-renewable) system. The equipment has no record of great longevity and will almost certainly require replacement long before more traditional forms of heating equipment. That, in itself, does not matter greatly if no account is taken of the carbon footprint of manufacturing, shipping and installing it.

Whereas ASHPs are effective for most of the year they are often unreliable in the coldest weather. They are most efficient when maintaining flow and return temperatures to radiators at around 50degC and 40degC respectively which on the face of it sounds warm enough but with significantly negative external temperatures they struggle to heat both water and space when it is required.

In this particular development there is a reduced roof area - as a result of introducing very large dormers – and so the opportunity to secure 10% of the predicted energy usage by installing solar PV or thermal panels is effectively lost. My own view is that solar thermal panels dedicated to heating water may have some positive benefit.

The residual site area is already compromised by the need for cycle storage and car parking spaces and the siting of ASHPs is, in reality, problematic.

This is an existing building that is being converted from a residential care home to flats. The wording of the condition requires renewable energy sources (for their own sake) at the exclusion of all else – irrespective of whether that is the best use of resources or produces the most effective energy/CO2 saving - when I believe the intent of the NPPF is fundamentally to conserve energy and reduce CO2 emissions.

We should like to explore an alternative approach whereby better savings can be achieved by enhancing and improving insulation and airtightness in the building fabric, for example, in a sustainable way rather than slavishly adhering to this bizarre drive towards renewable energy - even in the most inappropriate circumstances – that is predicated upon spurious mathematical models rather than real-life building use.

Perhaps you would advise whether such an approach might be considered acceptable

Kind regards,

Richard Lowe



Simon Davis

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 October 2013 10:44
To: Simon Davis
Subject: 3 Marine Drive West, Bognor Regis; BR/201/13/DOC
Attachments: Roofing Report.pdf

Dear Simon,

*For principle, same as
but need to
or no actual difference?*

Do match so

Further to our recent telephone conversation I am pleased to attach a copy of a report prepared by Romans Surveyors following an inspection of the existing roof in September. The report records the poor state of repair of the existing slate covering and recommends that they are re-covered in a riven artificial slate. This is contrary to our understanding at the time we sought the discharge of the external materials condition 3 of the planning permission.

It is therefore proposed to use Cembrit *Westerley* artificial riven slates to re-cover the whole roof, instead of the natural slates that we were proposing to use for making good the existing roof areas disturbed in the process of construction. I trust this will be acceptable to you.

Unfortunately, the roofing sub-contractor has proceeded to re-cover the rear roof with Cembrit *Jutland* artificial slates. These are the same size and colour but have a plain finish rather than a riven one. The rear roof cannot generally be seen and so I trust it will not be necessary to remove the tiles and re-cover the roof a second time. It is proposed that the front part of the roof, which is, of course, visible (although there is not a lot of it given the extent and scale of the approved dormers) will be re-covered in the riven slate.

You may well consider that it would be better if the whole of the roof were to be re-covered in the same slate, in which case the front roof would be finished with the *Jutland* slate.

I would appreciate your comments.

A further matter pertains to the renewable energy condition 6. As matters currently stand, the developers consultants OG Energy are still, it would appear, locking horns with your own consultants. I would, however, prefer to consider an alternative approach.

If the intent of NPPF is to save energy and reduce carbon emissions – and I believe it is – then the use of renewable sources is only one method of achieving that. It will not in every instance be the best one. Not the slightest account, for example, is taken of the significant, additional carbon footprint of manufacturing, shipping and/or installing equipment from (largely) Japan or Belgium and this seems to me a glaring omission. Indeed, if this were to be

somehow factored into the SAP2009 calculations the results would be hugely and excoriatingly different. Rather like going out for a meal and setting aside the cost of the food.....

The installation costs alone of providing, for example, air source heat pumps are in the order of 4-5 times the cost of a more traditional (non-renewable) system. The equipment has no record of great longevity and will almost certainly require replacement long before more traditional forms of heating equipment. That, in itself, does not matter greatly if no account is taken of the carbon footprint of manufacturing, shipping and installing it.

Whereas ASHPs are effective for most of the year they are often unreliable in the coldest weather. They are most efficient when maintaining flow and return temperatures to radiators at around 50degC and 40degC respectively which on the face of it sounds warm enough but with significantly negative external temperatures they struggle to heat both water and space when it is required.

In this particular development there is a reduced roof area - as a result of introducing very large dormers - and so the opportunity to secure 10% of the predicted energy usage by installing solar PV or thermal panels is effectively lost. My own view is that solar thermal panels dedicated to heating water may have some positive benefit.

The residual site area is already compromised by the need for cycle storage and car parking spaces and the siting of ASHPs is, in reality, problematic.

This is an existing building that is being converted from a residential care home to flats. The wording of the condition requires renewable energy sources (for their own sake) at the exclusion of all else - irrespective of whether that is the best use of resources or produces the most effective energy/CO2 saving - when I believe the intent of the NPPF is fundamentally to conserve energy and reduce CO2 emissions.

We should like to explore an alternative approach whereby better savings can be achieved by enhancing and improving insulation and airtightness in the building fabric, for example, in a sustainable way rather than slavishly adhering to this bizarre drive towards renewable energy - even in the most inappropriate circumstances - that is predicated upon spurious mathematical models rather than real-life building use.

Perhaps you would advise whether such an approach might be considered acceptable

Kind regards,

Richard Lowe

Very much likely to be acceptable

Perhaps very then renewable

RL

Off: 01420 561667

Mob: 07793 837 978

35 The Avenue
Southampton
Hampshire
SO17 1XN

Mr D Beason
Keebee Marine Developments Ltd
Newlands Farmhouse
Stroud Green Lane
Stubbington
Fareham
PO14 2HT

11 September 2013
Our Ref: JR-OZ13-3839

Dear Sir

Re: Roof Inspection - 3 Marine Drive West, Bognor, West Sussex, PO21 2QA

Further to instructions received from Mr Colin Nicholls of Messrs Oakenrose on 24 August 2013 with regards to the obligation to meet the requirement of PG Surveyors Ltd for the Warranty of the above property to undertake an appraisal of the roof with a view to the confirmation that the existing roof covering that is to remain, or be re-used, has a useful future life in excess of 15 years the following can be confirmed.

On Friday 06 September 2013 an inspection of the above property was carried out by Jonathan Ranson MSc CHE MRICS at which time the weather was overcast with intermittent rain. The property was scaffolded and set up as a functioning construction site at the date of inspection. The inspection was a visual non-destructive property examination carried out from scaffolding incorporated on site.

The property is a large 1960's constructed detached villa of traditional construction with natural slate pitched tiled roof covering set over a hand cut timber roof of raised tie format whilst external enclosing walls are of brick faced cavity wall construction with plastic cladding to the front gable elevation. Ancillary flat roofs including dormer roofs have been incorporated that benefit from basic mineralised felt flat roofs.

The roof structure was generally free from significant distortion and deflection suggesting that the existing roof framework is performing adequately. The slate roof covering is however in a very poor state of repair and has historically been provided over a reinforced bitumen underfelt that is directly fixed over the original sarkin planks. The roof covering is suffering from probable nail sickness due to the highly corrosive nature of the sea air and high exposure conditions and it is also likely that a number of slates have been subject to dissolution / conversion giving rise to a further number of slipped slate. The mineralised felt flat roofs are in a mixed state of repair all being old with two roofs showing signs of failure. Immediate recovering of pitched and flat roofs is required.

It may be possible to undertake recovering of the roof using a mixture of new and original slates most likely a 50:50 split of new and original slates will be required. Taking account of the exposed location of the property believe however, it would be best suited to provide a complete replacement roof covering, perhaps a riven artificial slate and then to offset the cost of recovering against the salvage value of the good condition natural slates. There are a number of high value plum coloured slates which are very difficult to source and they in particular should attract a good premium.

When recovering of the roofs is carried out it is suggested that the timber sarkin planks should be retained to maintain the structural integrity of the roof structure because the boards in effect act as bracing to prevent racking of the roof. Where this is retained however, proprietary preservative treatments should be provided to the unseen upper edge of the boards and allied repairs to individual areas of defective timber.

The existing bitumen underfelt is likely to have deteriorated as a result of being directly fixed over the sarkin planks and there were various areas of moisture ingress noted inside the building at the date of inspection suggesting that existing underfelt is not completely effective. It is suggested that the opportunity is taken to provide a warm deck insulated roof with insulation being both provided between rafters and also placed above the sarkin planks together with a counter batten arrangement to allow air circulation around any replacement underfelt which should ideally be a high performance breathable underfelt. All fixings to any battens and slate tiling will need to be corrosion resistant copper or similar type.

The felt flat roofs are sufficiently deteriorated to warrant immediate short term replacement with works best undertaken in conjunction with recovering of pitched slate finished roofs. The opportunity should be taken to provide modern insulated warm deck flat roofs to overcome a general lack of ventilation provision and either cut to falls insulation of firings and a replacement WBP plywood deck to improve falls to flat roofs. It is suggested to achieve a minimum of a 15 year life as required by the proposed building warranty that it will be necessary to utilise a high performance polymer modified felt with insurance backed guarantee by Anderson roofing or similar approved.

The works to both pitched and flat roofs will require alteration to roof perimeter joinery to facilitate altered eaves details according to the position and extent of insulation provided. Therefore by proxy the rainwater goods will need alteration and adaption to suit. It is therefore recommended that the existing aged rainwater goods be replaced at the time of roof recovering.

Additional Items of concern noted at inspection.

Whilst not forming part of inspection there was clearly evidence of horizontal cracking to the rear gable elevation and parts of the rear of the side elevations that is synonymous with cavity wall tie failure which in many ways should not be treated as not to be expected taking account of the exposure conditions and likely corrosive sea air in the location. The structural strength of the walls to the property will be derived from the combined strength of the two independent leaves that act as a whole when suitably tied but when untied the strength of the wall in essence may be halved. Therefore taking account of visual findings suggest that it is imperative that a cavity wall tie survey must be carried out at this time and any necessary remedial works undertaken. Where remedial wall ties are provided these will need to be of stainless steel type and existing cavity wall ties will need to be cropped and isolated to

prevent ongoing expansion of mortar bed joints. These works could prove to be very expensive and further investigation is strongly advised at this time.

At the time of writing would assure you of our best intentions and provide our deep regrets that the roof covering in our opinion is unlikely to afford a fifteen year lifespan although we do trust that the information provided does indeed address the instruction as required. Naturally if we can be of further assistance then please do feel free to contact the undersigned.

[REDACTED]
CHE MRICS

Chartered Building Surveyor

For and on behalf of Romans Professional Services Ltd.

dk
dkinson
& greene
a Romans company

2

