

Lynnyrd Wolfe

From: Andrew Wood
Sent: 14 May 2019 13:52
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: M/27/19/NMA - Plans request & Update
Attachments: NM-248-09 Rev A Proposed Elevations.pdf; NM-248-10 Existing & Proposed Street Scene.pdf



From: Rose Hollis [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 May 2019 13:44
To: Andrew Wood
Subject: Fwd: M/27/19/NMA - Plans request & Update

[Get Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Rose Hollis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 7:33 am
To: Andrew Wood
Subject: Re: M/27/19/NMA - Plans request & Update

Dear Andrew

Please find attached the amended plans.

The architect stated the height of the house to be 7 metres, this height was given prior to the Environment Agency setting the finished floor level. The Environment agency stipulation means the overall height of the house has risen at ground to finished floor level. The dimensions of the rest of the house remain the same.

The window on the south first floor is fixed and obscure as per condition set by Arun. The windows have been ordered, constructed and are ready next week.

The street scene now shows that the new dwelling sits within its surroundings. The ridge of the dwelling will be the highest point which is set a good distance away from the neighbouring ridge. The majority of the remaining roof will be 7 metres or under.

I hope this is sufficient for the NMA decision to be processed as soon as possible as the due date for a decision is today. If there is going to be a delay please can you let me know asap, as the delays are having a huge financial impact upon not just ourselves but the other trades that are involved in the building process.

Many Thanks

Rose Hollis

From: Andrew Wood [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 May 2019 15:11
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: M/27/19/NMA - Plans request & Update

Ms. Hollis,

M/27/19/NMA - Plans request & Update

In considering the plans submitted there is no difference in height between elevations plan no. NM-248-09 submitted with M/27/19/NMA and PA-248-07 submitted with M/84/18/PL despite the description of the NMA application stating the overall height of the dwelling has increased by 30cm.

The only difference between the plans is the change of materials at first floor level. Can you please submit an accurate plan of the building which accords with what has been constructed on site and what is to be constructed in terms of the roof.

Please demonstrate on a drawing the difference between the finished floor levels of the proposed scheme under the NMA and that approved in M/84/18/PL.

Can you also submit an accurate strip elevation including 22 and 28 Alleyne Way.

These drawings will be checked on site and must be entirely accurate.

I would further note that under application M/84/18/PL the finished floor levels decreased from 4.1 metres to 4.01 metres. As such a reduction in the height of the overall building would have been expected. Please explain.

The construction as it has been progressing has attracted a number of significant complaints alleging it is not being constructed in accordance with approved plans. What is clear is the windows at first floor height are significantly higher than shown on the strip elevation which, while it is acknowledged that the primary plan to scale is the elevation plan, is a matter of significant concern.

Please provide the plans requested as soon as possible so your application can be determined expeditiously and do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries.

Thank you,

Andrew Wood MRTPI

