

Dear Rebecca

Re: Planning Application No 3/2020/0353, 2 Pendle Street West, Sabden BB7 9EG

Further to our brief telephone conversation on 24th June, I wish to submit representations regarding this proposal and would also like to apply to speak at the planning and development committee meeting when the members sit to consider the application.

Whilst I have been instrumental in bringing this matter to the attention of the planning authority, through communications with both Jigsaw Homes and your colleague Andy Glover, and am in support of permission being granted to replace the current structure, I do have a number of concerns relating to the nature and content of this application that I wish to make you and your committee members aware of.

For clarity, I will address each of my concerns in order of how they are presented within the application documents – apologies in advance for any duplication:

20 0353 Application Form

In my opinion, the application form has been completed with a bias towards suggesting that planning has been sought to amend a historically long standing structure, when this is not the case. There are a number of inaccuracies also within the application.

4 – Description of proposed works, *replacement of an existing flat roof over a ground floor south facing rear outrigger* – this makes the suggestion that the existing roof is a long standing/original structure when it is not. The original roof was removed and the current ‘existing’ replacement has been put in place recently and without planning permission.

Has the work already been started without consent? The applicant states ‘no’ which is a false statement, the work has been started.

5 – Explanation for Proposed Demolition Work

Why is it necessary to demolish all or part of the building(s) and/or structure(s)?

The existing roof is in poor quality and impedes daylight from entering neighbouring residential properties. The existing roof is to be removed and the roof height reduced. The existing roof associated structure in its entirety will be removed. There is evidence that the existing roof is a cause for mould and damp buildup within the property thus needing to be fully replaced.

the explanation for the proposed demolition work is also inaccurate and refers to both the pre-existing roof and the current structure as one and the same when they are not. The original (gabled, pitched) roof was assessed as being of poor quality and of being the cause of a buildup of mold and damp within No 2, which subsequently impacted on my own adjoining property, however it did not impede daylight from entering my property. Jigsaw Homes took the decision to remove the roof, replacing it with a high level, modern, flat structure which overhangs my boundary considerably. They carried out these works without seeking planning permission and without proper consultation with myself as adjoining neighbour. I have raised a number of concerns relating to this structure, the result of which being that Jigsaw Homes have been advised by planning enforcement that the current structure is not acceptable and that planning be sought to replace it.

6 – Materials

Description of proposed materials and finishes: - BauderTEC KSO SN CAp sheet (charcoal Grey or Black in colour to match existing) - Apron Flashing - Fascia Board to match existing

I am unsure what the materials quoted are, but remaining mindful that the application refers to the current structure as being the 'existing' one, my understanding is that the proposed materials are to match what the Housing Association (HA) have put in place of their own accord, and which absolutely do not match what was on the original, historic gabled, pitched roof.

Aluminium Gutter with black paint finish. Colour, finish and profile to match existing

It is unclear to me where on the structure, the guttering will be situated.

20 0353 Design and access statement

This statement is in support of the application for Full Planning Permission to amend the use of the specified residence existing flat roof, to the keeping of a new flat roof at a reduced height.

I consider the content of this statement to be inaccurate and misleading. The flat roof that is in situ currently and which is referred to as the 'existing' flat roof was installed without planning permission. Following objection by myself, as well as intervention by the planning enforcement officer, the HA have accepted that proper procedures were not adhered to and that they will undertake to correct this, however the pre-existing roof structure for this property was gabled, pitched in design and used materials sympathetic to the age of the property and the surrounding area.

The application follows pre-application consultations with the Ribble Valley Borough Council's Planning Department, and the enclosed proposals have been designed to take into account their comments in the letter dated 01/04/ 2020.

During the pre-application consultations, were the planning department made fully aware that the current structure was constructed without due consideration to planning restrictions and is not in any way similar to the original roof? If not, I kindly request that when considering the application, the committee are made aware that the Housing Association appear to be proposing a lower version of what they have recently constructed, rather than a replacement sympathetic to the original structure.

Access to the property will be unaffected by the proposed design with being a refurbishment to the existing structure.

I consider this statement to be a fabrication of the true facts – Although this is now to be considered a refurbishment of the 'existing' this is purely due to the fact that the original roof was removed and replaced (without planning permission) with the current structure, the design and materials of which, are in no way sympathetic to the original property, neighbouring properties, or the historic nature of the area as a whole. This is the opinion of myself and my neighbours.

Design proposal

The applicant aims to achieve a high standard of design with the following considerations being taken into account:

I dispute this statement on the basis that, having been erected without planning permission, the current design (the proposal seems to be to replicate this) is perfunctory, modern in design and completely at odds with the dwelling and surrounding area.

The proposal's design keeps in accordance to the historic value of the areas heritage

I have provided photographs to dispute this claim, I would also urge you or one of your colleagues to perform a site visit so that you can fully appreciate the inaccuracy of this statement.

The proposal retains the existing roof type to match neighbouring properties

This is also a fabrication of the true facts – the original (existing) roof type has not been retained at all, but replaced with a modern, utilitarian, perfunctory structure

The application is within the properties boundary and is to improve from the existing roof. The proposal will improve the intrinsic value of the Conservation Area and neighbouring daylight to residences, therefore is considered to be a sustainable amendment to the site.

It has been accepted that the structure that has been erected by Jigsaw Homes in place of the previous historic roof, is not within the boundary, and I would like re-assurance that the replacement will not encroach upon my boundary in any way – I have been unable to seek re-assurance from the information submitted within the application documents.

This statement is true of the original pitched, gabled roof however, in my opinion the proposed replacement for what has been erected recently (without planning permission) will not improve the intrinsic value of the conservation area

Complaints from neighbours for the lack of daylight caused by the existing roof has encouraged the proposed design. The proposed roof will reduce the height to amend this issue.

This is not an accurate representation. There had been no complaints previously, other than to report that my adjoining property was developing a damp patch which was investigated and found to be due to moisture encroaching on my property from No 2. The roof structure at this time was gabled, pitched in design, sympathetic to the age of the property and I had made no comment to the design or intrusion to light on my property at any time – you should be aware that Jigsaw homes removed this roof (without gaining permission from the planning department) and replaced it with the structure that is there at the moment – the objections that have been raised by me refer wholly to this structure.

Materiality being used will match those used for the rest of the property; to respect the Conservation Area and surrounding material heritage. This includes a Charcoal Grey or Black cap sheet roof covering and fascia.

I dispute this statement – should it be proposed that the materials to be used, replicate the ones used in the current (non-agreed) structure, a site visit will conclude that these are in no way respectful of the rest of the property or the surrounding material heritage.

Conclusion The enclosed application presents a scheme that is appropriate to the setting of the site, with the intention to provide a proposal on a sympathetic scale, form and massing and the use of appropriate materials.

I dispute this conclusion – I fully support an application being made, and permission granted to restore the original pitched, gabled roof or to re-install a flat roof of proper proportions, however I

am most concerned that the preference for the HA is to replicate what's been used already and in which case, this does not present a scheme that is appropriate to the setting of the site at all.

Existing Plan and Elevation

Existing roof elevation from back alley – this is not an accurate reflection of how the structure looks currently and is not how it looked before Jigsaw Homes installed what is currently in situ. The drawing seems to suggest that the current replacement roof structure does not overhang my boundary which in fact it does, quite significantly.

Heritage Statement

The proposal is to amend a resident's flat roof towards the rear extrusion on the ground floor, situated within Pendle Street West. The existing flat roof is blocking daylight to the neighbouring property due to the current height. The proposal is to reduce the roof height to allow further daylight to enter the neighbouring property, and improve the habitual conditions from the existing roof. The scheme aims to improve the waterproofing and thermal insulation of the space to prevent mould and damp from occurring inside the property. The design is focused on keeping in accordance to the historic value of the area's heritage, and retains the existing roof type to match that of neighbouring properties. The property's outrigger initially supported a gabled pitch roof, however with neighbouring properties at present supporting a flat roof, and due to the loss of light to neighbours; from the existing flat roof on the site, the proposed design is to keep in context with the neighbouring outriggers flat roof plan. The existing flat roof design is being reduced, and being lowered to be less obtrusive to the conservation area's character as best as possible. Colours of the roofing materials will relate to the surrounding slate (if existing) otherwise the proposal is to be as incongruous as possible to remain in keeping and maintain neighbourly qualities of light.

The applicant is leading the planning officer to believe that they propose to make alterations to a long standing flat roof purely to improve lighting conditions from my adjoining property when this not the case. In fact, despite including the heritage statement in support of this application, they took little interest in this when they undertook to install the current structure with no regard to heritage, or planning requirements. I am therefore suspicious of the housing association's statement that the design is focused on keeping in accordance to the historic value of the area's heritage and would be grateful for more information on the proposed materials to be used this time. I have included photographs of the original roof, materials used on the structure currently in situ, along with photographs of surrounding properties/roof structures and the materials used in keeping with the heritage of the area and hope these will be of use to the committee.

Proposed Plan and Elevation

Much of the information within this document are based on approximation and assumption as follows:

Approximate 340mm roof reduction

Existing roof height and assembly is to be verified

Presumed resident boundary

New fascia board to match existing (fascia board in situ now does not match the roof removed prior to this application, and has been clumsily fitted above historic material causing an unsightly mismatch). I would like clarity on how the HA intend to couple the replacement roof to the existing material on my boundary (photo provided).

Summary

I am fully in support of Jigsaw Homes' application, and permission being granted to restore the original pitched, gabled roof or to re-install a flat roof of proper proportions, however I am most concerned that the Housing Association's intention in submitting this application in its current format, is to seek approval to make alterations to what's been constructed and put in place already. The application seems to suggest that they propose to replicate the (pre-application) design and materials used, and in which case, I feel that this does not present a scheme that is appropriate to the setting of the site at all.

My understanding is that the planning application is submitted for the purpose of seeking approval/guidelines from the committee on installing an appropriate replacement for the historic/original roof structure (which has already been removed) which has been found to be the cause of damp and mold within the properties No 2 and No 4 Pendle Street West. However, it seems that from information presented in support of the application, the housing association are seeking approval to use design and materials in line with a construction already installed by them. A construction which was installed without permission and using inappropriate design and materials. The purpose of my comments, along with my wish to be represented at the meeting is to ensure that, given the history of this case, the roof structure is restored to its previous character.

I am keen to ensure that in advising on this case, the committee have all the facts to hand and that they are not referring to an application which in my opinion is misleading in some of its content.

Photographs attached:

Original roof on No2 outrigger extension as visible from No4 – please note lower height at the end furthest from the house.

Replacement construction – please note the height at the end has also been lifted (as per above note), removing height difference but also please notice that this leaves a poor finish where the original fascia has been left falling short. This is most apparent in replacement construction photograph numbers 6 and 8.

Materials used on current construction

Surrounding area and neighbouring properties for comparison



