

## JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT

9<sup>th</sup> February 2017

**RE: Richmond Chase, Condition NS04 (Hard Surfacing) of the planning permission 16/0523/VRC dated 18/05/2016.**

Dear LBRuT Case Officer,

This statement of justification has been prepared to support the application to remove the wording “*all hard surfacing to be made of porous materials*” from Condition NS04 which states:

*No development, except for works of demolition, shall take place until details of the following have been submitted to and approved writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.*

- A. *The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of all buildings hereby approved, including their colour and texture.*
- B. *Boundary treatments, including walls, fences and gates.*
- C. *The treatment and layout of all parts of the site not covered by the approved buildings, including hard and soft landscaping. All hard surfaces shall be made of porous materials.*
- D. *Refuse storage facilities.*
- E. *Street furniture and lighting.*
- F. *Sewer and drainage runs.*
- G. *Any external plant and equipment.*
- H. *Details and siting of solar panels.*

**REASON:** *To ensure a high quality development, and protect the amenities of residents*

1. When overlaying servicing plans with the road layout there are a number of locations where servicing runs underneath the main thoroughfare. Running services under a permeable surface is not best practice and should be avoided. Berkeley's civil engineers from RLT provided the following statement which is also attached as further evidence:

*“The service corridors within the permeable road widths must be impermeable as part of the services provider's requirements. This is so they do not have to deal with flooded trenches when they are maintaining their services.”*

2. When re-grading and demolishing the site to a fit for purpose state to build, 4500 cubic metres of crush was excavated.
  - The ability to use the existing materials from the crush, as opposed to hauling these away and importing material from other locations, creates the potential for a few hundred lorry movements to be reduced, minimising the Carbon Footprint, enhancing local ecology and reducing the impact on local residents.

Berkeley Homes (West London) Ltd, Chelsea Bridge Wharf, 380 Queenstown Road, London SW8 4PE

Tel: 020 3675 1501

**[www.berkeleyhomes.co.uk](http://www.berkeleyhomes.co.uk)**

Registered No. 2660063

Whilst we appreciate that improving surface water drainage through new development is a key objective and that hard landscaping materials are required to be porous as standard, we demonstrate that we are still providing adequate surface water drainage in accordance with the approved FRA. Supporting information can be found in the form of:

- Statement for evidence from RSK Consultants Ltd
- Email dated 11 January 2017 from RLT including statement on service corridors – appended to this letter
- Floor Risk Assessment approved under original planning application
- FRA addendum letter from RLT Engineering Consultants Ltd
- Planning Cover Letter from Indigo Planning Ltd
- Hard landscaping drawings
- Drainage plans

Yours sincerely,

**Matthew Coveney**  
Development Manager

---

**From:** [pr@rtengcon.co.uk](mailto:pr@rtengcon.co.uk) [<mailto:pr@rtengcon.co.uk>]

**Sent:** 11 January 2017 16:50

**To:** Phill Davies <[Phill.Davies@berkeleygroup.co.uk](mailto:Phill.Davies@berkeleygroup.co.uk)>

**Cc:** Neil Lynch <[neil.lynch@brookesarchitects.co.uk](mailto:neil.lynch@brookesarchitects.co.uk)>; Joe Todd <[Joe@turkingtonmartin.com](mailto:Joe@turkingtonmartin.com)>; Sean Convery - RLT Engineering Consultants Ltd <[sean.convery@rtengcon.co.uk](mailto:sean.convery@rtengcon.co.uk)>; [daniel.mucklow@rtengcon.co.uk](mailto:daniel.mucklow@rtengcon.co.uk); Ben Cui <[jian.cui@rtengcon.co.uk](mailto:jian.cui@rtengcon.co.uk)>

**Subject:** 150903 - Latchmere House - External Finishes Plan

Phill,

We have revised the finishes drawings and attach them together with the construction details.

The service corridors within the permeable road widths must be impermeable as part of the services providers requirements. This is so they do not have to deal with flooded trenches when they are maintaining their services.

We have currently showed a bullnosed edging to separate the permeable/impermeable areas of the access roads due to the differing construction required (See extract from our construction detail below).

These strips were not intended as footpaths as you seemed to have interpreted them. I appreciate that this is somewhat of a dilemma since you need to have a form of delineation to be able to undertake the different forms of construction either side of the edging, but this may have the appearance of being a footpath even though the block paving both sides is at the same level and is the same appearance/colour.

Regards

Yours sincerely,

Philip Richards  
Principal Director  
On behalf of RLT Engineering Consultants Ltd.



**RLT ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS LTD**  
2 St Peters Court, Middleborough, Colchester, Essex. CO1 1WD.  
Tel: 01206 768655 Email : [pr@rtengcon.co.uk](mailto:pr@rtengcon.co.uk)  
Website: [www.rltengcon.co.uk](http://www.rltengcon.co.uk)

This communication and any documents accompanying it contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is privileged. The information is intended only for use of the named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this Emailed information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this Email in error please immediately notify us by telephone.