

## SUPPORTING STATEMENT

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY. AND PART FIRST FLOOR. PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS WITH THREE DORMER WINDOWS / BALCONIES, AND DETACHED CLASS E OUTBUILDING TO REAR GARDEN

Planning permission was granted for the above development on the 23rd October 2023 under reference 23/2329/HOT. The description of the development, as submitted and validated, referred to the outbuilding as a *Class E Building*. During the discussions between the Case Officer and the Applicant's Agent prior to the decision being issued, it became clear that the proposed outbuilding did not qualify for the permitted development rights conferred under Class E.

The application was subsequently approved but the description of the development had not been changed and still referred to the outbuilding as the *Class E Building*. However, the wording of the Case Officer's Delegation Report and the conditions on the decision notice clearly indicated that that building had been part of the formal consideration of the application and not permitted development.

When the decision notice was issued, the list of drawings that had been taken into account in the determination of the application, as set out in Condition U0167402, *Approved Drawings*, one of the relevant drawings had been omitted. That drawing *ref: 343.03.110 rev B* included details of the outbuilding and as it had formed part of the decision making process, it should have been included in the list of relevant drawings.

The above issues, having been considered by Nicki Dale, the South Team Leader, are the subject of this application which is submitted under Section 96a of the Act. It has been agreed as a result of that consideration, the failure to change the description of the development and the omission of the drawing referred to above, were errors but which could be corrected through the submission of this application as a Non-Material amendment.

---

## SUPPORTING STATEMENT

The findings of the review of the case was attached to an email dated 14th November 2024 which was sent to the writer of this Statement.

The Review states:

*"I have reviewed the application and see that your assessment is correct that drawing 343.03.110 rev B was omitted in error. Given that the outbuilding is in the description of development, shown on the site plan and included within the officer's assessment, this is a clear omission.*

and

*The outbuilding plans were available for public scrutiny from validation, are drawn to scale and illustrate the uses as home office and gym. As such, I do not regard this description as undermining the validity of the permission although I would agree that removing reference to 'Class E' through an appropriate mechanism would be preferable for the sake of clarity,*

and

*The test is one of non-material/minor material and as the change to the description is a matter of clarification only and the outbuilding has been consulted upon, fully assessed and deemed acceptable with these conclusions published in the officers report, I consider that this correction may be considered as a non-material amendment."*

In the light of the above comments, it is requested that the proposed changes are accepted as an application under Section 96a and that those changes do not materially affect the nature or character of the development originally approved.

Prepared for: Mrs Elice Jaswal  
Prepared by: Eric Telford B.A., B.Sc  
Date: 29th November 2024  
Proposal number: 24/00887