

- There appears to be a difference between the proposed drawings and 3D rendering as to the position and thus relationship with the extant garden walling/oil tank storage – the drawings suggest the orangery would sit in front of the walling, whereas the 3D render suggests it would be ‘tucked behind’. Related to this it would be helpful to see a plan drawing without the cornice i.e. to clarify the exact distance between the two structures.
Please find attached an updated base plan ref: 12940/02A which shows the relationship between the orangery and oil tank storage building. You will see that the orangery no longer projects beyond the corner of the oil tank building. The proposed plan ref: 12940/01B also shows the corrected positioning.
- The existing and proposed ground floor plans appear to erroneously show the South Scarletts side of the boundary wall being flush/in-line with the side elevation wall to Scarletts Close. It appears the boundary wall to be stepped back by some 50-60mm from line of the side wall to Scarletts Close. The alignment of this walling should be correctly shown on the plans.
Please find attached an updated existing and proposed plan ref: 12940/01B and 12940/02B. These now show the correct positioning of the boundary wall, as per your advice.
- Details concerning the two rainwater downpipes – it is presumed the extant downpipe on the east elevation will be retained – as shown on the drawings – how will this pipe continue and to where will it discharge? As it currently kicks round the roof structure and continues down externally. The existing rainwater hopper and downpipe will be retained and re-routed against the host wall and above the orangery flat roof and will discharge externally to the left of the orangery. Please refer to section drawing 12940/10A. Similarly, the downpipe which serves the concealed parapet of Scarletts Close, how will this continue and discharge in relation to the new structure – as was noted on site there are issues concerning water drainage. The existing rainwater gully that services the downpipe from Scarletts Close will be relocated to the outside of the new orangery, but will remain within the curtilage of South Scarletts. Please refer to plan drawing 12940/09B. Directly related, how will water be removed from the new addition’s flat roof and where will be new downpipe(s) be located? There will be 2 hoppers and downpipes to drain the rainwater from the orangery roof and these are now shown on the proposed plans and elevations – drawing ref: 12940/02B.
- An elevational cross-section is required as to show the retention of the extant fabric on the eastern elevation – it is presumed and was mentioned on site the existing downstand would be retained and also the extant nib on the northernmost wall. The proposed drawing appears to indicate this would be reduced; however, the existing nib should be retained as is. I can confirm that the nib will be retained – please refer to drawing 12940/10A. In addition, details are required for a vertical cross-section from just inside the new extension that shows the opening through to the rest of the ground floor, to be able to understand the enlarged opening is to be in its width and height, preferably also detailing any needed new steel to support the first floor walling and how it would be installed – would it require

bridging over the top of the brickwork to the window opening to be enclosed? Please find attached section drawing ref 12940/11A which shows the indicative positioning of the proposed steel lintel (this will be designed by a structural engineer to accommodate the widening of the existing opening and weight loading from the floor above once planning and listed approval has been granted). This drawing also shows the relationship between the ceiling height of the orangery and the existing ground floor ceilings.

- Clarification is required on the current finish of the fabric behind the cupboards in the 1970s garden room and how would this area be treated within the new structure? The wall behind the cupboards has a breathable lime plaster and paint finish and there is no evidence of damp. There is concern over breathability, if for example, this area is plastered using an impervious gypsum which may lead to increased moisture levels within the walling of Scarletts Close (which is understood to be the rear of a cupboard and chimney stack). A structural insulated timber stud wall will be constructed on the inside of the original wall of Scarletts Close allowing a small gap so that it can continue to breathe. Please refer to drawings 12940/5B and 12940/09B. Similarly, clarification is sought as to the interior finishes of the areas of walling, currently external, which will become internal e.g. repairs to the brickwork, re-pointing etc. Any repairs to the brickwork and pointing will be undertaken in a sensitive and manner appropriate for this heritage asset.
- Details are required that show the means by which the roof of the new extension would be attached to the brick of South Scarlets, as the drawing 12940/05 – Detailed Roof Section, is only a part section from the edge of the roof lantern to the glazed outer wall of the extension and as such does not show how the roof would be affixed to the brickwork. Please find attached drawing ref 12940/05a which details the fixing method for the abutment of the flat roof structure to the east elevation of South Scarlets. You will note that we will use resin anchor fixings to minimise the damage to the original fabric of the brick wall and code 4 lead flashing to provide a traditional weathered seal. Furthermore, no details have been provided that explains how the extension's roof is to be built-off/abutted the external walling of the neighbouring listed property of Scarlets Close with details to confirm how a waterproof junction is to be formed (presumably a traditional lead or some other form of waterproof sheeting would be dressed into the mortar bedding of the brickwork), which would not be in the applicant's ownership. Please now find attached drawing ref 12940/05b that shows that a traditional code 4 lead flashing detail will be used to provide a weathered seal. There will be no weight loading or intrusive fixing of the flat roof to Scarlets Close to minimise the impact on this neighbouring property. The structural stud wall that will be formed on the inside of the Scarlets Close will accommodate the weight of the joists.
- Concerns are raised and confirmation is required on how the section of the new extension's walling to be on the same alignment as the existing brick boundary wall with Scarletts Close would connect with the rear wall of Scarletts Close as it is presumed there is a need for load-bearing to take the weight of the roof that there would be the need to comply with building regulations in terms of the walling abutment and foundations. Give a need for structural stability it is thought that to meet with building regs grounds the new extension wall could

not just be abutted/free standing off the corner brickwork of Scarletts Close but would require for some form of physically connect between the two. From heritage stance impacts to the neighbouring fabric would not be supported [Noting your points of concern, we have changed the design to show how the new retaining parapet wall will be fixed to the outer corner of Scarlets Close and not the boundary garden wall where a small gap will be created and sealed with lead flashing. We feel that this will cause the least impact to the neighbouring fabric, whilst conforming with current building regulations. Please refer to drawing ref 12940/09B which clearly illustrates the new proposal which has been agreed between the owners of South Scarlets and Scarlets Close.](#)

- The application proposes to take down the existing section of brick boundary wall from the rear corner of Scarletts Close up to the oil tank enclosure and erect a taller section of wall, part of which would form part of the proposed extension. This raises not only the question as to the ownership of the walling, the alignment of the new section of wall, given the step in nature of the wall (not shown on the plans), the walls much greater height and given the existing soakaway rainwater drainage. It is also noted as shown on the floor plan the thickness of the new wall to the old would not change - this does not appear to be a consistent detail given the low base wall of the extension is depicted to be of a greater thickness, with drawing 12940/08 - Detailed Horizontal Frame Section showing the low base wall to be of a cavity design. It may be the case that the applicants are seeking to install insulation of the new section of boundary walling that forms part of the new extension, or possible across the that section of new wall and the whole of the internalised brickwork of the listed neighbouring property's exterior wall. No details given, likewise for the existing internalised area of brickwork of South Scarletts or the additional area to be encased by the extension. [Please refer to the answer in the paragraph above and drawing ref 12940/09B which we believe addresses the concerns you have raised as the garden wall will no longer be altered.](#)
- Given the position of the first-floor window to the side of Scarletts Close, clarification is sought as to the issue of overlooking given the position of the roof lanterns (and potential a noise issue if lanterns are openable). [I can confirm that the new flat glass roof lanterns will be fixed \(non-opening\) so noise is not deemed to be an issue. The window to the side of Scarletts Close is currently overlooking the existing garden room glass roof lantern and, therefore, the orangery will not significantly change to impact of the view from this window. Moreover, the owners of Scarletts Close are in support of the orangery proposal.](#)