



Mr Dyer

33 Willow Park

Non-Material Amendment Statement

10 September 2026

This non-Material Amendment Application has been submitted on behalf of the applicant Mr Dyer.

The proposed works were approved under Householder Planning Application reference DM/25/0315, dated 9 April 2025, and are described as follows

Removal of the existing conservatory and construction of a new extension including the part conversion of the existing garage

As part of this application the following documents have been submitted

- ufm20_Permission_Householder_BNG
 - Approval Notice
- 067-001-100A Site Location Plan
 - Original Site Location Plan
- 067-001-210B Proposed Ground Floor
 - Drawing Provided at Planning Stage
- 067-001-211 Proposed Roof Plan
 - Drawing Provided at Planning Stage
- 067-001-310B Proposed Elevations
 - Drawing Provided at Planning Stage
 - Elevations East and South shown at 1:100
 - Elevations North and West shown at 1:110
- 067-001-310C Proposed Elevations 1
 - Drawing Provided During Discussions with Enforcement Officer
 - Elevations East, South and North shown at 1:100
 - Differences North elevations on Rev B and C shown
- 067-001-210C Proposed Ground Floor
 - Revised Drawing
- 067-001-211A Proposed Roof
 - Revised Drawing
- 067-001-310D Proposed Elevations 1
 - Revised Drawing

Following the start of the works on site a representation was made to Mid Sussex Planning Investigation and Enforcement. Following a site visit from Ms Clare Beauchamp on the 7th August 2026, it was highlighted that there was a potential concern being raised about the height of the rear extension.

Upon review, Jonathan Talley Architects identified a minor discrepancy in the scaling of two of the four elevations which had not previously been identified

The drawing referenced *067-001-310B Proposed Elevations* contains four elevations, all of which were intended to be shown at 1:100. Two elevations (East and South) are correctly shown at 1:100; however, due to an error in the preparation/output of the drawing, the North and West elevations were inadvertently scaled at approximately 1:110. The drawing itself is identified as being at 1:100, and this discrepancy was unfortunately not identified prior to submission or during the determination of the planning application.

A subsequent drawing reference *067-001-310C Proposed Elevations*, was prepared and issued to Ms Beauchamp indicating the error and offering the correctly scaled elevation. Further to this issue of the drawings a combined site visit to take measurements of the built extension was undertaken on 2 September 2026 by Jonathan Talley Architects, Sinclair and Jones (builders) and Ms Beauchamp.

During this visit, the appropriate datum from which the building height should be measured was agreed. Based upon the measurements taken on site and comparison with the correctly scaled approved elevations (East and South), the constructed extension was established as being 'approximately 50mm higher' than shown on the approved elevations.

As discussed on site, the apparent difference is exaggerated when measured against the Northern elevations that we have previously identified as having been inadvertently reproduced at approximately 1:110 rather than the stated 1:100 scale.

Following a review between the Planning Case Officer and Ms Beauchamp, Jonathan Talley Architects was provided with a recommendation via email from Ms Beauchamp that a Non-Material Amendment application under section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is submitted to regularise these changes to the approved drawings and that this application would also address the minor variation in the height of the extension. Further to this advice, a detailed survey was undertaken to provide accurate dimensions for the purposes of the Non-Material Amendment application. This subsequently confirmed the precise as-built height as 3,125mm from DPC level, representing a 57mm increase over the correctly scaled approved elevation.

The following revised drawings are therefore submitted to account for the changes to the approved drawings.

- 067-001-210C Proposed Ground Floor
- 067-001-210C Proposed Ground Floor
- 067-001-310D Proposed Elevations 1

A summary of the amendments is as follows:

- Correction of the previously identified scaling discrepancy affecting the approved elevations, with all elevations now shown at the correct stated scale.
- Regularisation of the as-built height of the extension, which has been measured at 3,125mm from DPC level, compared with 3,068mm shown on the correctly scaled approved elevation. This represents an increase of 57mm, or approximately 1.86%.

- Reduction in the overall width of the extension by approximately 240mm compared with the approved drawings.
- Alteration to the type and configuration of the proposed patio doors.
- Minor alteration to the arrangement of the patio and stepped access to the lower garden area.

The amendments outlined above are considered to have a negligible to no material impact upon the overall scale, massing, appearance or character of the approved development.

The correction to the elevation scaling addresses a drawing presentation discrepancy and does not, in itself, represent a physical change to the development. The as-built increase in height is limited to 57mm, representing approximately 1.86% of the approved height, while the extension has also been constructed approximately 240mm narrower than approved. Taken together, these dimensional variations do not materially increase the overall scale or visual prominence of the extension.

The alterations to the patio doors, patio arrangement and stepped access are similarly minor in nature and do not materially alter the appearance or planning impacts of the development.

Importantly, the amendments do not result in any material increase in overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, overbearing impact or other harm to neighbouring residential amenity when compared with the development previously assessed and approved.

The development therefore remains materially consistent with the form, scale and character of the approved scheme. The amendments outlined above are considered to have no material impact upon the overall scale, massing, appearance or character of the approved development.

Conclusion

As set out within this statement, a scaling discrepancy has been identified on the previously approved elevation drawing. While the drawing was identified as being at 1:100, the North and West elevations were inadvertently output at approximately 1:110. The East and South elevations were correctly shown at 1:100 and therefore provide the appropriate basis against which the intended dimensions of the approved development should be understood.

This drawing presentation error had the effect of exaggerating the apparent difference between the approved and as-built development when measurements were taken from the incorrectly scaled elevations. The scaling discrepancy should not therefore be interpreted as representing an equivalent physical departure from the approved development.

Following the joint site inspection and subsequent detailed survey, the as-built height of the extension has been confirmed as 3,125mm from DPC level, compared with 3,068mm shown on the correctly scaled approved elevation. This represents a difference of 57mm, equivalent to approximately 1.86% of the approved height.

While this minor dimensional variation is acknowledged, the extension has also been constructed approximately 240mm narrower than approved. Considered in the round, these limited dimensional variations do not materially alter the scale, massing, form, appearance or visual prominence of the approved development.

The other amendments, comprising alterations to the patio doors and minor changes to the patio and stepped access arrangements, are similarly limited in nature. Collectively, the amendments do not result in any material increase in overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, overbearing impact or other harm to neighbouring residential amenity when compared with the development previously assessed and approved.

The development as constructed therefore remains, in all material planning respects, consistent with the development previously approved.

We trust that the clarification provided within this statement, together with the dimensions verified on site and the revised drawings submitted, provides the Council with a clear basis upon which to consider the application positively.

Given the very limited nature of the amendments and the absence of any material planning harm arising from them, we respectfully request that the Non-Material Amendment application is approved at the earliest opportunity, allowing the minor discrepancies to be regularised promptly and bringing the matter to a satisfactory conclusion for all parties.