

Andrew Ardill
86 Southwood Lane
Hornsey
London
N6 5SY

15th May 2026

Planning Service
London Borough of Haringey
5th Floor, Alexandra House
10 Station Road
Wood Green
London N22 7TY

Application for a Non-Material Amendment

Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Original Planning Reference: HGY/2025/2929

Approval of Details reserved by a condition Reference: HGY/2026/0905

Site: 86 Southwood Lane, Hornsey, London, N6 5SY

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to apply for a non-material amendment to planning permission HGY/2025/2929, granted on 27 January 2026. The proposed amendments relate to minor refinements to the south boundary retaining wall, arising from detailed design development and site investigation carried out in preparation for the party wall award process and construction. The amendments are described below.

1. Description of Proposed Amendments

Three amendments are proposed to the approved boundary wall detail:

(a) Introduction of a 50mm drainage cavity behind the facing brickwork

During cleaning of the existing boundary wall in preparation for discharging Condition 4 (brickwork specification, ref: HGY/2026/0905), significant efflorescence was identified on the face of the existing bricks, caused by salt migration from the retained earth and groundwater behind the wall. Historic England's *Principles of Repair for Historic Buildings* advises that effective repair requires understanding "*why its materials are starting to fail, as well as what can be done to prevent it happening again.*"

To protect the existing reclaimed (and replacement LRBMs bricks if needed) from future salt damage and ensure the long-term durability of the rebuilt heritage wall, a 50mm drainage cavity is proposed between the facing brickwork and the concrete retaining wall. This is a standard construction detail for retaining wall situations. The cavity marginally increases the overall wall

thickness but this change is not perceptible in elevation or from any public viewpoint. The boundary wall is not visible from the public realm.

(b) Revision to the plinth stone at the junction between the rebuilt brick wall and the new concrete retaining wall

The approved drawings indicate a dark grey/blue plinth stone at this junction. Following detailed design development, it is proposed to substitute with a 20-25mm white/sandy textured bullnose coping stone. This provides a more refined and visually coherent transition between the textured concrete base and the rebuilt masonry above. The projecting bullnose profile creates a subtle shadow line which reinforces the legibility of the junction between the existing and new elements, consistent with the conservation objective of maintaining a clear distinction between old and new, as sought by the Conservation Officer during the determination of the planning application. The dark grey/blue plinth stone was not a feature of the original locally listed wall at this location and its replacement with a lighter, more sympathetic treatment is considered an improvement.

The contextual relationship to the locally listed Southwood House boundary wall is maintained through the reclaimed brick character and header course detailing of the upper wall itself, which is also consistent with the previous planning decision in 2014 (HGY/2014/3447).

(c) Clarification of the textured concrete finish to the lower retaining wall

The approved drawing SWL-SEC-11 (P7) describes a "textured bamboo imprinted concrete finish" to the lower section of the retaining wall. This description is refined to "textured linear patterned formliner finish providing an abstract pattern inspired by bamboo/reed forms." The design intent remains the same as a textured concrete surface with a vertical linear character that provides visual contrast with the rebuilt brick wall above, as agreed during the planning application.

The refinement reflects the specification of a commercially available formliner system that achieves the intended abstract linear character. Following detailed design testing including 3D computer visualisation and physical sample assessment on site, the proposed pattern is the Reckli 'Friesland' formliner, which produces an irregular vertical profile consistent with the bamboo/reed-inspired finish described in the approved drawings. It is noted that the graphic hatch pattern used to depict the concrete finish on approved drawing SWL-ELE-09 (P4) already closely represents this vertical linear character.

The proposed Friesland pattern, supporting visualisation, and a photograph of the physical formliner sample assessed against the existing boundary wall brickwork are enclosed at Appendix 1.

2. Amended Drawings

The following revised drawings are submitted:

- **SWL-SEC-11 (Rev P8)** - Proposed Boundary Wall Section, showing the drainage cavity, revised coping stone, and updated concrete finish annotation
- **SWL-ELE-09 (Rev P5)** - Proposed Boundary Elevation, with updated annotation to reflect the revised coping stone and concrete finish description

All other approved drawings remain unchanged.

3. Assessment of non-materiality

The proposed amendments are non-material for the following reasons:

- All three changes relate to a boundary wall that is not visible from the public realm, as established during the determination of the application.
- The changes do not alter the scale, height, footprint, or overall design of any element of the approved development.
- The drainage cavity is a standard construction detail that protects the heritage brickwork and is not perceptible externally.
- The coping stone revision is a minor material refinement that improves the visual transition between old and new elements, consistent with the Conservation Officer's request during the application for clear differentiation between the rebuilt wall and the new retaining structure.
- The concrete pattern description is a clarification, not a change, the design intent (a textured linear pattern contrasting with the brickwork above) is unchanged from the approved drawings.
- The vertical linear character of the proposed Friesland formliner is consistent with the graphic representation of the concrete finish shown on approved drawing SWL-ELE-09 (P4). The proposed specification therefore delivers the visual intent already depicted in the approved drawings.
- The amendments do not affect the amenity of any neighbouring property.
- The amendments do not give rise to any new or different policy considerations.

4. Conclusion

The proposed amendments are genuinely minor refinements arising from detailed design development and site investigation. They do not alter the substance of the approved development and in certain respects improve it. I respectfully request that the amendments be accepted as non-material.

Yours faithfully,



Andrew Ardill

BSc(Hons), BArch, RIBA, ARB

Chartered Architect

Enclosures:

- Drawing SWL-SEC-11 (P8) - Proposed Boundary Wall Section (amended)
- Drawing SWL-ELE-09 (P5) - Proposed Boundary Elevation (amended)
- Appendix 1 - Proposed Formliner Pattern (Reckli Friesland)