We strongly object to the recent addition to this application for a change of material from the specified and approved green/cream coloured Chicksgrove to orange Lincolnshire Clipsham which has been used on all the other elevations contrary to planning conditions.

We have supported this proposed demolition and redevelopment of Bevisfield and were happy that our comments concerning the plant screening and dual pitch roof to the garage were considered and implemented by the applicant as this now affords both Bevisfield and our property at Littledown a high degree of privacy which would not otherwise have existed.

Our decision to support the application was based on several factors as follows.

1 – Local stone to be used and on enquiry we were told Chilmark / Chicksgrove

2- As stated in the last paragraph plant screening and dual pitched roof.

3- The elevation plans were of a quality building with a mix of traditional and modern styles/ materials, with timber lintels over the windows and a traditional chimney.

4- The planting design was appropriate for the location and would provide good cover as it matures.

I refer to the change of materials comment as follows:

In response to the Applicants Letter report from IBIS dated 25th March 2024

Ashlar stone was not / has not been used at Bevisfield. What was proposed would have been classed as dressed rubble brought to course, what has been built is rough random rubble.

Ashlar is a type of masonry that requires only a little mortar to bind it. The term can refer either to an individual stone that has been “finely dressed” (cut and worked) until squared off, or to a structure built from such stones.

Supply issue – I am aware, as I run a local masonry company, of the extended production times that the local supplier of Chicksgrove stone was experiencing during springtime last year, this was due to volume of orders and is not uncommon from time to time .However, I understand from the supplier that the **correct** stone *Chicksgrove stone* was supplied but the applicant decided some of this was too similar in size. The applicant was given a few options by the supplier which would then have met his expectations, but he declined and demanded his deposit back which was duly given.

Clipsham stone was **not** used in the construction of Salisbury Cathedral but was used for repair works in the 1950s to the top nine metres, not courses, of the spire and was used because there were no Chilmark quarries producing stone during this period and not because Clipsham was a superior material.

Properties in Cow drove

There are ten other properties accessed from Cow Drove – Three of reconstituted stone all pale in appearance to resemble Chilmark stone and not of varied colours. Five rendered, some with the struck render to give the appearance from a small distance of stone and of a washed white sand to reflect Chilmark stone in colour. One built of Chilmark stone with flint inclusions, and one built of Purbeck stone from the 1970s when Chilmark stone was not available.

Stone comparison-- Fig 1





Stone comparison --Fig 2

Above Fig 1 is the approved Chicksgrove dressed and brought to course stone and Fig 2 is what has been built in Clipsham rubble at Bevisfield.

The Chicksgrove stone appearance is sandy in nature with the colour being predominantly cream / white with a tinge of green and will appear slightly darker when wet. There is a varied size range of stones from 300mm down to 65mm which sit well together and are regular in appearance.

The Clipsham rubble in Fig 2 is course in texture, very similar to Bath stone, and is of a light buff to dark orange which will become more pronounced when wet. The stone sizes are all very similar, rough, oblong shapes some of which have been fitted upright with an overall wavy look to the coursing.

There is a vastly different water absorbency rate between the two different stones and it is highly unlikely that the Clipsham will ever weather down and loose its orange colour which is clear to see in Fig 2 of IBIS letter report.

The two are not comparable at all.

Summary

If the applicant had proposed the use of Clipsham stone for this build it would have been rejected out of hand by all as Chilmark Village is mainly constructed with our local stone of which a source is available.

The Clipsham stone has been used without consultation with the LPA, against what was approved and is a travesty, setting a precedent for other developments in Chilmark to use this very un-environmentally friendly alien stone which has been dragged from 290 miles away. This was simply over a few weeks delay for the supplier to reprocess the Chicksgrove stone that had been delivered to satisfy the applicants expectations.

The Clipsham stone that has been used at Bevisfield is nearly all the same size which is the very reason used by the applicant to reject the delivered Chicksgrove stone which is bizarre.





We would also refer to the approved elevations which had timber lintels for window heads and a stone-built chimney both of which have been changed (*also without consultation with LPA)* and we are now looking at not particularly upright unclad metal flues with Witch hat covers sticking out of the flat roof and random bits of rubble stone in the space where the timber lintels should be which could be expected on a mass housing development but not on a prestigious build like this.

This could be solved in three different ways

1- Remove the Clipsham stone and fit the approved Chicksgrove.
2- Render and strike the Clipsham stone as other properties on Cow Drove. This would save the neighbours adjacent to Bevisfield further disruption, misery and noise from an already overdue building project which could also be done relatively quickly.
3- Approve the use of Clipsham stone and face many other infringements on other building projects from unscrupulous developers.

If these changes are accepted by the LPA, it will make a complete mockery of the planning process as the message for developers will be to just tell the LPA / Parish Council / neighbours what they want to hear to gain permission, then just change materials and design after obtaining approval just as they please.

What's the point in the planning process at all !!!.

The LPA must also consider that if this application for change of material is approved, they may well be faced with many further infringements and unauthorised changes to approved plans as a precedent will have been set which will inevitably incur considerable expense in legal challenges for the LPA.

Nigel Goodenough