PLANNING REF: 18/00190/FPH



32 Lammas Way
Letchworth

Dear Mr Tiffin

I am writing to object to the above revised planning application and would like to draw your attention to the appeal decision, reference APP/X1925/D/17/3181162, points 11, 12 and 15.

Point 11

"The depth of the rear extension from the rear wall of the existing house would be some 1.3 metres deeper than the 3 metres which is normally allowed under saved Policy 28. The overall scale of the extension, drawn by the combination of its width, depth and height, would result in a structure which would have a dominating presence in relation to the existing dwelling and its adjoining neighbour No 34. In addition, the scale of the extension and sense of its presence would not be just restricted to being from within the rear garden of No 32 and surrounding neighbours. As No 32 is sited on the end of this section of Lammas Way, the roofscape and blank elevation at first floor level of the extension would be clearly seen from the public realm when approaching from the west. This would further emphasise the scale and dominance of the additional proposed built form."

Although I understand that a window is proposed in the upper storey west elevation, all other comments would still appear to apply. I believe that the fact that No. 32 is already on a small plot will accentuate the overbearing effect of the proposed plan.

Point 12

"Consequently, I find that the scale and dominance of the rear extension would not be sympathetic to the existing house, such that it would result in an unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Accordingly, there would be conflict with Policy 28 of the LP which requires amongst other things, for extensions to be sympathetic to the existing house in height, form and proportions and in addition, for rear extensions to not dominate the adjoining property."

The width of the upper storey has been reduced by just 1.5 metres but the depth remains the same with the addition of a 600mm upstand around the flat roof portion. Therefore, it will still have a dominating impact on neighbouring properties and is not sympathetic in proportion to the existing house as described by the planning inspector in points 11 and 12 above.

Point 15

"Arising from the siting and height of the proposed rear extension, there is likely to be a reduction in light received through No 34's rooflight. As I understand that this is the only source of light to this habitable room, consequently any reduction would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 34 in this regard."

The revised plan will still reduce the amount of light reaching the roof window due to the depth and proximity of the flank wall and the upstand on the flat roof portion of the proposed extension. This is the only window giving natural light **directly** to this room.

Overall it seems that little has changed from the original proposal with regard to the dominating and overbearing impact on all neighbouring properties and, consequently, would be contrary to the inspector's decision.

Yours sincerely

John & Moira Moss

34 Lammas Way
Letchworth

