

Mr. J. Czuba
39 Bowershott
Letchworth Garden City
Hertfordshire
SG6 2ET
9th September 2026



Re planning application 26/02003/FPH to extend 41 Bowershott, Letchworth Garden City
I hereby wish to express my current concerns and questions regarding the proposed works.

- i) I appreciate the reasoning for the proposed removal of the hip end roof with replacement gable end, with such being able to provide more attic space for a loft conversion. However, the original hip end is an integral part of this 1930's designed semi detached property, providing a streamlined, aerodynamic and uniformed look to both houses. The proposed addition of a gable end would contradict the original aesthetic, uniform design this and our joined property and be a significant departure from the existing character and street scene of this, and similar semi detached properties both nearby and within the wider Garden City.
- ii) Gable ends are not as efficient in dealing with high winds and more vulnerable to damage that could possibly affect neighbouring properties.
- iii) The subsequent removal of guttering with the hip end could place an unnecessary additional burden on existing guttering that is regularly already overwhelmed during heavy downpours.
- iv) The increased roof size as a consequence of a gable end would negatively effect the amount of direct sunlight to our rear garden during the morning, particularly when the sun is lower in the sky during the autumn and winter months.
- v) The proposed rear dormer on the plans appears excessive in comparison size to the existing house, dominating the elevation of the rear facing roof of the property.
- vi) The submitted drawings show the proposed 4.7 metre rearwards extension of the ground floor. This would be larger than the current length of both individual downstairs reception rooms in the existing house and by my calculation, be equal to 62% of the total combined length of both rooms. This therefore raises questions as to the balanced proportions and scale of the proposed extension in relation to the original building and compliance with light angle guidance.
- vii) Plans state the 1.8 metre fence to the rear garden boundary is to be retained. However, the first floor drawings only show the retention of the fence along the boundary beyond the proposed rear extension. There are no measurements showing the distance from the extension to the boundary line and whether construction would involve alterations to the current small brick wall and fence extending from the properties along said boundary. Any alteration to this existing boundary wall would be

likely to require access to our side of the boundary and possibly effect our block paved patio area which runs continuously along the current boundary line.

viii) The application states parking bays would be reduced to allow for two vehicles however, according to the drawings submitted this would rely on one vehicle being garage parked. If, as suggested within the application, additional parking be allocated to a bay in the front garden, I question whether this would leave sufficient area for soft landscaping and possibly increase surface water run off in contravention to any sustainable urban drainage design guidelines.

I trust the points raised will be given appropriate consideration by your office before any recommendations to proceed with the proposed application.

Yours Faithfully,

Mr. J. Czuba