34, Dacre Crescent
Kimpton
Nr. Hitchin
Herts
SG4 8QJ

24th September 2018

Tom Donovan
Planning Control Department
North Hertfordshire District Council
PO Box 10163
Nottingham
NG6 6DH

Ref: 18/01288/FPH

Dear Mr Donovan,

With reference to the two storey rear extension and single storey front extension (as amended by drawing RL/4884/36-02B) for 36 Dacre Crescent, Kimpton, Hitchin, Hertfordshire, SG4 8QJ.

Firstly I believe that the plans as they are currently proposed should be rejected as there is insufficient detail to make an informed decision. There is also some confusion relating to the drawing and revision levels as they are all dated the same and contain differences. Without informative drawings we are unable to properly understand where the cause and effect of different dimensions may occur.

Please find below my comments based on what we can understand at present:

- The depth of the ground floor plan has not changed since the initial plans; it still remains at 4.5m which will project approximately 3.0m beyond our current building line. Please refer to the enclosed annotated picture of the effect of the current proposed plans.

- The depth of the first floor plan has been reduced to 3.0m which has been an overall reduction from the initial plans of only 1.0 m meaning there has only been a very small reduction in the depth. Apart from the visual aspect this will block a lot of light to the rear of our property.

- The overall width of the first floor plan on this latest version appears to have increased by approximately 1.6m (0.8m on each side) (the latest revision have omitted any dimensions that clarify the total width of the first floor bedrooms). Meaning that the overall dimensions of the first floor may remain the same as on the initial plans and therefore no total reduction.

- The configuration of the bathroom on the first floor has changed, on the initial plans the window was facing to the rear of the property this has now been moved to the side of the property. Meaning that this will now face the side of our property with the potential that it could overlook our landing window (as the measurements supplied on these plans are

PTO

limited it is difficult to ascertain exactly where the window will be located). Therefore there are potential privacy issues especially due to the proximity of the side walls on both properties, even with the proposed obscured glass.

- The comments at the top of the plans relating to the external materials mention rear extension walls to be 'finished with monocouche render system to selected colour'. As there is no indication as to what this colour will be and the side walls will be in full view from our property, once this has been proposed we may also have some further objections to this.

- The detail provided for the proposed plans for the single storey extension to the front of the property are very limited and no measurements or dimensions have been provided as to the size of this extension. It appears however, from the diagram of the side elevation that the living room will be extended to consume the current lobby bringing the front in line with the games room and then adding a new lobby of indeterminate dimensions. This will seriously impede the current building line and will engulf the front of our property due to the positions of both properties.

- As the garage of number 36 has recently been converted to a games room and the driveway will be decreased if the front extension is approved the amount of parking available will be limited which in turn could encourage further parking on the congested road. This again cannot be determined due to the insufficient dimensions provided.

- Although there has been a small reduction in the depth of the proposed extension it still remains a two storey, full height of the property extension which will severely reduce the amount of light both inside and outside our property in particular our kitchen, landing and stairs, rear bedroom and the complete outside patio. Additionally the kitchen, which is the heart of the house, will suffer a loss of U-value heat gain through the windows.

- These plans will create an increased health and safety risk due to the reduced light on our stairs. There will also be an effect on our general wellbeing as we currently spend many hours in the garden and our enjoyment will affected not only by the loss of light but also having a view of a large imposing wall.

- Due to the size and scale of this extension, if granted, could set precedence for future planning applications on Dacre Crescent.

With reference to our earlier comments regarding the drawing dimensions and all the above, I hope you will seriously consider these and all the previous comments made by both myself and Simon McCullough and I therefore strongly urge that these proposals are rejected.

Yours sincerely,

Patrick and Ann Dyer

