30 Uplands Avenue
Hitchin
Herts
SG4 9NH

6th March 2018

Ref 09/00088/1HH and Ref 18/00252/FPH

Attention: Ben Glover

N. Herts. District Council
Council Offices
Gernon Road
Letchworth
Herts
SG6 3JF

Dear Sirs

Ref 32 Uplands Avenue
Case Ref 09/00088/1HH (19 Jan 09)
Case Ref 18/00252/FPH (06 Feb 2018)

With reference to your letter dated 6 Feb 2018 I give below my views regarding the above proposal.

The Owner and Occupier of 30 uplands avenue is my mother in law, Mrs Pamela Bamfield. My wife, Marion, and I are writing on her behalf. Marion Bradbury has LPA (Lasting Power of Attorney) over Mrs Pamela Bamfield's affairs and her signature is used in this letter accordingly. Mrs Bamfield is partially sighted with failing vision and other health issues. She is currently in hospital and unable to address paperwork which is why this response to your letter has been delayed beyond your requested 27 February.

The current proposal "Full Permission Householder: Part two storey and part single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory" is a similar overdevelopment proposal to **two** previously former rejected/not granted Planning Permission proposals reference…

Previous proposals… "Full Permission Householder: Part single, part two storey rear extension" is an updated version of **two** former rejected/not granted Planning Permission proposals reference…

Ref 32 Uplands Avenue
Case Ref 08/00193/1HH (28 Jan 2008)

Case Ref 08/02818/1HH (17 Nov 2008)

Re the current proposal…

All the points I have raised successfully with regard to previous proposed developments (copied below) apply to 18/00252/FPH. The proposed East and West elevations clearly shows overdevelopment and restriction of light into 30 Uplands Avenue.

You should have on record denial of approval of similar applications previously and therefore automatically deny approval of the present application for the same reasons.

i.e.

"The proposed rear extension, due to its depth, form and bulk, is a poor form of development that will adversely impact the character and appearance of the property and appear visually over dominant and overbearing to the neighbouring occupiers, adversely impacting on their residential amenities. The proposal therefore fails to comply with provision of Policies 28 and 57 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan no.2 with Alterations 1996."

Re the former proposals...

The applicant has stated that they have been advised "to reduce further size of dormer by a noticeable amount from rejected plans **as is possible**"

The previous two plans were rejected because...

"The proposed rear extension, due to its depth, form and bulk, is a poor form of development that will adversely impact the character and appearance of the property and appear visually over dominant and overbearing to the neighbouring occupiers, adversely impacting on their residential amenities. The proposal therefore fails to comply with provision of Policies 28 and 57 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan no.2 with Alterations 1996."

The current proposal has re-instated the **side extension** (ground floor development) previously included in the rejected plans submitted 28 Jan 2008. (08/00193/1HH).

The current proposal is therefore a **"larger extension"** than the 2nd set of plans rejected 17 Nov 2008 (08/02818/1HH) because of the **additional side extension**. The plans do not show roof water drainage/guttering. I do not approve of guttering overhanging the boundary between our properties. (This is not clear from the plans). The scale of the **side extension** is too large and inappropriate for a 2 bedroom bungalow and an eyesore from my perspective (30 Uplands Avenue).

The dormer has not been significantly reduced. I perceive a reduction in **width** of approximately 12-18 inches (30-45cm) from the boundary with 34 Uplands Avenue.

The **depth** of the proposed rear dormer is only approx 12-18 inches (30-45cm) less than the previous submission and thus the points raised in my letter of 22nd November are **still** applicable to the current application with respect to the impact of the dormer.

The current application references these allegedly similar approved developments...

28 Manor Crescent - Rear extension
16 Broadmead – Rear extension
7 Broadmead – Rear extension

12 Uplands Avenue – dormer roof extension with flat roof
14 Uplands Avenue – dormer roof extension with flat roof
56 Uplands Avenue – dormer roof extension with flat roof

32 Broadmead Chalet ***House*** Rear Dormer roof extension with flat roof
36 Broadmead Chalet ***House*** Rear Dormer roof extension with flat roof
38 Broadmead Chalet ***House*** Rear Dormer roof extension with flat roof
40 Broadmead Chalet ***House*** Rear Dormer roof extension with flat roof

58 Broadmead Chalet ***House*** Rear Dormer roof extension with flat roof

Please note the above properties are Chalet Bungalows and **NOT** "Chalet Houses". (These are rear extensions and NOT **combined rear+side extensions**).

An example small scale previously approved development elsewhere, where the first floor dormer extends out only as far as the original ground floor design is shown below in figure 1.

FIGURE 1: COMPARISON OF A MORE APPROPRIATELY SIZED EXTENSION



A SUGGESTED MORE COMPARABLE SIZED EXTENSION

This extension pictured above is also only a <u>small scale dormer in the existing roof</u> and NOT a dormer that EXTENDS past the current rear of the property as is proposed for 32 Uplands Avenue. The proposal for 32 Uplands Avenue also has an additional extensive ground floor development.

I therefore argue the current proposal is not an appropriate "similar extension" to previously approved local developments. Therefore the cited references are <u>not</u> relevant.

This is now the third **overbearing** proposal submitted to the planning office with regard to the overdevelopment of 32 Uplands Avenue (a 2 bedroom bungalow).

I feel most vehemently that the submitted proposal with only a 1 foot by 1 foot reduction in the first floor dormer **and a significant additional ground floor extension** does not meet the requirements as advised of a development that has been significantly reduced in scale.

Potential approval of these plans would set as precedent for similar overdevelopment of other chalet bungalow properties within the area.

I await your comments on the integrity and suitability of this proposed extension.

Yours faithfully



P.J. Bamfield (Mrs)

K M Bradbury (Husband to Mrs. Marion Bradbury)

M J Bradbury (Daughter with LPA over Pamela Bamfield's affairs)