

REPORT FOR INDEPENDENT INSPECTOR

Comments on the Appellant's Statement of Case

6 South View, Letchworth Garden City

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Please see my responses where relevant below to the appellant's Statement of Case

2. THE PROPOSALS

- 2.1 It is proposed to demolish an existing conservatory and erect a part single, part two storey rear extensions, new side first floor windows, front garage door and alterations to garage door opening, insertion of rooflights.

3. POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Design Principles state:

Page 8 rear extensions

The area and volume of the proposed extension shall be subservient and in proportion to the existing house and plot.

An appropriate rear garden should be provided to ensure that an adequate private amenity provision is retained and to prevent a cramped or over-developed appearance.

Ground floor and two storey extensions up to a depth of five metres from the original main rear building line of the house may be acceptable. When two storey extensions have a harmful impact on neighbouring properties, a reduction in depth and/or width may be required.

Page 23 Chimneys and flues

Other than in exceptional circumstances, existing chimneys stacks or pots should not be removed.

4. The APPEAL SITE AND ITS CONTEXT

- 4.1 The property is located adjacent to a public amenity green space in the centre of the town. The plot is a near rectangular site that runs from south-west to north-east. The depth of the rear garden reduces by four metres over the width of the plot. 6 South View is the first property in the street and has no neighbour to the north side.
- 4.2 The neighbouring property to the south-east is linked by the garages. The neighbour to the north-east in Meadow Way has a separation of approximately fourteen metres at the nearest point which would be reduced to approximately eleven metres if the proposal were to be approved.

5. RESPONSE TO REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 5.1 The Heritage Advice Service is content with the ground floor element of the scheme as there is an existing conservatory of a similar depth. However, it is considered that adding the first-floor element above constitutes an overdevelopment due to the extra massing on this very tight plot.
- 5.2 The distance between the back of the extension to the rear of the neighbouring property on Meadow Way is only approximately eleven metres at the nearest point.
- 5.3 We agree with the appellant that the proposed is entirely subservient and in proportion with the existing house, however strongly disagree that this is the case for this very small plot and the proximity of the neighbouring property in meadow way highlights how the extra massing at first floor level is detrimental to the street scene especially when viewed from the public space on Broadway.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Whilst we feel that the proposed would be acceptable in other locations in the town, the restrictions that this small plot pose, and the proximity of the neighbouring property render a first-floor extension impossible without producing a cramped form of development that can clearly be seen from a very public space.
- 6.2 It is considered that the retention of chimneys on Homes of Special Interest is an important principle.