

REPORT FOR INDEPENDENT INSPECTOR

Comments on the Appellant's Statement of Case

5 Croft Lane, 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 The application under consideration is for a rear single-storey extension and a two-storey side extension to the existing dwelling. This appeal centres on the rear single-storey element of the scheme.

3. RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S STATEMENT OF CASE

- 3.1 The appellant has drawn attention to the fact that the property is a Grade II listed building and considers that, for this reason, special consideration should be given to this application. The legislation in place to statutorily designate a listed building is entirely separate to that which we operate the Scheme of Management under. We do not distinguish between listed and unlisted buildings when making our assessment and applying the Design Principles.
- 3.2 The appellant has outlined and prepared visuals and plans to demonstrate the recommendations made by HAC following their initial decision to refuse the application. These visuals and plans correctly demonstrate the recommended reduction in depth that HAC outlined would be acceptable. However, the images show the extension to be 'squared off', omitting the glazed 'linking' extension that the scheme currently proposes. At no point was it suggested that the glazed link be omitted from the scheme. Furthermore, the visuals prepared by the appellant to demonstrate HAC's recommendations show amendments to the proposed fenestration and doors on the extension. At no point did HAC recommend any alterations to these elements of the scheme. HAC's recommendation for revisions, as communicated by the case officer via email, are reiterated below:

'[HAC] have suggested that were the depth to be decreased to a maximum of 5.5m then we could approve the application. As I suggested previously, they felt that you could increase the width of the extension on the inner side, even ever so slightly, to make up for some of the lost area. They also felt that the bike storage could be accommodated elsewhere on the site, which would then not result in much of a loss, if any, of habitable floorspace.'

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1 We feel that the Design Principles are clear and that a requirement for single-storey rear extensions to be a maximum of 5m deep, in this specific context, is in place specifically for situations such as this where there is limited space within the rear garden and where there are houses within close proximity of the rear boundary of the site.