

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Letchworth

SG6 [REDACTED]

Tel: 01462 [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

4.9.2019

Dear Ms Hone,

RE: Application 34235 – Rear Extensions, Garage Conversion, New Doors & Windows Plus Carport (Revised Scheme)

Thank you for your letter dated 23rd August, informing [REDACTED] of the appeal by Ventersdorp against the refusal of the above application, and about the Independent Inspector Process.

[REDACTED] should like to reiterate [REDACTED] objections to the original and revised scheme proposed by the owners of Ventersdorp, as expressed in [REDACTED] previous objection letters (attached under Annexe [REDACTED] in the Independent Inspector's file). [REDACTED] objections made against the original and revised application stand.

Furthermore, [REDACTED] support the reasons stated by the Heritage Foundation for refusal of consent for the application in its original and revised form, and [REDACTED] make and/or reiterate the following points:

1. **Consultation:** Neither the Heritage Foundation or the adjoining properties of Ventersdorp were consulted about the proposed scheme to further develop the footprint of Ventersdorp.
2. **Advice:** Despite advice being provided at various stages of the application process by the Heritage Foundation to Ventersdorp's owners on alternative and more appropriate design features than those proposed, no substantive changes have been proposed to date.
3. **The reasons for refusal of consent** were set out by the Householder Applications Committee (HAC) in their letter of 18th December 2018 and the application was reviewed by the Advisory Management Committee (AMC), which supported HAC's decision (letter of 29th April 2019). The reasons include:
 - **Impact on existing properties (the current design makes no concession to the adjoining property; there is a need to respect the rear garden and right-hand boundary with the adjoining property);**
 - **Increasing the footprint of the current construction leading to over-development, on a site where development was already substantially increased by the previous owner (the encroaching nature of which is clear in 3D drawings);**
 - **In particular, the size, volume and extent of the proposed hydrotherapy pool is highlighted as a reason for refusal of consent (the extension still extends too far into the rear garden);**

- **No impact assessment reports have been submitted by Ventersdorp concerning the potential environmental or acoustic impact of the proposed hydrotherapy pool, despite concerns having been raised by us and the Foundation on this matter. Reference is only made to the manufacturer’s product information. The Statement of Claim submitted by Ventersdorp contains only generic and estimated data on levels of noise, unsubstantiated by independent reports.**

4. **Conservation Area, Heritage Character Area:** [REDACTED] should like to point out once again that [REDACTED] property [REDACTED] is designated as a “Home of Special Interest”, which lies within the Heritage Character Area and the Conservation Area. The following quotes from the Design Principles document serve to underline the importance of setting to any proposed alterations within those areas:

p.3 **(The Design Principles)** “have been developed taking into account the style and characteristics of specific homes and streets……. The impact of alterations on the surrounding context as well as an individual property will be addressed.”

p.4 **Homes of Special Interest:** On historic value, these homes are: “Properties located in areas which reflect the town and country ethos of the Garden City” “The importance of these homes warrants special attention when it comes to considering and implementing exterior alterations”. While the focus of the latter statement relates to proposed work on Homes of Special Interest, it is self-evident that alterations made by other home-owners can have an adverse effect on these Homes of Special Interest.

[REDACTED] maintain that the proposed extensions so close to our home are detrimental to the status and significance of a Home of Special Interest.

p.10 **Rear/side extensions:** The Design Principles state that “The area and volume of the proposed extensions shall be subservient and in proportion to the existing house and plot; Design shall respond to and harmonise with the individual qualities of the host building and its setting.” Reference is also made to a rear garden so that “an adequate private provision is retained to prevent a cramped or over-developed appearance.” On side extensions in particular, under Bungalows (which it is claimed Ventersdorp is) [REDACTED] read “Ground floor extensions will only be accepted where they are of modest proportions and sympathetic to the appearance of the existing dwelling and its setting.”

The proposed extensions are clearly not of “modest proportions”, given that they increase the current footprint by a large percentage, and will result in a cramped and over-developed appearance.

Proximity to a Grade II* Listed Building: Furthermore, Ventersdorp and Cloisters Cottages lie within the curtilage of “The Cloisters”, a Grade II* listed building, which has a boundary with Ventersdorp. [REDACTED] understand from discussions with the Manager of The Cloisters that the management have strong reservations about the proposed development, in particular concerning over-development and negative visual impact in a conservation area, factors which are detrimental to this historic and emblematic area.

[REDACTED] trust that the Independent Inspector will take [REDACTED] comments into consideration in making her decision on this application.

[REDACTED]

█ would be grateful for written confirmation of receipt of these comments.

Yours sincerely,

████████████████████