



From: [Redacted]

Sent: 08 July 2021 20:11

To: Home <home@letchworth.com>

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Comments on 197 planning application

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to [REDACTED] with regards to the planning application for 197 Icknield Way. It is with regret that [REDACTED] raise the issues below as [REDACTED] had only minor comments / clarifications on the previously proposed scheme. [REDACTED] have reviewed the application and associated plans and [REDACTED] feel there are a number of issues that need to be addressed, these are predominantly linked to the newly proposed position of the extension.

The previous application had the proposed extension running alongside a similarly scaled extension at [REDACTED] Icknield Way. From a use of space and impact to neighbours this seems the most logical position for an extension, resulting in limited impact to the neighbours on both sides of 197. Moving the extension to the other side raises the following objections:

- Sunlight – The height and proposed projection of the extension, when combined with its proximity to the boundary will have a significant impact to the amount of sunlight entering [REDACTED] kitchen / living room and [REDACTED] lounge, in addition to putting [REDACTED] patio with outdoor dining / seating area in the shade for much of the afternoon, for the vast majority of the year. The proximity and height of the extension is obviously the main driver to this.
- Light - The height and proposed projection of the extension, when combined with its proximity to the boundary will have a significant impact to the amount of light entering [REDACTED] lounge and to a lesser extent [REDACTED] kitchen / living room. Linked to this is the obvious reduction in visible skyline from both [REDACTED] kitchen / living room window and patio doors, and [REDACTED] lounge door / window. This will have a detrimental impact to the use of these rooms. [REDACTED] believe the proposed plans contravenes the Letchworth Garden City Heritage Guidance with regards to loss of amenity, as shown by the angles, shown on the plans, to [REDACTED] windows.
- Overlooked / loss of privacy – There are two new windows proposed in the design looking towards [REDACTED]r property where currently there are no windows in this aspect at this level. One of these looks directly into [REDACTED] master bedroom and whilst [REDACTED] believe it to be obscured (not shown on the plans), the direct alignment with [REDACTED] existing and original bedroom window creates a significant loss in privacy. In addition the skylight could potentially overlook [REDACTED] (there are no dimensions defined on the plans to show this is over head height). This loss of privacy is contrary to that of the previous proposal which [REDACTED] believe did not lead to privacy loss for other neighbours.
- Design – The roof line of the existing property is defined by a roof running from the ridge line to near ground level ([REDACTED] believe it is referred to as a cat slide). From [REDACTED] perspective (and aspect), in addition to that from the road to the front, this is a unique feature defining the silhouette of the existing building. This feature will be completely eliminated to be replaced with a largely featureless high wall, which appears to not be subservient to the line of the existing house (the original line of the building continues, without a step in to denote an extension) and roof pitch down to the characteristically low level currently existing at the back of the property. [REDACTED] think this would be a significant aesthetic loss to the rear of the building, which is visible from the street and not in line with Heritage design principles.
- Overbearing position of extension – Due to the height, position and projection of the proposed

