

Emma Graham

---

**From:** Tara Walton <tarzi@hotmail.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 28 March 2019 22:12  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Boe Walton  
**Subject:** Appeal for 348 Howlands Loft Conversion - application number 6/2019/0221/EM

**WARNING: This email originated outside the WHBC Network. Please be extra vigilant when opening attachments or clicking links.**

.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We would like to appeal the refused decision from the Estate Management Scheme with regards to the single dormer at 348 Howlands (application number 6/2019/0221/EM). Our previous application (6/2018/1326/EM) was approved on the 9<sup>th</sup> July. I have attached both drawings.

The difference between the two applications is the joining of the two dormers to make one larger dormer. The dormer would not be any wider on the roof, than the original double dormers. The additional space requested between the two dormers is less than 1.47m.

Refusal has been given on the grounds of the dormer being "overtly visible from a number of properties" "and the public footpath". However the same was true of the original plans which have been approved and there have been no objections from the surrounding neighbours. The rear of the property is not visible from any road at all. There are a number of properties within the EMS that already have double dormers attached. I have included nine photos of houses where the full dormers have been completed, within a short walk from our house. These dormers are fully visible from the main roads. The attachments are saved by their Road Names. One on Howlands, one on Sandpit Road, one on Hollybush Lane, four on Great Ley, and two Great Gannett. Not only are they overtly visible from a number of properties but also from the public pavements and roads.

We feel the single dormer would be less conspicuous as it would actually cast less shadows on the roof. We would be happy to tile the dormer, using matching roof tiles to blend in with the existing roof. We will ensure all materials

are in keeping with the existing building and surrounding area as per Policy EM1. We would be happy to consider any other suggestions the council may have. In the refused application, we have not changed the size or position of the windows and we would not be over-looking anyone any more than the original plans.

We are unable to have a pitched roof or lower the roof line further, as we are already having to lower first floor ceilings inside the property to allow for enough headroom in the loft room. Every millimetre will count. The room will be fairly small inside and the design of a straight across dormer will make such a huge difference to us inside the house, giving us that little bit more space. Previously we have been told that the ridge tiles would be too high, but they have been approved at this height on the separate smaller dormers, which we will be going ahead with currently. The proposed dormer will not be visible from the front of the house or change the look of the house from the front in anyway.

The added extension to the house, rather than being "detrimental", as suggested, would instead be beneficial adding not only financial value to the house and area but also as a reflection of the values of the Garden City, as an area for growing families. In its own words, the very purpose of the EMS is 'to be administered for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing amenities..... with due regard to the convenience and welfare of persons residing....there'

We hope you will reconsider our application and we look forward to hearing from yourselves.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs Tara Walton and Mr Boe Walton

Mob: 07939 575 818  
Home: 01707 390684

 Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)