

DM

✓

Sent: 15 August 2012 23:05  
To: Planning  
Subject: Welwyn Hatfield Council Online Planning - Comment

PLANNING  
DEPARTMENT

16 AUG 2012

RECEIVED

Application Number: S6/2012/1142/FP

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: 8 Wilkins Green Lane  
Hatfield

Comment Type: Object

Comment: Re; planning application S6/2012/1142/FP 9, Wilkins Green Lane, Hatfield As the occupant of no 8, I wish to supplement my previous objections.

&#8226; The proposal involves a 3 storey vertical wall adjacent to my boundary, reaching to the same height as the ridge line of my house.

&#8226; The proposed wall would extend from the front of my house beyond the back, blocking a gap where currently we get some early afternoon sunshine and light.

&#8226; Afternoon and evening sun would be cut off from one of our bedrooms.

&#8226; This is NOT a one-storey property, as the applicants claim, nor can it be described in any way as a &#8220;chalet bungalow&#8221;!

&#8226; The applicants comment on the impact of them of no 8. Firstly, the conifers in our garden screen us from the back door of no 9, which because of the slight elevation of the plot extends above our fence. They do not shade windows or garden of no 9. Secondly, the flank wall of no 8, which they claim is obtrusive, was until recently shielded by trees which the applicants cut down themselves.

&#8226; There would be no possibility of our shielding the new wall by trees, because it is adjacent to the path beside our house.

&#8226; It is true that extensions have been made to other neighbouring properties, but all of them have respected building lines and have not had an adverse effect on neighbours. This is not true of this application.

&#8226; If this application is granted it would set a dangerous precedent. Others in the road might wish to massively increase the depth of their properties, and build high walls domineering over the neighbours.

&#8226; Finally, I would like to say that the overwhelming opposition which this application has received is not due to &#8220;Nimbyism&#8221;. We accept that there are issues with no 9 that need addressing, but this proposal is excessive. A genuine chalet bungalow would be far more appropriate to the site.



Click

<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/K5oN2Y9Pa2vTndxI!oX7Uppg5WhU1LIgF1Q5j!chuh4RA9m8zll+!11NBmbOu33cu21cYzGWYGLi5jK2rp2Ftw==> to report this email as spam.

Re; planning application S6/2012/1142/FP

9, Wilkins Green Lane, Hatfield

As the occupant of no 8, I wish to supplement my previous objections.

- The proposal involves a 3 storey vertical wall adjacent to my boundary, reaching to the same height as the ridge line of my house.



- This shows the view from my back garden, showing a gap where currently we get some early afternoon sunshine and light. The proposed wall would extend from the front of my house to approximately the right hand edge of this picture. The ridge line can be seen, indicating the height. The new wall would be clearly visible above the conifers, increasing the shade in the later afternoon.

- The next picture shows the view from our bedroom window.



- I admit it is not particularly attractive, but it would be replaced by a vertical wall, the right-hand edge of which extends to the existing ridge line of the bungalow, and the height of which is approximately that of the top of the aerial which can just be seen in the sunlight. Afternoon and evening sun would be cut off from this room.
- This is NOT a one-storey property, as the applicants claim, nor can it be described in any way as a “chalet bungalow”!
- The applicants comment on the impact of them of no 8. Firstly, the conifers in our garden screen us from the back door of no 9, which because of the slight elevation of the plot extends above our fence. They do not shade windows or garden of no 9. Secondly, the flank wall of no 8, which they claim is obtrusive, was until recently shielded by trees which the applicants cut down themselves.
- There would be no possibility of our shielding the new wall by trees, because it is adjacent to the path beside our house.
- It is true that extensions have been made to other neighbouring properties, but all of them have respected building lines and have not had an adverse effect on neighbours. This is not true of this application.

- If this application is granted it would set a dangerous precedent. Others in the road might wish to massively increase the depth of their properties, and build high walls domineering over the neighbours.
- Finally, I would like to say that the overwhelming opposition which this application has received is not due to "Nimbyism". We accept that there are issues with no 9 that need addressing, but this proposal is excessive. A genuine chalet bungalow would be far more appropriate to the site.



