




Trevor Harvey
121 The Ridgeway
Northaw
Potters Bar
Herts. EN6 4BG



Welwyn Hatfield Planning

6th April 2017

Planning Application 6/2017/0489/MAJ
Objection.

I object to this application. The proposed fence has no direct impact on my address. However, the applicant mentions that this is a 'phased' programme, thus further application to cover the rest of The Ridgeway is likely in the future and any such extension would directly affect my property.

The applicant is asking planning permission to impose a 2m (6'7") post and wire mesh fence along part of his boundary between his land and the residential neighbours. This is said to be alongside any existing residents fences.

Impact.

Many residents enjoy an impressive vista from their houses and the garden area is an important part of this. Many have designed their surroundings to take account of this with particular attention to their boundary fence. The unsightly tall close mesh wire fence will, in some cases, block or significantly impact on the enjoyment. The wire fence, in addition, will be extra to whatever existing fence there is, resulting in an unsightly double arrangement. I have attached two photographs which illustrate how such a new fence could impact if allowed at the bottom of my garden. I also attach a photograph of a metal barrier which the applicant had unlawfully erected at the end of April 2016 and which remained there impacting my view for over 5 months. (Withdrawn application 6/2016/1726/Maj refers).

Need

The applicant states that it is 'the replacement of existing dilapidated perimeter fencing...' I cannot comment on the poor condition or otherwise of existing fences, but they are each owned by the individual house owners and is thus a matter for them and not to have an arbitrary fence imposed upon them without specific consultation.

The applicant makes significant mention of security of his boundary yet his application does not provide for such fencing along his roadside boundary in Vineyards Road north of his driveway and towards Carbone Hill junction.

Despite that, this application is totally confined to the bottom of resident's gardens. Is he suggesting that the access for 'flytippers and travellers' onto his land is via these gardens? Surely one of the best security situations for agricultural land is that provided by residential private property boundaries.

The applicant indicates that the first phase to the south of his estate has been completed, inferring that this was undertaken by him and the current phase application is merely a continuance of that. To the contrary this fence was completed by the neighbouring estate of Nyn Park, did not require planning permission as no Article 4 Direction applied and significantly does not involve impinging on residential properties. It should not provide a precedence nor a relevance to this current application.

Conclusion.

The presence of such fencing in an agricultural setting would be obtrusive and detrimental to the openness and visual amenity and harm the character of the Green Belt.

I ask that the application be refused.

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Trevor Harvey.

Trevor Harvey

ROUGH VISUAL EFFECT. POSTS EXACTLY 2m



PLANNING APPLICATION 6/2016 /1726/MAJ



CURRENT - WITHOUT ADDITIONAL
NEW FENCE

