

FAO: Mr A Mangham
Planning Officer
Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
The Campus
Welwyn Garden City
Herts AL8 6AE

9th April 2016

Dear Sir

RE: Notice of Objection
Application Reference: 6/2016/0391/VAR
Proposed Development at: 45 Northaw Road East, Cuffley Herts

Firstly I would like to give some background to our objection.

We exchanged contracts on our property mid January 2016 and were totally unaware of any redevelopment to the adjacent property at No 45.

The previous owners who live in Australia had either been unaware or for whatever reason had omitted to tell us of any proposed development.

The first thing we knew was when just before we completed scaffold was erected on our land to enable the building works.

We have now inherited a property which has 3 large dormers looking straight into our bedrooms , two ground floor windows that look straight into a block wall and have no light into them and a boundary wall which is 5m high and totally over shadows our property.

The boundary wall as built has encroached onto our land at the rear of our property by about 200mm and as a Planning Department you should also address this issue

We are really not impressed with the Planning Departments decision to grant such an overbearing structure and are certainly not in context with the rest of Cuffley's residences.

We now have received from you a letter with a variation of Condition 1 (approved plans).

The original plans have already been contravened as the whole of the house has been raised by the height of two building blocks which is nearly 900mm.

The Planning Drawing approved reference nor/plan/15 dated December 2015 shows on the side elevation proposed boundary wall at is maximum 3.5m high.

The resubmitted drawing referenced nor/plan/16 dated February 2016 shows the same elevation but 4m high.

Firstly as mentioned above it is actually 5m high and secondly it is higher than the original approved planning drawings.

This would surely contravene the Planning Approval.

This makes the property higher than the plans submitted for Planning and also means that the 3 dormers that look directly over our property are higher than they should be.

The parapet wall that has been built on the boundary wall adjacent to our property was not on the original plans and I assume has been built to negate a gutter, which would overhang our land. However this has made the boundary wall even higher than originally drawn and is not acceptable.

The works conducted at No.45 have been in contravention of the Originally Approved Plans submitted to the Council.

The Application for Planning Permission is hereby objected to on the following grounds:

1.1. The Roof Ridge Height

The ridge height of the roof has been raised without Planning Permission and breaks what has been established planning regulation in place for some time.

1.2. Ground Floor Wall Height

The height of all the ground floor walls has been raised without Planning Permission. Again it is standard practice that the ground floor wall height should not be altered and a loft extension does not give permission for this.

1.3. Size of the Dormers

The size of the dormers are not in keeping with the surrounding area, the road or the neighbouring properties. They are oversized and overlook into properties on either side thereby causing them loss of privacy and intrusion

1.4. The Height of the new Guttering

The height of the new guttering is a direct consequence of breaches of the Planning Permission. To allow the new guttering is to indirectly permit the contravening actions above.

1.5. Enforcement of Planning Permission Breaches

It should not be the objective of persons building within our area to submit a plan, intentionally build something else and then once built easily obtain retrospective planning approval. When Planning permission has so obviously been breached, the Council must take action to ensure rectification of the breach. Otherwise the Council is inadvertently encouraging this behaviour.

1.6. Loss of Privacy & Obscure Glazing

The dormers by their very size will look in to neighbouring properties reducing their right to privacy. Where dormer windows look in to another property, those dormers should be fitted with obscure glass.

1.7. Loss of Light

The height of the walls, height of the roof and size of the dormers will result in a loss of light to all those neighbouring properties and should not be allowed.

1.8. Setting a dangerous precedent

This size of this development and also the nature of the way this build has been managed are not to be encouraged and set a dangerous precedent for the surrounding area. On the basis of all of the above it is urged that the planning application be rejected.

Whilst writing we would reiterate previous correspondence in which we mentioned the over looking rear dormers are meant according to your Planning Approval to have obscure glass.

This has not been installed; instead clear glass has been used.

We would expect the applicant to say they will use some kind of glazing film which can be removed at a later date.

This however is not obscure glass and again would contravene your Planning Approval.

We would be more than happy to meet you to discuss the above and look forward to your further response.

Yours faithfully,



David & Julie Chapman.

47 Northaw Road East