

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Comments \(Shared Mailbox\)](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to Application: 6/2024/0616/HOUSE - 41 Northaw Road East, Cuffley, EN6 4LU
Date: 30 April 2024 13:01:19
Attachments: [REDACTED]
Importance: High

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

FAO: Mr. Chris Carter
Assistant Director (Planning)
And Ms Elizabeth Mugova
Planning Support
Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council,
Hertfordshire AL8 6AE

29 April 2024

Dear Mr Carter and Ms Mugova,

RE: Planning Application: 6/2024/0616/HOUSE

Thank you for your letter dated 18th April 2024.

As suggested, we have considered the Application and the proposed plans for the development of the above existing Bungalow.

Thank you for considering the below. We hereby **OBJECT** to the submitted planning application on the grounds set out below.

Local planning laws and the Northaw & Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan are designed to maintain and enhance the locality and importantly "extensions to houses... sympathetic to the character of Northaw and Cuffley (2.3). Northaw Road East is a road of small bungalows, situated within large plots, many of which have been extended, but it is critical that any extensions are suitable for the size of the plot, maintain the character and sense of community.

1. Neighbourhood Plan 3.11

The proposed plans at No.41 are an overdevelopment, building to the boundary, cutting light to neighbours and therefore should be scaled back. This contravenes 3.11 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

3.11 states

"...undertaken unsympathetically, development proposals (including...extensions) can have adverse impacts on visual and neighbour amenity, character and highway safety (e.g. through overdevelopment of a plot).

The below will set out how the proposed plans at No.41 represent an **overdevelopment and should be scaled back**.

2. **Side Access D1(k)**

No.41 currently has space in front of and behind the room marked as Utility on the Existing Plan. This open space in front and behind the Utility provides important Right To Light to the main bedroom of No.43.

The current Utility has a door at the front and rear of the room, allowing access through the Utility to the rear of the property. It therefore serves as an access way.

D1(k) states:

"... side access gate is a feature of the existing property this should be maintained... for an extension...order to safeguard access and views between properties;"

The proposed plan has the access route removed, the room(s) marked "Studio and Bedroom 2" extended to the front and rear, resulting in a loss of views and amenity to the front and rear.

Consequently, in accordance with D1(k) the rooms marked "**Studio and Bedroom 2**" at No.41:

- A. **may only be built on the existing footprint of the existing Utility;**
- B. access through the room must be maintained; and
- C. views on front and behind the room should be maintained.

3. **Side Extensions - Building to the Boundary**

Appendix 2 - Household Extensions states that:

"In case of side extensions, the new part should be set back from the front of the main building..."

Again, the Neighbourhood Plan is being breached. The open space in front of the room marked Utility should be retained. The proposed plan has the room(s) marked "Studio and Bedroom 2" extended to the front and rear.

This room(s) (**Studio and Bedroom 2**) **should not be brought forward to the front of the property**, instead it should retain its current position, and be set back.

4. **Building to the Boundary**

Appendix 2 - Household Extensions states that:

"Extensions should not be made right up to boundary line (plot boundary)"

Clearly the submitted plans contravene this. The points raised above are again relevant here. The rooms marked Studio and Bedroom 2 are extended and built along the entire boundary line with No.43. The spaces in front of the room currently marked Utility on the existing plans, should instead be retained. There will be a considerable loss of light to the principal bedroom of No.43 if building on the boundary is allowed.

Only the footprint of the current Utility should be built upon and should not be extended.

5. Loss of Private Amenity - Dormers

Appendix 2 - Household Extensions states that:

"Extensions should not result in a significant loss to the private amenity area of the dwelling."

An extension up to the boundary would result in a significant loss of light to the principal bedroom of No.43. Further, the roof and dormers being set close to the boundary will have the same impact as an entire second floor and will entirely block out light to the principal bedroom of No.43.

The council does not allow second storeys to be built and should not allow the same by over-sized dormers built right up to the boundary.

The dormers facing No.43 will be very close to the boundary line. This contravenes D1 (b) of the Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan.

These dormers must be scaled back, they should not be as close as they are to the boundary, in order to reduce the impact on the loss of light and privacy to No.43.

6. Ridge Heights D1(e)

The plan requires the ridge height to be completely changed and raised, which is not in-keeping with adjacent properties.

D1 (e) states

"Ridge heights will be required to be in conformity with the adjacent properties to retain a continuous frontage"

The submitted plan is clearly in contravention of this. These rules are created to ensure that character of Cuffley is maintained, we should not simply ignore these rules. **The ridge height should not be raised.**

7. Wrap Around Extensions

Appendix 2 - Household Extensions states that:

"Designs that wrap around the existing building and involve overly complicated roof forms should be avoided."

The submitted plan by No.41 is a wrap around extension. It is on three sides of the property, involves a significantly increased roof size, involves large Dormers, and changes to pitch, elevation and size.

It is clearly in contravention of this requirement. **This is a wrap-around extension, and therefore should be avoided as per the Neighbourhood Plan.**

8. Extension Overwhelms the Property

Appendix 2 - Household Extensions states that:

"The original building should remain the dominant element of the property regardless the amount of extension. The newly built extension should not overwhelm the building from any given point".

The complicated and expanded roof, the front to back side extension, the rear extension - all of this **will result in the original property being "lost" in the extension which is in contravention of the rules.**

9. Raised Patio

The application drawing does not show how No.41 relates to adjoining properties. It fails to show elevations and heights. So it is not possible judge the impact of the raised patio on immediate neighbours ie the potential loss of privacy. As well as water run off.

The raised patio should therefore be rejected.

10. Rear Second Floor Juliet Balcony

This will result in a loss of privacy to local neighbouring gardens. Instead, this should be changed to a regular window.

This also appears to be in **Breach of the 45 Degree Rule and 12m protected zone of privacy.**

11. Rear Extension, Patio and Juliet Balcony Window

Appendix 2 - Household Extensions states that:

"rear extensions, the new part should not have a harmful effect on neighbouring properties in terms of overshadowing, overbearing or privacy issues."

Clearly the raised patio, the Juliet Balcony these are both in contravention of this requirement on the Neighbourhood Plan. **The raised patio and the Juliet Balcony should not be allowed.**

12. Dormer Windows - Obscured Glass

The side dormer windows are shown as obscured glass to 1.7m.

Appendix 2 - Household Extensions states that:

'Discourage side elevation glazing which overlooks adjacent properties, but where unavoidable this should be obscured glazed windows'

The Neighbourhood Plan (i) suggests that there should not be side windows; and (ii) where they are unavoidable, they should be obscured.

The proposed dormer windows seem avoidable and therefore **there should not be any windows in the dormers on the sides of the property** that overlook neighbours.

Where the applicant proves that a window meets the high threshold of being **unavoidable**, at the very least (as per a previous enforcement concerning No.45 Northaw Road East, ENF/2016/0043), **all side-elevation windows should be:**

A. **raised to 1.8m obscured glass; and**

B. **non-openable.**

This is in order to maintain privacy of neighbouring properties. We have suffered a significant loss of privacy by the Council previously failing to enforce this rule with regard to No.45.

13. **Porch Front Elevation**

The proposed porch appears to bring forward the front elevation. This **should not be allowed and the current elevation of the building maintained.** This change further takes the house out of falling in line with its neighbouring properties.

14. **Boundary Line Access**

Please note, based on prior experience with the owners previous development at No.45, pursuant to the Party Wall Act, we will not be allowing any access to our property for building works purposes. Whilst not a planning matter, we would appreciate if the logistics of the wider planning application take this fact into account.

15. **Lack of a Construction Management Plan**

We had numerous concerns regarding the previous withdrawn applications' Construction Management Plan and note that no such plan has been filed with this application. We therefore assume that the old plan remains. The CMP states: *"During the construction Phase delivery vehicles will also park on Northaw Road East immediately to the front of the proposed site"*.

School Children are either taken to and from Cuffley School on this road.

The pavement cannot be blocked to pedestrians and parents walking their children to and from school. Northaw Road East is a busy road and forcing pedestrians to walk into the road is not acceptable. This is a safety issue.

All vehicles should be parked within the front driveway of the site (No.41) and alterations to the front garden should be made to allow this.

Further, deliveries should be made outside of peak times.

16. Application Scope Creep

We believe that the owners of No.41 are also the owners of No.45 Northaw Road East. Mrs K Anklesaria is noted as the Applicant in respect of both this Application in respect of No.41 and for previous applications for No.45.

Please note that the works to No.45 had a tendency for scope creep from the original plan to the finished design – as clearly evidenced by the applications and numerous Parish Council decisions.

To avoid this this scope creep reoccurring, and save our own as well as the Council's time, we politely request that the Council Planning in their response to this application set out stringent rules on any future applications in relation to additional, or changes to currently specified windows.


We have previously had to bring to the attention of the Council breaches of planning regulation by the owners of No.45 and do not wish to be involved with further breach of building regulations / disputes with the same owner of No.45, who also owns No.41.

We request that the Council please specify that **no side-elevation windows** will be permitted on this development.

For the reasons listed in the above paragraphs, the submitted plans should be rejected.

Thank you for reviewing our concerns and objections.

Yours faithfully,


43 Northaw Road East
Cuffley EN6 4LU