

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Comments \(Shared Mailbox\); Lizzie Mugova](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Comments to Planning Application: 6/2023/1442/PN27 - 41 Northaw Road East
Date: 30 July 2023 21:50:07

**** 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 Mrs Natalie McIver
And Elizabeth Mugova
Planning Support
Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council,
Hertfordshire AL8 6AE

30 July 2023

Dear Mr Carter and Mrs McIver,

Re: Application Reference: 6/2023/1442/PN27
Proposed Development at: Freny Cottage 41 Northaw Road East, Cuffley, Potters Bar EN6 4LU (the “**Application**”)

Thank you for your letter dated 17th July 2023, which we received on the 22nd July.

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

Our comments for your immediate consideration are:

- The proposed development is incongruous with the local area, a two-storey house amongst 1930s chalet bungalows;
- The ridge height would render it a sore thumb, it would not blend at all with nearby housing;
- We do not believe that the application is in accordance with Permitted Development rights;
- We are concerned by safety and nuisance aspects relating to the Construction Management Plan; and
- We do not believe that the application is in accordance with the Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan.

1. Permitted Development

From reviewing the Government Planning Portal, we do not believe that permitted rights benefit properties built pre-1948. As confirmed from our deeds our Bungalow (No.43) was constructed in 1932. We believe No.41 would have been built in the 1930s.

Many bungalows in Cuffley are being extended into the loft space. This is because

most owners are fully aware of the date at which their property was built and permitted rights for an extra storey do not exist.
No.41 has been previously enlarged with a loft extension, rear extension and side extension.

Hence, we do not agree that this application can be approved under permitted development and **OBJECT** on that basis.

2. Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan Contravention

Unfortunately it would appear that no regard has been taken in respect of the Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan. We believe that there are contraventions of:

- D1 (c) *The 45-degree rule (see Figures 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3) must be integrated into designs to ensure that development will not lead to increased overshadowing or a significant reduction in levels of daylight or sunlight;*
- D1 (e) *Ridge heights will be required to be in conformity with the adjacent properties to retain a continuous frontage.*
- D1 (i) *Car parking should be provided on-site in accordance with the most up to date standards set by the County Council*

We would be grateful for confirmation that the new storey would not overshadow and significantly reduce the light to our main bedroom in contravention of D1(c).

We believe that the ridge height proposed entirely contravenes D1(e).

We note our concerns in relation to vehicle parking below.

We do not believe that this development is in accordance with the Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan and **OBJECT** on that basis.

3. Look and Feel

We feel this development would be a sore thumb on the road, and does not blend with neighbouring properties. We **OBJECT** on that basis.

4. Construction Management Plan: Vehicle access and traffic management statement.

The CMP states: *"Where peak deliveries cannot be avoided, we will attempt to limit activity during this period"*

Northaw Road East is plagued by standstill traffic from 0730-0930 and 1600-1830. Construction works should not add further traffic to the local area. We therefore cannot accept this statement, as for a well-managed development, the timing of deliveries can always be properly managed and timed. This disruption is therefore avoidable.

Therefore, there should be no allowance for any peak time (0730-0930 and 1600-1830) deliveries, and enforcement orders should be able to be made against the

development should this take place.

We **OBJECT** on the basis that the CMP in relation to delivery times is inadequate.

5. Construction Management Plan: Pavement parking and traffic management.

The CMP states: *“During the construction Phase delivery vehicles will also park on Northaw Road East immediately to the front of the proposed site”.*

The request to park directly on the pavement, or on Northaw Road East, are wholly inappropriate. School Children are either taken to and from Cuffley School on this road, either by car or on foot, which would be made more challenging if not impossible by this parking proposal.

Construction Workers’ vehicles should be prohibited from parking/blocking the driveways of neighbouring properties

Northaw Road East suffers from traffic as it is, and the road is not wide enough for traffic to flow in both directions with a vehicle parked on the 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.

We **OBJECT** on the basis that the CMP in relation to parking planning being unsafe.

6. Windows

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.

We note that the current Application does not have many windows. Unfortunately, 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. Given the lack of windows shown on the current Application, we believe that such scope creep is likely to occur again. We envisage that there is already an intention for additional windows not stated on the current Application.

To avoid this scope creep 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. This should specifically pre-empt any future applications in relation to this site in relation to side-windows.

Please note Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan D1 (b) *Discourage side elevation*

glazing which overlooks adjacent properties, but where unavoidable this should be obscured glazed windows.

We have 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.

7. Construction Management Plan: Management of Disruption to neighbours is insufficient.

This is a considerable development, part of the premises (the utility room) are on the boundary line. There is no statement as to whether there will be works on the boundary, if so how disruption will be managed.

Further, in any event, given proximity of works, neighbouring properties should have windows washed on a monthly basis and bi-weekly during high dust work/dry periods.

Hoarding is stated within the CMP. This could damage boundary fences. There must be a requirement to either ensure no damage or where damage has been caused there is a Planning requirement to replace like for like.

Neighbours should not be forced to rely upon claims under a Party Wall Agreement, and politely request for neighbours experiencing this to have full benefit of the Council Planning Enforcement team.

Thank you for reviewing our concerns and objections.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.