

✓

(2A) SD

Andrew Windscheffel

From: Planning Policy
Sent: 07 October 2013 14:26
To: Planning
Subject: FW: N6/2013/1938/MA Objection to plan submission

From: Helen Bromley
Sent: 07 October 2013 13:01
To: [REDACTED]; Planning Policy
Subject: Re: N6/2013/1938/MA Objection to plan submission

Thank you Paul. I will pass on your comments.
Helen

Sent from Samsung Mobile
Paul Baker [REDACTED] wrote:
Dear Sirs

Reasons for objection

1 We refer to the Council's own documentation regarding the Welwyn Garden City Management Scheme

POLICY EM1 - Extensions and alterations to existing buildings will only be allowed if they are in keeping with the design, appearance, materials and architectural detailing used in the existing building and do not have a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of the surrounding area or the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers.

<http://www.welhat.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=573&p=0>
<http://www.welhat.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=909&p=0>

and

It is patently obvious that the proposed extension completely fails to meet these stipulations. Hence, the application should be rejected on these grounds alone.

2 Failure of the Council to adhere to the requirements of the Welwyn Garden City Management Scheme would have adverse consequences including

1. Bring the Council into disrepute
2. Undermine the Management Scheme that the Council is supposed to champion and for which it should act as guardian.
3. Increase the risk of people choosing to ignore the scheme on the basis that what is good enough for the Council must be good enough for citizens.
4. As a result gradual deterioration of unique character of WGC.
5. Costs to Council – ultimately paid for by citizens in council tax – from legal challenge.

3 Mistakes in planning application and questionable (at best) validation procedure

There are an unacceptable number of mistakes in the plans such as some floor plans improperly titled. Such errors would not be accepted in submissions from an WGC citizen and so cannot be acceptable at all. It appears that the validation process took place within one working day. This is

patently not appropriate and may well explain why such errors have not been identified, let alone, sent back for correction.

4 Floor plans not compatible with basic Health and Safety Legislation and Guidance

It appears that rows of desks are orientated parallel to windows creating a risk of difficulties in staff being able to view DSE screens (screen glare etc.). This should be reviewed in light of copious information regarding DSE regulations and guidance available from Health and Safety Website <http://www.hse.gov.uk/msd/dse/guidance.htm>.

It may be that the Council would benefit from consulting its Health and Safety dept and DSE assessors, if it has such.

5 Whatever else there is now a somewhat clichéd phrase something like “A carbuncle on the face of an old friend”, which I believe is attributed to the heir to the throne. It is regrettable that the proposed extension would be an exemplar of this type of carbuncle.

6 We fully support the idea of locating staff at one site etc. We would just ask that it is done in a way that meets planning requirements and meets the policies of the Welwyn Garden City Management Scheme.

Mrs Cheryl Baker
Dr Paul Baker

58 Parkway
Welwyn Garden City
Herts
AL8 6HH

CC By email
Chief Executive WHC
Councillors Handside Ward

Welwyn Garden City Society (to forward)