
From: Madhavi Kotecha [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 November 2025 19:37
To: Anne McDonald
Cc: Planning Control
Subject: Ref. No: 25/02561/FPH- Comments
Attachments: No-26 eaves and gutter encroachment on No- 28 rear.jpg

Dear Anne,

I hope you are well.

I want to respond to the neighbour consultation comments for the record. Please could the following wording be uploaded as comments on the application **Ref. No: 25/02561/FPH.**

In response to Tom and Magda Rae- No 26.

Comments from no. 26: *The applicant has already built up to the first floor of the extension along the adjoining boundary. However, the actual wall that has been built, does not look like either the documents approved already, or these new plans. There is a return in the wall at first floor, that is not shown on any plans we have seen.*

My response: This has already been reflected in the drawings.

Comments from no. 26: *The plans submitted show that the boundary between No. 26 and No 28 as straight and then angling away. This is not correct according to the official Ordnance Survey plans - copies attached. We feel that the extension does encroach over the boundary line between our properties and therefore Certificate B should have been served on us, which it has not.*

My response:

My development sits within my boundary. This is clearly visible from the photos taken of the works so far. Certificate B was not and is not required. In fact, the extension built by the owners of no. 26 – specifically the roof eaves and guttering on both floors encroaches over our existing structure (also visible in their attached photos and my attachment). No. 26 would have been required to serve certificate B to no. 28 at the time, but I don't believe this was the case. I was also informed by the previous owner whom I am in touch with that a party wall agreement was not served.

The extensions at No. 26, as built, do not match their plans (approved) under 02/00253/1HH, 06/00127/1HH, 08/02919/1HH and 16/00713/1NMA. Finally, boundary disputes are civil matters, not matters for planning, but in any case, thank you for your comment.

Comments from no. 26: *The first floor extension nearest to our property appears to be closer than the submitted (and approved) plans.*

My response: This statement is incorrect.

Comments from no. 26: Please see the attached photos, which show the walls as partially built. We have a concern that the eaves and guttering on the new build will encroach on our property.

My response: As a new mother with a young baby, photos taken without my permission into my private living space are not appropriate. They constitute a loss of privacy. I would expect employees of North Herts Council to conduct themselves in a more neighbourly manner.

The comments from No.26 are mostly non-material planning considerations. Therefore, I request that the application **Ref. No: 25/02561/FPH** continue to be assessed solely on its planning merits.

In response to Jessica Benfield- No. 30

My response: The issues raised regarding access and title deeds relate to a private civil land matter and are not material planning considerations. Comments also relate to the previously approved plans, Ref. No: 25/00645/FPH, which has been built as per the approved plans.

Note- Plans were shared with No.30 via WhatsApp on the 25th June 2025, and again via email on the 30th June 2025 with No. 30, both pre-planning approval. A party wall agreement is also in place. I believe No. 30 also benefited from a neighbour consultation period with no objections at the time. From a planning perspective, the new proposal is still entirely within our boundary. Matters regarding the access are being investigated and discussed separately and do not alter the planning merits of the proposal. Therefore, I request that the application **Ref. No: 25/02561/FPH** continue to be assessed solely on its planning merits.

Yours sincerely,
Madhavi