

OBJECTION TO:

Planning Case Reference Number: 25/02968/FPH

Location: 13 Grimstone Road, Little Wymondley, Hitchin, SG4 7HH

Description: Single storey rear extension and detached office outbuilding following demolition of existing rear conservatory and detached garage. Rear garden patio area

Objection from: Miss Hayley Ward & Mr Julian Tribe, occupiers of 11 Grimstone Road, Little Wymondley, Hitchin SG4 7HH (immediate neighbours).

Dated: 19th December 2025

We are the occupiers of the **neighbouring property (No. 11 Grimstone Road) immediately adjacent** to the application site (No.13), and object to this planning application on the grounds that the proposed **rear extension** and **detached home office/ outbuilding** would result in **unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of our home**, contrary to the policies of the **North Hertfordshire Local Plan** and the objectives of the **National Planning Policy Framework**.

Our objection relates to both the **individual impacts** of each element of the proposal and the **cumulative effect** of the development. The rear extension and the outbuilding each raise serious concerns in their own right, particularly in relation to loss of daylight, overshadowing, overbearing impact, loss of outlook, noise and disturbance. When taken together, the combined scale, massing, siting and very close proximity of these developments would significantly intensify those impacts.

As the adjacent neighbour, we would experience the effects of the proposal directly. The combined development would create an **overly dominant and enclosing built form** along our shared boundary, materially worsening the relationship between the two properties and causing a level of harm to our living conditions that goes beyond what could reasonably be expected in a residential setting.

The points set out below explain these concerns in more detail, with reference to the relevant policies of the **North Hertfordshire Local Plan**, established residential amenity standards, and relevant appeal decisions.

General:

Inaccurate Site Representation and Failure to Meet NHDC Validation Requirements

The submitted drawings do not accurately or sufficiently represent the true site context, contrary to **North Hertfordshire District Council's Local Validation Requirements**, which require plans to be accurate, scaled and adequately annotated in order to allow a proper assessment of impacts.

In particular, the drawings fail to clearly or accurately show that the two dwellings are **not parallel** but are arranged on a **bend in the street**. As a result of this angled relationship, the **separation distance between the properties reduces significantly towards the rear**, meaning that rear spacing is materially less than at the front. This critical relationship is not properly illustrated on the submitted site plan or elevations, giving a misleading impression of available space and separation.

Because the rear elevation of the application property effectively **projects towards our property**, a full-width rear extension extending approximately 3 metres from the rear wall would, at its nearest

point, be positioned **significantly closer to the shared boundary than is apparent from the submitted plans**. This geometric relationship materially affects the assessment of amenity impacts and is central to understanding the true scale and proximity of the proposal.

In addition, the submitted drawings lack essential dimensions, including:

- the distance between the proposed rear extension and the shared boundary,
- separation distances between the two dwellings at both front and rear,
- the depth and effective length of the proposed flank wall; and
- clear dimensional relationships between the proposed garage/outbuilding and neighbouring boundaries and dwelling.

These omissions prevent a proper assessment of the proposal's impact, particularly in relation to **overbearing enclosure, loss of daylight to habitable rooms, and the cumulative effect of the rear extension and outbuilding**.

NHDC policy requires that planning applications be supported by **accurate and sufficient information** to enable informed decision-making. In this case, the failure to correctly represent the spatial relationship between the dwellings, together with the absence of key dimensions, **undermines the Council's ability to fully evaluate the harm arising from the proposal** and to assess compliance with **Local Plan Policy D1** and the amenity objectives of the **National Planning Policy Framework**.

Rear Extension: Poor Design Response to Context

The proposed rear extension fails to demonstrate a **sensitive or proportionate design response** to the relationship between the two dwellings. In particular, the absence of any meaningful **setback, stepping or reduction in scale adjacent to the shared boundary** results in an unduly dominant form that exacerbates its impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

Given the constrained spatial relationship between the properties, a more considered design approach—such as stepping the extension away from the boundary and/or reducing its depth or width—could potentially mitigate these impacts. As submitted, however, the scale, massing and siting of the extension are **not proportionate to the context of the site**.

The proposal therefore conflicts with **Policy D1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**, which requires development to be of a high-quality design that responds positively to local character and the relationship between neighbouring buildings.

Proposed Detached Office/Outbuilding: Exceedance of GPDO Height Limits and Lack of Justification for Scale

Under the **Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015**, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E, any outbuilding located within **2 metres of a boundary** must not exceed an overall height of **2.5 metres**.

The proposed home office/garage would have an overall height of approximately **3.218 metres** and would be positioned only **approximately 1.4–1.7 metres** from our kitchen/ dining room window and

part-glazed door. On this basis, the proposal **does not comply with the height limitations of Class E** and therefore does not benefit from permitted development rights. As such, it must be assessed against the NHDC Local Plan policies — particularly those protecting residential neighbour amenity.

No justification has been provided to explain why a structure of this height is required in such close proximity to the boundary. A building designed to comply with the **2.5-metre height limit** would be capable of meeting typical domestic storage or ancillary needs while significantly reducing the impacts on neighbouring amenity.

More generally, the applicant has not demonstrated that the **scale and height of the proposed outbuilding are proportionate to its stated function**. Alternative, less harmful options appear available, including a lower-height outbuilding compliant with permitted development limits, such as rebuilding the existing garage at the existing height, or accommodating storage or ancillary space within the main dwelling or other garden structures.

As proposed, the excessive height and scale of the outbuilding are **unnecessary and disproportionate**, and result in significant and avoidable harm to our residential amenity through overbearing impact and loss of light. The proposal therefore conflicts with **Policies D1 and D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**, which require development to be proportionate to its context and to safeguard neighbouring living conditions.

Proposed Detached Office/Outbuilding: Severe Loss of Daylight to a Primary Habitable Room

Our kitchen/dining room is a **primary habitable room** that relies on the openings closest to the existing garage/the proposed detached home office for natural daylight. Due to the **diagonal relationship** between the existing garage and our gable end wall, the dining area window is located approximately **1.7 metres** from the proposed structure, and the half-glazed kitchen door approximately **1.44 metres** away.

The proposed outbuilding would have an overall height of approximately **3.218 metres**, which is significantly higher than the existing structure and, given this extremely limited separation, would **significantly obstruct daylight** entering the kitchen/dining room. When considered alongside the proposed rear extension, the development would **severely restrict visibility of the sky** from these openings and create a **persistent sense of overshadowing and enclosure**.

As a result, the proposal would materially reduce the **usability, comfort and enjoyment** of one of the main living spaces within our home. The resulting loss of daylight and openness would be **substantial and unacceptable** in a residential context and would fail to safeguard reasonable living conditions.

The scale, height and proximity of the proposed development would therefore result in an **unacceptable loss of daylight and outlook** to a primary habitable room, contrary to established residential amenity standards and **Policies D1 and D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**.

The impact of the proposed building on daylight to our property can be assessed with reference to the **BRE guidance *Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight***, which is commonly used as an indicator of acceptable amenity standards.

25° Vertical Sky Component Test:

When assessed from our ground-floor and first-floor habitable room windows, the proposed structure **intercepts the 25° vertical line**, indicating that an adequate level of visible sky would not be maintained. In BRE terms, this suggests a **material reduction in daylight** to these rooms.

45° Horizontal Test:

In plan view, the proposed outbuilding lies **well within the 45° envelope** when assessed from affected ground floor windows, due to its height, depth and close proximity. This is a strong indicator of **excessive overshadowing** and overbearing impact.

Taken together, these BRE assessments demonstrate that the proposal would result in a **material and harmful reduction in daylight** to habitable rooms within our home.

The BRE guidance is an **objective tool** to assess amenity impacts. In this case, the results clearly indicate harm, and the proposal therefore fails to safeguard light and outlook as required by **Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**.

Proposed Detached Office/Outbuilding: Additional Harm to First-Floor Outlook (Policies D1, D2 and D3)

The proposed detached home office/outbuilding would have a roof height of **3.218 metres**, would be broadly level with the **windowsill of our first-floor side bedroom window**. The structure would be positioned at a distance of only **approximately 1.4–1.7 metres** from our property.

While the bedroom is also served by a window on the front elevation, the **side-facing window currently provides important secondary outlook and daylight**. As proposed, the outlook from this side-facing window would be **dominated by the upper portion of a blank, solid roof at very close range**, significantly restricting views towards the street and materially altering the character of the outlook from this window.

This relationship would introduce an **overbearing built form at upper-floor level**, creating a pronounced sense of enclosure and confinement that would materially diminish the amenity value of the room and the living conditions of its occupants, even taking account of the presence of the front-facing window.

Policies **D1, D2 and D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan** require development to respond positively to its context, avoid overbearing impacts, and safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents. In this case, the **height, proximity and siting** of the proposed outbuilding would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook from the side-facing bedroom window and an overbearing relationship that is contrary to these policy objectives.

General: Overbearing Impact, Loss of Outlook and Harm to Living Conditions - (Policies D1, D2 and D3)

Proposed Home Office/Outbuilding:

The proposed detached outbuilding, by reason of its **height** and **extremely close proximity** to our home (**approximately 1.44–1.7 metres** from three habitable room openings), would result in a **dominant, overbearing and visually intrusive form of development**.

When viewed from the kitchen/dining room window, half-glazed kitchen door and first-floor bedroom window, the structure would appear as a **looming built form at very close range**, removing the majority of visible sky and replacing it with a solid roof mass. This would create a **pronounced and oppressive sense of enclosure**, materially diminishing outlook and the quality of living conditions within these rooms.

The harm would be **significantly greater than that arising from the existing compliant garage**, which is lower in height and less visually intrusive. The proposed increase in height and bulk would therefore represent a material worsening of the existing relationship between the buildings.

Cumulative effect when combined with the Rear Extension:

In addition, when assessed **cumulatively with the proposed rear extension**, the impact would be intensified. The combined scale, massing and proximity of both developments would result in a **continuous and enclosing built presence** along the boundary, leading to substantial loss of outlook and daylight to the kitchen/dining room, rear garden room and adjoining lounge. In particular, the kitchen/dining room would lose almost all meaningful sky visibility from its primary openings, resulting in a materially darker and more enclosed living environment throughout the day.

Such impacts are directly contrary to the aims of **Policies D1 and D2 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**, which require development to be well designed, proportionate to its context, and not to dominate adjoining properties, and **Policy D3**, which seeks to protect neighbouring occupiers from overbearing development and harm to living conditions.

The seriousness of this type of harm has been recognised in appeal decisions within the district, including **APP/X1925/W/24/3347317 (165 Weston Way, Baldock)**, where development was dismissed in part due to its adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. The impacts in this case would be **more severe**, given the greater height and extreme proximity of the proposed structures.

Taken individually and cumulatively, the proposal would result in **unacceptable overbearing impact and loss of outlook**, causing material harm to residential amenity contrary to NHDC planning policies.

Proposed Detached Office/Outbuilding: Noise, Disturbance and Inappropriate Use of a Detached Habitable Building - (Policy D3 – Protecting Living Conditions)

The application describes the proposal as a “detached office”. However, by reason of its **size (approximately 8m²), insulation, heating and internal specification**, the building would function as a **habitable room capable of regular and prolonged occupation**, rather than as a purely incidental domestic outbuilding.

A detached structure of this nature is materially different from a shed or storage building. Its specification enables a **wide range of potential activities**, including but not limited to home working, hobby use, music or media activities, gaming or entertainment, workshop use, therapy or treatment sessions, and social or leisure use. These activities would generate a level and frequency of noise materially greater than that associated with an incidental outbuilding.

While the proposal is described as a home office, the **functional capability of the building**, rather than its label, is the relevant planning consideration. A heated and insulated building designed for year-round occupation must therefore be assessed on the basis of its **likely impacts on neighbouring living conditions**, in accordance with **Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**.

Impact of Proximity on Noise and Disturbance

The proposed building would be positioned at an **exceptionally close distance** to our habitable rooms, namely:

- approximately **1.7 metres** from our kitchen/dining room window,
- approximately **1.44 metres** from our half-glazed kitchen door; and
- approximately **1.7 metres** from our first-floor bedroom window.

Given this extremely limited separation, any noise, voice-level activity, meetings, music, media use, computer equipment, hobby activity or extended periods of occupation would be experienced at a level **well beyond what would normally be considered reasonable in a residential environment**, as the very narrow gap forms a **noise-reflective corridor**, amplifying sound between the two walls.

The lack of physical separation means that noise transmission would be **direct, continuous and difficult to mitigate**, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity. This harm would be experienced throughout the day and, potentially, into the evening, depending on patterns of use.

This is unacceptable and contrary to **Local Plan Policy D3**, which requires protection from noise and disturbance.

Policy Conflict

Policy **D3 (Protecting Living Conditions)** requires development to safeguard neighbouring occupiers from **noise, disturbance and intrusive activity**. In this case, the siting of a detached habitable building at such close proximity to multiple habitable rooms of a neighbouring dwelling would give rise to an **unacceptable risk of noise nuisance and disturbance**, contrary to the policy's objectives.

Furthermore, given the proximity to our habitable windows, it is questionable whether the proposal could realistically achieve adequate acoustic attenuation without substantial and atypical construction measures. Even with enhanced sound insulation, the **minimal separation distance fundamentally limits the effectiveness of mitigation**, reinforcing the conclusion that the proposal is poorly sited.

Risk of Intensification of Use

There is also a clear risk of **intensification of use over time**. Once constructed, a heated and insulated detached building of this nature could easily be used for purposes beyond those implied by a "home office", including commercial activity, therapy sessions, music practice, gaming, or extended evening use.

In practical terms, such activities would be **difficult for the Council to monitor or control**, particularly in the absence of clear and enforceable planning conditions. This uncertainty further weighs against the acceptability of the proposal in amenity terms.

For the reasons set out above, the proposal would result in **unacceptable harm to residential amenity** through noise and disturbance, contrary to **Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan** and should therefore be **refused**.

Requested Conditions for the Outbuilding/Home Office (in the Alternative)

If the Council is minded to approve the change of use from a garage to a home office, we respectfully request that **robust conditions** be imposed to safeguard neighbouring living conditions, including:

1. The outbuilding shall not be used as sleeping accommodation or as a separate residential unit.
2. The home office to be used solely for desk-based work (computer and telephony- based work) and for storage purposes.
3. No customer-facing or externally attended use shall take place within the outbuilding.
4. No non-office activities to take place, such as using the building as a games room, or music room for example.
5. The hours of use shall be restricted (for example, **08:00–19:00**) to prevent noise nuisance.
6. Acoustic insulation measures to be applied to the construction of the outbuilding.
7. All permitted development rights for alteration, extension or change of use of the outbuilding shall be removed, requiring express planning permission for any future uses.

Without such controls, the proposal would pose a **substantial and ongoing risk of noise and disturbance**, arising directly from the unusually close proximity of the building to our habitable rooms.

General:

Harm to Privacy and Living Conditions (Policy D3)

Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan seeks to protect the living conditions of existing residents by ensuring that new development does not result in unacceptable harm through loss of light, overbearing impact, or an undue sense of enclosure.

- 1) The proposed home office/garage is **contrary to Policy D3** for the following reasons:
 - By reason of its **height, scale and proximity to our primary habitable room**, the outbuilding would have an overbearing impact, materially harming residential amenity,
 - The proposal would **significantly diminish outlook** from our kitchen/dining room, which is a primary habitable space,
 - The siting and massing of the structure would create a **persistent sense of enclosure**, which would adversely affect the quality of the private amenity space and internal living conditions,
 - The proposed change in use from a domestic storage building to a **habitable workspace** introduces a **reasonable likelihood of increased noise and activity** close to the boundary, which would further erode residential amenity and living conditions.
- 2) When assessed **cumulatively** with the proposed home office/outbuilding, **the rear extension is contrary to the objectives of Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**, which requires development to be of a scale, design and layout that responds positively to its context and does not result in harm to residential amenity.

In this case:

- The siting and proximity of the **rear extension's side elevation** would **exacerbate the enclosed relationship** created by the home office/outbuilding, resulting in a **pronounced tunnel-like sense of enclosure** along the shared boundary that fails to respect the spatial character of the site,
- The combined scale, massing and alignment of the rear extension and outbuilding would create a **continuous and visually dominant built form**, which would be overbearing in outlook and unresponsive to the relationship between neighbouring properties.
- The cumulative impact of both structures would lead to **increased overshadowing** of an **additional ground-floor habitable room** within our property, resulting in a material loss of daylight.
- This loss of daylight would have a **further adverse effect on the adjoining ground-floor lounge**, which relies on morning daylight borrowed from the affected room, thereby compounding the overall harm to residential amenity.

Taken together, the proposal fails to demonstrate a design that respects local context or safeguards neighbouring amenity/living conditions, as required by **Policy D3**, particularly when the **combined and cumulative impacts** of the development are properly considered. **The harm to all our ground floor rooms and garden would be immediate and permanent.**

Proposed Detached Office/Outbuilding: Lack of Accurate Measurements

The submitted planning drawings do **not provide any wall-height or eaves-height dimensions** for the proposed outbuilding. This omission is a significant deficiency, as it prevents both neighbouring residents and the Local Planning Authority from properly understanding the **true scale and visual impact** of the structure.

From visual comparison with the existing garage, which has a maximum roof height of approximately **2.4 metres**, the proposed outbuilding walls appear to be **at least 0.5 metres higher**. This indicates an **eaves height approaching 2.9 metres**, with the stated **3.218 metres applying only to the ridge of the pitched roof**. As such, the drawings materially understate the bulk of the building by focusing on ridge height alone rather than the height of the walls that would dominate views from neighbouring properties.

An eaves height of this magnitude, particularly at a separation distance of only **approximately 1.44–1.7 metres** from our property, would result in a **far more overbearing and enclosing impact** than is apparent from the submitted drawings.

In addition, the application fails to provide **external footprint dimensions**, further limiting the ability to assess the relationship between the building and neighbouring boundaries.

The absence of accurate, scaled and fully dimensioned drawings prevents a proper assessment of:

- overbearing impact,
- overshadowing,
- loss of daylight; and
- loss of outlook at both ground-floor and first-floor level.

For these reasons, the application is **not supported by sufficient or reliable information** and should not be approved unless and until **accurate, fully dimensioned plans** are submitted showing wall heights, eaves heights, footprint dimensions, and the true relationship of the building to neighbouring properties.

Local Character and Context – Grimstone Road, Little Wymondley

Grimstone Road in Little Wymondley is characterised by modest, low-profile domestic buildings with **generous spacing between structures** and **open rear garden outlooks** that contribute to a sense of light, openness and suburban character. The few existing garages and outbuildings in the street are typically **single-storey, sub-2.5m structures**, and are positioned so as **not to dominate neighbouring habitable rooms**.

In this context, the proposal represents **overdevelopment of the plot** and would create a visually intrusive, overbearing feature not reflective of the character of Grimstone Road or the wider area of Little Wymondley. This is contrary to the principles of good design and neighbour-respect set out in Policies **D1** and **D2** of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011–2031, which require development to be sympathetic to local character and **not to dominate or harm neighbouring properties**.

Lack of Respect for Neighbouring Residential Amenity (Policies D1, D2 and D3)

The North Hertfordshire Local Plan includes policies which require development to:

- Avoid unacceptable loss of light, outlook or privacy to neighbouring properties,
- Be proportionate in scale, height and massing relative to its context; and
- Maintain a high standard of residential amenity for existing occupants.

For the reasons set out above, including the proposal's scale, proximity to the shared boundary, and its cumulative impact on light, outlook and sense of enclosure, the development would **fail to meet these requirements** and would result in significant and **unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity** of our home through:

- Overbearing impacts from both the rear extension and garage/outbuilding,
- A material loss of daylight to all habitable rooms on the ground floor of our property,
- Overdevelopment of the site (dominance),
- Substantial risk of noise nuisance,
- A failure to accurately represent the true site context and spacing between dwellings.

The proposal therefore conflicts with **Policy D1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan** and the amenity objectives of the **National Planning Policy Framework** and should be **refused or substantially amended**.

NHDC & HM Inspectorate Planning Decision Precedents:

Relevant appeal decisions and consistency with past NHDC decisions

We note that North Hertfordshire District Council and the Planning Inspectorate have consistently refused development where extensions and/or outbuildings close to a boundary cause overbearing impact and harm to neighbouring living conditions.

In the recent appeal at **31 Thatcher's End, Hitchin (APP/X1925/D/25/3368979, 14 October 2025)**, the Inspector found that extensions and an outbuilding along the plot boundaries caused an overbearing visual impact and harm to neighbours' living conditions, contrary to Policies D2 and D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011–2031, and raised concerns about compliance with the GPDO height limits next to the boundary.

This proposal creates **greater harm**, especially with the proposed outbuilding/home office being even closer to two primary openings in our home.

Similarly, an appeal relating to **165 Weston Way / 2 Willian Way in Baldock (APP/X1925/W/24/3347317, 5th December 2024)** was dismissed because the proposal would be very prominent, dominant, and overbearing when viewed from the neighbour's property and cause unacceptable harm to the neighbours' living conditions, conflicting with Policies D1 and D2 which seek to ensure new development does not dominate adjoining properties; and also conflicting with Policy D3: Protecting Living Conditions.

The proposed 3.218m high home office within approximately 1.4-1.7m of our kitchen/dining room window and half-glazed door, particularly when combined with the extent and angulation of the rear extension relative to our property, and extension side wall proximity to the boundary fence (and therefore a continuance of the "tunnelling effect" of the alleyway at the side of our property and the overshadowing of our habitable rooms), would have a very similar, if not greater, overbearing and enclosing effect, leading to substantial loss of light and outlook.

Approving this application would be inconsistent with the approach taken in the above decisions.

Summary and Potential Mitigation:

We are not opposed to the development in principle; however, we respectfully request that the Council:

- a) require a reduction in depth and/or width, with a stepped design away from the boundary for the **rear extension** and
- b) limit the total height of the **re-built garage**/detached home office to 2.5m high and
- c) impose the suggested **conditions of use**, should the Council be minded to approve the change of use from a garage/storage room to a habitable room for the outbuilding/detached home office, to prevent unacceptable noise nuisance.

The above are required in order to mitigate the identified harm.

In addition, the application should not be determined until **accurate, fully dimensioned drawings** are submitted that properly reflect the site context and relationships.

Therefore, in its present state, we respectfully ask that the Council refuse the application for the following reasons:

Loss of Daylight and Overshadowing

The proposed development, by reason of its **scale, height, depth and close proximity to the shared boundary**, would result in a **material loss of daylight and increased overshadowing** to neighbouring habitable rooms and private amenity space. The development would have an

overbearing relationship with the neighbouring property and would fail to safeguard acceptable levels of natural light, contrary to **Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan** and the amenity objectives of the **National Planning Policy Framework**.

Overbearing Impact and Sense of Enclosure

The proposal, due to its **siting, massing and lack of any meaningful setback or reduction in scale adjacent to the boundary**, would create an **overbearing and enclosing form of development** that would materially harm the outlook and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The resulting sense of enclosure would be excessive and out of keeping with the spatial character of the area, contrary to **Policies D1 and D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**.

Noise, Disturbance and Harm to Living Conditions

The proposed detached outbuilding, by reason of its **design, specification and extremely close proximity to neighbouring habitable rooms**, would be capable of regular and prolonged occupation, giving rise to an **unacceptable risk of noise and disturbance** detrimental to the living conditions of adjacent residents. The proposal fails to adequately safeguard neighbouring amenity and is therefore contrary to **Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan**, which seeks to protect residents from noise, disturbance and intrusive activity.

Poor Design Response to Context

The proposed development fails to demonstrate a **high-quality or contextually responsive design**, with insufficient regard to the sensitive relationship between the application site and neighbouring property at No.11. The scale, massing and siting of the development are not proportionate to the constrained plot and fail to respond positively to local character or the relationship between buildings. The proposal is therefore contrary to **Policy D1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan** and the design principles of the **National Planning Policy Framework**.

Inaccurate and Insufficient Plans

The application is not supported by **accurate and sufficiently detailed drawings** to enable a proper assessment of the proposal's impact. In particular, the submitted plans fail to accurately depict the **non-parallel relationship between the dwellings**, the reduced separation distances at the rear, and lack essential dimensions relating to boundary distances and built form. As a result, the local planning authority is unable to fully assess the proposal's impact on neighbouring amenity, contrary to **North Hertfordshire District Council's Local Validation Requirements, Policy D1 of the Local Plan**, and the decision-making objectives of the **National Planning Policy Framework**.

We thank you for your kind consideration of these objections and will happily assist with any further information or photographs should you require them.

Hayley Ward & Julian Tribe