22/03253/FP

Erection of one detached 3-bed dwelling

Toyldfor Heathfield Road Hitchin Hertfordshire SG5 1SY

Track

Total Consulted: 18
Comments Received: 3
Objections: 3
Supporting: 0

Collapse All Expand All

Mr R J And Mrs J M Warner 2 Heathfield Road Hitchin Herts SG5 1SY (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 09 Mar 2023

Thank you for your letter dated 6th February 2023, received on the 28th of February leaving once again very little time to oppose the proposed above build.
I would refer you to all our previous objections plus those of our neighbours but would like to draw your attention to the personal impact this build would have to our lives.
We moved into Heathfield Road, in 1979, raising a family and enjoying our garden.We now have grandchildren and would like to continue to enjoy our property and garden but as you will see from the proposed build this will not be possible.Our kitchen will be in darkness all year round, our conservatory a pointless piece of construction and as for the enjoyment of the garden,well, that also will be taken from us.
After 44years of enjoying our home and garden we fail to understand how someone could be so inconsiderate as to take this away from us in our fast approaching old age.
You have all the finer details of objection from previous applications but I felt it was appropriate to just give a personal perspective to this abhorrent situation

Comment submitted date: Thu 09 Mar 2023

further comments :
Further to our recent phone conversation regarding objections to the above application, it's becoming a bit of saga as no one will stand up and be seen to reject the application.
All previous objections still remain in place, and the resubmitting on a boundary issue is a mere technicality as nothing has changed. The on going traffic chaos in Heathfield Road will not be helped by it possible increase of 4cars at the property and only 2 parking spaces.The misleading scale drawings that make things seem better than they really are should also be addressed.
My over shadowing objections and loss of natural light seem to fall on deaf ears , but this is a massive problem almost to the point of taking away our human right to natural light.
Our neighbours at 4 Heathfield Road will also lose their natural summer sun light .
If the application is granted who pays for my electric bill as our lights would be on during all daytime hours ,I find it all totally unfair. I know at the end of the day the planning committee don't give a dam about our situation, but you put yourself in our position.Hope for a favourable conclusion.

Comment submitted date: Mon 30 Jan 2023

As i understand this is the third application from the same plot of land,and the second design, and any previous objections are now void.

So ,again my primary objections are the overshadowing of my property and loss of natural light to my kitchen and conservatory.
During summer time we would lose all sun light to our back garden,along with our neighbours at number 4 from about 2pm as the proposed dwelling is in direct line of sun light. Again I remind you of the ultra high energy costs I will incur to light my property which I think is totally unfair, as others strive for riches.
Other objections. Narrow parking bay,
The reduced size of an already small plot,due to boundary changes.
Binstore location by my back door,odour and vermin concerns.
On going existing parking issues at this location due to school parking for Strathmore School, and sporting activities at King George's Sports field..

Comment submitted date: Fri 27 Jan 2023

Regarding the proposed development. As before ,all objections regarding this planning application REMAIN.
Further notice should be given to the parking problem and the amount of vehicles parked on the pathway in Heathfield Road,due to school activities at Strathmore school and sporting events at King George's sports field.
I also find the bin store remaining next to my kitchen window and back door really offensive.
But in this day and age of massively high energy cost ,the deprivation of natural light to my house

Mr John Morris 88 Strathmore Avenue Hitchin Hertfordshire SG5 1ST (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Tue 28 Feb 2023

I wish to object to the application as it contains misleading "mistakes" which could result in planning permission being granted.

The "mistake" is found in the vehicle parking section of the application. This states that Toyldfor currently correctly states has 3 off road parking spaces. The proposed development and toyldfor will if the development proceeds each have 3 off road parking spaces. If the plans are reviewed then it is obvious that there are going to be only 2 parking spaces for each of the properties.
Thus for Tolydfor there will actually be a reduction in off road parking. This will only make the parking situation on Heathfield Road worse than it currently is.

Comment submitted date: Thu 26 Jan 2023

I wish to object to the plans for planning permission (received 10 Jan 2023)
The grounds for objection are:
Overshadowing:
The proposed development still results in excessive overshadowing of the house of 2 Heathfield Road and the gardens of 2 & 4 Heathfield Road. The front elevation drawing supplied as part the planning application, gives a misleading impression of the space between the proposed development and 2 Heathfield Ave as being approximately 8m. If the plan is reviewed it is approximately 4m. This overshadowing is made worse by the proposed development being nearly due south of 2 Heathfield Road and having a side gable roof facing 2 Heathfield Road.
Loss of Privacy:
The clear glass door on the north-east side of the proposed development still directly looks into the kitchen of 2 Heathfield Road. The kitchen window of 2 Heathfield Road and glass door of the proposed development are only approximately 4m apart.
The windows of the south-east side of the proposed development provide excellent visibility of the conservatory of 2 Heathfield Road (about 6 m away) and the gardens of 2, 4 Heathfield Road and the Garden of 88 Strathmore Avenue. This is particularly bad for the windows on the second floor of the proposed development.
The windows and glass doors on the south-west side of the proposed development provide excellent views of the gardens, houses and windows of 94, 92 & 90 Strathmore Avenue. The comment on the plan that existing fences will be retained is misleading and irrelevant as these fences are only 1.2m high, which results in only very limited retention in privacy from the ground floor of the proposed development. The loss of privacy is illustrated by one of the photographs ("92 Srathmore from site"). This photograph is very similar to the view from the proposed development.
Adverse Parking impact:
The proposed development is a 3 bedroom house. At points in its future there are likely to be at least 3 cars of residents. (Husband, Wife and teenage children) To make this usable these 3 spaces should be side by side. It is well known there is an acute shortage of on road parking on Heathfield Road. If parking on the proposed development proceeds with only two off road parking spots, the on road parking will become even worse.
Development out of character for the area:
The location of the proposed development i.e. far further from Heathfield Road than adjacent properties is out of character for the area.
The application contains a number of errors:
Since the previous application was submitted (22/01534/FP) the size of the garden has been significantly reduced. This involves a significant transfer of land to 90 Strathmore Ave. This results in photographs in "existing site plan" being incorrect and gives a misleading impression of the size of the existing garden. The picture "2 Heathfield" were taken today from the same position it would about 12m inside the garden of 90 Strathmore Ave. Likewise if picture "92 Srathmore" were taken today it would be very close the fence separating Toyldfor and 90 Strathmore Ave.

Helene Doonan-Jones 4 Heathfield Road Hitchin Hertfordshire SG5 1SY (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 02 Feb 2023

I object to the proposed development of the garden of Toyldfor on a number of grounds;
This is the third attempt to try and develop this land, there are numerous objections that make this development not viable that I and other commenters have detailed. These cannot simply be ignored.
It is noted that the garden of the existing property was extended via purchase of gardens previously from those properties in Strathmore Avenue that currently border the plot. The proposed plans look to utilise this garden for something other than its intended use by planners previously, a green space which houses a number of trees and valuable absorption of water.
It is noted within "BEY-001-PA-E Location; existing site plans; site photo"s - pictures are in accurate and have not been updated to reflect recent developments at 90 Strathmore Avenue, the fence line of 92 Strathmore Avenue has now moved significantly (c.12 meters) into the garden of Tolfydor. Again supporting the fact that these submissions are inaccurate and cannot be relied upon.
The change in boundaries in the latest position - leaves the existing property Toldyfor with c.72m2 private amenity space (which is below the new development guidance). The remaining amenity space that will be available to Toldyfor is occupied by a number of mature trees and shrubbery that will likely be needless destroyed to make the existing property at Toldyfor viable.
It is noted that there are significant inconsistencies within the submitted documents, the redacted Application Form and Design and access statement do not reflect the detail within the other plans submitted. These statements refer to the space being c.1000 sqm however that has been reduced significantly due to the false claim Toldyfor had on its boundary. It is unknown whether its other boundaries are accurate and whether the previous 'land grab' will result in more boundary movements - for this reason alone development should not go ahead. The Application form still refers two, three bedroom semi-detached properties, this is the first misleading an erroneous element of this application.
On review of the proposed site plan (document BEY-100-PA-G), it is evident that the plans are significantly out of proportion to the actual plot. The distance from road to garage as well as both the depth and width of both the garage and plot and are out of proportion with actual figures measured varying by up to 2m, this is further supported by the distance of our front garden (No.4) showing at 8m from the road, in which it in fact is only half this distance. This contributes to the misleading representation to allow for a fair process. This can be seen clearly within the site plan at BEY-100-PA-G vs the elevation BEY-510-PA-C, where the width of the plot is shown as significantly wider than the actual sight plan.

The inaccuracy of the plans is further shown with the proposed elevations in document (BEY-510-PA-C). The width of the proposed property to the border of No.2 boundary is around double that of actual distance and that shown on the site plan. The height of the proposed property is shown as the same height as the terraced houses No.2 to 8 when in fact there are significant height differences.
These terraced houses line both sides of the road surrounding the proposed site and this further highlights that the proposed property will be larger, more imposing and overshadowing of the current homes.

The proposed plan for a large semi detached property in such in confined space, as highlighted above. The layout has not changed since the previous submission which calculated a GIA of 100m2 (not the 105m2 referred to in the design and access statement) which is less than the advised GIA of 102m2 (for a three double
bedroom, two story property) as prescribed by the Governments technical housing standards, any increase in internal space would be of a detriment to the already small external amenity space.

The reference to a three double bedroom property is on the basis of the proposed floorplans placing a misleading single bed in bedroom three, where the room is a comparable size to the other two bedrooms. These facts are insurmountable in supporting the case that this application is in accurate and misleading.
The proposed property once taking into account the inaccuracy of the proportions on the site plan, will sit further back from the road than the current properties, by almost the additional comparable depth of the current properties of which the whole terrace from No.2 to 8 will be subject to a direct view of the side of this property. The proposed plans and their aspect have a detrimental effect on the overshadowing of both houses 2 and 4 of Heathfield Road. The impact on No. 2 is unimaginableand must be taken into consideration seriously with all rear windows being impacted by the shadow of the proposed property. Their kitchen and conservatory particularly will receive no light, and will be directly looked down on by two bathroom windows, which is likely to significantly impact the occupants of No.2 and their wellbeing. No 4 will receive significantly restricted light and overshadowing from around 12 noon to both the dining room, kitchen and garden, which is simply unacceptable. Both properties should be able to enjoy their homes without the permanent shadow of the proposed oversized property, and without the promotion of the overcrowding of this plot and much needed green space.
The blatant disregard for wellbeing of the residents of existing properties with these proposed plans in respect to daylight and sunlight which will be significant restricted. From what I can see from plans submitted there has been no assessment on the impact of both daylight and sunlight this will have on the existing properties in Heathfield Road (specifically no. 2 and 4), for new developments NHDC mandates the use of the DOE manual for Daylight and Sunlight (in Guideline 6 of Policy 57), without this assessment on the existing properties there is simply no grounds for an informed decision to be made. I therefore strongly recommend that the planning officers mandate further review into the impact on light and ensure full assessments are completed prior to allowing further approvals with regards to this plan.

In line with the comments previously made in consultation with Area Highway Development Control Manager, it is noted that a number of restrictions have been advised on the development of the area with the use of the highway - given the over development of the site as mentioned above the current road cannot facilitate any further parking (be that builders or delivery of materials). The plot cannot facilitate storage of materials due to it being a restricted space which will further cause risks to pedestrians using the highway and associated footpath and result in a significant breach of these conditions. When reviewing proportions on site plan (document BEY-001-PA-G) it is noted that vehicles will be set back in line with the bay window.
I note that the updated plans (September 2022) reconfigured the space to move parking arrangements to the North side of 'Toyldfor' - with two parking bays side by side. Hertfordshire County Council have failed to take into account that the site plans are significantly flawed in there scaling and general inaccuracies (which goes back to my initial comments on both the initial proposal 22/00729/FP and the amended proposal 22/01534/FP). The space between the proposed boundary for Toyldfor and the edge if the property is not 3.7m across, in fact it is only 2.7m - this against the average width of a modern car at 1.8m each (total 3.6m) is significantly deficient in space. The width available for the new dwelling is around 10 meters (from boundary to boundary) of which the gable including front access is over 5m wide per plans and therefore will already be tight for including an additional 3.7m width of parking for two cars, leaving roughly c.0.5m up to 2 Heathfield Road's boundary (and making the side door per the plans unusable). Per NHDC Policy 28 on House Extensions it is noted that plans will be refused if within 1m of the boundary. Using NHDCs own guidance and points laid out above, it is clear this is over development of land and is simply unviable with space available and certainly not for the greater good of Hitchin and its residents and I would hope NHDC would make this into account.
If you visit Heathfield Road on any given evening you will note that there is already a chronic parking issue. With parking only permissible on one side of the road, there is no further room to accommodate further vehicles that could not otherwise fit on the driveway of these properties (i.e. any vehicle given the space constraints noted above). It is also important to note that the current Tolydfor property more often than not has more than two vehicles and utilises the garden to the left of the garage to cater for demands - that the plans ignore; the proposed parking provision for the current property are untenable without a vehicle encroaching on the pavement as the space is less than c.2m in width, this will also be unfeasible based on the average cars turning circle. On the basis that the planned properties are each comprised of three (contested) double bedrooms, there is an
increased risk of a potential third car for each property and the proposed second vehicles for which the plans do not accommodate. The road can simply not accommodate parking for any further cars.

To build on the difficulties with parking, it must also be noted that the road is busy with pedestrians, electric scooters and young people from the local parks. The road is used as a cut through for many pedestrians and the greenery imposed in the plans to provide the possibility of privacy on the overcrowded plot will reduce the visibility splays of the property. The splays do not show that on the side of 96b Strathmore Avenue there is a fence that will make these splays unviable and a risk to those using the footpath.

The above points consider a number of areas in which the property is simply not viable, I implore you to take them account when considering the overdevelopment and overcrowding of Heathfield Road, our home.

I hope this is the third and final time we will need to object to such a development that is simply not viable and will bring misery to the current residents that call this road home.

Details

Comments (8)

Make a Comment

Public Comments (3)

Consultee Comments

Related Documents

Related Cases (1)