

From: Ivan Gao
Sent: 21 January 2026 09:56
To: planningcomments <planningcomments@stalbans.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to the application of 5/2025/2228

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to this planning application. I reside at 18 Cranbrook Drive, AL4 0SS and I believe this development would cause significant and lasting harm to the character, safety, and amenity of our neighbourhood.

Grounds for Objection

Loss of Privacy and Amenity

The proposed dwelling would directly overlook properties on Cranbrook Drive, including my own, I believe the new house is less than 2.5m away from my house resulting in an unacceptable view into my property and loss of privacy and quiet enjoyment. In the planning portal, the figure 13 is misleading as they use trees to hide/ignore the impact to my house. And the clause 2.10 is also keeping silent to the impact to my house This concern is supported by *Wheeler v Leicester City Council* [1981], which affirmed that loss of amenity is a valid planning objection.

Overdevelopment and Visual Impact

The insertion of a new dwelling into a rear garden constitutes overdevelopment and is inconsistent with the established character of the area. The proposal would disrupt the visual harmony and spacious layout of Cranbrook Drive, contrary to the principles of good design outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Traffic Disruption and Construction Chaos

Cranbrook Drive is a quiet cul-de-sac with limited access and parking. The construction phase would introduce heavy machinery, delivery vehicles, and contractor traffic into a confined residential street, creating noise, obstruction, and safety hazards. This disruption would particularly affect vulnerable residents, including children and the elderly. Under *Tesco Stores Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1995], the Council must weigh such material considerations, including public safety and traffic flow.

Mental and Emotional Impact on Senior Residents

As a senior citizen who has lived peacefully in Cranbrook Drive for many years, I am deeply concerned about the mental toll this development would take on me and others in similar circumstances. The noise, disruption, and constant activity associated with construction would shatter the tranquillity we rely on for our health and well-being. The stress of navigating blocked access, increased traffic, and the loss of quiet outdoor space is not a minor inconvenience—it

is a serious intrusion into the quality of life for older residents. Planning decisions must consider the lived experience of those most affected, and I urge the Council to recognize the disproportionate burden this proposal places on us.

Highway Safety and Long-Term Parking Pressure

Post-construction, the new dwelling would increase vehicular movements and parking demand in an already constrained area. This raises concerns about highway safety and emergency access, especially given the cul-de-sac layout of Cranbrook Drive.

Ecological and Environmental Concerns

Although the ecology consultation response suggests no significant ecological impact, it does recommend precautionary measures to protect nesting birds—highlighting the sensitivity of the site. Additionally, the garden may serve as a natural soakaway, and its development could increase surface runoff and exacerbate flood risks, contrary to sustainable drainage principles.

Imbalance of Benefit and Burden

It is clear that the owner of 14 Cranbrook Drive stands to gain materially from this development—whether through increased property value or future sale—while neighbouring residents, particularly those on Cranbrook Drive, bear the burden. This includes loss of privacy, increased traffic, noise, and disruption. Planning decisions must serve the public interest, not private gain, as reinforced in *Newbury District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1981]. The sacrifice of communal wellbeing for individual profit undermines the integrity of the planning system and sets a dangerous precedent.

Precedent and Planning Integrity

Approving this application may open the door to similar back-garden developments, leading to cumulative harm. The Council must consider the long-term implications for neighbourhood cohesion, infrastructure, and environmental sustainability.

Conclusion

In light of the above concerns—particularly the mental and emotional impact on senior residents—I respectfully urge the Council to reject this application. The proposed development would undermine the character, safety, and amenity of Rowan Close, and its approval would not be in keeping with sound planning principles or community welfare.

Best regards,

Xinghai Gao
18 Cranbrook Drive
St Albans
AL4 0SS

