

✓ already on system

KP

CD



Sent: 01 October 2013 11:38
To: Planning
Subject: Re: 5 Orchard Close, Cuffley - Your Ref: S6/2013/1884/LUP

We are writing with regard to the "Certificate of lawfulness for proposed loft conversion and erection of single storey side and rear extension" application as referenced above.

We are, of course, very concerned to note, if we understand matters correctly, that the applicant may have acted unlawfully with regard to the development at 5 Orchard Close.

We believe very strongly that the planning regulations should be respected and adhered to in order to prevent developments being undertaken without proper consideration and accountability.

We have already made a representation with regard to the planning application made for this property under your reference S6/2013/1886/FP, which we set out in italics below in case any of our objections and comments in this respect are in any way relevant to the certificate of lawfulness application:

For the Attention of Miss K. Phillips - Your Ref: S6/2013/1886/FP

Re: Erection of Two Storey Side and Rear Extension, Loft Conversion and Front Bay Windows at 5 Orchard Close, Cuffley, Potters Bar

We are writing with regard to the proposal referenced above and detail our objections and comments below::

Firstly, we have lived in our current property No 6 Orchard Close, which adjoins the proposed development, for over 25 years and have seen many changes to the properties in Orchard Close during this time. However, this proposal is by far the largest and we feel that the resultant property would be wholly out of keeping with the rest of the homes along the road. No 5 Orchard Close is already sited in an elevated position at the head of the culdesac and this height will be greatly accentuated by the mass and appearance of the proposed effectively three storey building. The current sloping roof will be protruded by dormers both to the front and rear adding height to every aspect of the house. As a result, it will appear to tower above the other properties in the road and, in particular, will dwarf the neighbouring chalet bungalow that comprises No 4, which is already lower than No 5 due to the natural lie of the land.

We would also question the boundary line as it is drawn on the submitted plans between Nos 4 and 5. Since we have lived here, both properties have changed hands twice and we have always understood that the boundary line to No 5 on that side of the property followed the edge of the driveway to No 5 at the front, along the existing garage at No 5, travelling back alongside the right hand side of the electricity sub station to the garden border with 36 Kingsmead. We attach a plan from H.M. Land Registry in respect of our own title which clearly indentifies a separate strip of land leading to the sub station giving them access for maintenance purposes. Our understanding is that this strip, as marked in red on the attached plan, does not form part of the land title relating to No 5.

Furthermore, there is a distinct reduction in land height along the border between this strip of land and No 5 where there are shrubs and trees that have never been maintained by previous owners of No 5. The submitted plans incorrectly show the boundary for No 5 to be sited as the left hand boundary of the strip of land giving access to the sub station. In our opinion, therefore, the proposed side extension would be built right along the actual boundary line between No 5 and the sub station, not within the applicant's own land as shown by the plan submitted for planning approval purposes. We therefore question whether appropriate permission has been sought from the electricity company concerned to build on this boundary. We would also point out that the flank wall on that side of the proposed structure would be a substantially high and imposing brick wall facing the property at No 4 that would no doubt interfere with that property's enjoyment of natural light.

We would also like to mention that the "existing property" (being the building so referenced in the planning application) had a double length garage to the left hand side whereas the proposed development, despite having provision for seven bedrooms, has no provision for any garage. However, we notice from the submitted 'Householder Application for Planning Permission' that it is stated that the proposed works will not affect existing car parking arrangements – this is clearly incorrect. It is also stated that no trees or shrubs will need to be removed or pruned in order to carry out the application – how is this possible? We can only assume that it is not intended to turn the former front garden over to hard standing but rather to replace the front lawn and shrubs that have already been removed as

a result of the groundworks undertaken to date. In either case, the property will have very little frontage on which to accommodate cars, even if the whole of the front garden was to be taken over as hard standing – something which would also be out of keeping with the rest of the properties in the road and surrounding area which all have, at the very least, green verges to their frontages. This greenery is very important for the local wildlife and birds and should be maintained wherever and whenever possible. A seven bedroom property implies a large family residence with the potential for several vehicles, so where will they be parked? It would be extremely difficult to accommodate these, and any additional visiting vehicles, in the road without blocking the access to other properties. We envisage that this would be a particular problem for residents, visitors and delivery vehicles alike due to the very limited other parking opportunities where No 5 is sited at the head of the culdesac, which is regularly used as a turning circle.

We would also draw to your attention to two other inaccuracies and/or errors in the application for planning permission submitted, in that the proposed works had already been started in earnest before the date of the application (i.e. 1st August, 2013) and there are trees that are within falling distance of the proposed development.

In conclusion, we consider that the proposed application represents over-development of the site. In particular, we have concerns for our neighbours' and ourselves regarding the designation of the boundary to No 5, the potential impact of the double storey side extensions and the lack of provision for parking. Please note that these concerns are based upon a very good understanding of the potential impact of the proposal given the substantial amount of building works that have already been undertaken, and continue to take place, on the site which, according to the applicant, are covered by the "permitted development" rules. It appears to us that the level of the proposed development on the site is far more than we would have envisaged would be permitted under the current planning regulations.

These concerns would, perhaps, be somewhat alleviated if:

- (i) We were to be assured that the proposed development is to be undertaken wholly within the boundaries of the applicant's own land, and
- (ii) The side extensions were to be reduced to single storey, thereby making the whole property less imposing, and
- (iii) The front left hand side extension were to form a double garage with an adequate driveway to resolve, to some degree, the anticipated parking difficulties.

We trust that our comments will receive the planning department's full and careful consideration.

Thank you in anticipation of your kind attention.

Mr & Mrs R Crawley
6 Orchard Close
Cuffley
EN6 4QD