

- **Design of the proposal**

We object to the size, scale, footprint, design and position of the proposed dwelling as it is too big for the size of the plot. The proposed design is a taller building than that of the two adjacent houses, it is also too deep from the front to back. It would be too prominent and at odds with the areas character. The proposed dwelling is also wider than No. 32, even though it's on a narrower plot. The side elevation of the house with the chimney stack is extremely close to our fence line. We believe that this contradicts the openness of Green Belt and unduly dominates our property in the length of projection, height and proximity. Also, with reference to the elevation and floor plans ref. DPL/20/02-1, we see no reason or justification as to why the proposed new dwelling should jut out further forward towards the road than our property and the properties to the west. See location plan detail on the elevation and floor plan ref: DPL/20/02-1. Properties 26-32 are on similar sized plots and the front of these houses are more or less aligned with each other. But the proposed new dwelling does not follow this sight line, thus spoiling the existing street scene along this part of Vineyards Road. Additionally, we do not believe that the proposed dwelling will lie within a continuous built up frontage as the street scene along Vineyards Road varies, with the type and size of properties being cottages, bungalows and houses and also with woodland, fields and Green Belt land.

- **Impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area**

The proposed design amounts to a large three storey building, where in the immediate vicinity of No.34 Vineyards Road other properties have not been given permission to be built bigger or taller than a bungalow. The gaps between the houses along Vineyards Road are an inherent characteristic of this road and contributes to its open and rural character. No special circumstances have been shown to exist that outweighs the harm that this development will cause to the character of the area. We believe the proposed design is overdeveloped and overbearing for a Green Belt site and Landscape Character Area (Northaw Common Parkland) No new dwelling houses have been granted permission to be built in Northaw on Green Belt Land and if this application is granted, it would set a precedent for further developments within the Green Belt. So on these grounds this application should be refused.

- **Impact on the amenity of neighbours (e.g. sunlight/daylight, privacy, overbearing)**

Due to the position of the new dwelling on its plot being set further forward than ours, as mentioned above, it will cut out sunlight/daylight falling on to the front of our property. It will therefore cast a shadow on the front of our property as the proposed house is to our east. The design proposal is overbearing because it will mean that from the rooms at the front of our house we will be able to see the side of another property which is not a feature of the street scene along Vineyards Road. Additionally, our east facing window on the 1st floor will be facing the chimney/roof and dormer of the proposed building and will suffer significant loss of sunlight/daylight. The Chimney, because of its proximity to our property, is completely overbearing and surely not necessary for a new build house. Currently, we are not overlooked by any other property or neighbour. We will experience loss of privacy from the following:

- The window of the study and one of the windows to the side of the living room will look directly onto the front of our house and garden. Any occupant of the proposed new house will be able to see into our house from these windows. Also, the proximity of these windows are very close to our boundary line.
- We will be overlooked by all the dormer windows and the first floor windows to the rear, this would enable direct views over our private rear garden. We are not overlooked by our neighbour's bungalow at No. 30, because they were not given permission to have dormer windows on the top floor. None of the neighbouring properties have dormer windows. We therefore object to this aspect of the design.
- The folding doors in the kitchen/ family room will be facing our garden looking towards the west. Anyone standing at the sink will be looking directly onto our property.
- The dining room and living room windows and doors will also overlook our garden

- **Parking provision**

As the property is set forward I don't believe enough parking space has been left for the three cars mentioned on the plans.

- **Sustainability**

As Northaw village is not considered to be sustainable due to the village centre lacking facilities, other planning applications have been refused on these grounds which are of similar distance to the nearest main town of Potters Bar, e.g. Application Ref: 6/2020/0784/FULL & 6/2020/0658/4. The road from Northaw to Potters Bar often floods in heavy rain and cycling is not practical.

- **Environmental impact (e.g. noise, loss of trees/habitats).**

Until January 2020 the plot referred to as 34 Vineyards Road was an orchard of many fruit trees, shrubs and bushes and was used for fruit growing (agricultural land, section 336 of the town & Country Planning Act 1990) and this has been the case for many decades. The google map picture shows the plot having many trees and is evident from the stumps on the topographic diagram in the application. In January 2020 the spouse of the owner and his colleague spent many days chopping down and burning all the trees. They also filled in the pond, cleared the land of vegetation and sprayed weed killer. They have come back a number of times since and removed any regrowth of vegetation on the plot. This has been done immediately prior to their application to make the plot look vacant. I have included a photo showing a fire being lit and there is still a large scorch mark on the land where the fire was. The actions of the land owners have meant a loss of trees and habitats to the Northaw Common Parkland and have damaged the view and vista of Northaw Village and eliminated the verdant nature and openness of the plot. Previously, we have had in our garden on many occasions' frogs from the pond of No. 34. Birds used to use the trees of No. 34 for nesting in at night and muntjac deer grazed on the vegetation that used to be there at No.34. The owner's actions of clearing the plot of all trees and vegetation has had a negative impact on the local biodiversity.

Noise of the wildlife that was once there will be replaced by the noise of another household. We feel all of the above is not acceptable because of its negative environmental impact on Green Belt Land and therefore object to this development on these grounds.



Prior to trees being cut google earth picture & bird's eye view and street view (No.32 on the right, No.36 to the left)



Burning of trees in January 2020



Current picture of plot after clearing of the land

Other issues/ errors in the application

There are inaccuracies/errors on the application form for questions 1, 4, 6, 10 & 13 and we feel that the council should reject this application because of these errors. I have listed the errors below:-
 Question 1. The site address is not 34 as has been indicated but is in fact, according to the Land Registry deeds title number HD140167 is "Land on the South side of Vineyards Road, Northaw, Potters Bar". We feel that this is misrepresentation as this plot doesn't have a numbered address. In the applicants Design and Access Statement under the paragraph of Assessment the line stating "but is assumed to have the postal number of 34 as the properties on either side are numbered 32 & 36. Presumably it was always intended that in the future a dwelling would be constructed on the site". Is there any evidence to substantiate this presumption? Calling it No. 34 gives the impression of it being a building plot but it is in

fact agricultural land as mentioned in the Environmental impact paragraph above. They also installed a post box recently to give this impression.

Question 4. The site area is shown as 0.18 hectares, it is in fact less than half of this stated size. It measures approximately $15\text{m} \times 50\text{m} = 750\text{m}^2 = 0.075$ hectares. This is misrepresenting the size of the plot.

Question 6. Existing use as vacant plot is debatable as its last use was agricultural land as mentioned above in the environmental section.

Question 10. There are a couple of trees still remaining on the plot and also on adjoining properties so a tree survey may need to be provided.

Question 13. Regarding Foul Sewage, details of the existing system have not been included on the application drawings because there is no existing sewage or drainage system on this plot of land. So there are no details of waste water management for this proposal.

In conclusion, we would ask that you consider the above comments in relation to the planning application ref: 6/2020/1365/FULL, as we object to this application in its entirety.