

I refer to the planning application in respect of 1 Maynard Place and make my observations from the Design and Access statement available from your website, which I believe is misleading.

My **objections** to the proposal are as follow: -

- **2.5 Height/Scale/Massing** “St Andrews sits above the height of the proposed extension”:
 - St Andrews is on higher ground and cannot be used as a comparison. This proposed one storey roof extension will make this block the tallest building in Cuffley village.
 - In allowing this to happen, it will create a precedent and the other two blocks in the village could consider making a similar application, as well as any other house in the area.
 - This is not in keeping with the area and will blight the skyline
- **2.6 Privacy/Overlooking** – “there are no overlooking/privacy issues”
 - This is incorrect. The new one story roof extension will overlook the rear gardens of the houses and bungalows in Plough Hill, including my property.
 - My neighbour recently submitted a planning application, which had to be reassessed/declined by Welwyn Hatfield planning office, on the grounds of the privacy/overlooking (into my garden) clause, whereas this application is ignoring the overlooking issue.
- **3.2 Parking Provision**
 - There is hardly any room for the council waste collection vehicle to manoeuvre in the current set up and struggles to make the collections on a weekly basis. The proposed restructure, to add more parking spaces will make this weekly task even more difficult.
 - Adding the gate, as outlined in the proposal will restrict the width of the road into Maynard Place. This will cause vehicles to enter and leave one at a time resulting in a wait until the road is clear (due to the restriction) and will cause a tail back into Station Road, which is already very busy.
 - No consideration has been made for the houses on Plough Hill, who have garages at the back of their properties, which can only be accessed via Maynard Place.
 - The charity shop, the insurance brokers, the estate agent and the flats above these premises, have not been considered **nor have they been advised about the proposal development**. These properties also have parking facilities, which can only be accessed via Maynard Place.

- The ongoing costs for the gate i.e. service maintenance agreement, breakdown costs and the Health & Safety inspections will be recharged to the 1 Maynard Place via their service charges. As the gate will have to be used by the other properties mentioned above (who are outside of the service charge regime) will they now be expected to contribute to the gate costs?
- Having the gate in place will also prevent my access in maintaining shrubs from my garden encroaching over the boundary
- Where, in an already crowded area, is the bike shed going to be erected?
- The suggestion that the retail shops on the ground floor of 1 Maynard Place would have to park their vehicles in the car park by the Library, obviously at a cost to them, would impact the population of Cuffley. These shops would increase their prices to re-coup the additional cost to their business and it will be us (by using their services) that will end up paying for this.

- **Public Transport**

The increase of passengers to Cuffley station, which does currently struggle with the numbers would be affected by the proposed one storey roof extension to the flats. Although it's 6 or 7 flats (see conflicting section below), which could result in circa 14 people. When you consider what is being built within the area, the combined increase in numbers will affect the public transport situation. Cuffley station already has issues with numbers pre Covid but even now with the social distancing requirements on trains this would still be an issue.

- **Health & Safety**

If I have read the documents correctly, no additional stairs are part of the proposal, leaving one way in and out – in the event of a fire you would have 20 flats converging to the one exit.

- **Conflicting Statements**

The notification received from Welwyn Hatfield refers that 6 flats are being built, whereas the Design and Access statement, on page 8 states “The erection of 7 Flats”, which is it?