

Objection to planning application reference 6/2020/1463/FULL.

, 14 Maynard Place, Cuffley, Herts, EN6 4JA.

A. Ardent technical note document item 2.2.

This item is simply incorrect. Item 2.2 says “The car park includes a total of 11 unallocated parking spaces along with 11 additional garages allocated to existing flats. Overall, the site includes a total of 22 on-site parking spaces.”. The truth is the following:-

1. **The 11 existing garages are NOT used for parking.** They are too small and as the applicant for planning is aware are rarely if ever used for parking. The garages are only 2300mm wide. Even a standard VW Golf cannot be parked in one of these garages as you cannot open the door to get out of the car. Also, the 6 garages in the rear garage block are accessed via a small entrance road between a garage in the front block and the side wall of Cuffley Hall. This entrance road (about 5 metres long) is often blocked by cars/vans parked in the main car park area so you dare not risk being blocked in. Also, the tarmac area in front of these garages is very small making actually manoeuvring a car into one of these rear block “garages” difficult and time consuming, even if you did have a car small enough to fit. Therefore there are NOT 22 on-site parking spaces as the planning applicant is fully aware.
2. **The garages are NOT “allocated to the flats”.** Many of the garages have been SOLD to others and so are nothing to do with the flats. They are rented out mostly to the shop owners for storage.
3. **There are not 11 unallocated parking spaces.** There is only space for 9 unallocated spaces as the two at the back of the parish council office shop are currently clearly marked on the tarmac “council”. I believe these may even be owned by the parish council.

In summary there are 9 plus 2 (council) parking spaces in total at Maynard Place, making 11 spaces. The document says 1.25 spaces are needed for a one bedroom flat and 1.5 spaces for a two bedroom flat. What is needed is as follows:-

- a) For the existing 14 flats by the guidance (two bedroom flats need 1.5 spaces) so we need $14 \times 1.5 = 21$ spaces for the existing flats.
- b) For the new flats the document states “The proposed new flats would provide 2x 2 bed units and 5 x 1 bed resulting in a car parking need of 9 (2 x 1.5 plus 5 x 1.25 = 9.25).

The total parking spaces requirement for the existing plus new flats is therefore **30 spaces (21+9)**. **We only have 11 so we would be short of 19 car spaces. In truth even without the new flats we are short of 9 spaces by your own guidance notes!**

Please note the proposed third floor plan (Drawing 1254.01.102) actually shows 3 two bedroom flats and 3 one bedroom flats, but the document states 2 two bedroom and 5 one bedroom. This would change the amount of spaces for the new flats to (3 x 1.5 plus 3 x 1.25 = 8.25) 8 spaces). We need the type and number of flats clarified. We would still be short of some 18 car parking spaces.

B. Application form redacted PDF.

1. Item 9, Vehicle parking.

This states there are 22 existing parking spaces which is incorrect. There are only 11 even if you include the two that I believe are owned by the parish council. Please see above for explanation. The difference is plus nine for the new flats and plus another ten for the existing flats to bring the block up to standard, **total plus 19.**

2. Generally this form refers to 3 two bedroom flats and 3 one bedroom flats. Other documentation with the application refers to 2 two bedroom flats and 5 one bedroom flats so this needs sorting out.

3. Item 18, Employment.

The shop owners use the rear parking area to park their cars during the day and evening. Also they have regular deliveries via lorries and vans into the parking area throughout the day. Lorries sometimes completely block access to the parking area for up to 15 minutes while a delivery is made. If the shop owners and their employees cannot park their cars, and if the shops have trouble with deliveries they are likely to shut down or move away. There is simply not enough space for 20 flats parking plus 7 shops parking/deliveries as proposed. The reality is there would be 11 spaces, enough for just 7 flats. We already have 14 flats and they want to build another 6! The existing parking situation is a struggle for all as it is, another 6 or 7 flats would make it impossible.

C. All buildings in Cuffley High Street are no more than 3 storeys high (Grd, 1st and 2nd).

If this extension goes ahead then Maynard Place will be the **only building on the high street 4 stories high**. Also it would set a precedent and Cuffley would become a giant building site for years to come. I think the population of Cuffley would be generally horrified if this 3rd floor extension gets planning permission.

D. Skylights in the roofs of the existing second floor flats.

I understand all the existing second floor flats have sky lights that let natural light into them. Obviously they would lose this if new flats are built on top and I know a number of them object to the new flats because of this.

E. Brooks Murray design and access statement (document 1254.01 – DAS(1).PDF).

1. Page 16, parking provision.

This refers to "11 Nr.existing allocated garages to the rear". The garages are not used for parking, are unusable for parking and are not allocated to the flats. Please see my item A for more information.

It goes on to say "18 of the spaces will be for the flats". There are only 11 spaces in total as the garages are not used because if you put a Golf car in one you can't open the door to get out (garages 2300mm wide). The applicant is fully aware the garages are not used.

2. Page 17, Bicycle.

This item says "The proposal includes for 11 bikes to be housed in the existing garages". The garages are not all "allocated to the flats". Some of the garages are owned by people who no longer live in the block. The garages are rented out mostly to the shop owners, and no doubt there are contracts involved. The proposal for 11 bikes to be housed in the existing garages is therefore an invalid statement.

I attach photos of the parking problems. **Many people may say the applicant is trying to deceive the Council about the current parking problems so they can build the flats. The same goes for the fact the current second floor flats have sky lights.**

