

I wish to **object** to application 6/2020/1463/FULL which is to create 7 additional flats on top of the retail/flat development at Maynard Place, Cuffley.

I am the owner of Flat 16 which is on the second floor of this development and therefore my flat is one which is proposed to be built on top of.

The application to create 6 flats including 3 1 bed flats and 3 x 2 bed flats as an additional floor on top of the existing development, would have a detrimental and unacceptable affect on the amenity of existing occupiers from the point of view of noise , dust and disturbance during construction but most importantly, the fact that there is no additional parking provision proposed will result in undue pressure on parking in Cuffley and particularly in the Maynard Place area. The impact of such building on the use and enjoyment of the flats – in particular the upper floor flats has not been properly considered.

Whilst it is accepted that Cuffley is an appropriate location for minor residential development and is served by public transport, it was clear from the pre application meeting that the main concern of the planning officers was the provision of additional parking for the additional flats.

At the pre application meeting, it was stated that the car parking will need to take into consideration the residential units at first and second floor, as well as, the commercial units at ground floor and advised that a car parking plan, identifying allocated spaces for all units should therefore be submitted in connection with any future planning application. In terms of the location of the site, and based on the 7 units being proposed at pre application stage, planning officers stated that the development would need 9 spaces.

In terms of the application now made which is for 6 flats, the equivalent guideline need is 8 parking spaces (3 x 1.25 spaces and 2 x 1.5 spaces). This already takes into account zonal restraint on car parking provision.

The transport technical note indicates (para 4.11) that the 22 spaces and garages serve the existing 14 residential flats and indicates that based on parking standard guidance that the total development proposed of 14 existing and 6 proposed flats should provide 29 spaces.

The use of Census data to argue that car ownership in flats in this area is lower than might be expected is not borne out by the evidence of use of car parking in this area at present which is far higher than the 2011 data . The Census data is now considerably dated and cannot be relied on to make informed decisions

The proposal has not followed the request of WHDC planners to provide specific allocated parking spaces for the additional flats. Instead it proposed to install gates to exclude the employees of the commercial units and most visitors from parking. This will lead to additional pressure on the small public car parking area (which is meant to provide parking for shoppers – not businesses) and although the access gate is to be set back there is the potential for obstruction on Station Road as cars and other vehicles access the secure parking area.

Provision of a total of 18 parking spaces on site for the total 20 flats compared with the existing 22 spaces (including garages) for the 14 flats & commercial development is simply providing far less spaces for 30% additional flats and cannot be acceptable. Provision of one space for visitors and two as a double delivery bay for the retail uses is noted as is removing one of these spaces to provide cycle parking .

However the end result is that there is no specific allocated car parking provision for this proposed development in terms of the 8 additional spaces which are the guidelines for 6 flats. There are 11 single spaces in garages which are allocated to existing flats and deducting the three spaces reserved for visitors/deliveries, there will be 10 spaces available for the 9 flats remaining on a first come first served basis - and thus provides no designated spaces for the additional 6 flats. This does not provision sufficient space for flats which are 2 bed/3 occupancy even allowing for reductions in car parking provision and will affect the overall parking provision for existing flats. This is contrary to the advice given by planning officers. This is not considered a car parking plan which accords with the advice of providing a plan which "allocates spaces for all units".

The application should be therefore refused.

Finally, I wish to comment on the nuisance and disruption caused by the building of the development as an additional floor to the existing development which is to be occupied throughout. This is not addressed in the application at all and whilst construction is only a temporary matter, such a proposal is not acceptable and if permission were to be granted then a condition restricting hours of construction operation must be included.