



# NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

## OBJECTION TO 6/2022/0132/LB

### Introduction

We are strongly opposed to this application to create 30 dwellings in the Green Belt. It is almost a replica of recent previous applications 6/2021/0071/LB and 6/2021/0072/MAJ. I understand that the latter was refused and is currently subject to an appeal. The total dwellings proposed in each of those two applications was also 30 but I believe there were negotiations which reduced the number.

### Green Belt

Despite the assertions within the current application there are absolutely no very special circumstances that could justify allowing what is proposed. Earlier fairly recent applications for less dwellings were approved to allow sufficient funding to cover the costs expected to be necessary to “save” the main house on the site. It is now claimed necessary to increase the total to 30 dwellings for the same purpose. However, **we have very strong objections to the insertion of four semi-detached houses along the East Drive.** They would be a blot on the existing very attractive view from Judges Hill closing the open gap and forming a continuous ribbon develop along that drive which would be completely against national and local policies regarding safeguarding the Green Belt.

**We have equally strong objections to the construction of two totally inappropriate Lodge Houses, one at each end of the driveway through the site.** Historically there were two Lodge Houses, one at each end of the driveway. That was reasonable at the time they were constructed but there can be no justification for duplicating lodge houses at each end of the driveway except for the developer to make more money. Again these would be completely against national and local policies regarding safeguarding the Green Belt.

It is claimed that a particular very special reason for allowing creating new dwellings in the Green Belt is the shortage of sites required by the Borough Council to satisfy the Government Inspector dealing with the Draft Local Plan. In the context of many thousands of dwellings required across the Borough the contribution from creating up to 30 dwellings is not enough to justify allowing the application against national and local policies.

### Unsustainable location

It is claimed that the site is in a sustainable location. Anybody who actually lives in the area knows just how wrong that is. There is one pub, one restaurant, one church, one village hall, one club run by a charity which provides opportunities to play snooker and table tennis and one primary school which takes around 15 new pupils each year. There is no shop, no doctor's surgery, no dentist, no secondary school, and almost no public transport. The one bus service

(242) makes so few journeys in each direction that it is hardly worth walking to the bus stops. Motor vehicles will be necessary to access stations at Cuffley or Potters Bar.

Walking is mentioned in the application but only those walking for enjoyment or for health reasons would contemplate that because of the lack of facilities within walking distance. Cycling is also mentioned but only committed cyclists could cope with the hilly terrain all around the site and the very busy, very dangerously narrow roads.

#### Traffic issues

I also read a claim that the additional housing would make the local roads safer. Given the above comments, the additional vehicles that would be moving out from and into the site would only make the already heavily congested local roads worse. At peak times and whenever there is a problem on the M25, the B156 and other roads feeding into and out of that road can be at a standstill for ages.

Access to the proposed development site is not satisfactory for reasons of safety. The East Access does not have a clear view of the road towards Potters Bar and the Western Access is basically a 4-way junction with blind bends on both sides and with traffic allowed to move at 40mph in two of the four directions.

The number of vehicles belonging to the site would be in the region of 60. Add to that number further vehicles entering and leaving the site for business purposes such as collections, deliveries and trades people working on site.

For these reasons I suggest the roads will be less safe, not safer.

#### Conclusion

Finally, it is disappointing to see that there is no offer of affordable housing in a development of this size.

For all of the above reasons **we strongly oppose this application.**

MICHAEL GREEN

CHAIR