Reduction in parking provision.

There is already insufficient residential parking in Maynard Place. The ‘Slack space’ (as described) is used for parking by residents for this reason. In fact, the developer concedes there will be pressure on existing provision (Planning Application, section 7) ‘It is also proposed, as in existing, to utilise some of the parking area for wheelie bins storage and access to them by waste collection services’.

A reduction in available parking space is implicit in the proposal, since in section 14 ‘Existing Use’ is listed as ‘Access and Parking’. The notion that the new residents will be commuters without cars, is idle speculation.

Traffic congestion in Maynard Place.

Daily instances of complete gridlock during office hours. The proposal can only exacerbate these problems. The photo in drawing 0/A000/LP/003 confirms both full occupancy by vehicles of the ‘Slack space’ and congestion created by a delivery lorry. The assertion that a catering outlet will not increase traffic is speculation.

Catering outlet.

Cuffley has an ample and varied supply of catering outlets. There is no demand for another.

 From the District Plan “Avoid over-dependence on any one business sector”

Surface water drainage.

A buried drainage pipe which takes excess surface water from Tolmers Gardens crosses the lower part of my property and may intersect with the development. This was installed in response to flooding of gardens on the south side of Tolmers Gardens. During heavy rainfall, the flow of surface water into the proposed access way is considerable, yet the developer asserts the development does not increase the risk of flooding.

Local housing needs

Planning permission has been granted for 24 apartments in Station Road. The adjacent Mansfield Place development was recently completed. Additionally, there are proposals for large scale developments to the south and west of Cuffley. The ‘housing needs and aspirations of existing and future residents’ do not require this development.

Crossing hazard.

Pedestrians will have to traverse the vehicle access to reach the catering outlet - a blind corner.

Additionally, the vehicle access is used as a turning space by vehicles entering Maynard Place - the photo on page 12 of the previous planning proposal illustrates this in action. In section 6 of the planning application, the developer asserts no new or altered access is proposed to or from the public highway which is demonstrably untrue - the access way will be narrowed and enclosed.

‘Shared Garden Access’.

The development will close off the established access to the garden at no. 8 and the developer appears to propose a communal access via my property. I do not agree to this. The current access to my garden was created in 1974 when Maynard Place was built. It is not a later addition.

Privacy and overshadowing.

No fewer than 11 opening windows on the first and second storeys will have direct oversight into my property. The height and proximity of the structure will remove light from the lower half of my garden. This is conceded by the developer. It is inconceivable that there will not be a darkening effect.

 From the District Plan : “The massing and height of a building should pay attention to any overlooking or overshadowing that it may cause”

The planning proposal anticipates the existing ‘green boundary’ will screen the development. As there is no free space between the development and the boundary, the trees in question are unlikely to survive. There is still no evidence of a Tree Survey. For the applicant’s benefit, I can confirm all trees ‘are to be kept’.

Waste.

Waste from fast food catering is continually deposited into and outside, my garden. Given the extreme proximity of the proposed catering unit to my property, this problem will become intolerable. The applicant has nothing to say on this matter.