

APPENDIX D – PLANNING APPEALS RELATING TO PARKING IN DACORUM

Appeal	Comments
<p>APP/A1910/W/16/3151498 Land adjacent to 26 Station Road, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire HP4 2EY 4 dwellings</p>	<p>The appeal proposal would formalise publicly available parking on land adjacent to the highway and would provide 10 parking spaces. The proposal would result in a small loss of between 2 and 4 parking spaces available to residents. Whilst it is evident that there is a high demand for parking in the area, the proposed development would lead to only a very small reduction in the overall level parking provision – not held to be so significant as to warrant refusing planning permission on this ground.</p>
<p>APP/A1910/W/16/3145385 Land rear of 126-132 George Street, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire HP4 2EJ Detached dwelling</p>	<p>The proposed dwelling would be served by two tandem car parking spaces of limited width. The appellant's and Council's comments noted that the number of spaces would be in accordance with the Council's residential car parking guidelines for the proposed dwelling. However, the access arrangements and turning area for the parking spaces would be restricted by the width of the road and the unrestricted on road parking in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. No swept path analysis or other similar evidence has been submitted by the appellant to show that the car parking spaces for the proposed dwelling would work in such restricted circumstances. The proposal would effectively provide only one replacement off-street parking space for No. 132 (which currently has two). The new access for this parking space would potentially result in the loss of further off-street parking along William Street. Overall, considered that the increased pressure on, and loss of off-street parking in this instance, is not considered to be acceptable.</p>
<p>APP/A1910/W/16/3145933 89, 87, 85 and 71 Sunnyhill Road, Hemel Hempstead HP1 1S 26 dwellings</p>	<p>The evidence indicates there is a small deficit of parking provision within the estate; the layout indicates 59 bays would be required and there are 56 shown. In addition, given the tandem parking layouts for most plots, it seems likely that it would sometimes be impractical and inconvenient to park both vehicles within the curtilage of dwellings, even where this is indicated as such on the layout. Consequently, I am not persuaded that there would not be an increased demand for on-street parking on Sunnyhill Road, were the development to be allowed, as there would be limited availability within the estate for visitor or service delivery parking. Whilst not necessarily normally consider these concerns sufficient to warrant dismissal of the appeal in the absence of other considerations, they support an overall reasoning that the proposals would represent overdevelopment of the site.</p>