



Department of the Environment  
Room 1309  
Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ  
Telex 449321

Direct line 0272-213 863  
Switchboard 0272-218811  
GTN 2074

Trevor J Westbrook & Associates  
8-10 Church Street  
DUNSTABLE  
Bedfordshire

Your reference

Our reference

T/APP/5252/A/79/11032/G9

Date

- 1 MAY 1980

Gentlemen

- 2 MAY 1980

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9  
APPEAL BY APSLEY VILLAGE CLUB COMMITTEE  
APPLICATION NO: 4/0325/79

1. I refer to this appeal, which I have been appointed to determine, against the decision of the Dacorum District Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of an extension for new club facilities at Apsley Village Club, 39 London Road, Hemel Hempstead. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the council and I inspected the site on 16 April 1980.
2. The issue on which this case turns is the adequacy of the parking provision. The club fronts the A41 trunk road which is particularly busy at this point, acting as a route to Watford and London. In addition there are paper mills nearby attracting heavy traffic. Parking is a problem in the area because of the paper mills, the club, the public house and the railway station in the vicinity. I therefore consider that any scheme of development should make proper provision for all cars likely to be attracted to the site.
3. In considering the proposal the local planning authority adopted a process in which estimates of the number of people using the premises and car occupancy were used. A revised calculation was then made using data supplied by you. On this latter basis the authority says that 92 spaces should be provided.
4. In reply to the council's figures, you have put forward a detailed assessment based on the experience of the club committee and the planned use of the proposed extension. This assessment shows a requirement of 78 spaces to satisfy likely demand. The actual number of cars likely to be attracted to a building such as this is never easy to assess in advance, but I am prepared to accept your figures, albeit as a bare minimum, based as they are on a first hand knowledge of the current situation and the future intentions of the club.
5. Taking 78 spaces as the minimum requirement, the application drawing shows 80 spaces. At my visit I was able to see that the car parking area is fully within your clients' boundaries. However, there is a road improvement line for the A41 which I consider would reduce this figure at some future time by 5 spaces. In any event, the 3 spaces in the northern corner of the site have a rather cramped access and would not be very satisfactory in my opinion, nor are they acceptable, in terms of appearance, in front of the building. Furthermore, the council make the point that such a large parking area is not attractive and that some planting should be provided to give some visual relief. I concur with this, and regard the loss of a further

2 spaces as the minimum area necessary for this purpose. Therefore, in my view the maximum provision for cars on the site would be 73, 5 short of the 78 requirement.

6. In paragraph 4 above I described 78 spaces as a bare minimum, based as it is on what must reasonably be regarded as an estimate designed to bring the figure as low as possible. Therefore, although the shortfall is only 5 spaces, I regard this as sufficiently serious to warrant refusal of permission. Therefore, in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Gentlemen  
Your obedient Servant

*T. J. Kenmann-Lane*

TJ KENMANN-LANE, DipTP, FRTPI, MBIM  
Inspector