



The Planning Inspectorate

An Executive Agency in the Department of the Environment and the Welsh Office

Room 1404
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line 0272-878927
Switchboard 0272-878000
Fax No 0272-878769
GTN 1374-

PLANNING DEPARTMENT DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL							
Ref.	CPM	DP	DC	SC	Alm	File	
Mr and Mrs R Hill							Your ref
64 Highfield Road							
Berkhamsted							
Herts							
HP4 2DD							
Received				24 OCT 1994		Our ref	
						T/APP/A1910/A/94/238134/P5	
Comments						Date	
						21 OCT 1994	

Dear Sir and Madam

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
APPLICATION NUMBER:- 4/0419/94

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your appeal against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a 2 storey side extension at 64 Highfield Road, Berkhamsted. I have considered the written representations from you and the Council. I have also taken account of representations made directly to the Council which have been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 12 September 1994.

2. Policy 19 of the adopted Dacorum District Plan states that all proposals for development should include provision for car parking based on the guidelines adopted by the Council. The guidelines currently in force are those adopted by the Council on 11 October 1989. The deposit version of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan contains the same standards. The guidelines apply to both new buildings and extensions. The Council say that applying the standard only to the 2 additional bedrooms that would be formed, your scheme should have 2 car parking spaces on the site.

3. Policy 54 of the deposit Local Plan says that a development can only operate efficiently if it provides for parking on site or adequate alternative public parking is available nearby. In the context of this case, it seems to me that the objective of these policies is to ensure that the development would not result in excessive on-street parking which might lead to congestion or danger. I conclude that the main issue is whether the scheme would cause unacceptable congestion on this residential street.



4. Highfield Road, Victoria Road and Holly Road are part of a residential area consisting of comparatively dense, terraced development at the bottom of Highfield Road and Victoria Road and less dense mainly semi-detached housing in the higher parts. All the streets are narrow and, for the most part, would not permit parking on both sides of the road without causing congestion. When I inspected the site there were few cars parked in the immediate vicinity of the site, which is at the top of Highfield Road. Many cars were parked in the lower parts of Victoria and Highfield Roads, and I understand the Council is carrying out a survey of public opinion with regard to on-street parking in the area.
5. The Council has not questioned your survey which shows that even in the evenings and at weekends there are some on-street car parking spaces available close to your house. In addition, there is a public car park to the rear some 40m from your home which appears normally to be underused.
6. Policy 9 of the deposit Local Plan warns against too rigid application of the policies. In my opinion the scheme would not result in a material increase in congestion in the immediate vicinity of the site as there is sufficient space on and off-street to accommodate a small increase in parking demand. Furthermore, the site does not lend itself to the convenient provision of on-site parking, because of its limited size and the steep slope on the front garden. The reason for refusal concerns only car parking and I have concluded that the objections are not sufficient to justify preventing the development.
7. Allowing this scheme as an exception to the policies should not be seen as creating a precedent for other developments whose parking does not meet the development plan standards.
8. In my opinion, the appeal decision on a change of use from a public house to offices, which endorsed the parking standards, is not comparable in type or location with this smaller, domestic proposal (Ref T/APP/A1910/A/89/145493/P8). I have considered all other matters raised in this appeal. However, I have found nothing to alter my view that material considerations indicate that it is appropriate not to apply the development plan standards strictly in this case.
9. The Council has suggested a condition that the materials should match those existing, but you say matching materials are not available. In the circumstances, I shall impose a condition requiring the materials to be agreed before work is commenced, as it is important that the new materials should not clash with those of the existing attractive property.
10. For the above reasons and in exercise of the powers transferred to me I hereby allow your appeal and grant planning permission for the erection of a 2 storey side extension at 64 Highfield Road, Berkhamsted, Herts, in

accordance with the terms of the application No 4/0419/94 dated 23 March 1994 and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced on or before the date 5 years from the date of this permission;
2. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the external materials shall be submitted to and approved by the Council.
11. An applicant for any consent, agreement or approval referred to in this permission has a statutory right of appeal to the Secretary of State if consent, agreement or approval is refused or granted conditionally, or if the authority fail to give notice of their decision within the prescribed period.
12. This letter does not convey any approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, bye-law, order or regulation other than section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R H Baker', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

R H BAKER BSc MA ARICS MRTPI
Inspector