

## 6. APPEALS UPDATE

### A. LODGED

None

### B. WITHDRAWN

None

### C. FORTHCOMING INQUIRIES

None

### D. FORTHCOMING HEARINGS

4/00365/15/FUL      BRAYBEECH HOMES LTD - MR S BOOTH  
CONSTRUCTION OF TWO SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES  
LAND TO THE REAR OF 17 STATION ROAD, TRING,  
HP235NG  
[View online application](#)

### E. DISMISSED

None

### F. ALLOWED

4/00274/15/FHA      Mr Goldthorpe  
FRONT & REAR DORMER WINDOWS  
3 MONTAGUE ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3DS  
[View online application](#)

The Inspector concluded that, given the design approach and proposed facing materials, which can be finally agreed by condition, the architectural form proposed would not be out of place or harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it was concluded that the proposed additions would have a neutral effect

on the character, appearance and setting of the Conservation Area and so would preserve it.

4/03188/14/FHA

Dr R Green

LOFT CONVERSION WITH TWO FRONT DORMERS, ONE REAR VELUX ROOF LIGHT AND GABLE END WINDOWS  
65 SHELDON WAY, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1FG  
[View online application](#)

## Decision

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion two front facing dormers, one rear facing velux roof light, gable end windows at 65 Sheldon Way, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire, HP4 1FG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 4/03188/14/FHA, dated 3 November 2014, subject to the conditions in Annex A.

## Main Issue

The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (a) the character and appearance of the area and (b) the availability of on street car parking.

## Summary

The property fronts onto the river and the dormers would be visible to passers by using the river footpaths or travelling south along Sheldon Way. However, given that they would be well proportioned and detailed I do not consider that this would be harmful to the overall character of the area. It would not be in conflict with policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (CS) or Saved Local Plan Policy (LP) Appendix 7

The development would increase the size of the house from 3 bed to 5 bed. The Council consider that a dwelling of this size should have 3 parking spaces. The Appendix to the LP expresses the standards as a maximum. Nevertheless I have considered whether an additional car could, if required, be accommodated on street.

There are not any parking restrictions in place along Sheldon Way. At the time of my visit, in the morning, there was some on street parking taking place. Equally there was also space available to park safely close to No 25. In addition the information supplied by the appellant demonstrates that this is the case at other times of the day. I appreciate that the Council consider that there is an issue of parking stress. However, I have no substantive evidence that shows this to be the case. This level of availability in combination with the available on plot for nearby dwellings parking suggests to me that there is unlikely to be a significant pressure on the available on street parking. As such I consider that it would be possible for an additional vehicle to be accommodated on street if required.

Overall I have considered the existing situation and the ability of any unmet parking

demand to be accommodated safely on the street. The adopted policies point to consideration of a maximum provision. Furthermore the appellant has highlighted that the site is accessible. In particular that there is access to bus routes nearby, local shops and services on foot and that a mainline train station is also within walking distance. This is not disputed by the Council. These factors would assist in reducing the need to travel by car and weigh in favour of the proposal.

I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the availability of on street car parking. It would not be in conflict with CS policy CS12 in so far as it requires new development to provide sufficient parking and Saved Local Plan Policy Appendix 5 which amongst other things seeks appropriate parking for residential development.

### Conclusion

For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

.