

## Clare Howe

---

**From:** Matthew McCann  
**Sent:** 16 April 2021 14:34  
**To:** Clare Howe  
**Cc:** Durk Reyner; Kirsten Roberts  
**Subject:** 6/2020/3420/MAJ

Hi Clare,

I just got a reminder that the response for Biopark I put together did not reach you. In terms of the application I had selected "objection" for the following reasons:

Parking although at the minimal allowed standards is far below the number of parking spaces I would expect to see on a development this size. Such a minimum standard may work well in a development with only 4 properties for example, but does not fit to this size. The number of parking spaces is far less than one per property, and does not take into account multi vehicle households (especially 2/3 bedroom households where there is a strong chance of more than one vehicle owner). Although the development is close to WGC train station and bus station not every trip can be managed by public transport alone like you may see within London. Connectivity with public transport cannot be viewed in the same way it is within London Boroughs as there is not a train station within half mile of every property or 24/7 buses that run on a route every 5-10mins. The railway services for example run towards London and Cambridge, but does not offer flexibility to travel with ease to many other towns within Hertfordshire such as Watford/St Albans/Borehamwood, or further afield such as Milton Keynes. To do so by train would involve travelling into London to travel back out and would not be cost/time effective. Bus services within the area do serve some of these towns albeit catching more than one bus in order to reach and does not offer a direct or quick service.

The fob system mentioned in the basement does serve well to manage the parking on the site, but would lead to the strong possibility of residents who may already be in situ purchasing a vehicle and then displacing parking into nearby residential roads which is already subject to parking issues. The 22 visitor spaces is less than 8% of all on site properties, and there would be many times where a family event such as birthdays/Christmas/other religious festivals will increase visitor parking demand beyond this provision. This does also not take into account any regular visitors who may need to come each day to help support a resident and could lead to residents feeling they cannot have visitors come to them leading to additional social isolation. The proposals does not highlight clearly to what happens when there is either more than 22 visitors, or if it's a visitor to see a resident who is not allowed a fob (proposals read the fobs will be issued on first come first served basis to ensure only those with a fob can have a guaranteed and numbered space)

The car club provision may offer a way of reducing car ownership, however, the site only offers one car club vehicle, so if there was a regular user it would not seem a viable option to another regular user if the times conflict. Car clubs such as this would have to be created on a much larger scale to fully reduce car ownership e.g. a pool of 15-20 vehicles or more to ensure there is a regular vehicle available to hirers as its success would be based upon close to guaranteed availability rather than leaving a potential hirer either seeking using public transport or a taxi, and in the long run would push drivers back into private vehicle ownership. One car club vehicle does not allow for a instant turn up and go scenario as not every driving experience/requirement can be planned days or weeks in advance.

A parking consultation has begun in the nearby public roads where it is likely a resident permit scheme is introduced to reduce parking issues already caused by railway station commuters and non-resident parking. If such a provision is introduced, we would not be in a position to offer any potential residents on this site an opportunity to purchase a parking permit to park in the roads nearby as we need to ensure parking demand is not outstripped in roads where properties already exist.

We have also received complaints from a nearby development where 12 properties had 1 space each and that has already been outstripped with residents not able to have multi vehicles and lack of visitor capacity, and further development within Broadwater with less spaces than properties would likely lead to further neighbourly disputes and parking displacement either into industrial areas/shopping estate land or into highways that is already close to capacity.

For parking to be fully sustained within the confines of the site, I would expect to see at least one space for every property with multiple bedrooms, one bedroom properties with the current provision plus parking for 10% of properties parking for visitors/residents shared use.

Yours Sincerely,

Matthew McCann  
Parking Services Team Leader  
Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council  
Telephone: 01707 357000  
E-mail: [parking@welhat.gov.uk](mailto:parking@welhat.gov.uk)

***Working better, together***

[www.welhat.gov.uk](http://www.welhat.gov.uk)  
[@WelHatCouncil](#)

[Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council](#)

