

**Annex 2: Analysis of On-Line Survey for Berkhamsted Conservation Area and Character Appraisal**

**Q1. When looking at the conservation area as a whole, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements**

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
There is the right balance of uses within the conservation area	7	<b>21</b>	12	3	0
	(16.3%)	<b>(48.8%)</b>	(27.9%)	(7.0%)	(0.0%)
The buildings are generally in good condition	5	<b>36</b>	3	2	1
	(10.6%)	<b>(76.6%)</b>	(6.4%)	(4.3%)	(2.1%)
The area feels safe	13	<b>19</b>	7	0	2
	(31.7%)	<b>(46.3%)</b>	(17.1%)	(0.0%)	(4.9%)
There is enough parking for owners and visitors alike	5	5	1	14	<b>20</b>
	(11.1%)	(11.1%)	(2.2%)	(31.1%)	<b>(44.4%)</b>
New development has generally been successful in preserving the character of the conservation area	8	10	12	<b>13</b>	4
	(17.0%)	(21.3%)	(25.5%)	<b>(27.7%)</b>	(8.5%)
The conservation area boundary is correct	3	10	<b>17</b>	9	3
	(7.1%)	(23.8%)	<b>(40.5%)</b>	(21.4%)	(7.1%)

The majority of respondents (65%) felt there is the right balance of uses within the conservation area (although one respondent remarked that “there is no answer for the first question. Right balance of uses of what?” and another simply stated "We should conserve it all")

A higher proportion considered the buildings to be generally in good condition.

This in turn prompted most respondents to agree that the area feels safe.

**Q2. When looking at the details which make up the character of the conservation area how important are the following to you?**

	<i>Very important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Neither important nor unimportant/ no opinion</i>	<i>Unimportant</i>	<i>Very important</i>
The original timber windows and doors of traditional buildings	25	17	4	1	0
	(53.2%)	(36.2%)	(8.5%)	(2.1%)	(0.0%)
Traditional shop fronts	27	18	1	1	0
	<b>(57.4%)</b>	(38.3%)	(2.1%)	(2.1%)	(0.0%)
The rear elevations of historic buildings	12	20	9	6	0
	(25.5%)	(42.6%)	(19.1%)	(12.8%)	(0.0%)
The continued use of matching materials for extensions	26	20	0	1	0
	(55.5%)	(42.6%)	(0.0%)	(2.1%)	(0.0%)
The colour and type of signage used on shop fronts	20	21	5	1	0

	(42.6%)	(44.7%)	(10.6%)	(2.1%)	(0.0%)
The colour of paint on brickwork and render	16	25	3	2	0
	(34.8%)	(54.3%)	(6.5%)	(4.3%)	(0.0%)
The survival of traditional floor surface (such as stone cobbles)	20	21	2	1	1
	(44.4%)	(46.7%)	(4.4%)	(2.2%)	(2.2%)
Views across the Conservation Area	24	17	3	0	1
	(53.3%)	(37.8%)	(6.7%)	(0.0%)	(2.2%)
Features seen to roofs such as chimney stacks	21	20	5	0	1
	(44.7%)	(42.6%)	(10.6%)	(0.0%)	(2.1%)
Mixture of old red clay tiles and slates	14	23	8	1	0
	(30.4%)	(50.05)	(17.4%)	(2.2%)	(0.0%)
Absence of roof lights to front elevation roof pitches	10	9	13	9	1
	(23.8%)	(21.4%)	(31.0%)	(21.4%)	(2.4%)
The lack of satellite dishes	20	11	11	2	2
	(43.5%)	(23.9%)	(23.9%)	(4.3%)	(4.3%)
The trees	32	13	1	0	0
	<b>(69.6%)</b>	(28.3%)	(2.2%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
The private garden spaces	25	14	5	2	1
	(53.2%)	(29.8%)	(10.6%)	(4.3%)	(2.1%)
Historical associations	26	14	7	0	0
	(55.3%)	(29.8%)	(14.9%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
Public green spaces	37	10	0	0	0
	<b>(78.7%)</b>	(21.3%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)

“Other details considered important:

Aesthetic proportions; roof pitch; rebate of windows allowing light/shadows to give definition to building; building line; front walls/gates often inappropriate size/style.”

“Matching” need not be identical (use of limewash). Plastic slates???

Partly spoilt already by indoor tennis courts & lights-in-all-night station car-park”

"Please ensure open spaces are maintained in the conservation area. Too much damage has already been done with infill eg Manor Street and Chapel Street Please stop further in fill that is eroding the conservation character of Berkhamsted"

### Q3. Which of the following would be your priorities for improving Berkhamsted Conservation Area? (please select no more than 3 options) – in rank order

<b>27</b>	<b>(57.4%)</b>	<b>General improvements and repair of buildings</b>
<b>22</b>	<b>(46.8%)</b>	<b>Improvements to parking</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>(42.6%)</b>	<b>Landscaping to the public realm</b>
16	(34.0%)	Street furniture (benches, letter-and post-boxes, rubbish bins etc.
12	(25.5%)	More heritage interpretation – information boards, blue plaques, etc
10	(21.3%)	Improvement of signage to shops
8	(17.0%)	Street signage
5	(10.6%)	Street lighting

The main priority for respondents was ‘General improvements and repair of buildings’, followed by ‘improvements to parking’, with ‘landscaping to the public realm’ as third.

### Q4. The conservation area has been divided into areas which have a particular character, please tell us whether you agree with this analysis

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
<b>Character Area 1</b>					
High Street East	15 (34.9%)	17 (39.5%)	9 (20.9%)	2 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)
High Street Central	20 (45.5%)	16 (36.4%)	6 (13.6%)	2 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)
High Street West	17 (39.5%)	17 (39.5%)	8 (18.6%)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Collegiate	22 (50%)	15 (34.1%)	5 (11.4%)	2 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Character Area 2</b>					
The Canal	27 (58.7%)	14 (30.4%)	4 (8.7%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Castle and Railway	25 (53.3%)	16 (35.6%)	3 (6.7%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (2.2%)
George Street & District	17 (39.5%)	20 (46.5%)	5 (11.6%)	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>Character Area 3</b>					
Charles St/Shrublands Rd.	19 (40.0%)	20 (44.4%)	5 (11.1%)	2 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)
King's Road/Doctor's Commons Road	18 (39.1%)	19 (41.3%)	7 (15.2%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)

"These areas seem more 'geographical' than have intrinsic character attributes."

"Area 1: High St areas should perhaps also include in title 'plus residential roads off both sides of High St'".

"What exactly is the point of this question? Whether we agree or disagree is irrelevant as these areas are designated as part of the Conservation area already."

"I think Castle Street should be part of Area Two as those are the aesthetic and emotional links."

**Q5. The Appraisal has proposed four amendments to the boundary of the conservation area. Can you tell us whether you agree with these suggested changes.**

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
Extension 1: St John's Well Lane	21 (47.7%)	14 (31.8%)	6 (13.6%)	2 (4.5%)	1 (2.3%)
Extension 2: London Road, Bulbeggar's Lane, Bank Mill	22 (46.8%)	17 (36.2%)	6 (12.8%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)
Extension 3: King's Road, east side	20 (42.6%)	17 (36.2%)	8 (17.0%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)
Extension 4: Montague Road	17 (38.6%)	17 (38.6%)	8 (18.2%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.3%)

"The boundaries need extending as you have suggested"

"The boundaries for conservation should not be restricted to certain areas, it should be established on an individual basis to protect buildings not currently in the conservation areas, but equally deserve protection. Any individual building - houses, public or commercial properties etc should be considered worth preserving if they have any historic merit. Hence the 'boundaries' should not exist to exclude any such properties and these should be considered on an individual basis. Boundaries restrict this from happening."

"I agree with extending the conservation area boundary. Why is Ashlyns School not included?"

"Agree Ext 1: Esp. the canal edges. If we have to have recycling bins here, could they not be better designed/screened. Future M & S building backing on to this area will be out of proportion & not well enough in keeping"

"I would only flag up that the pond as you call it was hugely enlarged when the flats were built - so in its present form was not original. It was bog land where watercress was grown. The deepening of this part of the river has resulted in lessening the flow of the Bulbourne which is not in the interest of the river. Although it must be remembered that the Bulbourne is anyway a bourne river which means of intermittent flow."

"Ext 2: In some ways it seems ironic to protect this area, then allow it to be spoiled by new development at sensitive location (New Lodge) which will definitely not preserve or enhance a conservation area"

"Extension 2 should read Bank Mill Lane"

"Need to extend to Bank Mill and canal areas."

There were no specific suggestions to the question:

**If you have any suggestions for further areas that should be included in the existing Conservation Area, please specify the area(s) below with your reasons as to why they should be considered for inclusion:**

"I believe that almost all of Berkhamsted should be in the conservation area"

"A much bigger area is needed to be included in the conservation area, to stop our precious buildings being left to rot."

"There is a need to widen this area to take in other older parts of the town to include pre-war building - the school and Waitrose are responsible for a lot of 'clutter' in the town!!"

"More of the town should be included within the conservation area"

**Q6. The Appraisal has identified a number of buildings which are considered to make a positive contribution towards the significance of the conservation area and are therefore worthy of being 'locally listed'. Could you tell us whether you agree with this analysis.**

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
16 (35.6%)	16 (35.6%)	9 (20.0%)	2 (4.4%)	2 (4.4%)

*Local Listing*

**If you disagree or strongly disagree with any or all of the local listings in Q6 please tell us why.**

"A mere matter of opinion"

"After so much new and poorly designed buildings why list local buildings now? a bit too late isn't it ? Leave my Victorian semi alone! And do not impose your values on my property and my local community."

Suggestions for further inclusion:

Include Ravens Lane: Nos 23/24/25 appear to have been left off?

Gravel Path: Between canal & station road – are these included (west side)

Gravel Path: Between George St & Ellesmere Road (east side)

View from canal bridge of stepped slate roofed cottages with chimneys.

The station needs listing.

"George Street ..... many extensions, PVC replacement doors and windows, Satellite dishes and unwanted street signage are spoiling the area."

"Speaking for myself and my husband, when people or businesses buy or lease a property within a Conservation there is an expectation and a responsibility to preserve the qualities, the facade of the building. We don't believe as homeowners in the Conservation area that additional listing is necessary. We bought the house for a number of reasons including its facade so wanting to radically change its frontage onto Castle Street is not nor will ever be on our agenda!"

"When considering all responses please lend more weight to those who actually own businesses or residential homes in the Conservation areas. We probably would not have bought our house if it was locally listed as it generally means a more lengthy process in the event of an Application for Planning Permission. It's great to ask for the general population's opinion but there are an extraordinary number of people who have very firm views on Planning and Conservation but don't have to live with it! Berkhamsted needs to find a balance between preserving the old whilst moving with the times to make sure that the town can continue to prosper."

**Q7. Some of the buildings proposed for Local Listing and certain streets in Berkhamsted already have Article 4 Directions applied to them. The Appraisal recommends that further Article 4 directions should be considered on a case by case basis. Do you agree with this analysis?**

<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
18 (40.9%)	13 (29.5%)	9 (20.5%)	2 (4.5%)	2 (4.5%)

"It becomes unsustainable for people who own these properties to finance the up keep if certain restrictions are imposed - properties then become unsustainable and run down. Become not in keeping to the local area."

"I realise that not everyone thinks like I/we do with regards to preserving the look of homes and businesses in the Conservation Area but I don't think additional bureaucracy is the way forward."

"As a school, we would be concerned that the proposal to include our building as a locally listed building and being recommended for Article 4 Direction, would not impact the safeguarding of the children (i.e. Having to remove security screening from fencing/installing security"

**Q8. If you consider certain buildings (eg all proposed locally listed buildings) or certain streets, or parts of streets would merit having Article 4 Directions applied to them, please state the number(s) or name(s) of the building or buildings here**

"The need for more article four coverage in sensitive areas."

"This is very difficult as article four means the buildings in essence are put in aspic as they are - and most of the buildings we would like to see further protected already have certain inappropriate features that need reversing - I would like the opportunity of discussing this further with the conservation team. We certainly need much heavier control of shop signage not just the design but the placing on the existing facade which in many cases is already incorrect."

"None when I am surrounded by sad looking new builds with satellite dishes. The area has already been ruined!"

"Without having to walk around the whole town, my answer to this question would be to ascertain Article 4 Directions on an individual basis as and when the issues arise."

"I think the current arrangements are appropriate for the town."

"It would be appropriate to put article 4 on all proposed locally listed buildings so there is a uniform approach of conservation to the town."

Specific Suggestions for Article 4:

"Dean Incents house, Court house, St.Peters Church"

"Manor Street Caste Street Chapel Street High Street Sand Pit lane"

"No's 1-11 George Street."

**Q9. Please add any further comments relating to the Berkhamsted Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan here:**

*General*

"Conservation should include more than buildings."

*Lighting*

"Poor street lighting, lighting turned off just after midnight. My husband subjected to a vicious attack all 3 men were sentenced this happened 2 doors down from my house which is in the conservation area"

"Spend the money elsewhere like leaving on the street lights so that no young hooded gangs who owe drug money are hiding in the darkness ready to attack commuters."

"Station: the dreadful lighting outside taken down."

"Leave us alone and go spend the money on switching on the lights again"

"Switch the lights back on"

#### *Noise*

"Too many drunks returning from pubs and youths shouting and disrupting the neighbourhood, causing petty crime, urinating"

#### *Litter and Mess*

"Too much litter and dog mess. Constantly picking up litter thrown in my garden and blown in on driveway"

#### *Parking*

Traffic, cars and parking attracted considerable comment – a separate consultation on parking was being undertaken at the same time in Berkhamsted.

"Parking is a nightmare and is getting worse BUT there needs to be more parking, not less. We do not need a CPZ with yellow lines etc all over the Conservation Area."

"Narrow streets and too many non resident parkers"

"Parking is modern intrusion and therefore not applicable to conservation"

"Lack of parking for the residents. Visitors parking on double yellow lines and not being fined."

"There is not enough parking, but you already know. This consultation is not about parking so this should not be included as a factor that decides whether or not our town should be saved from developers or have inappropriate parking restrictions/schemes put in place."

"Car Parking in several roads makes them single line as residents have to park on both sides of the roads. This is because too many houses have been built with no thought to car parking."

"Need more parking not less, less commuter parking on roads."

"Parking has become an increasing problem, largely caused by high charges at the Station and in council car parks. Roads built in pre-car ages cannot cope with two car ownership. The result is gridlock"

"There is not enough car parking in Berkhamsted. The proposed permit holders only on street parking scheme will kill our lovely town and the conservation area. We need more parking not less!"

"parking is a serious problem to the town going forward"

"Indiscriminate parking spoils the area. Why cannot a logical solution be found to commuter parking?"

"Parking. I suggest more public parking is required outside the conservation areas for use by commuters using the train station and visitors to the town, rather than the current proposed parking scheme which will reduce the available parking, favour a few residents and push the parking problems elsewhere in Berkhamsted."

"There is very little parking for residents. There are too many parking restrictions. The majority of properties do not have off street parking available."

"Parking leaves a lot to be desired. We need proper parking facilities for a town that is growing and receiving more footfall from other encroaching areas. The price of parking is fine but the parking enforcers are young, disrespectful and dishonest."

"Cars have to park on the pavement and there is not enough parking generally"

"Short term, long term and undesignated parking areas need addressing in the town. It's almost impossible to park outside our house in Castle St at any given time of the week, it's alleviated slightly when the School is on holiday but the daily commuter parking needs action. There needs to be more provision for 1-4 hour parking too for shoppers/visitors to the town."

"More cheap central parking required. Some roads, eg George St, require parking on pavements on both sides. But this should be resisted in future developments. Grass verges should be maintained, front gardens should not be made into car parks. Would not want to see CPZ's partly because of extra signage clutter in C. Area"

"Parking will always be a problem: unfortunately the 'solutions' currently suggested tend to lead to "urbanisation" –e "no parking" or "limited parking" or "residents-only parking" signs, plus yellow lines, policing by wardens etc. This is particularly true of roads which have become "rat-runs" for the by-pass (such as Charles Street) or refuges from station-parking"

"I have concerns that the paraphernalia associated with the proposed new residents' parking zones would seriously detract from the appearance of the CA."

"We must have some decent reasonably priced parking in central Berkhamsted ie multi level parking in Lower Kings Road and Johns wells lane. If we had more capacity, cars could be cleared from the narrow streets, but we are already in trouble with parking due to inaction over the years. How can the town be expanded as it has without basics problems like this being dealt with. The council's answer to this before was that it was not government policy to encourage parking. Absolutely ridiculous in our semi rural environment!"

"Better parking and traffic flow"

"I feel the current proposals on the controlled parking and installation of a multi-storey car park are to the complete detriment of the conservation area and Berkhamsted as a whole. It will have a major adverse impact on house prices and the type of businesses that are attracted to Berkhamsted or that will be able to operate in Berkhamsted going forward."

"More off road parking paid by big supermarkets"

"The proposed parking restrictions will have a serious detriment to Berkhamsted and go against the whole conservation proposals and general ethos of the conservation area."



### *Cars*

"Cars using the roads in the conservation area as rat runs and driving so fast that the parked car alarms are set off, too dangerous for my young children. Inpatient drivers driving on the pavement. Parked motorbikes pushed over"

"Important to consider ways that the overall number of cars within the town can be reduced, particularly on the narrow roads and in the high street. Note this is not the same as adding more parking."

"20 mph speed signs down the side streets or police speed cameras!"

### *Surfaces*

"Traditional floor surfaces: Cobbles in Church Lane. I would personally like to see these retained, but only if they can be properly maintained. If a utility needs to be dug up, I think they should be required to have the cobbles re-laid by an expert. More council supervision of works is required to ensure work is up to standard."

"It is better to cover ground with stone cobbles and not asphalt so that water can continue to drain down to the water table and not cause flooding."

"Improve quality of the pavements as these Are unsightly And major trip hazards."

### *Dustbins*

Related to Church Lane, "would it not be possible for Dacorum o be asked to supply commercial bins, perhaps painted black, more suitable for sensitive areas such as this?"

Wheelie Bins: "Discourage residents from leaving these at front or on pavements"

"Dustbins/rubbish should be out of sight"

### *Street Furniture*

"One of my main concerns about the Conservation Area is a lack of a sense of place. One of the obvious ways of achieving this, as the Appraisal acknowledges, is by having a consistent overall policy towards an agreed design style for public street furniture, signs, bollards etc, which it appears we don't have at the moment. In my view, any proposed design/style should be discussed as a matter of courtesy at least with Berkhamsted Town Council, and once decided stuck to by all. This also requires in my opinion much greater communication between Conservation Officer and all relevant borough and county departments so that they all know exactly what is required when doing work."

"Bollards: in the area where we live there are several ugly concrete bollards which do nothing for the area."

"Works in the Conservation Area: borough and County council staff need to know that they are working in this area. For example, granite kerb stones should not be removed & replaced with concrete; they should be reset. It's all about effective communication and joined up working!"

### *Signage*

"Street Signs: firstly I think these should always relate to the past history of an area. Just north of Ellesmere is a new development on the site of an old house, Netherfield. Everyone knew where this was. The development is called Grantham Mews – why?"

Secondly there seems to be utter inconsistency in road signs. Until recently I understand there was not an agreed design for signs in the Conservation Area. Nearly all the signs where we live, in the heart of the Conservation Area, are different; it looks a mess. Consistent signage helps a lot to give a sense of place. But once decided, Cupid Green needs to know at the outset whether a road is in the Conservation Area or not."

"Minimal modern street signage. If it's not necessary, we don't want it. Replacement of old street signs with new is not appropriate. It is possible to replace like for like using modern materials so to protect the look of the conservation areas."

"Removal of signage clutter."

"Use the Road name signs agreed by DBC in the nineties for the conservation area."

### *Sustainability*

"Solar panels should be allowed as we will become short of power which these are helping."

"Applications for renewable energy installations should err on the side of being accepted"

"I strongly feel that the conservation area controls should not be used to stop householders from modifying their properties to reduce their environmental impacts - specifically I mean installing solar panels, external solid wall insulation, flues associated with wood burning stoves or other low carbon heating, and so on. The other aspirations of the conservation area protection seem to be well meaning - and there are areas within the town that warrant this."

### *New Development*

"Far too much infilling already allowed creating unacceptable precedents. The character of the town must be seen as whole as well as particular areas in context. The whole town should be viewed as whole in relation to collective facilities."

New recent development not in keeping. Gated communities that are insular and not part of the community and not neighbourly, cement used in brick work, satellite dishes visible on the new houses - lack of respect to the area, inferior railings used on the new development. UPVC used on the new developments"

"Tesco?"

"There has been far too much infill property development in Berkhamsted."

"Recent development is ok but some earlier examples such as Londrina Court are not in keeping with the character of the area"

"Some recent developments are not sympathetic to their surroundings."

"Very patchy. Attention to detail vital. Some has been quite successful eg Sevens Close (but marred by concrete cappings to garden walls) eg New Manor Croft – attempts made to relate buildings to surroundings. But others eg Barratts estate opposite Rising Sun display large areas of shallow pitched roofs with no redeeming features, esp when seen from above from both sides of valley – completely at odds with 2 storey cottages with steeper roof pitches & chimneys. New Collegiate building in Castle St – v. interesting architecturally but fails to relate to its surroundings, & dwarfs & diminishes architectural value of 'The Boote' & other cottages opposite."

"Back Lane (recently renamed Church Lane) has been ruined by a tasteless office block, which is poorly maintained and fire escapes dangling in mid air."

"(Don't allow) inappropriate extensions to traditional buildings."

"New shops and homes should be built at all times with the character of the town"

"In spite of appeals at the time 37 Charles Street was replaced by Fern Court (1970s) This should not be allowed to happen again (cf The Grey House – Kitsbury Rd)"

"any modern infill should be refused planning permission if the character of the old town is to be maintained."

#### *Allowing Change*

"I think the overall look should be preserved as far as possible but that doesn't mean that doors and windows can't be changed for modern equivalents/copies of original features to help improve the quality of life for owners/occupiers of homes and businesses in the town. As an extreme example I think there's a danger of the town taking on a theme park quality where people will only come because of the way it looks. As a result business in Berkhamsted could stagnate and decline and people may choose to live elsewhere as making changes becomes a battleground with Planning and Conservation. Well planned change can be good thing and can definitely improve the outlook for those living and working within the town."

#### *Trees*

"Trees: automatic rolling plan for replacing street trees which need to be removed, plus metal tree guards."

"Trees wherever possible – ie in Cowper Road/Montague Road the trees originally planted on pavements are now at the end of their lives/some have been removed. They were so lovely."

"More care of and replacement of street trees."

"TREES, TREES, TREES!"

#### *Hanging Baskets*

"Encouragement to shop keepers to put out and look after hanging baskets to make the CA appear more cared for by individuals."

“Encouragement to the community to value and look after our conservation area. (Perhaps a film at the Rex?-perhaps posters at the station)”

#### *Views*

“More care should be taken to conserve envelope views and vistas.”

#### *Training*

“Members on the planning committee should receive much more stringent training so that they better understand the importance of spaces as well as buildings and understand the need for new build to be complimentary to the existing ambiance of the town.”

“Communicating the importance of these criteria to those who own or occupy the buildings, so that they willingly undertake sympathetic building or improvement. Some straightforward literature for distribution would be a good idea.”

“The most important comment is that the average resident is unaware of the importance of every small change ... therefore it seems to me that public education is of paramount importance so that everyone feels responsible for their town.”

#### *Support*

“Supporting organisations which promote the conservation area.”

#### **Specific Areas/Buildings within the Conservation Area**

“Return the name of “Back Lane” to the old cobbold lane leading to the Court House. The New Name “Church Lane” has no historical significance”

“Very Important for Church Lane: - I live in Church Lane and I am very interested in positive methods to advance conservation in this area. There seems to be two views on Church Lane. Residents and frequent users find it a pleasant, mostly traffic free, historic route through the area. Businesses backing onto the lane however seem to regard it as a back alley and of no real interest to them other than the route for their rubbish. I can imagine that if the feel of Church Lane was improved the businesses might allow access to their shops from the lane and the High Street. Of particular concern are the following: - 1. Unsightly fluorescent yellow business rubbish bins. These four bins should be positioned in a less obtrusive way and be painted black (As in other conservation areas). A couple of years ago, the bins were all grouped together on the North side of Church Lane against the Church gates building which worked well for a while. However that changed when the Churchgates owners stated that the bins were on their land. However, on checking with Land Registry, I have discovered that the wedge of land between the bollards in the lane and their boundary wall is not theirs. In fact, Churchgates does have a gated, walled small wedge of land adjacent to Badgers drift which is designated for rubbish bin use (on the deeds of Candlemakers Cottage and Badgers Drift). Could this not be used by the other businesses backing on Church Lane so as to hide the bins? The businesses are not supposed to overload their bins, which is a health risk and unsightly, but they frequently do. There is a business cardboard recycling collection scheme that should be changed so that the cardboard is not left on the street more than overnight before the day of collection. Piles of wet cardboard lying next to unsightly yellow bins for a week is definitely not conservation. I'm sure they would not have it outside their High Street shopfront for more than a few hours. 2. Public waste bins like the High Street ones should be provided at the junctions of Church

Lane and The Wilderness where a lot of (Tesco?) smokers congregate and there is a concentration of litter and cigarette ends. Another waste bin outside the Court House would also help. 3. Proper maintenance of the cobbles using the correct materials, not tar macadam should be enforced. 4. Restoring a traditional look to the rear of some of the High Street shops which back onto Church Lane would lift the area significantly. There are many examples of the use of non-conservation materials and repairs: - Wooden cladding to downpipes and unsightly insulated pipework with tie-wraps Metal grill doors and window coverings Unsightly electrical wiring, which I suspect is often unused. Damaged grills across road level window access pits should be repaired Downpipes draining into open drains where the grills are often blocked causing spillage into the lane at the Tesco end. Could these not be plumbed directly into the drains?"

"What will happen to those 70s/80s horrors – Berkhamsted Police Station/Post Office?"

"Berkhamsted Collegiate School changed its name back to Berkhamsted School over a year ago. This error makes your survey form look dated."

"M&S proposals. Need lights at High Street carousel."

"The proposed "development at the top of Swing Gate Lane would have a terrible effect on traffic & infrastructure."

"The green space between Old Mill & A4251 should be safeguarded if possible."

"At present the town has greatly benefitted in its growth from many buildings and whole streets being brought into an excellent state of repair over the last 10 years. Whole streets of houses are regularly painted and maintained, inappropriate metal frames replaced by timber etc, it was a very different picture here 15 years ago when we chose our first married home. Many houses have strived to restore and enhance their street elevations. Families have also been able to bring the current lack of storage and light up to date with the aid of the skylight, while modernising the use of space in older properties. All this has been achieved with many fitting mechanisms such as the conservation velux, appropriate dormers, glass extensions, lantern roofs and so on, all of which compliment the locality without detriment and have encouraged it to flourish under current planning permission and conservation area guidelines. This has been integral in the towns success. The illustrations of where this has gone wrong is when permitted development rights have not been regulated in the same way allowing inappropriate design selection. When we applied for planning permission to make alterations the conservation officer was involved and all materials approved; our neighbours then made the same alterations through permitted development rights without being required to use conservation selected materials and the build was not monitored. I believe it would be more appropriate to detail these requirements in a uniform fashion to continue to compliment the properties as planning laws are relaxed, than put a complicated "lockdown" on growth and development by simply no longer allowing these alterations. Buildings will no longer have a potential to adapt to healthy modern needs of daylight and storage, the home office etc, then we fall once again back into undesirable city centre properties."

#### Q.10: Postcodes listed

2		HP1 (Town centre/Boxmoor)
1		HP23 4 (Tring West)
1		HP23 5 (Tring/Aldbury)
9		HP4 1 (Berkhamsted/Little Gaddesden)

23		HP4 2 (Berkhamsted/Potten End)
10		HP4 3 (Berkhamsted/ West)
1		HP4 2AX

**Q11. Please tell us if you work in the Borough**

Yes	No
25	19

**Q12. Are you completing this survey as...? (Please tick one box only. If more than one option applies please cross the one that you feel is most appropriate)**

A Dacorum Borough Council Member of Staff	1	
A representative of a group or organisation	2	
A Dacorum Borough Councillor	0	
A Herts County Councillor	0	
A Town/Parish Councillor	0	
None of these	43	

**Q12.a Please tell us which group or organisation you represent (will take you Q13)**

"Berkhamsted Local History & Museum Society"  
"Victoria C of E School"

**Q13. Please tell us if you recently received a letter from Dacorum Borough Council's Conservation and Design Department about your property**

Yes	No	Not sure
19	25	2

**Q14. In a proposed extension to the Conservation Area, please tick which area your property is in.**

<i>Extension 1</i>	<i>Extension 2</i>	<i>Extension 3</i>	<i>Extension 4</i>
0	5	1	1

**Q15. In the proposed list of locally listed building that can be found in the report, please tell us the name/number of your property?**

- "Manor street"
- "4 Station Road"
- "21"
- "Stonycroft, 9 Shrublands Road"
- "13 Lower Kings Road"
- "12 Manor Street, Berkhamsted , Hets HP4 2BN"
- "Candlemakers Cottage, HP4 2AX"
- "8 High Street"
- "3 George Street"
- "6"
- "It's 23 Castle Street, Berkhamsted."
- "Victoria First School, Prince Edward Street, Berkhamsted"
- "10 Chapel Street"
- "39 Montague Road"

**Q16 What is your ethnic group?**

- White- English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British; 35
- White – Irish 1
- White – any other background 1
- Prefer not to say – 3
- Any other background – 1

- White English Jewish"
- "Celt"
- "None of your business get on with the main job"
- "What a pointless question. There are no ethnic groups within the Berkhamsted Conservation Area. There may be one or two individuals dotted around but none will be interested in this survey."

**Q17 The Equality Act 2010 defines disability as: "A physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on a person's ability to carry out day-to-day activities". (Long term in this definition is taken to mean more than 12 months). This definition also includes long term illness such as cancer and HIV or mental health. Do you consider yourself to have a disability under the Equality Act definition?**

Yes	No	Prefer not to say
0	36	6

**To help us have a better understanding of your needs, please select the answer(s) below which best describe your disability or impairment**

- Hearing: 2
- Mobility: 1
- Stamina or breathing fatigue: 1

*General Comments re Survey*

"I found the film very helpful because I don't like reading through long documents."

"Some of the questions are too general. There is a fault in the box with suggestions for expanding the conservation area. It will accept no text!"

Q.5: "Don't get the exercise"

Q.6: "Should have had active URL to back look"

Q.6: "Question is too general"

Q.7: "This question is ambiguous and implies that article 4 restrictions could be applied on an ad hoc and unstructured basis."

"The box in the on line questionnaire is faulty and will not accept text."