



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AGENDA

THURSDAY 29 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 7.00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC CENTRE

The Councillors listed below are requested to attend the above meeting, on the day and at the time and place stated, to consider the business set out in this agenda.

Membership

Councillor D Collins (Chairman)
Councillor Guest (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Birnie
Councillor Clark
Councillor Conway
Councillor Maddern
Councillor Matthews

Councillor Riddick
Councillor Ritchie
Councillor Whitman
Councillor C Wyatt-Lowe
Councillor Fisher
Councillor Tindall
Councillor Imarni

For further information, please contact Katie Mogan or Member Support

AGENDA

7. **ADDENDUM** (Pages 2 - 124)

Agenda Item 7



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Thursday 29th September 2016 at 7.00 PM

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item 5a

4/00122/16/MFA - CONSTRUCTION OF 8 HALF STOREY CAR PARK WITH ASSOCIATED WORK TO PROVIDE 312 SPACES + 15 DISABLED SPACES

CAR PARK, LOWER KINGS ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2AJ

Further Representations

Environment Agency

Following discussions we would like to amend our formal response dated 10 August 2016.

Following the release this year of new modelling for the river Bulbourne we have updated our flood risk maps and the site now falls outside of the flood plain. As a result of this our previously requested flood risk condition is no longer needed. The site is still within your 3b (functional flood plain) designation according to your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), but layer was designated based on a lack of detailed modelling at the time, and subsequently shown to be incorrect by the hydraulic modelling submitted as part of the applicants flood risk assessment. I would advise that you look to update your SFRA functional flood plain layer taking the new modelling for the Bulbourne into account.

The site is still located in a vulnerable groundwater area and conditions are recommended (These are covered by conditions 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the published report. Condition 4 is to be omitted.)

Berkhamsted Parking Forum

Planning Application No. 4/00122/16/MFA Berkhamsted MSCP - Planning Officers Report

DBC cabinet report Agenda Item 9 dated 26th July 2016 - Item 3.4

On behalf of the Berkhamsted Town Council Parking Forum I would like to draw your attention to the above document which gives the impression that the Parking Forum have been regularly consulted and involved in the development of the brief and design of the Multi Storey Car Park.

This is a long way from the actual situation. As evidence to this I have set out below, the statement in the Cabinet Report and the chronology of events which are evidenced by minutes of meetings of the Parking Forum all of which are in the public domain and available on the BTC website.

"Berkhamsted Town Council Parking Forum has been used to discuss issues arising from the MSCP. Feedback from the Parking Forum has been given to the Council (DBC) and the Council has provided progress updates since project inception. Council officers and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources have attended recent meetings of the Parking Forum to ensure that dialogue continued". The first of 3 meetings to 'discuss' the proposal was on 19th May 2016 (some 4 months after the planning application!) the last being on 21st Sept 2016. At none of these meetings was there a meaningful discussion about the proposal but simply responses to the concerns that we had raised in the two reports in March 2016 and August 2016.

11th June 2013 - Cllr Nick Tiley attends parking Forum meeting as the DBC Portfolio Holder to explain *"that there is not a project or proposal to debate"*.

3rd March 2014 - Cllr Nick Tiley attends Parking Forum meeting as the DBC Portfolio Holder to explain that *"DBC Cabinet had agreed to move forward to the second phase of the design and planning for the MSCP. That phase would involve extensive consultation with residents and businesses on proposals and their impact on the town. The Parking Forum would be part of that collaborative and consultative approach"*.

July 2015 - Accidental release of pre planning application to BTC in confidence. This is the first time that any information was issued to BTC and the Parking Forum (in confidence)

3rd December 2015 - First presentation of the design to Berkhamsted at the 'Community Consultation Event' on 3rd December.

8th January 2016 - Clive Birch and Ian Stephenson meet WYG to explain discuss the Parking Forum's initial points of concern following a brief analysis of the design and proposal

28th January 2016 - Planning Application registered

9th February 2016 - Parking Forum meet to discuss their assessment of the Planning Application in order to prepare a report for the BTC (Planning Committee) as a consultee to DBC

22nd Feb 2016 - Parking Forum Assessment (Rev D 16 Feb 2016) of the Planning Application issued to BTC Planning Committee

25th March 2016 - Revised Parking Forum Assessment (Rev E 25 Mar 2016) issued to DBC

19th May 2016 - DBC attend Parking Forum Meeting in response to request from BTC to discuss the Parking Forum Assessment . (There is no real discussion about the design and proposal contained in the planning application).

21st June 2016 - DBC issue response to points raised at the meeting of 19th May 2016

18 July 2016 - Amended planning application submitted

19 August 2016 - Revised Design Statement (Issue 6) issued by WYG as a substitution for issue 5

30th August 2016 - Revised Parking Forum Assessment (Rev G 25th Aug 2016) to reflect the amended planning application issued to BTC Planning Committee BTC Town Planning Committee meeting

30th August 2016 - Revised Parking Forum Assessment (Rev G 25th Aug 2016) to reflect the amended planning application issued to DBC Planning Officer by BTC

21st Sept 2016 - Short notice meeting with the Parking Forum requested by DBC to respond to Revised Parking Forum Assessment

Local Residents

In support (5)

30 Orchard Avenue

Berkhamsted desperately needs more town centre parking. We live up the top of a hill and do walk into down, about a mile to the station, and back but this isn't always possible with heavier shopping or in bad weather etc. It is also a 25 minute walk down and the same or more to return. The car parks are invariably full at most times and it is difficult to find spaces, despite what the opponents say. There is a high elderly population who use cars to visit the town. The people who buy the new houses on the edge of town will have further to walk so will use cars to come into town so putting more pressure on the parking. There are no busses up Durrants Lane and not everyone wants to cycle or walk despite what the builders say about these being feasible options for a quick trip into town.

The majority of people who oppose the car park seem to either live outside the town , or if they are residents they live either in the valley or within five to ten minutes walk uphill of the town centre; I also suspect that many of them are relatively young. The building good be "prettier" with more suitable colours or cladding maybe but the town will become less attractive for visitors and residents alike if a quick resolution to the real parking problem is not implemented. It is much easier to park in Tring.

Please stop the squabbling and start building.

Sandiford, Graemesdyke Road

I write to convey full support of the planned car park as per application denoted above in the subject line. It has come to my attention that there is a significant effort to oppose this development which I personally see as essential to support the growth in traffic and commercial activity in this great town.

Should there be anything I can do to support this initiative, please do not hesitate to ask.

14 Oakwood

I have today received a leaflet through my letter box encouraging me to object to these plans.

I write to say I SUPPORT the plans for the proposed new facilities in Lower Kings Road.

I have written to the Gazette and had two letters published disagreeing with some of the claims made by the objectors.

Their leaflet states the proposal is not in keeping with this lovely historic town and conversation area.

The area in question is currently neither lovely nor in keeping at the moment.

It's a service road to the back of the shops and a ground level car park.

Their argument is therefore a false one.

The leaflet claims it will add traffic congestion.

Frankly this is a nonsense, the traffic will have somewhere to go, rather than queuing as it does now at particularly busy times.

Emissions issues-Again if the traffic has somewhere to go, then emissions could be reduced rather than sitting in congestion as they do now.

They claim there are better alternatives-Then let's see them rather than just complaining about the proposals.

They claim there are architectural flaws-This is total misinformation, as I'm given to understand no final decisions have been made on that aspect.

The artists impressions published in the Gazette are just that, artists impressions.

They also sight safety concerns and the fact the proposal is against local and national policy, neither of which I am able to comment on.

However, I'm sure such matters would as a matter of course be taken into account.

My Gazette letters referred to most of the points raised, yet nobody bothered to respond and enter the discussion via that medium.

I have also had some exchanges via the Everything Berko Facebook medium where I will post this as an Open Letter.

Berkhamsted desperately needs improved parking facilities and this proposal is an ideal way of achieving it.

Hollybush House, Water End

I recently received a mail shot asking me to oppose this new car park. I would like to say that it is a great idea. It supports local businesses by making the town centre accessible and reduces the amount of parking on Berkhamsted's congested streets. A big reason that the lower kings road gets congested on the weekend is actually traffic queuing out of this undersized car park.

Please don't let the nimbies stop this important project from going ahead. It's about time.

Celyn, Doctors Commons Road

Having received a rather misleading flyer seeking to block this application, I am writing as a Berkhamsted resident in support of the application and very much in favour of the car park as planned.

Objecting (173)

Letter on behalf of 4 Local Berkhamsted Architects

Design

Background legislation:

In reviewing the design and heritage impact of the proposal we would firstly highlight the relevant key legislation:

*"The primary legislation relating to listed buildings and Conservation Areas is set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Section 16(2) states "In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of **preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest** which it possesses."*

*In relation to Conservation Areas, Section 72(1) reads: "**attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.**"*

Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy 2006 - 2031

The main policies which relate to the proposed development in relation to heritage are policy CS27: Quality of the historic environment and Policy CS12: Quality of site design.

Policy 27 states that:

*“All development will favour the conservation of heritage assets. **The integrity, setting and distinctiveness of designated and undesignated heritage assets will be protected, conserved and if appropriate enhanced. Development will positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of conservation areas.**”*

Heritage and design

The Heritage statement submitted within the application and prepared by WYG concludes:

*“[WYG] consider that there will be a minor positive impact on the character and appearance of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area as a result of the proposed development. This impact arises from the introduction of a **well-designed, contemporary building into an area possessing a neutral character. The proposed design and external treatment of the multi storey car park will ensure that the existing car park area becomes more vibrant and interesting and will make a positive contribution to the character and appearance**”*

We fundamentally disagree with the statement above that the proposal is well designed. On the contrary the proposal is a bland and uninspiring solution to wrapping a bulky four storey form which is dropped, without sensitivity onto the site. The design of the scheme incorporates vertical stripes of industrial style Corten (pre rusted) steel mesh panels and timber louvres alongside a chaotic mix of buff brick, red brick and an unconsidered green wall as a thinly veiled gesture to include an element of “sustainable design” which screens the required structural bracing. The design is industrial in its proportions, materials and form and therefore is insensitive to the context of the conservation area.

There is no meaningful consideration of public pedestrian routes, permeability of the site, views and vistas from the High Street. We would also raise concerns that security of this area is compromised due to the reduction in sight lines and defensible space and that the bulk of the car park creates a series of alleyways around its perimeter.

There is no consideration of sustainability either within the design of the car park or the scheme as a whole and its impact on the town in particular the associated increase in pollution levels within the wider town centre.

Transport and infrastructure issues.

We have read the Transport Assessments submitted with the application for the MSCP on Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted. We would challenge the conclusions within the assessment that the significant additional load to the local road infrastructure could be mitigated purely by adjusting the timings on the traffic signals at the High Street/ Lower Kings Road junction, by the introduction of a mini roundabout at the entrance to the car park off Lower Kings Road and by adjusting the kerbside restriction along Lower Kings Road. We would also note that a mini roundabout on Lower Kings Road has not been included within the submitted plans

The local road layout currently becomes gridlocked at peak times with stationary traffic queuing along the High Street in both directions and along Lower Kings Road. With an increased load of 205 spaces to be accessed it will not be possible to mitigate the added congestion solely by adjusting the timings on the existing traffic lights. As a result congestion will spread from this area to other roads, as drivers attempt to avoid the significant increased congestion by using Station Road, Castle Street, Bridgewater Road and Charles Street to the south- all of which have existing significant congestion issues.

Cost

The scheme proposed provides an additional 205 car parking spaces at a cost of £3million the cost per space therefore being £14,634 we would question the financial viability of the proposal.

Potential

We are disappointed in the very poor vision that such a prominent project in the heart of Berkhamsted has been given. There are many examples up and down the UK which demonstrate how parking needs can be successfully integrated into sensitive town centres. By giving greater attention to design quality and better engaging with the abundant and considerable design skills available in Dacorum it would have been possible to provide a more appropriate solution.

In conclusion we object to the scheme in terms of the negative impact on Berkhamsted in terms of design, transport issues, the increase in pollution, security and lack of sustainability and the fundamentally detrimental impact on the Berkhamsted Conservation area.

As a result the scheme should be refused as it does not comply with relevant legislation.

Signed

Nicola Few RIBA Berkhamsted Architect

Hugo Hardy RIBA Berkhamsted Architect

Kirsten Holland RIBA Berkhamsted Architect

David Kirkland RIBA Berkhamsted Architect

114 George Street

Totally out of keeping and out of scale for the town. Will bring significant congestion at the main traffic lights and in Lower Kings Rd, plus risks to pedestrians from the resulting heavy traffic. Against sustainable transport policies and would add to

emissions in the area. Needs careful thought and collaborative consultation with Berk. residents to identify smaller, less intrusive alternatives around the town.

Wentworth, Shootersway

We wish to object to the application for planning permission 4/00122/16/MFA relating to the proposed development of a multi storey car park in Berkhamsted town centre. We have a number of concerns as to how the consultation process has been addressed. In effect it would seem that local people had a week to respond to a public consultation in December 2015. For such a large project on a prime site in the centre of Berkhamsted, that will have an enormous impact on the town if allowed, this approach is in our view wholly inappropriate. In our view it gave inadequate time for all interested members of the public to comment (during a particularly busy month of the year) and to make such a consultation a meaningful exercise. In any event, no alternatives were put forward for consideration.

What is more, it is only as a result of a flier prepared by an interested party recently posted through our door that we became aware of the critical Development Control Committee meeting on 29 September. We believe this to be wholly unsatisfactory. No doubt proper notice has been given of the application for planning permission but for those who do not live next to the site and/or who were away during the summer holiday this is in our view again wholly unacceptable for such a major development.

We support those objections set out within the Statement of Community Involvement and would hope that those on the Development Control Committee consider those fully along with all other objections lodged when considering this application.

In summary, our objections to the proposed development are as follows:

1. they are contrary to the Core Strategy (2013)
2. they are contrary to the Local Development Plan
3. pursuant to s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the proposals are detrimental to the appearance of the Conservation Area in which the proposed development is to be sited

We believe that the application should be refused for the reasons stated above.

In detail we object on the following grounds by reference to the numbered paragraphs above:

1. Contrary to the Core Strategy (2013)

1.1 The application is contrary to Policy 1 of the Core Strategy (2013) relating to Distribution of Development which provides that development to be allowed ...is of a scale commensurate with the size of the settlement and that that development should causeno damage to the existing character of the settlement.

The Applicant has critically failed to provide clear documentary evidence that there is a need for parking of the magnitude proposed. The document upon which the Applicant appears to rely as evidence of need is a report from Savell Bird Axon dated August 2012 which crucially has no data to back up the assertions made as to need for additional parking spaces and is certainly inaccurate in the number of car parking spaces at the railway station currently 484 as opposed to the 395 noted. (We accept that this first figure is accurately noted in other supporting documents).

The issue of parking within the town has been one largely stemming from commuter parking and not short term parking which it would seem this development is designed to address albeit that there is no clear evidence that this is what is required. Having lived in the town for 15 years we have on only one occasion been unable to park in the town centre and that was at Christmas in the middle of a busy Saturday. It would seem that many other objectors have had similar experiences. However, whilst this may be deemed anecdotal evidence, the availability of short term parking spaces would appear to be borne out by the data produced in the Existing Parking Supply and Demand document annexed to the application.

The Applicant has failed to demonstrate how a large eight level multi storey car park in the centre of this attractive market town is commensurate with the size of the settlement and/or has failed to demonstrate how it will cause no damage to the existing character of the settlement.

1.2 Section 9 of the Core Strategy (2013) provides that the need to travel by car must ...be reduced and goes on to provide thatTravel demand needs to be managed in a way that is more sustainable and delivers carbon reductions. This approach includes:..... managing public parking, both on street and off the street; controlling and managing new car parking spaces; encouraging fewer car journeys; promoting non car travel; and implementing Green Travel Plans.

Critically, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate how this strategy, which is supported by national policy, is being achieved by the building of the proposed multi storey car park other than that a handful of charging points are to be provided for electric cars.

1.3 The application is contrary to Policy 8 of the Core Strategy (2013) relating to Sustainable Transport which provides that principles to be followed in any development should be:

to give priority in all new developments to other road and passenger transport users over the private car in the following orderpedestrians, cyclists, passenger transport (buses, trains and taxis), powered two wheeled vehicles.

to improve road safety and air quality.

The Applicant has failed to demonstrate how priority has been given to these other road users and specifically as to how the development will improve road safety and air quality.

It is clear from the plans supporting the application that road safety will not be improved and will in fact be compromised and congestion increased not least that the exit from the proposed development onto Lower Kings Road will meet with the exit of traffic from Greene Field Road (from the Water Lane car park behind Tesco's) and notwithstanding the introduction of a mini roundabout. This will inevitably lead to a build up of traffic at busy times.

Air quality will not be improved and will inevitably suffer with increased traffic. We do not accept the traffic data produced as reliable having been resident in the town for the past 15 years and passing through the centre every day we are perfectly well aware of the numerous occasions when congestion has been an issue particularly in Lower Kings Road and particularly at the weekend.

1.4 The application is contrary to Policy 11 of the Core Strategy (2013) relating to Quality of Neighbourhood Design which provides that development has to (amongst other things)(a) respect the typical density in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character.....(f) avoid large areas dominated by car parking.

The proposed development fails to adhere to either of these principles the proposed development fails to respect the current density of the area and will instead totally dominate the area. Photographs of the proposed development not being visible from the town high street are a nonsense. The car park will be highly visible from vast areas of the town not least because it is to be situated at the bottom of a steep sided valley. As with the car park at the railway station, the bulk of the proposed development along with lighting at night from the multi storey car park will be visible from many of those properties on the elevated slopes of the valley in which the town is situated. In addition, it will inevitably be very visible from the Grand Union canal which is only a very short distance from it. Indeed we believe that what currently makes the market town of Berkhamsted such an attractive place to live and work will be destroyed by this development.

1.5 The application is contrary to Policy 12 of the Core Strategy (2013) relating to the Quality of Site Design which provides that a development should (amongst other things) respect adjoining properties in terms ofsite coverage, scale, height, bulk..... It is a clear that the proposed development does no such thing the scale, height and bulk of an eight level multi storey car park at the bottom of a steep sided valley are totally out of proportion with adjoining properties and the town itself.

Whilst the Waitrose building that is situated next to this plot is of a large size its angled roofing at differing levels has been designed to complement the pitched rooves of the older neighbouring properties nearby. The proposed multi storey car park is effectively an enormous cube with no attempt made to blend it into the local historic area (see below).

The current open car park area on the proposed development site has clear sight lines gives no cause for safety concerns particularly at night. However, this current scenario contrasts starkly with a multi storey car park on eight levels. We appreciate that CCTV is to be included in the proposed development but we believe this simply adds more cost to an already expensive project (which inevitably has to be maintained) in circumstances where there is no demonstrable need for parking of this magnitude.

It is not clear that the service road that currently allows access to very large delivery lorries to the back of Waitrose will facilitate easy access for these lorries or for delivery vehicles to the back of the shops on the stretch of the high street facing the proposed development. The turning circle from Lower Kings Road into the service road is tight and the immediate sharp bend left in the service road will cut across the entrance/exit of the car park aswell as a zebra crossing causing safety and congestion issues for pedestrians and cars alike. These concerns do not appear to have been addressed.

We can see no evidence that the size of the proposed car park spaces adheres to the standards set by the council but accept that we may have been unable to locate this detail in the very many poorly identified online documents in the short time available to us.

1.6 The application is contrary to Policy 13 Quality of the Public Realm which provides that New development will be expected to contribute to the quality of the public realm by:

- (a) providing active frontages and natural surveillance;
- (b) promoting clutter free streets by removing unnecessary signs and utilising multi-purpose street furniture;
- (c) promoting pedestrian friendly, shared spaces in appropriate places;
- (d) incorporating a coherent palette of sustainable surface materials, planting and street furniture;
- (e) including an interactive and stimulating realm with public art and appropriate lighting; and (f) incorporating suitable trees, living walls and soft landscaping

The proposed design does not satisfy any or all of these requirements. We would refer to the report prepared by Ian Stephenson for the Berkhamsted Parking Forum dated 30 August 2016 discussed at the meeting of the Town Council and note that the Applicant has made no response to this very valid concern.

1.7 The application is contrary to Policy 27 of the Core Strategy (2013) relating to the Quality of the Historic Environment which provides that all development will favour the conservation of heritage assets. The integrity, setting and distinctiveness of designated and undesignated

heritage assets will be protected, conserved and if appropriate enhanced. Development will positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of conservation areas (our emphasis). It is clear from the proposals that they are contrary to this policy the Applicant has not demonstrated how the setting will be protected, conserved or enhanced or as to how it will positively conserve and enhance the appearance of the conservation area in which the development is to be sited.

1.8 The application is contrary to Policy 28 of the Core Strategy (2013) relating to Carbon Emissions Reductions it is inevitable that with a dramatic increase in the number of cars attempting to enter/exit the site that there will be an increase in air pollution around the new development.

1.9.1 The application is contrary to Policy 29 of the Core Strategy (2013) relating to Suitable Design and Construction in that the Applicant has failed to explain as required how(i) they have considered the whole life cycle of the building and how the materials could be recycled at the end of the buildings life;

1.10 The Berkhamsted Place Strategy referred to within the Core Strategy (2013) clearly refers to the need for ...promoting opportunities for sustainable travel, including improved cycle routes and facilities (for example at the train station) will in part help tackle a number of parking and traffic issues in the town. An additional deck at the railway station car park and the development of the Water Lane / High Street site will also provide for a modest increase in spaces.

At no point has future development been referred to within the Core Strategy at the site of this proposed development and little has been made of the fact that existing car parks are in fact rarely at capacity (see 1.1 above). As stated above the issue remains that of commuter parking commuters who are paying very high annual season tickets inevitably do not want to pay for the high cost of parking at the railway station if they can park for free in the roads near the rail station. A multi storey car park where space is to be charged for at a higher rate than even the railway station car park will not address this issue.

1.11.1 No material consideration has been submitted by the Applicants to demonstrate why the Core Strategy should be overridden.

2. Contrary to the Local Development Plan (LDP)

2.1 The application is contrary to Policy 11 of the LDP relating to the Quality of the Development which clearly provides that

Development will not be permitted unless:

- (a) it is appropriate in terms of:
 - layout
 - site coverage
 - design
 - scale
 - bulk
 - height
 - materials
 - landscapingon the site itself, in relation to adjoining property and in the context of longer views;
- (b) it retains and supplements important trees and shrubs, and where relevant includes measures to enhance the local landscape;
- (c) it respects the townscape, density and general character of the area in which it is set;
- (d) it avoids harm to the surrounding neighbourhood and adjoining properties through, for example, visual intrusion, loss of privacy, general noise and disturbance;
- (e) it retains, does not adversely affect and where appropriate enhances important landscape, natural, ecological, historical or architectural features;
- (f) it provides a satisfactory means of access that will not cause or increase danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users;
- (g) the traffic generated would neither compromise the safe and free flow of traffic on the existing road network nor have a detrimental impact on the safety of other road users or on the amenity of the area;
- (h) it provides sufficient parking and space for servicing;
- (i) it meets reasonable requirements for access by people with disabilities;
- (j) it avoids harm arising from pollution in all its forms, including air, water, noise and light pollution. In particular there should be no detrimental effect on air quality in sensitive areas (especially where traffic related air pollution problems arise);..... (our emphasis)

The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that it has met any of these criteria and particularly those emphasised for reasons stated earlier.

2.2 The application is contrary to Policy 40 of the LDP relating to the Scale of Development in Town Centres which provides that:

Development will not be permitted in town centres and local centres, unless it is of a scale which is compatible with: (a) the size and function of the centre; and (b) the centre's historic and or architectural character.

Development will not be considered compatible in scale if:

- (i) the height or massing of building, the area occupied by the use or the level of activity it generates would significantly exceed that associated with the surrounding pattern of buildings and uses;
- (ii) the resulting movement and parking demands cannot be accommodated without damage to the character of the surrounding area; or
- (iii) it fails to respect any special local character, particularly in Conservation Areas. (our emphasis).

The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that it has met these criteria and we repeat the comments made above (see 1.4) about the positioning of the proposed development at the bottom of a steep sided valley where it will be visible to very many properties.

2.3 The application is contrary to Policy 49 of the LDP relating to Transport Planning Strategy which provides that in considering the transport implications of new development proposalsSchemes will not be promoted solely to provide additional capacity for private cars.....(and) The detailed design of new development should facilitate access and use without reliance on motorised private transport. The Council will give priority to walking and more sustainable modes of travel in the following order: Walking Cycling Passenger transport (bus, trains and taxis) Powered two wheeled vehicles Other motor vehicles. (our emphasis).

The Applicant has not demonstrated how this development is not promoting additional capacity for the use of private cars in reality it is doing just that by providing for a multi storey car park and is in direct contravention of policy. In addition, the Applicant has failed to show how it has given priority to more sustainable forms of travel. Objectors have suggested a local (electric?) bus constantly circling the areas outside of the town centre which residents could use for short trips into town but it would seem that this has not been considered or, if it has, no reasons have been given as to why it has been discounted. Similarly, no consideration appears to have been given to the use at the weekend (when the town is at its busiest) of the town railway station car park close to the town centre when it is invariably more or less empty.

2.4 The application is contrary to Policy 57 Provision and Management of Parking which provides that On street and off street parking space will be provided and managed in accordance with the following principles:

(a) parking provision and management will be used as a tool to encourage reduced car ownership and usage. This approach will be applied for general environmental reasons, and also to limit traffic problems (e.g. congestion and safety) and environmental impact (e.g. pollution, physical damage and amenity) in particular locations;

(b) the objectives of parking provision and management proposals should accord with Policy 49;

The Applicant has failed to show how the parking provision will encourage reduced car ownership and usage. In our view there will be increased traffic issues for the reasons stated above not least with regard congestion and safety. It is inevitable that the Applicants reports assert that here will be no issues with congestion, safety and pollution but we would suggest that with such an anticipated increase in traffic it is inevitably logical that there will be congestion, safety and pollution issues.

2.5 The application is contrary to Policy 120 Development in Conservation Areas and which provides that New developmentsin the conservation areas will be permitted provided they are carried out in a manner which preserves or enhances

the established character or appearance of the area.Each scheme will be expected to:

- (a) respect established building lines, layouts and patterns. In particular, infilling proposals will be carefully controlled;
- (b) use materials and adopt design details which are traditional to the area and complement its character;
- (c) be of a scale and proportion which is sympathetic to the scale, form, height and overall character of the surrounding area;
-and (e) conform with any design guides for conservation areas prepared by the Council.

The Applicant has failed to demonstrate how it has adhered to this policy.

2.6 The application is contrary to Policy 59 Public Off Street Car Parking which provides that Public off-street car parking provision will normally only be expanded and improved where the planning and highway authorities consider there is a pressing short stay/visitor need....

No pressing short stay/visitor need has been clearly identified other than anecdotally. The evidence obtained shows that there is existing capacity in the towns car parks see 1.1 above.

2.7 The application is contrary to Policy 111 Height of Buildings which provides that Within the towns and large villages, buildings up to three storeys will be permitted provided they harmonise with the character of the surrounding area. Higher buildingsmay be permitted....., provided there is no harm to: (a) the character of the area and the sites surroundings; (b) the character of open land; (c) views of open land, countryside and skylines; and (d) the appearance and setting of conservation areas and listed buildings. Such higher buildings will be expected to make a positive contribution to the townscape of their area. In all cases special regard will be paid to the effect of site levels on the resultant appearance and visual impact of the proposal.

The Local Development Plan clearly articulates the reasons for this namely Berkhamsted,(is) characterised by low-rise buildings of domestic scale, i.e. having one to three storeys (with pitched roofs over). It is in our view inconceivable how it can be judged that such a large building will comply with this policy.

2.8 No material consideration has been submitted by the Applicants to demonstrate why the LDP should be overridden.

2.9 There has been no attempt by the Applicants to explain and justify the design approach of the proposals made by them in contravention of the policies set out within the LDP.

3. Pursuant to s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the proposals are detrimental to the appearance of the Conservation Area in which the proposed development is situated

3.1 The proposed development is situated within a Conservation Area that is a fine and historic example of a local market town this is a material fact.

3.2 s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 clearly provides that in the exercise of any powers prescribed by statute a planning authority must havespecial attentionto the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. We believe that the proposals for the development of a multi storey car park will represent an erosion of the architectural character of the area by the introduction of a building totally out of keeping with the local area in contravention of the statute.

3.3 The town centre of Berkhamsted has in recent years been sympathetically and carefully maintained in keeping with the Conservation Area the proposed site for the multi storey car park is an integral part of that Area. The changes proposed to the area will be detrimental to the appearance of the Conservation Area as it will fundamentally change the look of the town centre clearly visible from many parts of the town which is of course set in a steep sided valley. This is a material consideration which must be taken into account when considering the application for planning permission and means planning permission should be refused.

Conclusion

It is in our view incomprehensible as to why the Applicant has failed to produce clear evidence of need for such a large number of additional short term parking spaces. Alternative solutions have not been addressed and we would really question the use of public funds in pursuing this proposal when cheaper viable alternatives have not been considered.

Whilst considerable time and effort and been expended by the Applicant in pursuing this application it is for the Development Control Committee to consider whether or not the Applicant has adequately assessed the need for such a development. We do not believe that such a need has been clearly identified but, if the decision is taken that such a need has been established, the Development Control Committee must in our view be satisfied that the Applicant has complied with the numerous planning policies set out within the Core Strategy and Local Development Plan - to ignore these policies is to render pointless the fact of having a Core Strategy or Local Development Plan. In our view it is quite clear that the Applicant has failed to comply with these policies and for those reasons the application must be refused.

For the reasons expressed above we strongly object to the application for planning permission re 4/00122/16/MFA

7 Castle Hill Close

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal of this car park. I understand there was a public consultation regarding this application in Dec 2015, for which the public were given a week to respond. That is wholly unacceptable for such a proposal. The car park will be a monstrosity and complete eye sore in the middle of a historic market town. We have already endured the enlarged station car park, despite much opposition, which is rarely full. There are times of the day when Berkhamsted becomes grid locked with almost stationary traffic, a car park of this nature will just make this situation even worse. There should be encouragement to use other forms of transport other than the car. There appears to be good turnover of existing parking spaces within the town, resulting in minimal waiting time and therefore absolutely no need for such a car park. I can see absolutely no good reason for this application to be approved, not least because it appears to contrary to

many development policies for the town. I reiterate my strong objection to the proposal.

31 Granville Road

What a huge, monstrous, ugly, out-of-keeping, eye-sore!!! Are you out of your minds thinking of building such a thing? Use your collective brain to think of something more in keeping with the area.

15 Shrublands Avenue

The existing open air car park is adequately lit enabling pedestrians safe passage across the open space, or around the service road. With the multi-storey car park in place, and the proposed degree of lighting, this route is likely to become unsafe after dark. This road is used not only by pedestrians but also workers leaving the rear of the High Street properties at night, some as late as 22:30 or later.

With such a mass of car park, sight lines will be impaired on the service road. This is likely to create safety issues to both pedestrians and delivery drivers who have to stack while waiting for their slot to deliver.

The drawings online are not in sufficient scale but it would appear that there is inadequate space for wheel chair users existing the Waitrose emergency exit. The end of the railed ramp with its necessary turning space currently encroaches into the existing car park by nearly a cars length.

12 Callard House

I object to this application. My objection is based on the following concerns with the proposal:

1) The new car parking structure will increase traffic congestion and therefore pollution in an already very busy area of the town. The Kings Road junction is already suffering with weight of traffic, the location of this parking facility will only increase congestion and degrade air quality further. Current emission levels in the area should be reviewed and a forecast given for the expected increase. Emissions must fall within safe limits.

2) There is already plenty of parking in that area of lower Kings Road, and it is never fully utilised now. This should therefore indicate that the location is not the most useful position for a large parking structure. It will likely not be used or relieve congestion in key areas of the town.

3) Why does the structure have to be overground? Would it not be more in keeping with an historical town to keep such a development below ground.

44 Orchard Avenue

Berkhamsted is already being destroyed by developments intended to attract more people, and more vehicle movements. This out of scale car park will only attract more people by way of extra vehicles. This is to the detriment of all.

6 Orchard Avenue

I write to state my objections to the proposed development, in line with my comments on the related change.org petition.

There is no evidence for demand for such a facility. Although I try to run, walk or cycle as often as possible to get into town (I only live about a mile from the centre), I do have a young family and so have driven in on many an occasion - but not once have I failed to find a parking space. I also have a wide social network in Berko, as does my wife, and not once has parking arisen as an issue during our conversations with local friends. Moreover, my wife and I believe that this will actually create a demand - i.e., once people from further afield realise that there has been an increase in parking, a facility not dissimilar to something one might find in a much bigger town, then they will inevitably drive into Berko more frequently - thereby congesting the roads. This will inevitably lead to someone deciding, in their wisdom, that Berko needs a new arterial road in order to alleviate the (artificially induced) congestion...and so the downward spiral continues, without anyone seemingly giving a thought to promotion of lifestyle change, including alternative modes of transport (e.g., a shuttle bus, from the new apartments built near Bank Mill Lane?).

On the note of alternative transportation modes and lifestyle change combined: why is there a proposal to introduce something so environmentally damaging and unimaginative as a multistorey car park? The world is changing: more and more people are striving to work from home, not commute on the 'cattle train' into the centre of London - and they can, thanks to positive technological advances. So, instead of saying, "hey, here's another dormitory town 'serving' London, so let's stuff more people in there, pack them into the same number of trains, and then launch them into a city that is already struggling with overpopulation and traffic congestion on an alarming scale?", why not look at ways to promote a sense of community, so that dads can spend quality time with their kids, in a central community space that combines family-friendly eateries and an outdoor plaza for free community events and local business promotion, with a sheltered and CCTV-monitored cycle park that has room for baby trailers? For the sake of pragmatism, such a space could sit above an underground car park, for those who absolutely need to use a car to come into town. Cycling could easily be promoted as an alternative means of transport for those within a 1-2-mile radius, by converting the many alleyways and paths around Berko to accommodate cycle traffic - with the addition of calming measures such as regular chicanes, to prevent/reduce collisions with pedestrians.

A great - and more aspirational - alternative location for a multistorey car park would be at the rear of Sportspace Hemel Hempstead. This would be a fantastic hub for people to engage in more wholesome pursuits than shopping and consumerism; for example, use of the sports centre, walks down the canal towpath, and strolls across the gorgeous green space with grazing cattle. Moreover, the location is just a short walk from both the town centre and the rail station - and so could be used by shoppers and commuters alike.

I see this unsightly and light-blocking construction as doing more harm than good - and there will almost certainly be no going back: once towns have been 'built up', they just become more so, in my experience; next-to no one puts a field where a building used to be. Berkhamsted has some stunning architecture and sites of

outstanding natural beauty, and this would be neither. Our friends who live in the neighbouring large shopping centres of Hemel Hempstead and Aylesbury come to Berko to enjoy the beautiful high street, the castle (which I'm sure was more beautiful before the railway line was constructed), and the 'community feel'. Much of these would be compromised if this car park were to be constructed. Berkhamsted is a gorgeous town, one I feel lucky to live in, and so I do what I can to enjoy, and retain, its charm. Please don't make a decision that would seem to be for the sake of 'progress', when in fact it would be a regressive step in the 21st century.

6 Dellfield

I would like to object to the proposed development of the multi-storey car park on Lower Kings Road in Berkhamsted.

Not only would the structure would be completely out of keeping with the town and the area in general, and would destroy the carefully cultivated atmosphere of this part of town. It would also be at odds with the historic and beautiful nature of the town, in particular in this conservation area.

This level of parking is overkill for such a small town, and would do nothing to alleviate the few areas where parking is an issue, as it's too far away from these areas and so people would not be able to use the new car park instead of the local parking. There are many preferable alternatives to such a structure, which would alleviate the known problems without destroying the town, and so we would greatly prefer that these options be fully explored first.

Finally, building such a structure completely out of proportion to the requirements, runs contrary to all of the local and national transport policies, which are supposed to be encouraging sustainable and public transport.

4 Chinneck House, Chesham Road

It will be a eyesore that destroys a lovely town and will mean that fewer people from outside the area will visit Berkhamsted and use the local shops and amenities. An absolute disaster. Brainless.

74 Upper Hall Park

I would like to register my objection to this proposal on the basis that the car park would be an unnecessary eyesore and totally dominate the area. It would also lead to considerable congestion in Lower Kings Road, where the entrance and exit junction is simply not capable of coping with the additional traffic that a car park of this size would attract. There is plenty of parking in Berkhamsted apart from maybe on the Saturday leading up to Christmas. Perhaps if the issue is a lack of short term parking then the Council could instead reclassify the current long term parking spaces in the St John's Well Lane car park, which are rarely used, and maybe even do a deal to make more use of the station car park for long term parking?

8 Coram Close

I am writing to voice my objection in the strongest possible way to the above planning application. It is unjustifiably large and will detract tremendously from the appearance and character of our town as well as cause serious safety concerns.

It is not all in keeping with the historic nature of the town - particularly the Conservation area and canal corridor. The proposed multi storey car park will have a massive detrimental impact on all its surroundings due to its overbearing size. The Conservation Area and surrounds are a vital and integral part of the towns character necessary to the heritage, quality and appearance of Berkhamsted, and is one of the primary reasons we moved here. Open space and natural light are already at a premium, and the little space that remains is an extremely important asset to the area, and should not be a target of developer's profits. The centre of Berkhamsted needs to retain the space and open air it has; the height of the proposed car park would create an overbearing and dominating impression.

It's unnecessarily large size is not in any way justified. Four storeys and eight floors are completely unnecessary. It is structurally way out of scale. The existing car park is rarely full.

Lower Kings Road and the junction with the High Street is an already congested area - building such a monstrosity will only exacerbate this problem. Other alternatives should be closely examined and discussed. Increased traffic would add further worrying pressure to an already congested area and have serious implications for safety. Additionally and significantly - Berkhamsted is a town full of families and children; this is a heavily used pedestrian area and any increase in traffic will be a serious safety concern which must be addressed.

This plan is entirely against local and national policy which promotes sustainable transport.

There has been no collaborative consultation with residents of Berkhamsted.

The Berkhamsted Place Strategy issued by Dacorum Council states that any new development respects and protects the built and natural heritage of the town, the canalside environment, and the character of neighbourhoods. Clearly this proposal entirely ignores this Strategy.

2A Anglefield Road

I wish to object to the building of this car park. It is grossly inappropriate in both design and position. The traffic at the junction with Lower Kings Road is already a headache with people turning into Waitrose. This will make the centre of the town a complete bottleneck. The size and design is also completely out of keeping with the town. It should not go ahead.

18 Ellesmere Road

I wanted to write to object to the plans for their to be a car park in Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted. The reasons for this are: -

- A building which is not in keeping with those in Berkhamsted - an Historic town with plenty of charm and attraction
- Issues with traffic congestion - already a real bottle neck, especially on a Saturday. This will only get worse and many visitors will choose to shop elsewhere
- Ideas for developing other areas for parking - there are a number of other options
- Maintenance of this building - it won't take long for it to look very shabby

I am fortunate enough to live close enough to walk into town and would never consider driving. I feel very strongly that for such a beautiful and attractive town a parking building of this kind would really detract from it's appeal.

47 Ellesmere Road

I would like to log my objection to the above planning consent. I don't feel the size of the car park fits the requirement (to big) and the design is not sympathetic to the local area/ buildings.

7 Boxwell Road

I am writing with regard to the above Car Park Planning Application at Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted. I strongly object to the development of this multi-storey car park plan for Lower Kings Road for the following reasons:-

1. It is not in keeping with our historic town and conservation area.
2. Traffic congestion will increase significantly in the Lower Kings Road which is already a busy junction.
3. Existing emissions in this area are already dangerously close to EU limits.
4. There are much better alternatives for developing an already underused parking area.
5. There are architectural flaws in materials and design, space sizing and maintenance.
6. The development is against local and national policy.
7. There has been no effective or collaborative consultation with residents.

Ewhurst, Shootersway lane

I am writing to object to the car park planning application 4/00122/16/MFA at Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted.

This is because the plans do not appear to have considered or taken account the historic nature of the town of Berkhamsted and its architectural heritage or the fact that this would be built within the conservation area and not be in keeping with its surroundings.

In addition to this planned car park not being in keeping with the area, there clearly has been no consideration given to the congestion at Lower Kings Road at this already a busy junction or to the build up of traffic that will be caused back to the town centre traffic lights.

Finally I am objecting because of the safety aspect that does not appear to have not been taken into account the significant risk being posed to children and other pedestrians when trying to cross what would become an even more busy junction with significantly more cars.

53 Victoria Road

With regard to the proposals for a huge car park on lower kings road berkhamsted I must object.

Once this is built it will ruin the back end of the town. Lower kings road and the traffic lights are already at breaking point. The bypass was built to get cars out of our lovely town, this will do nothing more than bring them in.

Please do not allow this monstrosity to be built.

4 Pond Lane, Hudnall, Little Gaddesden

I write to object to the above application on the **following grounds:**

1. Scale : it is excessively large, being 4 storeys
2. Design: it is ugly and not in keeping with many better looking buildings in the town centre
3. Traffic congestion: the traffic at the High Street and Kings Road/Lower Kings road junction is already extremely heavy, evidenced by the time it takes to travel along the High Street in either direction. This development will only exacerbate the problem. The car park adjacent to Tesco offers a better alternative.

4 Gilpins Ride,

I am emailing prior to the committee meeting on 29 September to object to the plans for the car park. I have lived in Berkhamsted for six years, about 1 mile from the town centre, and have never felt extra car parking was needed. The only time the existing car park is busy is Saturdays, and then the traffic going in and out of it, and the adjacent Waitrose car park, gets gridlocked. It would be so much worse with a larger car park, as surely more parking will actually generate more traffic. In turn this will have a knock-on effect on the other main streets.

It would be much better to spend the large sum of money that the car park would cost on better public transport so people do not need to drive in. A small hop-on/hop-off type bus which shuttled more or less continuously between residential streets and the town centre at busy times would be really useful.

I have yet to see an attractive multi-storey car park. Most of them are hideous and I fear this one will be the same. It is in the middle of a conservation area with some attractive old buildings nearby, which will be dwarfed by this.

Please register my strong objection to the proposal.

3 Chalet Close

I would like to object to the planning application above on the following grounds:-

- A) The need for this car park has not been justified.
- B) It is not compatible with the Urban Transport Plan
- C) It conflicts with Policies CS8, CS9, C11, CS12, CS13, CS27

A) Justification - many have asked at many meetings but the question of justification has never been answered.

1) Is it to ameliorate on-street parking?

There is currently a problem with long term street parking, (commuters and local workers) on narrow roads - but street parking is free so a carpark will not resolve this problem without additional measures to restrict on-street parking which have not been proposed.

I understand some businesses have said they may rent spaces for their employees - but no one has committed and they don't yet know the charges.

2) Is it to attract people to the town?

It may well, but that will just increase congestion which is probably the biggest current issue for the town and has been acknowledged as such.

3) Is it for Berkhamsted residents using the town?

Except at the busiest times (christmas) there are always spaces available.

Long term parking behind Woods Garden centre @ £3.50 per day always has vacancies as does the station carpark.

Parking in Waitrose without shopping is £3 for 2 hrs

Canal Fields 4 hrs free (always spaces except when there are events at the bowls or tennis clubs)

I cant speak for the other car parks as I have never needed to use them!

B) Conflicts with The Urban Transport Plan for Berkhamstead
<http://m.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/tranpan/tcatp/tnbutp/>

1)which does not mention the need for additional car parking, though it discusses at length the need for more/better cycle parking.

2) Scheme proforma 23 proposes "Introduction of Smarter Measures to reduce reliance on the Private Car" - low cost and easy to implement within 1 year.

<http://m.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/tranpan/tcatp/tnbutp/18440818.pdf/>

Has this been implemented - I see no evidence; surely this should be a first step before spending £3m + on a car park.

3) The Urban Transport Plan identifies the Lower Kings Road/High Street junction (

CH9) as an issue in congestion and delays and proposes that the software which controls the lights be adjusted to allow for current traffic levels, hopefully to reduce congestion.

<http://m.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/tranpan/tcatp/tnbutp/18440804.pdf/>

I understand this has not yet been done, although it was proposed for completion within 1 year

Until it has been done it is not possible to measure true levels of congestion prior to the introduction of the car park. Congestion on Lower Kings Road frequently backs up to the traffic lights (I will send photographs separately), The fact that the entrance/exit to the car park uses the same entrance from Lower Kings Road as the Waitrose carpark means that congestion is also impacted by Waitrose particularly when the barriers are locked down.

Exiting traffic will also need to cross the Waitrose traffic queue and Traffic queuing for the new car park will also block the Service Road. All affecting queuing on Lower Kings Road.

C Policies

- 1) The Proposal conflicts with Policy CS12 Quality of site design in that
 - a) it does not respect adjoining properties (scale, height, bulk, materials, etc);
 - b) it causes visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight loss to surrounding properties

The first and second floor flats above the shops will be severely impacted.

- 2) The proposal conflicts with Policy CS8 Sustainable Transport in that it encourages additional car use and does not give priority to other road and passenger transport users over the private car. If there is money to be spent in Berkhamsted it should be used to support the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and to provide additional passenger transport eg the "Smarter Measures proposed in the Urban Transport Plan"

- 3) The proposal conflicts with Policy CS13 Quality of the Public Realm In that the proposed palette of surface materials is not sustainable. Decorative wooden facades and "green walls" will decay if not maintained and there are no proposals for ongoing maintenance.

- 4)The proposal conflicts with Policy CS27 Quality of the Historic Environment In that it does not " positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area" - in fact exactly the opposite.

- 5) The proposal conflicts with Policy CS9 Management of Roads In that it is not compatible with the " location and capacity of the road hierarchy taking into account any planned improvements and cumulative effects of incremental developments.

It will add to congestion in an area where congestion has already been acknowledged as a major issue.

- 11) The proposal conflicts with Policy CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood design "

incorporate natural surveillance to deter crime and the fear of crime"
" avoid large areas dominated by car parking"

Currently we have a safe open, lit carpark heavily used both in the day and in the evening. Fear of crime, will prevent people using it in the evening; it will attract crime - become a hang out in the evening for local drug users, vandals and other miscreants. Is there a proposal to close it in the evening?

If built, this carpark, for which no justification has been provided, will significantly impact the quality of life of those who live in its vicinity; will be an unsightly monstrosity in a historic town will add to traffic congestion and deterioration in air quality and my well end up as a white elephant- if people are already unwilling to pay £3.50 for all day parking they will not be prepared to pay the higher charges that will be required to recoup the building costs.

These were snapped on a random day, walking back from Berkhamsted Station.

I had another occasion having dropped someone at the station at 4.30 in the afternoon, to drive back up Lower Kings Road to the traffic lights. It took 12 minutes. The hold up was caused by cars exiting the carpark behind Tesco once passed that junction Traffic moved at normal speed. We are now proposing to add another carpark exit into the same traffic flow. Traffic from the Waitrose Car Park does not exit onto Lower Kings Road - I assume there was a good reason for this.







16A West Road

I would like to state my objection to the proposed new multi storey car park in Lower Kings Road in Berkhamsted. My reasons are these.

I believe there will be serious congestion in Lower Kings Road. This is already an area which constantly has tailbacks as far as the canal bridge, not only caused by the traffic lights, but also due to cars turning right into the current car park. Also I really think the proposed building will be a complete blot on the landscape and spoil the approach to this lovely market town. I don't understand why the planners can't locate the proposed parking either where the station is, as this is grossly under used at the moment, it's close enough to the town and wouldn't impose on the flow of traffic. Another consideration I feel, could be the car park at the rear of Woods Garden Centre. This can't be seen from the road and spoil the approach to the town. There is just as much room there to build, as there is at Lower Kings Road yet it wouldn't cause as much congestion.

I hope you will consider my suggestions and concerns. Berkhamsted does need more parking I agree, but surely common sense should prevail?

2 Oxfield Close

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed multi-storey car park planned near Lower Kings road.

I object on the basis that:

1. It is not in keeping with this small market town
2. The town is increasingly congested due to new housing developments, namely High Street near the Old Mill public house (Royal Quays I believe) and Bearoc Park on Durants Lane. You are choking this town with additional people in a infrastructure that cannot cope
3. Dacorum council is the 'custodian' of the town not its permanent master and once you change such aspects here it is gone forever. We live in a very busy town as it is and your council is merely adding to the congestion impacting all of our quality of lives. Please have some regard for those who already live here. Not the transient Profit & Loss account that must be driving such inconsiderate planning decisions.
4. The current car park is under utilised.
5. The car park next to Waitrose and Marks and Spencer operates the most ludicrous short-stay / long-stay model which deters people from using those spaces. Whoever devised that system?
6. It is against local and national policy of sustainable transport
7. There has been a complete dearth of local consultation with residents. Why do you act like that? Why impact our way of life permanently when we live here and contribute to this town.
8. The additional emissions will take us near the EU limits of safe living. How can you ignore this?

Any town planned will appreciate the increasing population must be matched by improved infrastructure but not at the price of complete mobility or quality of life for the current residents.

It must stop somewhere. Councillors are temporary custodians of this town's future, amongst others.

Please cease behaving like its owners. Residents deserve to continue with their current quality of life and not have it destroyed by those who operate with opaque agendas or in ignorance of the wishes of the residents.

19 Gravel Path

I write to object to the proposal Car Park, Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted, which has several severe flaws, detailed below:

Appearance: The development is not in keeping with the historic appearance of the town, and surely something more aesthetically pleasing could be designed.

Traffic congestion: Lower Kings Road is already significantly congested. The junction with the high street always has significant traffic jams, which increase air pollution. As a pedestrian the junction is extremely hard to cross, and the pedestrian traffic lights do not allow enough time.

To conclude, the current proposal has serious flaws, adding to the existing road congestion. Furthermore, the development will cause substantial detriment to the appearance of the historic town. Due to the points raised above the planning application should be rejected.

I would like to be kept updated regarding any amendments to the proposal and any other relevant materials.

I write to object to the proposal Car Park, Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted, which has several severe flaws, detailed below:

Appearance: The development is not in keeping with the historic appearance of the town, and surely something more aesthetically pleasing could be designed.

Traffic congestion: Lower Kings Road is already significantly congested. The junction with the high street always has significant traffic jams, which increase air pollution. As a pedestrian the junction is extremely hard to cross, and the pedestrian traffic lights do not allow enough time.

To conclude, the current proposal has serious flaws, adding to the existing road congestion. Furthermore, the development will cause substantial detriment to the appearance of the historic town. Due to the points raised above the planning application should be rejected.

I would like to be kept updated regarding any amendments to the proposal and any other relevant materials.

18 Ellesmere Road

I wanted to write to object to the plans for their to be a car park in Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted. The reasons for this are: -

- A building which is not in keeping with those in Berkhamsted - an Historic town with plenty of charm and attraction
- Issues with traffic congestion - already a real bottle neck, especially on a Saturday. This will only get worse and many visitors will choose to shop elsewhere
- Ideas for developing other areas for parking - there are a number of other options
- Maintenance of this building - it won't take long for it to look very shabby

I am fortunate enough to live close enough to walk into town and would never consider driving. I feel very strongly that for such a beautiful and attractive town a parking building of this kind would really detract from it's appeal.

47 Ellesmere Road

I would like to log my objection to the above planning consent. I don't feel the size of the car park fits the requirement (to big) and the design is not sympathetic to the local area/ buildings.

7 Boxwell Road

I am writing with regard to the above Car Park Planning Application at Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted. I strongly object to the development of this multi-storey car park plan for Lower Kings Road for the following reasons:-

1. It is not in keeping with our historic town and conservation area.
2. Traffic congestion will increase significantly in the Lower Kings Road which is already a busy junction.
3. Existing emissions in this area are already dangerously close to EU limits.
4. There are much better alternatives for developing an already underused parking area.
5. There are architectural flaws in materials and design, space sizing and maintenance.
6. The development is against local and national policy.
7. There has been no effective or collaborative consultation with residents.

Ewhurst, Shootersway lane

I am writing to object to the car park planning application 4/00122/16/MFA at Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted.

This is because the plans do not appear to have considered or taken account the historic nature of the town of Berkhamsted and its architectural heritage or the fact

that this would be built within the conservation area and not be in keeping with its surroundings.

In addition to this planned car park not being in keeping with the area, there clearly has been no consideration given to the congestion at Lower Kings Road at this already a busy junction or to the build up of traffic that will be caused back to the town centre traffic lights.

Finally I am objecting because of the safety aspect that does not appear to have not been taken into account the significant risk being posed to children and other pedestrians when trying to cross what would become an even more busy junction with significantly more cars.

53 Victoria Road

With regard to the proposals for a huge car park on lower kings road berkhamsted I must object.

Once this is built it will ruin the back end of the town. Lower kings road and the traffic lights are already at breaking point. The bypass was built to get cars out of our lovely town, this will do nothing more than bring them in.

Please do not allow this monstrosity to be built.

4 Pond Lane, Hudnall, Little Gaddesden

I write to object to the above application on the **following grounds:**

1. Scale : it is excessively large, being 4 storeys
2. Design: it is ugly and not in keeping with many better looking buildings in the town centre
3. Traffic congestion: the traffic at the High Street and Kings Road/Lower Kings road junction is already extremely heavy, evidenced by the time it takes to travel along the High Street in either direction. This development will only exacerbate the problem. The car park adjacent to Tesco offers a better alternative.

14 Oakwood

I have today received a leaflet through my letter box encouraging me to object to these plans.

I write to say I SUPPORT the plans for the proposed new facilities in Lower Kings Road.

I have written to the Gazette and had two letters published disagreeing with some of the claims made by the objectors.

Their leaflet states the proposal is not in keeping with this lovely historic town and conversation area.

The area in question is currently neither lovely nor in keeping at the moment.

It's a service road to the back of the shops and a ground level car park.

Their argument is therefore a false one.

The leaflet claims it will add traffic congestion.

Frankly this is a nonsense, the traffic will have somewhere to go, rather than queuing as it does now at particularly busy times.

Emissions issues-Again if the traffic has somewhere to go, then emissions could be reduced rather than sitting in congestion as they do now.

They claim there are better alternatives-Then let's see them rather than just complaining about the proposals.

They claim there are architectural flaws-This is total misinformation, as I'm given to understand no final decisions have been made on that aspect.

The artists impressions published in the Gazette are just that, artists impressions.

They also sight safety concerns and the fact the proposal is against local and national policy, neither of which I am able to comment on.

However, I'm sure such matters would as a matter of course be taken into account.

My Gazette letters referred to most of the points raised, yet nobody bothered to respond and enter the discussion via that medium.

I have also had some exchanges via the Everything Berko Facebook medium where I will post this as an Open Letter.

Berkhamsted desperately needs improved parking facilities and this proposal is an ideal way of achieving it.

4 Gilpins Ride,

I am emailing prior to the committee meeting on 29 September to object to the plans for the car park. I have lived in Berkhamsted for six years, about 1 mile from the town centre, and have never felt extra car parking was needed. The only time the existing car park is busy is Saturdays, and then the traffic going in and out of it, and the adjacent Waitrose car park, gets gridlocked. It would be so much worse with a larger car park, as surely more parking will actually generate more traffic. In turn this will have a knock-on effect on the other main streets.

It would be much better to spend the large sum of money that the car park would cost on better public transport so people do not need to drive in. A small hop-on/hop-

off type bus which shuttled more or less continuously between residential streets and the town centre at busy times would be really useful.

I have yet to see an attractive multi-storey car park. Most of them are hideous and I fear this one will be the same. It is in the middle of a conservation area with some attractive old buildings nearby, which will be dwarfed by this.

Please register my strong objection to the proposal.

3 Chalet Close

I would like to object to the planning application above on the following grounds:-

- A) The need for this car park has not been justified.
- B) It is not compatible with the Urban Transport Plan
- C) It conflicts with Policies CS8, CS9, C11, CS12, CS13, CS27

A) Justification - many have asked at many meetings but the question of justification has never been answered.

1) Is it to ameliorate on-street parking?

There is currently a problem with long term street parking, (commuters and local workers) on narrow roads - but street parking is free so a carpark will not resolve this problem without additional measures to restrict on-street parking which have not been proposed.

I understand some businesses have said they may rent spaces for their employees - but no one has committed and they don't yet know the charges.

2) Is it to attract people to the town?

It may well, but that will just increase congestion which is probably the biggest current issue for the town and has been acknowledged as such.

3) Is it for Berkhamsted residents using the town?

Except at the busiest times (christmas) there are always spaces available.

Long term parking behind Woods Garden centre @ £3.50 per day always has vacancies as does the station carpark.

Parking in Waitrose without shopping is £3 for 2 hrs

Canal Fields 4 hrs free (always spaces except when there are events at the bowls or tennis clubs)

I cant speak for the other car parks as I have never needed to use them!

B) Conflicts with The Urban Transport Plan for Berkhamstead
<http://m.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/tranpan/tcatp/tnbutp/>

1)which does not mention the need for additional car parking, though it discusses at length the need for more/better cycle parking.

2) Scheme proforma 23 proposes "Introduction of Smarter Measures to reduce

reliance on the Private Car" - low cost and easy to implement within 1 year.
<http://m.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/tranpan/tcatp/tnbutp/18440818.pdf/>

Has this been implemented - I see no evidence; surely this should be a first step before spending £3m + on a car park.

3) The Urban Transport Plan identifies the Lower Kings Road/High Street junction (CH9) as an issue in congestion and delays and proposes that the software which controls the lights be adjusted to allow for current traffic levels, hopefully to reduce congestion.
<http://m.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/tranpan/tcatp/tnbutp/18440804.pdf/>

I understand this has not yet been done, although it was proposed for completion within 1 year

Until it has been done it is not possible to measure true levels of congestion prior to the introduction of the car park. Congestion on Lower Kings Road frequently backs up to the traffic lights (I will send photographs separately), The fact that the entrance/exit to the car park uses the same entrance from Lower Kings Road as the Waitrose carpark means that congestion is also impacted by Waitrose particularly when the barriers are locked down.

Exiting traffic will also need to cross the Waitrose traffic queue and Traffic queuing for the new car park will also block the Service Road. All affecting queuing on Lower Kings Road.

C Policies

1) The Proposal conflicts with Policy CS12 Quality of site design in that
a) it does not respect adjoining properties (scale, height, bulk, materials, etc);
b) it causes visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight loss to surrounding properties

The first and second floor flats above the shops will be severely impacted.

2) The proposal conflicts with Policy CS8 Sustainable Transport in that it encourages additional car use and does not give priority to other road and passenger transport users over the private car. If there is money to be spent in Berkhamsted it should be used to support the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and to provide additional passenger transport eg the "Smarter Measures proposed in the Urban Transport Plan"

3) The proposal conflicts with Policy CS13 Quality of the Public Realm In that the proposed palette of surface materials is not sustainable. Decorative wooden facades and "green walls" will decay if not maintained and there are no proposals for ongoing maintenance.

4)The proposal conflicts with Policy CS27 Quality of the Historic Environment In that it does not " positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area" - in fact exactly the opposite.

5) The proposal conflicts with Policy CS9 Management of Roads In that it is not

compatible with the " location and capacity of the road hierarchy taking into account any planned improvements and cumulative effects of incremental developments.

It will add to congestion in an area where congestion has already been acknowledged as a major issue.

11) The proposal conflicts with Policy CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood design " incorporate natural surveillance to deter crime and the fear of crime" " avoid large areas dominated by car parking"

Currently we have a safe open, lit carpark heavily used both in the day and in the evening. Fear of crime, will prevent people using it in the evening; it will attract crime - become a hang out in the evening for local drug users, vandals and other miscreants. Is there a proposal to close it in the evening?

If built, this carpark, for which no justification has been provided, will significantly impact the quality of life of those who live in its vicinity; will be an unsightly monstrosity in a historic town will add to traffic congestion and deterioration in air quality and my well end up as a white elephant- if people are already unwilling to pay £3.50 for all day parking they will not be prepared to pay the higher charges that will be required to recoup the building costs.

16A West Road

I would like to state my objection to the proposed new multi storey car park in Lower Kings Road in Berkhamsted. My reasons are these.

I believe there will be serious congestion in Lower Kings Road. This is already an area which constantly has tailbacks as far as the canal bridge, not only caused by the traffic lights, but also due to cars turning right into the current car park. Also I really think the proposed building will be a complete blot on the landscape and spoil the approach to this lovely market town. I don't understand why the planners can't locate the proposed parking either where the station is, as this is grossly under used at the moment, it's close enough to the town and wouldn't impose on the flow of traffic. Another consideration I feel, could be the car park at the rear of Woods Garden Centre. This can't be seen from the road and spoil the approach to the town. There is just as much room there to build, as there is at Lower Kings Road yet it wouldn't cause as much congestion.

I hope you will consider my suggestions and concerns. Berkhamsted does need more parking I agree, but surely common sense should prevail?

2 Oxfield Close

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed multi-storey car park planned near Lower Kings road.

I object on the basis that:

1. It is not in keeping with this small market town 2. The town is increasingly congested due to new housing developments, namely High Street near the Old Mill public house (Royal Quays I believe) and Bearoc Park on Durants Lane. You are

choking this town with additional people in a infrastructure that cannot cope 3. Dacorum council is the 'custodian' of the town not its permanent master and once you change such aspects here it is gone forever. We live in a very busy town as it is and your council is merely adding to the congestion impacting all of our quality of lives. Please have some regard for those who already live here. Not the transient Profit & Loss account that must be driving such inconsiderate planning decisions.

4. The current car park is under utilised.

5. The car park next to Waitrose and Marks and Spencer operates the most ludicrous short-stay / long-stay model which deters people from using those spaces. Whoever devised that system?

6. It is against local and national policy of sustainable transport 7. There has been a complete dearth of local consultation with residents. Why do you act like that? Why impact our way of life permanently when we live here and contribute to this town.

8. The additional emissions will take us near the EU limits of safe living. How can you ignore this?

Any town planned will appreciate the increasing population must be matched by improved infrastructure but not at the price of complete mobility or quality of life for the current residents.

It must stop somewhere. Councillors are temporary custodians of this town's future, amongst others.

Please cease behaving like its owners. Residents deserve to continue with their current quality of life and not have it destroyed by those who operate with opaque agendas or in ignorance of the wishes of the residents.

19 Gravel Path

I write to object to the proposal Car Park, Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted, which has several severe flaws, detailed below:

Appearance: The development is not in keeping with the historic appearance of the town, and surely something more aesthetically pleasing could be designed.

Traffic congestion: Lower Kings Road is already significantly congested. The junction with the high street always has significant traffic jams, which increase air pollution. As a pedestrian the junction is extremely hard to cross, and the pedestrian traffic lights do not allow enough time.

To conclude, the current proposal has serious flaws, adding to the existing road congestion. Furthermore, the development will cause substantial detriment to the appearance of the historic town. Due to the points raised above the planning application should be rejected.

I would like to be kept updated regarding any amendments to the proposal and any other relevant materials.

Upper Gade Little Gaddesden

Hi, I would like to register my views on the above.

Berkhamsted is an historic town going back to way before William the conqueror. Planning laws are quite rightly tight. In this time of blanket look a like towns it is becoming increasingly obvious to those with a view to future prosperity that individuality will be the key to attract shoppers, service users etc. The proposed car park is unsightly and quite inappropriate for a town like Berkhamsted. France has become quite a master at design owing to its large number of civic and structural engineers employed by councils. Their car parks are in town centres but underground. Obviously this is a greater expense but as the area above the car park can also be used it evens out. This should be a project that in 20 years time people can still say well done. Hemel town centre has been re designed a number of times because it was not well thought out. We lost a perfectly good hospital because someone thought some cash could be made as a development site. Please do not let Berkhamsted suffer the same fate. There needs to be a much greater time and effort to get as many people as possible to discuss this.

26 Highfield Road

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed development in Lower Kings Road.

Firstly I do not believe that the residents of Berkhamsted were adequately consulted about this proposed car park.

Secondly, I do not believe that it is necessary and I am wondering if the borough council undertook any kind of traffic survey. At present the existing car park is rarely full during the day, so why is an eight floor multi storey needed? Even with an under-used car park, the traffic congestion at this point can be severe so why try and add to it and increase the problem of emissions.

The scale of the proposed building is totally out of keeping with anything in the area, and out of place in an historic town like Berkhamsted. There is simply no justification in plonking an ugly monolith, with no architectural merit, in the heart of this town. It would surely be better to develop sustainable transport, and sort out the current traffic chaos in the High Street, rather than wasting money in this way.

Kings court

We object to the above in its current form

It would be better if it was lower and matched the Waitrose building on terms of the outside appearance

6 Oakwood

I am writing to object to the development of the multi story car park on Lower Kings Road.

Apart from the fact that I think the development is overly built-up for the site, and frankly ugly, I think it will bring more cars into the town – too many for the local road infrastructure to cope with.

I moved to Berkhamsted from London only 4 years ago and in that time the traffic has increased significantly. I regularly drive up and down Lower Kings Road (the entrance to the proposed car park) to and from the station at all times of day and up and down the length of the High Street at regularly have to wait up to 15 minutes to travel a few hundred yards. The hotspots are the entrance to the proposed site on Lower Kings Road, the High Street lights where it crosses Kings Road and the high street from there all the way to M&S at the other end of town.

Traffic in Berkhamsted is comparable to Central London at all times of day, not just in the rush hour. These roadways cannot cope with even heavier traffic without coming to a complete standstill.

Shootersway, at the North side of the town has taken the overspill of traffic due to the congestion on the high street with cars racing down there on a constant basis and the development at Bearoc park has/will bring c.500 new cars into the town. Encouraging more cars to drive down Lower Kings Road or through the High Street to reach this car park is madness and will destroy the peace of the town and the ability for the people here to move around freely.

I use this and the other car parks regularly and rarely can I not find a parking space, Despite many of the spaces being taken up by people parking all day for the station. Perhaps if the car park station was developed instead, you wouldn't need to consider this development. There are plenty of underutilised parking facilities in the town which could be better sign-posed? Freeing up other parking options (1hr max parking bays increased to 1.5hrs for example) may ease congestion at the main car park sites for example. I'm not aware of any alternatives being reviewed before leaping to a massive 8 storey development.

I'm sorry but I cannot make the meeting in Hemel Hempstead on 29th as I have young children and no evening childcare. I would be there if I could, as I'm sure will would most of the mums of the town. Don't take a low turnout at the public meeting as a sign of disinterest. The town is full of mums who cannot drop everything at 7pm to travel to Hemel Hempstead. (Why this meeting isn't taking place in Berkahmasted I don't know!)

Please do not approve this development it's wrong for the town.

Townend, Shootersway

I wish to object to the application for planning permission 4/00122/16/MFA relating to the proposed development of a multi storey car park in Berkhamsted town centre.

I have a number of concerns about this.

1. Insufficient notice and opportunity has been given to the residents of Berkhamsted to comment on this proposal. The consultation process has been far too short and very little effort has been made to ensure people are aware of the proposed plans.
2. I support the objections specified in the Statement of Community Involvement and would ask that these be given full consideration together with other objections lodged by members of the community.
3. The proposals are contrary to the Core Strategy (2013)
 - a. There is insufficient evidence that the town requires so much additional parking. People are looking for more short term free parking not more paid-for parking.
 - b. The applicant fails to show how a large multi storey car park in the centre of this attractive market town is in keeping with the size of the settlement. The applicant has failed to demonstrate how it will cause no damage to the existing character of the settlement.
 - c. It will increase local traffic and will encourage people to travel by car which is against national policy.
 - d. It gives priority to cars when priority should be given to other means of transport
 - e. Air quality will suffer
 - f. The proposals are contrary to Policy 11 which specifies that the development must avoid large areas dominated by car parking
 - g. The car park will be very visible from many areas of the town.
 - h. Its design, a large block, is not in keeping with the look of the town and its buildings.
4. They are contrary to the Local Development Plan
 - a. The application is contrary to Policy 11 of the LDP relating to the Quality of the Development
 - b. The application is contrary to Policy 40 of the LDP relating to the Scale of Development in Town Centres
 - c. The application is contrary to Policy 49 of the LDP relating to Transport Planning Strategy
 - d. The application is contrary to Policy 57 Provision and Management of Parking
 - e. The application is contrary to Policy 120 Development in Conservation Areas
 - f. The application is contrary to Policy 59 Public Off Street Car Parking
 - g. The application is contrary to Policy 111 Height of Buildings
 - h. No material consideration has been submitted by the Applicants to demonstrate why the LDP should be overridden

- i. There has been no attempt by the Applicants to “explain and justify the design approach” of the proposals made by them in contravention of the policies set out within the LDP.
5. The proposals are detrimental to the appearance of the Conservation Area in which the proposed development is to be sited (ref: s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
 - a. The proposed development is situated within a Conservation Area that is a fine and historic example of a local market town. The proposals for the development of a multi storey car park will damage the architectural character of the area by the introduction of a building totally out of keeping with the local area, in contravention of the statute.

It seems to me that the Applicant has failed to comply with the policies set out within the Core Strategy and Local Development Plan and for those reasons the application must be refused. These policies have been put in place for a reason and can't simply be ignored can they?

For the reasons expressed above we strongly object to the application for planning permission re 4/00122/16/MFA

South Lodge, Shootersway

Please accept this as my formal protest against the Council's plans to erect a multi-story car park between Waitrose and Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted.

I do appreciate that parking is an issue in Berkhamsted and, as you permit more residential building around the town, will be increasingly problematic. However, your plan to erect a multi-story car park in the proposed location is, in my opinion, ill-conceived.

- You are planning to put a monstrous concrete and steel box (squeezed between a row of shops and Waitrose) in the middle of our small market town. It will detract from the appearance of the town centre which is of huge importance to its residence. You should not solve a Council problem at the expense of the residence enjoyment of their town.
- Its locations seem to be ill-conceived. That stretch of the Lower Kings Road is already congested; locating a car park there will create grid-lock.
- With all that extra traffic, the atmosphere will be polluted....right in the centre of town. In the years before the A41 by-pass, the atmosphere on the main road was horribly polluted by vehicle emissions which meant that I preferred to shop elsewhere. Don't encourage more traffic into the very centre of town and recreate the pollution that was removed by the by-pass.

- Berkhamsted already suffers from poor planning decisions, e.g. allowing Waitrose to locate to an area that would have been ideal for an off-the-main-street bespoke shops, bistro and coffee shops. I suppose the person that approved that disastrous has long retired but the consequence live on. Waitrose should have been moved further from the centre which would have resulted in a healthier town centre (less charity shops!). Too late now but please avoid another poor planning decision that has lasting consequences.

I implore you to find a more suitable location for the addition parking that you feel is needed....

1A Barncroft Road

I have already signed the petition but just wanted to send this additional email as I feel so strongly about these plans.

Our historic town is known and is popular for that 'certain something' and, apart from the obvious additional traffic congestion, pollution and other residential concerns, the car park proposal is so ugly and not in keeping with the delights of this town at all.

It seems so wrong to just allow it go ahead with, as far as I can see, not enough positive reasons to fully justify its build.

I have lived in Berkhamsted for thirty years now and am so disappointed at this plan and I do hope my small voice may make some difference

4 Anglefield Road

I wish to object to the above planning application for the following reasons;

Out of scale for town centre

Unnecessary - parking is not at capacity in the town at present Against policy on sustainable transport - the council should look to improve public transport links before building this Traffic congestion at an already busy part of town

I hope these concerns are taken into account and planning permission is not granted.

12 Castle Mill, Lower Kings Road

I am concerned about the planning of the Multi Storey Car Park in Lower Kings Road for the following reasons,

- As a resident of Lower Kings Road I and many others frequently walk to and fro the High Street and find crossing the current car park access unsafe due to traffic entering/exiting the car park.

- The traffic is constantly backed up and delayed by the traffic lights, at times taking 3 to 4 changes for a car to pass through the lights. Traffic can be stacked up from the traffic lights to the station. This increases the pollution and makes accessing Lower Kings Road very difficult which would cause further problems if the number of cars increases.

Consideration needs to be taken concerning

- pedestrian safety by providing safe crossing over car park access.
- altering sequence of traffic lights
- plan to reduce traffic flow
- use station car park at weekends
- consider alternative site for a multi storey car park should it be proved Berkhamsted needs one.

35 Bridgewater Road

I have just heard about a proposed multi-storey car park in Berkhamsted. I wish to raise my objection as it is not needed. I walk around the town regularly and there are always car parking spaces. It is only on event days when it is difficult but the station car park is used.

It will only cause more cars to drive into Berkhamsted leading to more pollution and congestion. Leading to more health problems.

People need to be encouraged to walk or cycle and NOT encouraged to drive.

Please can the money be spent on better community projects such as better cycle paths and education on the benefits of walking to town.

36A Charles Street

I am writing to express concern about this planned development which frankly appears to be being bulldozed through the approval process without little attempt to listen to the views of local residents, none of whom, of the many people i have discussed it with, are in favour.

The proposed development appears unnecessary given that I have never had any difficulty parking in the existing carpark and always see spaces when I walk through. There are other better options for increasing parking within Berkhamsted.

The proposed building is in any case completely oversized for the space available and its use will increase traffic congestion and emissions in the centre of Berkhamsted. Indeed building it is against the policy of increasing use of more sustainable forms of transport.

The scale and design of the multi-storey car park will result in an absolute eyesore in the centre of an attractive small market town.

Please take these points into consideration.

Manor Cottage, 55 Little Gaddesden

prior to the council meeting on 29th September, I would like to register my opposition to the proposed multi-storey car park in Berkhamsted town centre.

Irrespective of my belief that multi storey car parks are architectural monstrosities, which should not be being built in the middle of conservation area, I believe this proposal is wrong on so many other levels:

- The current car parking area is empty most of the week, especially at nights. This will render it an empty and unsafe area throughout the night, which will lessen its attractiveness to users;
- There is already traffic congestion in this area during weekday rush hours and at weekends; I don't believe this car park will make much difference to that, apart from Saturday mornings and Xmas Eve and the detrimental effects of it will outweigh the benefits;
- It is contrary to sustainable transport policy to encourage more cars to come into and clog up the streets of the town;
- The environmental impact of the car park is bad, with emissions already high in this area, let alone the impact of manufacturing and pouring X00 tonnes of concrete;
- The business case that the council has produced has been significantly redacted in that the costs and proposed payback periods are blacked out. If the council felt it had a strong business case it would surely be prepared to share these with the people who pay the council's wages, bills, and who will ultimately pay for this car park;
- The only beneficiary seems to be Waitrose; and
- Surely in a time of cost cutting, spending millions of pounds on a car park is reckless. I'm sure the council would be better supporting health or aged care than building this folly.

Finally, the proposed car park has received overwhelming negative feedback from the people of Berkhamsted. Yet it seems the council is planning to push this through. In a time of lack of confidence in councils, governments and democracy over riding the wishes of the people who elect the council is wrong.

I urge your planning committee to listen to the people it represents and reject this proposal.

18 Finch Road

I am writing to lodge my objection to the proposed car park in Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted in the strongest possible terms.

This construction is totally out of character with the town and is not supported by most residents of the town. The heritage of the town, which has ensured it has

retained its popularity , is likely to be bulldozed away with the structure and those which will inevitably follow should this car park be permitted

13 orchard Avenue

We are writing to express our strong opposition to your plans to build a multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted.

Our family have lived in Berkhamsted for the last 33 years and have observed with alarm the unstoppable growth of the town beyond its capacity to hold its inhabitants. To implant, in the middle of this lovely historical town, a multi-storey car park, unsightly from every point in view, with a structure out of scale (4 storeys, 8 floors), increasing the already intolerable traffic congestion in the town, increasing the dangerous emissions close to the EU limits... well, we could go on mentioning all the inconveniences that this plan would cause to all the inhabitants of Berkhamsted, but sufficient to say that we are sure that you can find a much more appropriate location for such an aberration! Another objection is that we feel that there was not an effective or collaborative consultation with the residents of Berkhamsted.

Please stop these plans for this location and search for a more appropriate place.

36A Charles Street

I would like to add to the objections to the above planning application . Apart from the building being wholly out of character with the area from my own experience there is no actual need for the additional parking.

32 Orchard Avenue

Objection to Car Park Planning Application 4/00122/16/MFA at Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted

I wish to strongly object to planning permission being given for the above project, for a number of reasons given below.

o In my view the proposal is not at all in keeping with this lovely historic town and conservation area. I am also concerned the proposal is structurally way out of scale, having 4 stories and 8 floors, and that it will impact visually on Lower Kings Road.

o In my view, the case for additional parking has not been well researched - every time I've had to drive into Berkhamsted, including busy Saturdays, I have always found a place to park my car safely.

o The proposed location is already at the busiest junction in the town, and it is certain that this proposal will only serve to impede the flow of traffic as cars slow to enter/exit the proposed development. It would be far better to take traffic out of the town centre, rather than increasing it.

o Our roads in Berkhamsted are in a disgraceful state and a £3m investment in an unnecessary car park shows a clear lack of prioritisation of the infrastructure investments needed in our town with the limited budgets available. There is no clear evidence of need and according to my understanding, it is contrary to national and local planning policy. In my view the need for the proposed car park is unproven by the council, and I feel that to allow it to go forward will lead to a misuse of public money.

o I don't think enough thought or analysis has gone into this application, and I am concerned about an increase in congestion & pollution, and note that existing emissions are already dangerously close to EU limits, particularly in the case of diesel emissions, which we now know are not good for health reasons.

o The existing council car park is very useful for access to evening events in town, but I wouldn't even think of using a multi-storey like this after dark.

o There are alternatives that should be explored, such as using existing railway car park at weekends, by lowering the price, or encouraging traders to give up some of their parking provision and spaces. There is enough excess space already sitting empty much of the time that could, and should be used instead of allowing this proposed development to go through. From the (lack of) evidence I have seen so far, the options have not been properly investigated or consulted upon.

o At a time of national austerity, investing in a £3 million pound project without a clear case at a time of austerity is, in my view, short sighted and foolhardy.

- I therefore register my strong objection to an award of planning permission for this project, and ask you as my council representatives to reject the proposal. As an alternative, I request that you postpone development in favour of greater and more thorough research so that a more balanced decision can be taken with a good evidence base behind it that better suits the needs of Berkhamsted residents.

1 Oaklands

I, would like to register my objection to the Car Park Planning Application - 4/00122/16/MFA at Lower Kings Road. I think this proposed car park is not at all in keeping with the town and will not only be a total eye sore but will create hugh traffic congestion to that area of the town. It is disappointing that something as significant as this can get to this stage of planning without any effective consultation with residents.

163 Peartree Lane, Welwyn Garden City

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed idea of a multistory car park in the centre of Berkhamsted, just off the main high street. This will cause much congestion to an already very busy road and it is totally not in keeping with the aesthetics of this ancient town.

For these reasons, I believe the plan for this car park should not go ahead. I hope the plans will be rejected and a thoughtful alternative found. Many thanks for taking the time to read this brief email, my family live in Berkhamsted and I am a frequent visitor. It would be an error of judgement to build it and make a mess of a picturesque high street while increasing traffic.

26 Orchard Avenue

I would like to register my objection to the proposed multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road in Berkhamsted (Planning Application 4/00122/16/MFA).

Having attended the December meeting in the Civic Centre and the Town Council Planning Committee recently held in the Town Hall, I found very few people who were prepared to address the real problem viz. there are too many cars in Berkhamsted for the size of the town.

I came to Berkhamsted in 1994 and I am sure that the numbers of cars were less then, as was the total population of the town. However, the rise in car numbers seems to have risen at a much faster rate than the number of residents – it seems common for there to be at least two cars per household and, in some cases, there are four or more. There are some streets (Kitsbury Road, for example) where cars are parked on both pavements and the police assure me that this is not legal, but they are not going to do anything about it.

So, will the multi-storey car park proposal solve the problem? Will it make it worse? How can we reduce the number of cars in Berkhamsted? Have you ever seen an attractive multi-storey car park? Do you think the "greening" of the car park wall to be anything other than a joke?

22 Finch Road

I would like to raise my Objection to Car Park Planning Application-4/00122/16/MFA at Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted. My reasons are:

1. Will significantly increase traffic in town already busy. Lower Kings Road junction is intolerable now. Waiting time for light change is about 4 minutes.
2. More traffic more emission which is already close to EU limits in this area.
3. Existing car parking is not fully utilised now so what is the purpose of creating more car parking spaces.
4. More traffic will increase safety concerns in town with many local schools.
5. Berkhamsted is a historic town in conservation area. I do not want to become another Milton Keynes.

2 Red Lodge Gardens (1)

I strongly object on the following grounds,

The design is an architectural mess/disaster without any merit and cannot possibly satisfy criteria for a new building in the heart of a "conservation" area. (I am surprised that anyone claiming to be an architect would be happy to attach their name to this monstrosity.)

It is completely oversized for the location

Lower Kings Road and The High Street are the two key roads in Berkhamsted . Both are frequently congested with traffic flows greatly hampered by the programming of the traffic lights at the junction of these two roads. Creating more parking in the centre of Berkhamsted will only exacerbate traffic flows on these two roads .Towns seeking to enhance their attractiveness are seeking to create pedestrian friendly centres rather than giving pedestrians a secondary status to cars.

In my view we should be striving to keep cars on the outskirts of the town centre given that most people are capable of walking a short distance. In this respect the car park currently located on the other side of the canal and accessible by footbridge could be easily expanded or a portion of the much underused meadow /recreation ground lying between Mill Street and Lower Kings Road which also has easy vehicle and foot access to the town centre. Has a vehicle bridge over the canal between the St Johns Well Lane car park and an extended car park on the other side of the canal been considered?

Dragging more vehicles into the town centre will increase pollution (Berkhamsted lies in a valley) and increase pedestrian safety risks....both Lower Kings Road and High Street are poorly served with pedestrian priority crossing points and the 20 mph limit is poorly observed or enforced.

More traffic in the centre of Berkhamsted will serve to make it a less attractive place and drive local residents to take their custom out of the town.

The proposed development of a new supermarket at Gossoms End/Billet Lane could significantly change traffic flows around and into Berkhamsted and render the proposed new car park for Lower Kings Road a white elephant and economic liability.

Any decision on the car parking requirements in Berkhamsted should clearly be a matter exclusively for the residents of Berkhamsted to decide on.....it's called local democracy.

2 Red Lodge Gardens (2)

As a long- term resident of Berkhamsted and a regular user of the facilities and

shops in the centre of the town, I am stunned and outraged at the absence of public notification, information and consultation on the building of an 8-level car park at the Lower King's Road site. Why were residents not canvassed by mail at an early stage on their views and ideas about how to solve the parking issues of the town? Dacorum Council appears to have drawn up plans with no reference to local opinion and to be forcing them through with a brutal disregard for local democracy.

May I remind you and your colleagues that this location is a part of Berkhamsted's historic conservation area, residents of which are normally obliged to seek permission for any exterior alterations or extensions which would not be in keeping with the general character of the area. It is quite clear from the plans and artist's impression that a car park of this size and structure would be overly large, light blocking and an ugly eyesore in an attractive and historic part of the town.

Berkhamsted, with its attractive shops and restaurants, is undoubtedly a popular town, especially on Fridays and at weekends. The crossroads at the junction of King's Road, Lower King's Road and the High Street is also widely used by Berkhamsted School and Ashlyns parents, station commuters, delivery vans and lorries and residents wishing to access the by-pass. Long queues at the controlled traffic lights build up frequently as do the noxious emissions, a serious health hazard to pedestrians. A car park on Lower King's Road would massively exacerbate these congestion and pollution problems.

Please consider alternative sites in the town. The Canal Fields car park near the tennis club could be extended and linked by a vehicle bridge to St John's Well Lane. The existing children's play area could be moved, either further along the Canal Field or to an extended Butt's Meadow play area. Has any consideration been given to a park and ride scheme from an edge of town site?

Please do not approve the current planning application without further consultation with the local community and with experts in town planning issues.

7 Chapel Street

I wish to express my objection to the above planning application on the grounds that it is not at all in keeping with Berkhamsted as a historic town and conservation area. Despite living in Chapel Street for the last 12 years where street parking as a resident is a huge problem, I would not like to see this building proceed as proposed. I feel it would add to the congestion in the town and is far too big considering its siting and need – surely there must be more suitable, in keeping, alternatives?

16 Finch Road

We would wish to indicate our concerns for the above Planning Application

1) we already have significant traffic congestion to Lower Kings Road and an already busiest junction in the town without adding to this

2) There must be better alternatives to developing an already underused parking area

Whilst we will unfortunately not be able to make your meeting of the 29th September to arrange the final decision on the above matter i would hope that our comments will be taken in consideration towards the decision

Thank you for your time in this matter

2 Greenway

It has recently come to our attention that there is a proposed plan to build a multi storey car park on Lower King's Rd. We would like to formally object to this plan as we believe it is not in keeping with the historic aesthetics of the town. We also believe that such a development will lead to increased traffic congestion and pollution.

Having lived in the town for the last 25 years we regard this development to be too sizeable (4 storeys, 8 floors) and not in keeping with the conservation area. Dacorum borough council in the last few years has gone to considerable lengths to list a large additional number of protected buildings/houses (such as our own); therefore how could the council now justify this action by approving such an extreme and modern development at such odds to the period of the town's architecture and style.

10 Kitefield

I am contacting you to voice our concerns regarding the distasteful idea of a multi storey car park in Lower Kings road. Firstly we feel that the design will not fit in with this lovely historic town and secondly as the junction is already very busy this development will add to the traffic chaos that occurs constantly. We oppose this development and urge the council to rethink.

86 George Street

I am writing to express my concerns about, and opposition to this proposal.

I have been living in George Street in Berkhamsted since October 2003 and have grown to love the town's homely yet lively atmosphere. I think the proposed car park will spoil the character of central Berkhamsted in the following ways:

- . A large multi storey building in the middle of the town is not in keeping with its character. It will look ugly and affect the appearance of the little town centre.
- . Lower King's Road winds down to the station over the canal passing a pleasant green area. It is already busy with traffic. More cars will make the situation worse and will be unpleasant for pedestrians and motorists alike
- . Attracting more cars to this part of town will increase air pollution which is being shown to have a detrimental effect on people's health. It is not right to inflict the risks from polluted air on the local population.

- . Apparently this car park is underused. This suggests that it is irrational to enlarge it.
- . I do not believe that we should be promoting the use of cars since as well as causing air pollution, they contribute to global warming. Indeed it is government policy to support more sustainable forms of transport.

Walking and shopping in Berkhamsted is a pleasant experience at the moment. Please don't spoil it for us!

The Neens, Cross Oak Road

I herewith wish to object to this above proposal as it is "blot on our lovely picturesque town centre"

This car park is totally out of character in this location in our town and that the status quo should be held with

the current car park.

I cannot understand how this proposed multi-storey car park would operate in this congested area of Lower Kings Road

and the area will be totally grid locked.

The increase in traffic from the additional cars in and out of this proposed monstrosity would increase the traffic pollution

to an intolerable level for shoppers and the local community dwelling in the surrounding accommodation.

I believe that any of the above concerns should be enough to reject this proposed application.

Larchwood, Graemesdyke Road

I wish to register a strong objection to the council's proposals for a multi-storey car park at Lower King's Road. My objections are threefold.

- 1) I am unconvinced by the economic case. Will £3m spent in this way really represent value for money for the majority of the town's population in either the short, medium or long term? I accept it may benefit some businesses in the short to medium term, but at a likely cost to the general population.
- 2) The aesthetics of the proposed building leave a great deal to be desired. I accept that some care has been taken with this aspect, but it seems quite inadequate. The principal issue is probably with scale – the sheer disproportionate size of the proposed building in the heart of this attractive market town is a dispiriting prospect.

- 3) If the environmental impact has not exactly been brushed under the carpet, it does seem to me to be very understated (see some of my points below).

However, my biggest concern is the near complete lack of consultation with the local community. I have seen occasional features in the local newspaper, but there has been no thorough or systematic attempt by the council that I have been aware of, to involve the community which will be affected by this very significant development. I work outside Berkhamsted, so the occasional poorly advertised weekday lunchtime consultation, if they have happened, will have entirely passed me by.

I have lived in Berkhamsted for nearly forty years, and have seen a number of ups and downs in both prosperity and the appearance of the environment generally over that time. I am aware that there is a parking problem in the town, as there is everywhere in former market towns and even some cities, like Oxford. Quite recently a majority of people opted to stay with the status quo, rather than adopt any of a selection of proposed parking scheme 'improvements'. The proposed car park will not do anything to solve the general parking problem in the town, but it will encourage traffic into the town, creating further difficulties for residents.

Many of us who were not here at the time must look at some aspects of the High Street, for example, such as the buildings either side of the wonderful old town hall, or what many of us still think of as 'the old Waitrose building' – formerly Woolworth's, and wonder how such eyesores could ever have been permitted at the time they were built. Same goes for the former police station, now demolished, although one does understand some of the rationale behind that. It therefore goes against the grain to feel that I am, by default, colluding in the same sort of short-sightedness that I have previously attributed to others.

I have commuted to Welwyn Garden City for over eleven years now, and have become very conscious of the increase in traffic coming into the town at rush hour, as well as along the A41. Long queues, as you will probably be aware, now form where previously there were none. The King's Road is an inadequate and potentially dangerous route into the town at this time, as there is a lengthy stretch where a lorry and a school bus, for example, are unable to pass each other, and unable easily to reverse if there is a queue of traffic behind them. This is in addition to the difficulty articulated lorries have safely negotiating the right-angle bend out of Kingshill Way. Issues of road use, and possibly road improvement, along with other, more radical strategies need to be considered ahead of exacerbating existing problems by creating a magnet which can only make them worse.

29 Shrublands Avenue (1)

I would like to lodge my objection to the above planning application for a multi-story car park in Berkhamsted.

My objections are numerous:

- The design of the building is totally out of keeping with the conservation area that surrounds the proposed site. The artists impression does not accurately depict the surrounding buildings, nor the width of the road leading into the current car park.
- The proposal and plans have been railroaded through by the Town council without any proper consultation with the residents of the town.
- The car park will exacerbate the traffic congestion on Lower Kings Road, not alleviate it.
- The parking charges are likely to be high.
- The money allocated for the car park could be used for other, more worthwhile projects in the town.
- The car park scheme goes against current policy for encouraging sustainable transport.

Possible solutions for the town :

- Reinstate the ability to park free for up to 1 hour on the High Street spaces and in other car parks in the Town, there would be sufficient spaces to serve the shoppers. (This works in Tring). Whilst ensuring a number of long stay spaces for workers at local businesses.
- Negotiate with the train company to allow free parking in the station car park on the weekend (as was the case when I first moved to the town in 1987).

29 Shrublands (2)

I'm writing to object to the proposed multi-storey car park development at Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted. As well as a local resident of 30 years standing, I am the owner of a town centre business employing 7 people, so I have a deep interest in the prosperity and wellbeing of Berkhamsted.

Try as I might, however I look at the proposal it doesn't seem to be a well thought out or imaginative solution to the parking challenges Berkhamsted faces. Indeed it seems to represent very poor value and is likely to compound rather than ease problems.

The lack of imagination in the solution seems to indicate an equal lack of understanding of the problem.

Context

Having spent the last 8 years working from premises either facing the Lower Kings Road car park, or just over the High Street from St Johns Well Lane car park, I

probably walk through or use the 4 car parks around Waitrose most days of the year, and I see them at all times of the day. I remember the site before Waitrose moved there, and I also remember the promises that the parking would be more than adequate, that shoppers would be able to park at Waitrose and do all their high street shopping, and that the long-term parking provision would be maintained. 20 years on and many of the issues that were pointed out to the planners as potential problems have now come home to roost.

I've noticed the parking patterns over the years. The vast majority of the time there is space in all 3 car parks on the High Street side of the canal. But even with many free spaces, traffic backs up on Lower Kings Road. This is particularly apparent when the school day starts and finishes. The reason for this is nothing to do with car parking, but the geography of the town. Berkhamsted is basically one main road (the High Street), intersected by a lesser (Kings and Lower Kings) road. The canal and railway prevent alternative routes on one side of town, the Girls School and Butts Meadow prevent it on the other. That inevitably means Lower Kings Road will always be a pinch point.

Many people prefer to park in Waitrose because it is free. Don't underestimate the average Berkhamsted residents determination and patience to get a free parking space in the Waitrose car park. I've seen cars queue from the Waitrose barrier back into Lower Kings Road whilst there are free spaces in the Lower Kings Road car park. Don't imagine that situation will change. I've seen a recent planning notice which will further restrict parking in the Canal Fields car park and in St Johns Well Lane car park. This will also add pressure to Lower Kings Road.

Parking in Waitrose and at Canal Fields is the only free off-street parking in the town. Ever since parking charges were introduced for High Street parking, this has increased pressure on both these car parks

In the last few years Waitrose had been managing their car park less and less. This includes Saturday morning, which is one of the times that demand for the Waitrose car park outstrip supply. A skeptic might believe that Waitrose are deliberately trying to cause chaos to increase the demand for the multi-storey option, but as I have previously said, Waitrose shoppers will always expect to park for free and will queue to wait. When Waitrose cynically reacted to the opening of Marks & Spencer but enforcing a minimum spend and punitive costs for stays in excess of 2 hours (completely disregarding the spirit of their original planning approval), they had to back down very quickly as both the car park and the shop were suddenly much emptier. One expects that the eventual opening of Lidl at the Billet Lane Junction will further reduce the footfall in Waitrose.

Suggestions

Rather than spend in excess of £3million on a structure that the majority of the town are probably opposed to, and will change the character of Berkhamsted irrevocably, can I suggest that the following are considered:

- Engage in talks with London Midland, the latter in particular for free/much reduced parking charges on the weekend.
- * Engage in talks with Waitrose so they manage their parking in the spirit of the original planning permission.
- Remove the charges for short term (up to 30 minutes)High Street parking
- Introduce smart parking controls which monitor and display where the free parking spaces are. This needs to be at both ends of the High Street before the Castle Street junction in the East and St Johns Well Lane junction in the west, and on Kings Road before the High Street traffic lights to the South, and by the station on Lower Kings Road to the North.

I suspect that should the multi-storey car park be built then it won't solve any of the current problems and is more likely to compound them. I also suspect that too many of the solutions that are suggested for Berkhamsted parking are driven more in the interests of raising revenue than in the interests of the citizens of Berkhamsted. I would urge you do remember that the people of Berkhamsted not only expect, but are entitled to, fair representation.

27 Hall Park

I object to the proposed lower kings road car park on all the grounds listed on your leaflet. This plan has not been clearly thought through

4 The Pines

As a local resident please note my strong objection to this car park. I think its not in keeping with the buildings in the area, I dont think its necessary and will encourage more traffic and less walking/cycling by locals. I have moved out of London for fresh clean air and this will only increase diesel pollution i.e. PM2.5 and PM 10 particles in the air in our town. I also do not think this has been proposed and discussed with local residents and is not promoting sustainable / alternative forms of transport.

Plowmans Piece, Shootersway Lane

My wife and myself strongly object to the proposed multi storey car park in Lower Kings Road. There is already horrendous traffic congestion at peak times particularly at the beginning and end of the school day . The traffic comes to a standstill sometimes for 15 minutes or longer. The resulting emissions from the cars and school coaches and heavy goods lorries must be at dangerous levels. The car park building is also certainly not in keeping with our lovely Conservation area and historic town.

4 Finch Road

I am contacting you to object to the proposed new multi storey car park. In my opinion it is the wrong solution to parking problems in Berkhamsted. It's ugly expensive and definitely not green. Dacorum should be encouraging people to leave their cars at home rather than prompting greater traffic and the resultant emissions

72 High Street

As a proud resident of beautiful Berkhamsted, I have a simple clear message - please do not allow the proposed high rise car park to be built in Lower Kings Road.

I am sure Dacorum has heard many reasons why the general population of Berkhamsted believe the proposed car park is not an appropriate solution for perceived over crowding in the current car park. I do not believe that these problems have been fully addressed. There are other solutions.

I brief, please reject current plans, take a step back and evolve a solution that preserves the identity of Berkhamsted and satisfies the need for additional parking.

The Chippings, Shootersway Lane

As a resident of Berkhamsted I wish to formally object to the above plans to build an 8-level multi-storey car park in the Berkhamsted conservation area

We need a double electric bus loop with free rides for kids and the elderly. It would cost less to run this for 20 years for free than build your car park. Why ignore such an obvious and beneficial solution?

I believe the proposed car park would:

- Worsen traffic & congestion on Lower King's Road and beyond.
- Make the Kings Road traffic-lights experience even worse than it is now.
- Dominate the landscape, overshadowing listed buildings
- Cut off the existing pedestrian short-cut across town
- Potentially lead to an increase air pollution in that part of town
- Make it more unsafe for pedestrians to cross the road there
- Block sunlight from the surrounding area
- Cost over £3 million

Furthermore I believe Dacorum Borough Council promised to consult closely with the local community about the early stages of this proposal but instead has only allowed comment on fully formed plans. People in Berkhamsted have had little say over whether we think this is the most effective way to deal with traffic and parking problems or is the best use of £3 million of public money in their town.

I would like Dacorum Borough Council to:

- Withdraw the planning application
- Do proper research & analysis into how to reduce traffic congestion and address parking issues in the town without ruining our local environment
- Properly consult with the people of Berkhamsted, if this is how they want £3 million of their money to be spent.

Beech House, Graemesdyke road

I am strongly opposed to the plans for a Multi Storey car park in Lower Kings Road.

As a resident of Berkhamsted for 23 years it is clear that the amount of traffic using the main roads at peak times, particularly in Term Times has increased dramatically, however I walk through the existing car park daily and at varying times on my way to and from the station and it is apparent that there are always available parking spaces with the only exception being just prior to Christmas when Waitrose are under pressure.

The fact that plans have not been clearly communicated to the resident of Berkhamsted in an appropriate manner does unfortunately not reflect well on the council. Many people I have spoken to were unaware of these plans.

The response I received from Tom Ritchie saying: 'I would be amazed by many people having a lack of any knowledge. The matter also featured as an issue in the May 2015 election and the views of various parties were headlined in their literature posted through every door in the Town.' Is I feel an example of someone with little idea of how to communicate and certainly out of touch.

Whilst I agree there are issues with parking I believe a different approach is required. First have a look at say Harpenden, if you wish to shop there you are allowed 1 hour free parking near shops and no return, this is usually enough time for shopping and frees up spaces quicker than in Berkhamsted's 2 hour pay and display areas.

In Berkhamsted there are plenty of areas in the vicinity that could be freed up to allow one hour parking.

It is clear that cycling in and around the town is not made easy, the road surfaces in many locations are now dangerous to cyclists and the preponderance of 4x4s

delivering children to the Berkhamsted School does nothing to help the situation. Cycling should be encouraged even if this is not something that Berkhamsted's councillors are willing to attempt.

Whilst people who travel into the town to work find it difficult to park near their places of work this is not a good reason to consider building a multi storey car park in the town centre.

The proposed car park will if fear mainly attract more commuters that will do nothing for the towns economy, it will cause more pollution, be out of keeping with the environment of the town and the plans should be dropped.

75 Kings Road

I wish to register my objection to the proposed multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road on the grounds that;

- we, the local residents have not been adequately consulted,
- the proposal is entirely out of keeping with the character of the town and the local environment,
- the existing car park in Lower Kings Road is already a cause of major congestion at busy /peak times,
- there is likely to be a significant increase in emissions in a heavily pedestrian area,
- it is against local and national policy as regards sustainable transport.

Please ensure my views are taken into account at the forthcoming meeting on the 29th September.

Highfield, Shootersway Lane

I am writing in connection with the above planning application for the Lower Kings Road car park and to lodge my objection.

I think this would be of HUGE detriment to our town.

1. It is an eyesore of a design, cumbersome and ugly, in such a pretty well preserved historic market town and in a conservation area?
2. Lower Kings Road is already terrible for traffic. It is not uncommon to be sat at the traffic lights for 3 changes and a multi storey exiting onto the road will only add to the dire problems this road already faces. It currently has 2 car parks tipping out onto it, plus traffic from the station.
3. It is also a busy road for pedestrians and increased traffic will increase the danger where people are always crossing. Often out of hours people park along one side which adds even further to the dreadful traffic flow problems.

I sincerely hope this does not get passed. There must be other places a car park can be more discretely and sensibly built . This would be a massive injustice to the town and to the residents if this is passed and I am not aware of a single person who supports this as a good idea.

4 Smith Dorrien, Townsend Gate

I object to this planning application for the following reasons:

- 1 It is a monstrous building, quite inappropriate in a Conservation Area.
- 2 It will cause enormous additional traffic congestion in Lower Kings Road.
- 3 It is an obsolete solution to the problem of our choked roads. It is well established that the provision of car parking spaces leads to increased car use. We should be trying to encourage people to use public transport rather than their cars. Large cities like Nottingham are already addressing the issue of over-dependence on cars and there is no reason why a small town like Berkhamsted cannot do the same. Park-and-ride spaces should be provided and electric buses used to ferry people into the town centre. Car parking in the town centre should be made prohibitively expensive.

Shopping habits are changing. People are increasingly buying their groceries online and fewer people are doing a big weekly shop. In large cities abroad supermarkets deliver and, once Waitrose and Marks and Spencer in Berkhamsted have grasped that their customers don't have their cars parked nearby, they could surely be persuaded to provide a delivery service.

I urge the Planning Committee to reject this application and look for a radical solution to traffic problems in Berkhamsted.

Grafton House, Cross Oak Road

I would like to register my objection to the proposed multi-storey car park, having seen the artist's impression in the Gazette and elsewhere. This will be for ever out of character with the surrounds, and one wonders, what is the point of a conservation area?

This project will be of little benefit to those of us who normally make the effort to walk into the town centre.

Any scheme which provides more parking centrally will generate more traffic in the High St. Some might prefer to look again at monitoring roadside parking and extending the 2-storey parking at the station.

I believe there should be full public consultation before huge sums are spent in this way.

Red Lodge, Graemesdyke Road

We are writing to object to the proposal to build a multi storey car park in Lower Kings Road.

It will :

- cause considerable congestion at an already busy junction
- block light in surrounding businesses
- look ugly and not be in keeping with the town

Please re-consider viable alternatives.

18 Mill Lane, Wingrave

Although I don't live in Berkhamsted, I attend a choir there once a week and work at the Oxfam Bookshop. I am convinced that the proposed multi-storey car park would be detrimental to the ambience of the town centre which makes it such an attractive town and draws so many people in.

It would create a blot on the landscape of the town and would not be in keeping with the historic nature of the other buildings around, being central to the conservation area. I believe it would also conflict with Town Centre policies on development and parking.

It would mean a loss of urban amenity in that one would lose the airy, open feeling of the area and the attractive views of the canal.

I feel very strongly that it would be a grave mistake to take the town down the commercial urbanisation route and destroy it's unique character.

1 Egerton Road

I frequently have to drive across the town from Bridgwater Road, under the railway bridge to Kings Road via Lower Kings Road. Each day and at most times of the day I have to wait in a long queue of cars to get through the traffic lights. Not only are cars coming from the railway station area but also they are joining the queue from Water Lane and Waitrose car parks at all times of the day. This is already a bottleneck for traffic in the town without the added strain of increasing the number of vehicles moving in and out of a multi-storey car park. In addition, more and more residential buildings are being built in the town.

Also the current view looking across the Lower Kings Road car park gives a one a feeling of space within the town and the trees that were set now enhance the look across to Waitrose. To build a multi storey car park here would ruin this view and would make the town feel claustrophobic. Green areas are already at an all time low within the town.

For these reasons particularly I am very unhappy about the proposal to build a multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road.

64 Shrublands Avenue

As a resident of Berkhamsted I would like to strongly object to the proposed multi-storey car park.

> The reasons, aside from the emotional knee jerk of having a vast ugly building slap bang in the middle of the conservation area are that Lower Kings road stacks up with traffic at the drop of a hat as it stands. With traffic also queueing as far back along the high street as St.John's Well Lane. How can adding hundreds of cars to that be a good idea?

>

> There isn't a need for the new car park. Although I live at 64 Shrublands Avenue HP43JG and often walk to town, there are times when I do drive for various reasons. I have never failed to find a parking space on even the busiest of days. Granted I may have to walk a few hundred metres but how can that be a bad thing when faced with the alternative of the cost and disruption of a new unnecessarily build?

>

> What are the alternatives?

> Better signage could utilise the station car park's 484 spaces, often unused at the weekend or highlight the free on street parking on almost all of the roads running perpendicular and parallel to the high street. All involve a short walk but we should encourage walking not driving wherever possible.

>

> Berkhamsted has a great high street, adding more pollution is not a sensible course of action.

>

> I hope that you will consider this objection seriously.

15 Hall Park Gate

Lower Kings Road Public Car Park and have found that the occasional bottlenecks are inevitably caused by cars queuing to enter Waitrose car park. We do not see how the proposed multi-story car park will do anything to alleviate this problem and we are convinced that it will be a vast waste of public money on three major counts.

1. According to the plans for MSCP, there will be no significant changes to the access from Lower Kings Road. In other words, it will do nothing to solve the fundamental problem and will have little or no impact on the bottlenecks.

2. Availability of spaces in the public car park is not the problem. The car park is rarely full but access is regularly blocked by the Waitrose tailback.

3. For some reason, Waitrose shoppers are disinclined to pay the parking fee for the public car park and no amount of extra space will encourage them to do so. Usually, there is also space in the free car park at Canal Fields but it seems that inconvenience deters customers from parking there.

There are many other reasons including worrying pollution levels which will be exacerbated by the extra traffic attracted into the Lower King Road bottleneck.

Many residents opposed the building of a supermarket in the centre of the town, anticipating the inevitable traffic and pollution problems. Those sensible objections were ignored at the time but have since been proved to have been valid. Hopefully, this time, the council will take heed of those who actually suffer the consequences of ill-thought decisions.

6 Bridgewater Road

I wish to object to the application for planning permission 4/00122/16/MFA relating to the proposed development of a multi storey car park in Berkhamsted town centre

My objection is on a number of counts which I have detailed very briefly below.

1. **the application flies in the face of a number of Dacorum's own policies, and the Core Strategy.** It appears that both the Strategy and numerous policies have been completely ignored in this proposal (for example, seeking to reduce the reliance on the car, putting the needs of pedestrians ahead of car users, introducing "greener" travel policies).
2. **the proposed development will be a blight on the landscape right in the middle of the conservation area in Berkhamsted.** Contrary to the requirements of any new development to positively enhance the conservation area, this will be detrimental to the townscape. It will downgrade the overall attractiveness of Berkhamsted for both residents and visitors.
3. **it is completely out of proportion.** An eight storey building will render this area of town a complete "no-go" area for pedestrians after dark (particularly more vulnerable groups).
4. **there has been no meaningful attempt to put any resources or effort into developing alternative proposals to an enormous car park.** Any suggestions from community groups that alternatives should be explored have been rejected without proper consideration.
5. **The proposals will increase traffic volumes and have a negative effect on air quality.**
6. **There has been no meaningful consultation of the local community.** We have only been asked to comment on the plans for the proposed car park in the proposed location, not whether we want a car park at all on that location (or any other location). Representations by local community groups have been ignored.

For these reasons, I register my objection against the application for planning permission re 4/00122/16/MFA.

6 Dellfield Avenue

I would like to strongly object to the proposed development of the multi-storey car park on Lower Kings Road in Berkhamsted.

Having reviewed the plans the structure would be completely out of keeping with the town and the area in general, and would destroy the carefully cultivated atmosphere of this part of town.

The car park would be totally at odds with the historic and beautiful nature of the town, and would ruin the revenue streams of many businesses who rely on this aesthetic to be preserved.

This level of parking is completely unnecessary for such a small town, and would do nothing to alleviate the few areas where parking is an issue, as it's too far away from these areas and so people would not be able to use the new car park instead of the local parking. There are many, many preferable alternatives to such a structure, which would alleviate the known problems without destroying the town, and so we would greatly prefer that these options be fully explored first.

Even if all of these considerations are to be dismissed, building such a structure completely out of proportion to the requirements, runs contrary to all of the local and national transport policies, which are supposed to be encouraging sustainable and public transport.

Altogether, this is an ill-considered and disrespectful plan which will have serious negative consequences to our town and to the lives of the residents and visitors, and we therefore completely oppose the plans..

8 Doctors common Road

I moved into this delightful town a few months ago. It is a conservation area! I am surprised and disappointed that this application is being taken seriously. It is ugly and would look appropriate in an out of town shopping mall.

The area at the Waitrose entrance in Lower Kings Rd. is already congested and several hundred more cars will cause obvious problems.

Please turn down this application?

15 West Road

would both like to register their opposition to the Car Park Planning Application - 4/00122/16 MFA Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted

The grounds for our objection are as follows:

Significant additional traffic congestion to Lower Kings Road which already is very busy

Absolute chaos in this area during construction which will affect shops very badly.

Safety concerns as above.

Longmead Kitsbury Terrace

I am very concerned about this proposal as this car park would be completely out of character with the surrounding streets. Eight layers of cars are a tremendous amount for a market town and a proposal more on the scale of the town would be welcome. This town has a conservation area where all development is tightly controlled so such a monstrosity as this should not be allowed. Please reject this proposal.

11 Finch Road (x2)

I am writing to object to the proposed multi-storey car park planned for lower kings road in Berkhamsted.

I feel strongly that Berkhamsted is a small, historic town which is already congested with too many cars. The car park will only encourage more people to bring their cars into town causing more congestion and air pollution. The junction leading to the proposed site is already a very busy junction and the addition of this car park could lead to grid lock down the high street.

I live in Berkhamsted and have two young children. One of the attractions of Berkhamsted is its countryside location and I do not want more cars encouraged to the town, increasing the air pollution levels in the town while I am encouraging my children to walk to school, shops, etc.

At a time when climate change is one of the most serious problems and threats affecting us all, I really feel that planning policy should reflect ways of addressing this and encouraging a reduction in car use in towns. I understand that there is local and national policy around sustainable transport and this is not in line with such a policy.

As a local resident I am very concerned about these plans and hope that they will not be approved in light of the objections cited above.

25 Hall Park Gate

I'm writing to object to the above planning application for a new car park in Lower Kings Road for the following reasons:-

1. It's not in keeping with the historic nature of the town and the conservation area. Aside of the fact it is monstrously ugly it is totally overbearing in size and unnecessary.
2. It will add to the congestion already suffered at that end of the town. Where on earth are the cars to fill an eight floor car park going to queue!
3. On top of the congestion it will add to the existing emissions in the area which are already close to the EU limits.
4. There are other car parks which could be improved to ease the parking issues in the town.

5. It's against local and national policy (e.g. sustainable transport)
6. There has been no collaborative consultation with residents.
7. There are architectural flaws in materials and design, space sizing, maintenance along with safety concerned.

I cannot imagine why anybody would think this horrid construction is in any way suitable for a beautiful town historic town. If councils keep up with this type of building England will become a nasty concrete jungle whose historic buildings have either been knocked down or obscured. On top of that it would remain very under used as it is far too big for the town. I hope the council see sense and turn this mad proposal down.

4 the Hawthorns

This car park is unnecessary - people can use the Station carp park.

The council could arrange for it to be free at weekends when there is traffic congestion in the middle of town.

The roads will not be able to cope with the additional traffic in lower kings road or the high street.

65 South Park Gardens

As a resident of Berkhamsted I wish to formally object to the above plans to build an 8-level multi-storey car park in the Berkhamsted conservation area.

Building the proposed car park will lead to an increase in traffic congestion on Lower King's Road. On a busy Friday afternoon when the schools have just finished the area can become gridlocked if the junction into the Waitrose car park reaches saturation point. Any increase in traffic will also inevitably lead to an increase air pollution in Lower Kings Road.

I wonder if sufficient research has been carried out into the necessity for a new car park I work in an office overlooking the Water Lane car park and this car park is rarely full. As soon as the schools break up the car park is often only a third to a half full for the majority of the day.

I believe that Dacorum Borough Council has a responsibility to conduct comprehensive research whilst taking into account the views and opinions of residents and that they should be looking for a more environmentally friendly solution should a need for more parking be identified.

If there is a requirement for more parking surely a solution can be found that is more sympathetic to our beautiful old town.

I therefore request that the planning application be withdrawn until appropriate consultation has been fully carried out.

9 Oakwood

I wish to object strongly to the planned car park on Lower Kings Road in Berkhamsted.

This ugly car park will not be in keeping with the historic town centre but more importantly the location of this car park will be highly detrimental to the town. The entrance to the car park on Lower Kings Road is already on one of the busiest, most congested roads in Berkhamsted. Adding a significant amount of traffic at this junction and on Lower Kings Road will have a significant impact on traffic getting to the station, will increase congestion along Lower and Upper Kings road and it will make crossing the road both from the car park onto Lower Kings Road and at the intersection of the High Street and Kings Road significantly more dangerous given the number of pedestrians in that area.

It would be a significant mistake to build this unattractive building in this busy, town centre location. Surely a better location could be found that will not add to the congestion in this area.

I would urge you to reconsider and not build this car park in the proposed location.

23 Shrublands Road

A further comment from me regarding the shortsightedness of the Berkhamsted MSCP - this is a very interesting article describing the future of modern transport which will do away with private ownership of cars for the mass market (currently cars are parked for 96% of their time whereas if autonomous cars are available on demand per journey they could be utilised more or less all day - fewer vehicles used more of the time which would mean less need for parking).

I appreciate that it is a rather self-serving article by the founder of Lyft (A US ride-sharing company) but history tells us that technological revolutions occur very swiftly once they gain viability and we know that this transport revolution is on the verge of possibility.

I do urge you to consider these possibilities before rushing into old fashioned solutions to current problems.

<https://medium.com/@johnzimmer/the-third-transportation-revolution-27860f05fa91#.2osqj94qb>

Introduction: A Country Built for Cars

I remember when I first fell in love with cars. It started small with Hot Wheels when I was three and Micromachines when I was six. Everything about them was fast and exciting—even the commercials were narrated by the World’s Fastest Talker. I loved them.

Then, when I turned 12, my dad and I began taking annual trips to see the real thing at the New York International Auto Show. I looked forward to going every year, because even at that young age, I felt a connection to cars and the freedom they represented.

I think, in some ways, it was my love of cars that largely influenced how I saw the world. But it wasn’t until I took a life-changing city planning course in college that I had an epiphany: Cars weren’t just shaping my worldview; they were shaping the world, itself.

In the class, we learned about the history of cities and the massive impact transportation had on their evolution—both on how they were built and how people lived in them. From then on, I couldn’t help thinking about the inextricable link between transportation and the design of the cities I was living in. And I started noticing a very basic problem everywhere, hiding in front of our eyes.

Next time you walk outside, pay really close attention to the space around you. Next time you walk outside, pay really close attention to the space around you. Look at how much land is devoted to cars—and nothing else. How much space parked cars take up lining both sides of the street, and how much of our cities go unused covered by parking lots.

It becomes obvious, we’ve built our communities entirely around cars. And for the most part, we’ve built them for cars that aren’t even moving. The [average vehicle](#) is used only 4% of the time and parked the other 96%.

Most of us have grown up in cities built around the automobile, but imagine for a minute, what our world could look like if we found a way to take most of these cars off the road. It would be a world with less traffic and less pollution. A world where we need less parking—where streets can be narrowed and sidewalks widened. It’s a world where we can construct new housing and small businesses on parking lots

across the country—or turn them into green spaces and parks. That’s a world built around people, not cars.

All of this is possible. In fact, as we continue into our new century, I believe we’re on the cusp of nothing short of a transportation revolution—one that will shape the future of our communities. And it is within our collective responsibility to ensure this is done in a way that improves quality of life for everyone. The coming revolution will be defined by three key shifts:

1. Autonomous vehicle fleets will quickly become widespread and will account for the majority of Lyft rides within 5 years.

Last January, Lyft announced a partnership with General Motors to launch an on-demand network of autonomous vehicles. If you live in San Francisco or Phoenix, you may have seen these cars on the road, and within five years a fully autonomous fleet of cars will provide the majority of Lyft rides across the country.

Tesla CEO Elon Musk believes the transition to autonomous vehicles will happen through a network of autonomous car owners renting their vehicles to others. Elon is right that a network of vehicles is critical, but the transition to an autonomous future will *not* occur primarily through individually owned cars. It will be both more practical and appealing to access autonomous vehicles when they are part of Lyft’s networked fleet.

Why? For starters, our fleet will provide significantly more consistency and availability than a patchwork of privately owned cars. That kind of program will have a hard time scaling because individual car owners won’t want to rent their cars to strangers. And most importantly, passengers expect clean and well-maintained vehicles, which can be best achieved through Lyft’s fleet operations. Today, our business is dependent on being experts at maximizing utilization and managing peak hours, which allow us to provide the most affordable rides. This core competency translates when we move to an autonomous network. In other words, Lyft will provide a better value and a superior experience to customers.

I’ll have more to say on how the autonomous network will work a bit later in this piece.

2. By 2025, private car ownership will all-but end in major U.S. cities.

As a country, we’ve long celebrated cars as symbols of freedom and identity. But for many people—especially millennials—this doesn’t ring true. We see car ownership as a burden that is costing the average American \$9,000 [every year](#). The car has

actually become more like a \$9,000 ball and chain that gets dragged through our daily life. Owning a car means monthly car payments, searching for parking, buying fuel, and dealing with repairs.

Ridesharing has already begun to empower many people to live without owning a car. The age of young people with driver's licenses has been steadily decreasing ever since right around when I was born. In 1983, 92% of 20 to 24-year-olds had [driver's licenses](#). In 2014 it was just 77%. In 1983, 46% of 16-year-olds had licenses. Today it's [just 24%](#). All told, a millennial today is 30% [less likely](#) to buy a car than someone from the previous generation.

Every year, more and more people are concluding that it is simpler and more affordable to live without a car. And when networked autonomous vehicles come onto the scene, below the cost of car ownership, most city-dwellers will stop using a personal car altogether.

3. As a result, cities' physical environment will change more than we've ever experienced in our lifetimes.

So why should you care about changes in transportation? Even if you don't care about cars—even if you never step into a Lyft or an autonomous vehicle—these changes are going to transform your life. Because transportation doesn't just impact how we get from place to place. It shapes what those places look like, and the lives of the people who live there.

Transportation doesn't just impact how we get from place to place. It shapes what those places look like, and the lives of the people who live there.

The end of private car ownership means we'll have far fewer cars sitting parked and empty. And that means we'll have the chance to redesign our entire urban fabric. Cities of the future must be built around people, not vehicles. They should be defined by communities and connections, not pavement and parking spots. They need common spaces where culture can thrive—and where new ideas can be shared in the very places where cars previously stood parked and empty.

Taken together, this urban reimagination has the opportunity to deliver one of the most significant infrastructure shifts we have ever undertaken as a nation. And the good news is that we have to make these investments anyway. The [American Society of Civil Engineers](#) recently gave U.S. infrastructure a D+, estimating that our country requires \$3.6 trillion in infrastructure investment by 2020. If we have to rebuild and

revitalize our roads and cities anyway, let's do it in a way that puts people, not cars, at the center of our future.

Before we continue looking forward, I want to take a moment to look back at how we got here. Because there's something I haven't mentioned yet. This won't just be a transportation revolution: It will be America's *third* transportation revolution.

How We Got Here: America's First Two Transportation Revolutions

America looked very different in the early days. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the U.S. was made up of loosely connected, largely agricultural communities. If you wanted to travel over long distances, the covered wagon was pretty much your best option. The United States, in other words, were still pretty divided.

That all changed over the next several decades, as America constructed a massive transportation network of canals and railroads. By 1860, [the first revolution](#) was in full swing as more than 30,000 miles of railroad track spread out across the U.S.—and as tracks linked together, so did communities, economies, and people. Wherever these transportation networks went, small outposts were transformed into thriving cities. Chicago, Baltimore, and Los Angeles exist as they do today because of transportation innovations that helped spark their growth.

Now fast-forward into the next century, when the assembly line automobile came onto the scene. For individuals, this brought almost unprecedented freedom. But for our cities, car ownership started a vicious cycle: as more cars filled the streets, more roads had to be built to accommodate them. This second transportation revolution caused communities to spread farther and farther apart, which made having constant access to a car increasingly necessary—resulting in even more cars that needed even more space. In the process, our cities were dramatically reshaped to favor cars over communities.

Across the country, city planners wanted to make it as easy as possible for drivers to access metropolitan areas. That often meant building highways straight through the centers of our most vibrant cities. Neighborhoods were literally split in half, and many never recovered.

In some cases, neighborhoods were demolished to make room for cars. In Los Angeles, for instance, engineers built structures like the Four Level Interchange, which connects the 101 with the 110 and hosts 425,000 cars a day. The builders made room for it by knocking down [4,000 houses and apartment buildings](#) that were there before.

In addition to widespread demolition, there was also a more subtle way that cars began to reshape our cities. Streets themselves used to look very different than they do today. Most were more narrow, leaving room for sidewalks, front yards, and places where people could come together outside.

Back then, people used city streets as public spaces. Streets were where children could play. A place for shopping, where you could stop at a cart on the way home to pick up everything from dinner ingredients to shoes for your family. People spent a lot of time outside on the street, making friends, seeing neighbors, and living their lives within a true community.

But when streets began to be redesigned for more and more cars, all of these other benefits suffered. As time went on, streets became a place solely for cars. They encroached closer to homes. Yards disappeared. People were left with narrower sidewalks—or no sidewalks at all. That meant less foot traffic, which made it harder for small businesses, shops, and restaurants to flourish. Development patterns changed dramatically and the strip mall was born. And with fewer people outside, neighborhoods also became less safe because we lost the benefit of having “eyes on the street” most hours of the day. For the first time in history, cities were no longer centered on human social interaction.

All of this made it harder for a community to thrive. And as changes like this played out across the country, the face of America’s cities was transformed for generations.

The Problem with Cars

At this point we should probably take another step back to answer a simple question: Why is a company built around cars complaining about cars? The answer is that vehicles themselves aren’t the problem. The problem is how we use them—and just as importantly, how we don’t.

I studied hospitality in college, so sometimes I can’t help looking at the world through the lens of a hotel. What’s the occupancy? Are you getting great service? And it’s actually interesting to think this way about transportation—to imagine that our ground transportation is being run like a hotel.

To measure the health of our transportation hotel, let’s start by looking into how much money we spend on car ownership and how often we actually use our cars. It may shock you, but Americans spend more than [\\$2 trillion](#) every year on car ownership—more money than we spend on food. What’s even more [staggering](#) is that for all the money we spend on them, the 250 million cars in America are only occupied 4% of the time. That’s the equivalent of 240 million of the 250 million cars being parked at all

times. For the most part, your car isn't actually a driving machine at all. It's a parking machine.

Can you imagine a hotel where almost every room is empty? A hotel that spends an enormous amount of money maintaining those empty rooms, no matter how little they're used? It would go out of business tomorrow. And if you think about occupancy of cars the same way, the observation is simple: America is running a failing transportation business.

America is running a failing transportation business.

Plus, think about where all those unused cars sit while they're idle. In 2011, researchers estimated that there are at least [700 million parking spaces](#) in the U.S. That means our country has more than 6,000 square miles of parking—[bigger than my home state of Connecticut](#).

We can't be this inefficient anymore, because we're about to hit an inflection point that will strain our cities' resources like never before. The U.S. already has [ten cities](#) with more than a million people. And our urban population is growing fast. By 2050, almost [100 million more people](#) will move to American cities.

We don't have enough space, housing, or public transit to accommodate this population influx, especially while keeping cities livable and desirable places to be. And while fixing transportation won't solve all these problems, it certainly doesn't help to continue devoting so much of our space to unoccupied cars.

The Third Transportation Revolution

The good news is we don't have to keep building our country around car ownership. Technology has redefined entire industries around a simple reality: you no longer need to own a product to enjoy its benefits. With Netflix and streaming services, DVD ownership became obsolete. Spotify has made it unnecessary to own CDs and MP3s. Eventually, we'll look at owning a car in much the same way.

A full shift to "Transportation as a Service" is finally possible, because for the first time in human history, we have the tools to create a perfectly efficient transportation network. We saw this potential in 2012 when Lyft became the first company to establish peer-to-peer, on-demand ridesharing, which is now what the world knows simply as ridesharing. What began as a way to unlock unused cars, create economic opportunities and reduce the cost of transportation, has today become the way millions of Americans get around.

Ridesharing is just the first phase of the movement to end car ownership and reclaim our cities.

Ridesharing is just the first phase of the movement to end car ownership and reclaim our cities. As I mentioned before, the shift to autonomous cars will expand dramatically over the next ten years, transforming transportation into the ultimate subscription service.

This service will be more flexible than owning a car, giving you access to all the transportation you need. Don't drive very often? Use a pay-as-you-go plan for a few cents every mile you ride. Take a road trip every weekend? Buy the unlimited mileage plan. Going out every Saturday? Get the premium package with upgraded vehicles. The point is, you won't be stuck with one car and limited options. Through a fleet of autonomous cars, you'll have better transportation choices than ever before with a plan that works for you.

Using the Lyft network will also save you money. Here's why: We don't often think about it, but owning a car and making monthly payments also means paying retail prices for every aspect of getting where you need to go—fuel, maintenance, parking, and insurance. In a future subscription model, the network will cover all of these costs across a large network of cars, passing the savings onto you. We cut the hassle and you get the one thing you really want: the true freedom to ride.

Once this happens—once autonomous networks provide better service at a lower cost—our country will pass a tipping point. And by 2025, owning a car will go the way of the DVD. Until then, over the next five to 10 years there will be both driver and driverless cars on the road, which we call a *hybrid network*.

We are currently in the first of three phases, and will be until vehicles can be operated without any human intervention. That said, we don't have to wait until autonomous cars are capable of handling *all kinds of rides* without human intervention. The second, or hybrid, period will be defined by a mix of limited capability autonomous vehicles operating alongside human-driven ones. At first, fully autonomous cars will have a long list of restrictions. They will only travel at low speeds, they will avoid certain weather conditions, and there will be specific intersections and roads that they will need to navigate around. As technology improves, these cars will be able to drive themselves in more and more situations. Hypothetically, Lyft could initially have a fleet of autonomous cars that completes rides under 25 miles per hour on flat, dry roads. Then, we could upgrade the fleet to handle rides under those same conditions, but at 35 miles per hour. And so on and so on, until every kind of trip can be completed by an autonomous car.

Some people assume that the introduction of autonomous vehicles will mean human drivers are no longer needed. We believe that in the first five or more years following the introduction of autonomous vehicles, the need for human drivers will actually *increase*, not *decrease*. How is that possible? Rides in autonomous vehicles will be less expensive than any options today and will lead to more people using Lyft for more and more of their transportation needs. As people rely on Lyft for more of their transportation, they are [more likely](#) to live car-free. And as more people trade their keys for Lyft, the overall market will grow dramatically. When autonomous cars can only solve a portion of those trips, more Lyft drivers will be needed to provide service to the growing market of former car owners.

Remember when cell phone coverage transitioned from 3G to 4G? The 4G networks were slowly rolled out, first covering only the largest cities and eventually growing to cover larger and larger portions of suburban areas. This ensures that people are always covered, one way or another. If you spend most of your time in a place that's only covered by 3G or even 2G, you still have a network to rely on. But as soon as you step into a spot with 4G coverage, you automatically get to try it. Just wait for the upcoming launch of 5G. Future 5G networks won't be introduced to the world by new companies, they will be rolled out on top of the largest existing networks around the world.

The introduction of autonomous vehicles will follow the same pattern, and will be the only way passengers are always covered. Safety is paramount, so any condition which remotely adds risk can be serviced through a hybrid network while the technology improves. If it's snowing or raining we can turn off autonomous mode—and still pick you up. But all of this happens behind the scenes. For the passenger, autonomous will just be another mode of transportation. And no matter where you want to go, you'll be able to enjoy safe and reliable service from Lyft.

Cars defined our cities. Now it's time for us to redefine them.

There are many concepts for what the inside of self-driving cars will ultimately look like. Will they have couches and TV screens? Will happy hour take place with friends on the ride back from work? When our children say, "Are we there yet?" will the car respond? But when it comes to autonomous vehicles, the most important question is not what they will be like on the inside. It's what changes they will enable in the world around them. Since autonomous networks will be much more efficient than individual ownership, a large number of cars will come off the road—freeing up an enormous amount of space to devote to anything but cars. Eventually, we'll be able to turn parking lots back into parks. We'll be able to shrink streets, expand sidewalks, and make room for more pedestrians. That means more local shops and small businesses, more shared spaces, and more vibrant communities. This translates to better cities—and better lives—for people all over the world.

And we don't need to look into some far-off tomorrowland to imagine what it will look like. It's already happening today. It's happening in New York City, which is expecting a million new residents by 2030. Under Mayor Bloomberg, New York embarked on a plan to reclaim [180 acres](#) of roads from vehicles—and turn them into things like bike lanes and public plazas. The parking lot below the Manhattan Bridge, is now a plaza where New Yorkers go to eat lunch and spend time with friends. Just five years after reclaiming this space from cars, retail sales in the surrounding area increased 172% (Sadik-Khan, Janette. *Streetfight: Handbook for an Urban Revolution*. Pg. 254).

Or look at San Francisco, where the historic Ferry Building was blocked for decades by a two-level freeway. Since locals couldn't really get there, it became a rarely-visited office building. But when the road was damaged by an earthquake in 1989, the city saw an opportunity. Instead of rebuilding the space for cars, it tore down the highway and [reimagined the area](#) as a place where people could gather. Shops, restaurants, and cafes were built, and before long the Ferry Building became the focal point of the San Francisco waterfront. Every weekend, almost [25,000 people](#) visit its farmers market and support local vendors. As a result, new neighborhoods emerged, and within five years, there was [51% more housing](#) available in the surrounding area.

Look at [Washington, DC](#), where the historic Georgetown district has begun widening sidewalks. Or cities like [Phoenix and Portland](#), which are replacing parking lots with parks, cafes, and meeting spaces. They're tearing up pavement and planting trees. Projects like this are happening all over the world, from Seoul to Barcelona, proving that taking back our cities is a global phenomenon.

This opportunity is not simply about more parks and less parking, though. The design of our cities has tremendous implications on global economics, health, social equality, the environment, and overall quality of life. The problem is, not nearly enough time is spent considering how we can improve our collective home.

Our society is at a fork in the road and whether we take the right path is not inevitable. I don't have all the answers, but what I do know is that decisive action must be taken by all of us—business leaders, policymakers, city planners, and citizens—to realize the full potential of this almost unprecedented moment in history.

Over the next year, to encourage more discussion on what is needed to deliver the right change to our cities, I will partner with experts in relevant fields to share and debate this opportunity through a column called "The Road Ahead." It will examine the future through the lens of transportation, and discuss the steps we need to take today to unlock an era of unbound social progress.

We have a long way to go. But when I look at the world through my 9-month-old baby girl's beautiful eyes, I know what we have to do. We must come together and grab this golden ticket to redesign an even greater home. A home that drives community—not cars—to the centre of our everyday life.

3 The Pines

I have been very surprised and concerned to learn from a neighbour of the proposal to build a multi-storey car park in place of the existing car park at Lower Kings Road in this lovely historic town.

I have used this car park on a regular basis over many years for shopping, classes and meeting friends in Berkhamsted and have not experience any problems with finding a space in this car park.

The main concerns and reasons for objecting to this proposal are:

1. This is in a conservation area
2. The entrance to the car park on Lower Kings Road is already a very congested area with queues from all directions
3. Unnecessary increased safety concerns for pedestrians and motorists on Lower Kings Road
4. Even during the busiest times there are parking spaces available in the existing car park, which suggests that there is no need for any more spaces here
5. Multi-storey car parks have a tendency to attract and become a gathering point for car criminals and drug addicts

It is hoped that someone with a modicum of common sense at Dacorum Council will rethink this proposal.

I would like to suggest that a collaborative consultation with the residents of Berkhamsted would no doubt provide a well informed solution to any parking issues.

6 Holliday Street

Please find attached Drawings showing existing, proposed plans and proposed sections in relationship to existing Waitrose Building. Sight line drawing also attached showing MSCP relationship to surrounding buildings and neighbours invasion of privacy due to the new Building.

The proposed building is totally out of scale and the use of materials are ill conceived and are in no way sympathetic, and in keeping with the attractive historic centre of the Berkhamsted Town.

It is one of the least sensitive planning application that I have had the misfortune to come across, more especially in relation to this historical site.

The proposed building will be taller in height than the existing Waitrose Building and the impact to the surrounding buildings will be considerable. The applicant was very selective in their choice of where photos and views were taken. Views were not generated where they would show a negative impact to the site. Full foliage trees were photographed behind – nice for a portion of the year but unfortunately not when the leaves have fallen.

For a multi storey car park plenty of trees were shown on the drawings to beautify the background. Nothing was shown in the way of vehicles, more especially above the Waitrose eaves level, on an open parking deck. This would have had more of a negative impact to a person scrutinising the scheme. A cynical person might even call it selective deception.

Have the consultants submitted vehicular sweep diagrams for the project? The entrance seems as if it could very easily become clogged up and cause massive congestion also to the surrounding roads and even to the Tesco Car Park. Does it work as a scheme? Probably Not.

Traffic:

The immediate proposal to introduce to try and improve access to the site using a roundabout and lengthening the time of the Traffic Light to the High Street junction will be fraught with problems.

Traffic coming from the MSCP would have right of way over the traffic coming from the direction of the Railway Station, which already backs up badly on a Saturday, this could back up even more than it does presently. This could seriously impact the exit from the Tesco Car park via Green Field Road.

The other exit from the Tesco Car park via Mill Street has its own bottleneck problems, and problems to the Tesco car park could very easily become seriously impacted by this proposal.

All Waitrose traffic that usually would park on MSCP site would now be using the car park to the North West of Waitrose during construction period, putting extra stress on High Street / St Johns Well Lane junction. Resulting in extra time to leave car park / clogging up the High Street at this junction and seriously impacting the delays to the High Street. This additional traffic flow from direction of Northchurch would also need added time at the traffic light.

The Consultant's comment that the additional vehicles would have a negligible impact is laughable.

Do we really need additional parking?

We have a Lidl that will be opening at some time in the future. This Retail outlet will have an impact on many people's grocery shopping habits - due to their point of sale pricing being a lot lower than our current providers.

The Lidl shopping model is based on getting customers through the door, around the circuit and out again as quickly as possible, resulting in a rapid turnover in the Lidl car park. The Lidl car park when it becomes functional, will have a much quicker turnaround of vehicles than the existing car parks (possibly two to three cars per bay per hour.) instead of the Waitrose car park which could have a shopper parking there for two hours while they stop for a coffee etc. and do their shop.

Twenty car parking spaces in a Lidl car park - would probably equate to 45-60 parking spaces in a Waitrose or Tesco car park per hour- double that for a Town centre shopper who also stops for a cup of coffee in a two hour period.

This should result in a lowering of demand in the Waitrose and Tesco car parks as many shoppers change their large grocery shopping habits.

Local shoppers if they are not doing a town centre grocery shop, could possibly make other transport decisions like walking and cycling into town if there is no need to load a boot full of groceries into their cars.

The council should start providing secure cycling storage etc. in its efforts to promote green living instead as opposed to promotion of car usage.

Public consultation:

Public consultation has been very low key, the citizens of Berkhamsted in the majority are totally unaware of this application. There has been no attempt to make people aware of this scheme.

Town Council – meetings – a week before Christmas and another during the school holidays – were these dates chosen to discuss the application and approve it when people were involved in family matters. A cynical person might think a spin doctor is lurking in the background.

During the last Council meeting, things got fairly heated by the concerned residents after they found out what the Council is trying to thrust upon the Town. This was also helped when they found out that the local Councillors had already recommended it for approval at a previous meeting.

How this application has even got this far is a puzzle, and will also influence how votes will fall in the next council election – Kingsgate the sequel.

The Proposal.

The proposal as previously stated is out of scale and out of proportion with the surrounding historical buildings. It is badly designed with sub-standard parking bays, structure and totally out of character with the Town Centre.

It has a bad material palette. The green wall is unfeasible – it would require a large amount of time and money on maintenance.

If the green wall was omitted it would leave metal mesh and panelling. The surrounding historical buildings are mostly brick (some painted render) and tile roof with timber framed windows. The MSCP does not sit well in the built environment, it disregards it.

The relationship of the MSCP to the surrounding buildings is not sympathetic at all. Cars are proposed to be parked at a higher than the eaves level of the Waitrose Superstore on an open parking deck. The lift overrun higher than the top of the Waitrose roof.

The MSCP impacts on the right to light zone of the Waitrose upper floor windows.

It also blocks off the existing fire escape from Waitrose ground floor Back of House area.

One might be tempted to say that the surrounding buildings were never considered by the applicant when designing the MSCP.

The MSCP has a negative impact on all the surrounding properties, including the loss of privacy, nobody wants a car park facing onto your bedroom window. Four levels are totally unacceptable. (Three too many)

This is an application for a scheme that is totally out of keeping with Good Town Planning Practice, as well as the aesthetics of the Historical Town.

It is an important site in the Town and this application should not be allowed to proceed.

If Dacorum Council needs to spend some cash – our road is full of potholes, our pavement is crumbling and the drainage culvert is blocked.

Fix what you have first before contemplating destroying the built environment for everyone.

44 Greenway

I would like to register my objection, and huge disappointment, at the proposal to build a multi-storey car park in the centre of Berkhamsted. I can't see any basis on which this can be justified.

It is out of scale, not in keeping, and unlikely to be architecturally beautiful. It will attract more cars, though the numbers are a point of debate, but more importantly is not encouraging a move to sustainable means of transport.

I will be out of the country with work on the day of the planning meeting, but I am sure that the voice of local residents will be heard whether in person or in writing. I can only hope that common sense prevails.

15 Finch Road

As a resident of Berkhamsted I wish to formally object to the above plans to build an 8-level multi-storey car park in the Berkhamsted conservation area.

I believe the proposed car park would:

- Worsen traffic & congestion on Lower King's Road and beyond.
- Make the Kings Road traffic-lights experience even worse than it is now.
- Dominate the landscape, overshadowing listed building
- Cut off the existing pedestrian short-cut across town
- Potentially lead to an increase air pollution in that part of town
- Make it more unsafe for pedestrians to cross the road there
- Block sunlight from the surrounding area
- Cost over £3 million

Furthermore I believe Dacorum Borough Council promised to consult closely with the local community about the early stages of this proposal but instead has only allowed comment on fully formed plans. People in Berkhamsted have had little say over whether we think this is the most effective way to deal with traffic and parking problems or is the best use of £3 million of public money in their town.

I would like Dacorum Borough Council to:

- Withdraw the planning application
- Do proper research & analysis into how to reduce traffic congestion and address parking issues in the town without ruining our local environment. There are much better ways to alleviate the problem which should have been considered before or/and could be considered. For instance there have been several buildings allowed for the Berkhamsted Collegiate/School without forcing them to build sufficient parking spaces. The School itself is responsible for a lot of congestion whether in the town centre or around Ashlyns School and seems to be allowed to do anything they want while others in Berkhamsted are asked to pay the price for this.
- Properly consult with the people of Berkhamsted, if this is how they want £3 million of their money to be spent.

25 Kitsbury Road

I am writing to register my objection to the above application as, amongst other things, there are several aspects that appear to be contrary to the Dacorum Borough Local Planning Framework.

1. Development in a Conservation Area

Subsection d states: Development will not be permitted unless it avoids harm to the surrounding neighbourhood and adjoining properties through, for example, visual intrusion, loss of privacy, general noise and disturbance.

The development is out of keeping with the conservation area and neither enhances nor preserves

it. The massive size of the proposed structure is completely out of scale with the surrounding

town centre buildings. Nothing has been done to articulate the building form in order to reduce

the size and bulk of the proposed car park.

2. Inappropriate Design

Subsection CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood Design in the Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy calls for

respect for density in an area and preservation of attractive streetscapes.

There is a need to control inappropriate types of permitted development which would be

detrimental to the conservation area. Furthermore the Dacorum Council Conservation Strategy

2014-2019 states that 'The Council has a twin role of ensuring the protection of the historic

environment together with its enhancement through the delivery of high quality buildings'. The

adopted core strategy 2006 includes the key policy CS27 which requires new development to

'positively conserve and enhance the appearance of Conservation Areas'.

The proposed multi storey car park fails to protect the local historic environment, fails to make any

positive contribution to the surrounding Conservation Area and does not deliver a high quality

building.

.../ continued

/... Page 2

The proposed site for the car park is at the heart of an attractive market town and next to the

River Bulbourne and the Grand Union Canal. The constant flow of pedestrians crossing this site

will be adversely affected by the increase in traffic and the impact of such an immense building.

It would appear that the proposed multi storey car park has been conceived and designed by car

park "consultants" with complete disregard for the local historic and landscape environment. In

Tring, the main car park offers a free first hour of parking. This policy enables a high turnover of

short-term spaces in the very centre of town which is beneficial to local shops and cafes as well as

ensuring fewer spaces are needed overall.

National and local planning, transport and parking policies aim to shift long term parking out of

town centres as it protects attractive market towns centres from becoming giant car parks.

I also object to the fact that the council did not consult with the people of Berkhamsted at an earlier stage in this process.

Orchard House, Shootersway Lane

I am writing to express my grave concerns regarding the proposed multi storey car park. I have been a Berkhamsted resident since 1988 & seen the town develop sensibly & appropriately over that time. In particular developments have been carried out in a generally sympathetic manner befitting of such a unique & historic market town. The proposed car park simply does not fit the nature of the town & the plans are anything but sympathetic to the surroundings. Moreover additional parking on this scale is unnecessary & the proposed site entering & exiting into Lower Kings Road would further exacerbate the already significant traffic problems in the road. The extended station car park is never full & there is ample space in the current ground floor council car park combined with canal fields & of course Waitrose. All in all I believe the proposal to be ill conceived & totally inappropriate. I would be grateful if my comments could be made available to the committee meeting this Thursday.

46 Bridgewater Road

Personally I am against the ridiculous proposal to put up a multi story car park in Berkhamsted. I believe it will destroy the sense of being a market town with a lot of character. I don't believe it will help in any way except to accelerate the ruin of the greenbelt .

Marchbank Shenstone Hill, Gravel Path

I wish to object to the above Planning Application on the following grounds:

1. There has been no effective collaboration consultation with residents. Many residents are completely unaware of the proposal.
2. Existing emissions in our town are already close to EU limits and this development is against local and national policy to reduce carbon and develop sustainable transport. It would also add to traffic congestion at the busiest junction in town.
3. A multi storey car park is completely out of context in a Conservation Area in a town that abounds an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It would be a dreadful 'blot on the landscape' and would actually deter casual visitors to the town.

4. What plans, if any, have been made for continuity of car parking in the town should permission for the car park be granted?

I urge your Committee to reject this proposal and start working on effective plans in consultation with the local community, rather than sidelining us.

21 Hall Park

The location of this car park is entirely unsuitable for this town Surely this is obvious ??

Please note my Objection

12 North Road

We as long term residents of Berkhamsted object to the proposed plan for a multi-storey Car Park on Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted on the following grounds:-
Not in keeping with the town and conservation area. We will lose Kings Roads delightful, popular restaurant and shopping area replacing it with a soulless car park, which will attract antisocial behaviour and deter people from using it especially in the evening. Once it gains a reputation for this all businesses in town will lose out.

More traffic congestion in the lower Kings Road area already a very busy road junction

More emissions - already High

Why do we need such an enormous car park when current car parking in the vicinity is already under used

Size of the proposed car park is totally out of keeping with the town.

This whole enterprise appears to have been foisted upon the residents with very little consultation.

Brunswick House, Shootersway

Reading the 'Attention People Of Berkhamstead' handbill delivered to us by concerned residents prompts us to contact you as requested. We are in agreement with the significant concerns and are totally opposed to the building of the car park. Reference 4/00122/16/MFA at Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted.

34 Lincoln Court

I wish to record my objection to the plans for a multi-storey carpark in Berkhamsted. I have been a resident of Berkhamsted for the past 14 years. Here are my objections:

1. **Traffic flow** at the main crossroads in Berkhamsted, where the Kings Road crosses the High Street and which is controlled by traffic lights, is often severely congested at peak times. A carpark attracting more cars into the town centre is likely

to make the situation worse, with long queues forming both up and down the Kings Road and in the High Street.

2. **Additional traffic.** The new retirement apartments currently under construction on the corner of the Kings Road and the High Street will have 23 apartments and 24 parking spaces plus six parking spaces for the new Library, making a total of 30 parking spaces. This means that up to 30 additional cars will be coming and going at the development's only entry and exit point on the Upper Kings Road. This will make congestion at the traffic lights even worse.

3. **Design:** The building will make a negative contribution to the Berkhamsted Conservation Area due to the unsympathetic building style and mass.

4. **Need:** The Council carpark, the site on which the multi-storey carpark is proposed, is seldom full. Additional spaces are unnecessary.

8 Station Road

I refer to the above application and wish to object on the following grounds:

I believe the design of the carpark overall is not with keeping of the Conservation Area.

I believe adding a barrier system at the junction of Lower Kings Road will cause more congestion and not less - you only need to watch the junction at busier times to see 6 or 7 cars queuing back to the current barrier for Waitrose - this already causes congestion to the current one way system and the service road into Waitrose.

The bulk of the proposed designs is not sympathetic with the other buildings around it.

I also believe this will then pave the way for a CPZ within the town - a town that simply cannot accommodate such developments due to the nature of the narrow streets and the current size of modern vehicles.

11 Hempstead Lane, Potten End

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed new car park to be built next to Waitrose.

It will look totally out of character with Berkhamsted town centre. The plans show a building which is too imposing and in a style out of keeping for the proposed site. It also stops the walking cut throughs that are regularly used by a high number of town visitors.

It really seems like a waste of money to "solve" a problem which doesn't exist; there is rarely a problem finding parking.

If something has to be done why not make it on a much smaller scale in a style sympathetic to the area, not so obviously out of character?!

33 Cedar Road

I'm writing to register my objection to the proposed car park. I believe that the car park is out of scale with the centre of this historic town, and that it will increase traffic and pollution.

I feel that other options should be explored to ease congestion in the town, including increased investment in transport and sharing parking facilities with the station, which is underused at peak weekend hours.

2B Station Road

I am writing to formally lodge my objection to the plans for a multi story carpark in Berkhamsted town centre.

How these plans have even reach this stage is beyond me, but to summarise why I think this would be detrimental to our town:

1) The existing car park on the site always has empty spaces. Even on a Saturday when there is a queue backing up for the Waitrose car park. Why on earth would we need more.

2) Trying to get people in and out of a barrier system (as exemplified by Waitrose) creates a huge backlog. There is already usually a queue backing out onto Lower Kings Road for Waitrose due to the barrier (again NOT the council car park). This point was heightened by a recent trip to Oxford - the car park created severe jams even though there were many empty spaces inside.

3) Lower Kings Road is not suitable for an increased volume of traffic - you just have to visit on a Saturday to see this for yourself

4) Within 5 mins walk of the site there is - the existing car park, the car park on the other side of Waitrose (by Woods), Canal fields and the multi storey at the station - all with spaces even on a Saturday! Again - why do we need more?

5) Berkhamsted town centre is not set up to increase any volume to traffic. It is already backlogged and over-serviced. Another car park will only add to the chaos.

6) It is unsightly, unnecessary and will cause huge disruption during build and once it is open... ruining our market town.

Please do not ruin our town with this unsightly, disruptive and unnecessary addition. With all the new builds the focus should be on schools and infrastructure, not on car parks.

I do hope common sense prevails on Thursday, or a ruling is delayed for more impact studies to be undertaken.

3 St Johns Well Lane

I would like to lodge my objection to the planned Berkhamsted high rise car park. I believe it is inappropriate in the conservation area and contrary to many of the council's own policies.

20 Hall Park

I am writing to object to the proposed car park in Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted.

Having viewed the proposed plans and visited the area yesterday I would like to raise the following points to support my objection :

Lower Kings Rd is already congested by the phasing of the traffic lights at the main junction and by attracting additional traffic to this road would create more delays in the vicinity of the proposed car park and raise traffic emissions.

The surrounding architecture is in a conservation area and recent additions to the area e.g. Waitrose, and the new library / apartment complex have used architectural styles in keeping with the local buildings. The proposed style of the car park does not meet the local style or conservation area planning criteria.

I plan to attend the planning meeting to support this objection.

12 Murray Road

As a resident of Berkhamsted, I am very concerned about the proposed plan to build a multistorey car park in Lower Kings Road.

Firstly, as you are very well aware Berkhamsted has a major traffic congestion problem. On the other hand, it does not appear to have a very significant parking issue, as 20 % of the car parking spaces are empty during the week days and 8 % during the weekends. This traffic congestion is causing significant and worrying air pollution that affects the young, the old and those with respiratory conditions. Siting the multistorey car park in this area of town will add to this congestion and pollution. Thus, far from having the desired effect of attracting people to the town it will deter visitors, as the town becomes a gridlocked, fume-choked nightmare. The councils own figures show these high pollution levels and Hertfordshire County Council Highways agencies have already raised their concerns about congestion.

Secondly, the proposed design of this car park is truly hideous, no amount of computer generated "green washing" detract from the oppressive scale of this rectangular monstrosity. It will make this area very dark and oppressive. I frequently park my car or bicycle in this area in the evening when I attend events, as it is well lit and open space. A huge construction like this will create shadows and dark corners that will give rise to the perception if not the reality of an unsafe space. Also, this is right in the centre of Berkhamsted's historic conservation area. Some dreadful planning decisions were made in the 1970s that disfigured sections of the High Street. Do you really want to be responsible for further architectural vandalism in

21st

century.

Thinking to the future, will we really need so much extra car parking? As more and more "bulky item" shopping goes on line and has home delivery demand for parking is likely to stabilise.

My final points are why doesn't the council look at addressing traffic congestion and parking through alternative means? We need to be encouraging people to leave the car at home. How about a regular, reliable round town bus service that collected people from the hillsides and brought them down into the High Street and collected them from the station? Did you know that people who visit town centres on foot or by public transport spend more money than those who came by car? Presumably as they feel less time constrained than drivers who have limited time in a metered car park? Isn't this what local businesses need? How about an out of town park and ride? Encouraging people to walk or cycle in? Put up informative signs to key places stating how far/time to walk or cycle? Making better cycle routes and having more places to park bicycles? Encourage people to visit the town by train?

If you really have to have more car parking why not look at repainting existing car parking space, using side on space and one way systems. This has been shown scientifically to fit more spaces in than conventional parallel spacing. This would be significantly less expensive and less resource intense than the proposed design. What about solar panels and electric charging points? What about intelligent sign posting to car parks around the town?

I hope you will consider more sustainable options. We need a cleaner, greener, brighter future for our town.

115 Sheldon Road

As a resident of Berkhamsted, I am very concerned about the proposed plan to build a multistorey car park in Lower Kings Road.

Firstly, as you are very well aware Berkhamsted has a major traffic congestion problem. On the other hand, it does not appear to have a very significant parking issue, as 20 % of the car parking spaces are empty during the week days and 8 % during the weekends. This traffic congestion is causing significant and worrying air pollution that affects the young, the old and those with respiratory conditions. Siting the multistorey car park in this area of town will add to this congestion and pollution. Thus, far from having the desired effect of attracting people to the town it will deter visitors, as the town becomes a gridlocked, fume-choked nightmare. The councils own figures show these high pollution levels and Hertfordshire County Council Highways agencies have already raised their concerns about congestion.

Secondly, the proposed design of this car park is truly hideous, no amount of

computer generated "green washing" detract from the oppressive scale of this rectangular monstrosity. It will make this area very dark and oppressive. I frequently park my car or bicycle in this area in the evening when I attend events, as it is well lit and open space. A huge construction like this will create shadows and dark corners that will give rise to the perception if not the reality of an unsafe space. Also, this is right in the centre of Berkhamsted's historic conservation area. Some dreadful planning decisions were made in the 1970s that disfigured sections of the High Street. Do you really want to be responsible for further architectural vandalism in 21st century.

Thinking to the future, will we really need so much extra car parking? As more and more "bulky item" shopping goes on line and has home delivery demand for parking is likely to stabilise.

My final points are why doesn't the council look at addressing traffic congestion and parking through alternative means? We need to be encouraging people to leave the car at home. How about a regular, reliable round town bus service that collected people from the hillsides and brought them down into the High Street and collected them from the station? Did you know that people who visit town centres on foot or by public transport spend more money than those who came by car? Presumably as they feel less time constrained than drivers who have limited time in a metered car park? Isn't this what local businesses need? How about an out of town park and ride? Encouraging people to walk or cycle in? Put up informative signs to key places stating how far/time to walk or cycle? Making better cycle routes and having more places to park bicycles? Encourage people to visit the town by train?

If you really have to have more car parking why not look at repainting existing car parking space, using side on space and one way systems. This has been shown scientifically to fit more spaces in than conventional parallel spacing. This would be significantly less expensive and less resource intense than the proposed design. What about solar panels and electric charging points? What about intelligent sign posting to car parks around the town?

I hope you will consider more sustainable options. We need a cleaner, greener, brighter future for our town.

59 Egerton Road

Please note the general view of Berkhamsted's community in relation to the planned multi-story car park.

There are more advantageous solutions than those in the proposed plan and these should be carefully reviewed in advance of any decision being made.

The site in question is not supported by adequate infrastructure to cope with the increase in traffic, and conditions for the local community will be effected negatively.

While there are calls to help stimulate trade in the town, there are a number of other options that should not impact the already stretched infrastructure or the aesthetics of a conservation area that holds residential improvements to such high standards.

With kindest regards and optimism for a decision based on community interest

25 Upper Hall road

We would like to register our concerns regarding the proposed car park - planning application 4/00122/16/MFA. While conceding that Berkhamsted does require more car parking space, the proposed development seems of a scale and aesthetic appearance that is not in keeping with its surroundings, especially as it is situated within a conservation area.

We regret we are unable to attend the planning meeting but hope you will take our views into account.

57 Egerton Road

I am emailing to object to the high rise car park being built in Berkhamsted.

It is not needed and will spoil a beautiful area of the town. Please count my objection.

16 Gravel Path

I want to register my objections to the proposed car park to be built next to Waitrose.

The scheme as it stands, is a monstrosity at the heart of a beautiful market town.

132 Bridgewater Road

I cannot think why we are even contemplating additional parking in Berkhamsted town centre? At a time when the town is clogged with vehicles, their use should be discouraged not encouraged. If the council sees fit to continue with this madness, it should consider an underground facility. Stop throttling our town with vehicles and make space for people! So not build a multistory car park!

Spend the money on cycleways or a pedestrian area if there is money to burn!

High Fells, Rambling Way, Potten End

I would like to register my objection to the proposal to build a multi story car park in Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted. I have lived in Berkhamsted all my life and have NEVER been unable to park although it is true that the car park by Tesco is often very busy.

I strongly object not only because I believe there is not sufficient need and believe that further increasing parking will simply encourage more vehicles into Lower Kings

Road increasing traffic congestion there and in surrounding roads and at the traffic light controlled junction.

A car park in this position will be a blot on the landscape, overshadowing attractive listed buildings and blighting our lovely town. We wonder now how the building where Clintons Cards is and the recently demolished Police Station were ever approved – we are in danger of repeating the experience!

It is hard to justify the cost when there must be more worthy things needed in Dacorum, or possibly a cheaper parking option could be pursued for Berkhamsted – for example why not have a simpler, smaller structure rather like the station car park on the free car park over the canal behind Waitrose, or possibly on the car park behind Woods.

It seems very strange that the County Council puts enormous resources into encouraging sustainable transport – as it recognises that ‘improving’ facilities for cars usually exacerbates existing problems. I have and use a car regularly, as do most of us here but that does not mean that we should ruin our town by placing a hideous facility for parking cars in a central location where it would simply increase current congestion problems.

Cumberland House, Elm Grove

As a resident of Berkhamsted who would live within 150 metres of the proposed development I want to express my concern that the council and various other committees who have considered this building have not done the required level of due diligence with respect to increased traffic congestion as well as building within the required boundaries of a nature habitat.

Each year around Christmas and at various other heavy shopping periods during the year when the existing car park is busy, it results in long queues of traffic in both directions on Kings Road. Adding a lot of capacity for parking will increase the traffic and congestion to Kings Road on a regular basis which will impact the traffic on the high street and other roads around the train station. This multi storey car park will essentially make Berkhamsted unpassable in a car.

I urge you and your fellow councillors to vote against this proposed multi storey car park and do all you can to make sure it does not get approved and developed. Should you require further details please do not hesitate to contact me via the methods below.

30 Cross Oak Road

I write to express my concern at, and objection to, the afore-mentioned development.

The local councils (Town & District) have chosen to proceed with this project without adequate consultation with the citizens of the town

Why has there not been any detailed consultation with residents, such as was carried out for the proposed residents parking scheme some years ago?

A costly, unwanted development is set to be foisted on the town, whilst many other essential services in the area continue to suffer from heavy cuts

Proposed development would represent a **permanent blot on the landscape of central Berkhamsted**

An exceedingly ugly building that is completely out of proportion with the surroundings, not to mention wholly inappropriate for a historic Conservation Area

Such a development is completely at odds with any sustainable transport policy

The streets in the immediate vicinity (Lower Kings Road, High Street, etc) are already very heavily congested much of the time, this MSCP would only make things far worse

Making journeys across the town time consuming and frustrating

Also frequently breaching safe pollution limits

This development would in fact only serve to encourage more short term car journeys (and ever more congestion and pollution) in the town centre

When we should be doing all we can to discourage these and to encourage people to walk or use more sustainable forms of transport (on both health and environmental grounds)It never ceases to amaze me how many of my immediate neighbours, towards the bottom of Cross Oak Road, make short car journeys within the town, rather than simply walking the short distance to the centre

Furthermore, this MCSP will do nothing to alleviate the problems associated with commuter parking in many parts of the town

Access

The site already has serious access issues in its present guise, with pedestrians exposed to danger when crossing the access from the Lower Kings Road

The proposed development will only serve to compound these issues

10 New Street

I object to the car park being built, it's totally not needed and is against the wishes of all local residents.

28 London Road

This is completely out of proportion to the rest of the town centre and a ridiculous proposal.

20 Hall Park Gate

The proposal is ill-conceived and will not address any of the parking or traffic problems in the town centre. It will add to them. The majority of problems are caused by people queuing for free parking at Waitrose and ignoring pay spaces. It will worsen traffic & congestion on Lower Kings Road and beyond. Worsen the Kings Road traffic-lights experience. Dominate the landscape, overshadowing listed building. Cut off the existing pedestrian short-cut across town. Lead to an increase air pollution. It is inappropriate development in a conservation area.

36 Swing Gate Lane

As a local resident I believe the parking in Berkhamsted is sufficient for the current needs of the town. Building a multi story car park near Waitrose will only in courage more traffic in roads not built for it. People can always park at the new multi story at the station and walk the short distance into town. I also walk across the current car park for accessing the river and playground with my children and the multi story will block this route and make crossing Lower Kings road more hazardous than it currently is.

5 Kitsbury Road

The general traffic in the proximity with be intolerably worsened. The air quality there already is unacceptably high and more traffic will push it even higher.

4 Grantham Mews

I think this would be a disaster for the town. It is completely out of character and unnecessary. It would be an eyesore and would lead to traffic getting worse in Lower Kings Road. I sincerely hope it doesn't go ahead.

18 Cedar Road

1. The air pollution that will be generated by adding to the traffic in the town centre, especially by probable queuing to access the proposed car park is unacceptable.
2. The height of the building is intrusive on the surroundings
3. The appearance of the building would dominate the conservation area.

The Firs

I wish to object to the plans to build a large multi storey car park on Lower Kings Road.

The plans are not in keeping with this historic town and conservation area, the car park will mean significant additional traffic congestion and worsen an already busy junction in town whilst leading to higher car emissions when cars are queuing up at the junction. The plans go against local and national policy of sustainable transport.

21 Hall Park Gate

I object to this planning application for the following reasons:

- Bulk and size to neighbouring properties. The exception is the Waitrose building, which is also large but too late to fix now. There are other examples of new builds where not sufficient attention was paid to bulk and size eg Stag Lane, New Lodge.
- With flexible working practices many station users are adhoc travellers and therefore do not gain financially from weekly/monthly season tickets therefore parking at the MSCP will be financial attractive.
- Green walls do not work. The initial impact is good and assists with the process of planning approval. They soon become too costly to maintain so become brown walls giving the impression of an uncared building.
- MSCP are perceived high risk to personal security at night. They will not be the parking space of choice.
- Dimensions of the individual car park spaces are too small.
- There is more parking land adjacent to Water Lane. May be the owner would be willing to part with this for a price!
- A creative thought - the area between Lower Kings Road and St Johns Well lane includes parking areas managed by The Council, Waitrose and Marks and Spencer. If these were amalgamated then additional parking space would be created by the removal of fences and walls.

45 Wingrave Road

I object as I think the proposed structure is too large for Berkhamsted town centre and out of keeping with its surroundings.

59 Egerton Road

The site in question is ill-equipped to support the volume of users as access is already strained by existing traffic flows.

There are more advantageous solutions for the town that do not seem to have been considered.

The recommendation that this application is to be past is misplaced and detrimental to the community.

74 Upper Hall Park

I would like to register my objection to this proposal on the basis that the car park would be an unnecessary eyesore and totally dominate the area. It would also lead to considerable congestion in Lower Kings Road, where the entrance and exit junction is simply not capable of coping with the additional traffic that a car park of this size would attract. There is plenty of parking in Berkhamsted apart from maybe on the Saturday leading up to Christmas. Perhaps if the issue is a lack of short term parking then the Council could instead reclassify the current long term parking spaces in the St John's Well Lane car park, which are rarely used, and maybe even do a deal to make more use of the station car park for long term parking?

Partridge Close

This scheme is inappropriate in terms of scale and location. It will cause further congestion in the centre of town. Gridlock will ensue in the surrounding roads. I urge the Council to reconsider this ill judged development.

57 George Street

I OBJECT to the above application

Grafton House, Cross Oak Road

I know we need more parking in Berkhamsted but I strongly oppose to this eyesore that is proposed. Is there anyway it could be made more in keeping with the rest of the town? Maybe in a different location?

I think the traffic will be slowed down considerably. At the moment it is very hard to turn right up Lower Kings Road coming from the present carpark due to the traffic jam going up to the lights from the station, which is particularly bad at school pick up times and certain commuter trains. You have to patiently wait until someone lets you out which is hard as they have been waiting in the queue for the lights to change for probably longer than you have. The huge Waitrose lorries will find it hard to turn into the delivery bay at the back of the shop.

20 Hall Park

I would like to record my objection to the proposed multi stores carpark off Lower Kings Road

14 Upper Hall Park

I write to protest against the proposed multi-storey car park in Berkhamsted.

The proposal is completely out of scale with the rest of the town and wholly inappropriate. It is an eyesore - one ironically well able to replace the ghastly 1960's police station that has just been demolished.

I'm sure that more car parking is needed, as an unfortunate consequence of having ever more houses imposed upon the town, but if this has to be then it is essential that what is provided is sympathetic to and in scale with the existing infrastructure. This fails on both counts.

I can well imagine that cost is paramount in bringing this proposal forward. To my mind, all proposals for consideration must be sympathetic to the architectural style and general appearance of the town. In the case of Berkhamsted, a car park in this location should be built underground as it would be in most similar cities in Europe where town centres are more valued than they are here. And if that is not affordable, then it should not be built at all.

In technical terms this is quite achievable, as we surely know from the extensive developments below the surface (and below the water table) in London. There are plenty of examples to consider, for example from Stade, a town near Hamburg in northern Germany. Under this market square (Am Sande, see attached map) is a car park for 450 cars. Stade is an historic town - they clearly felt it was worth preserving.

We seem to be aware of the price of everything and the value of nothing.

3 Crossfield Close

I object strongly to the construction of the proposed, multi-storey car park in Berkhamsted. The size proposed is way too big and certainly more than this town needs. It is inappropriate, ill-conceived and will be a blot on our beautiful town. Please reconsider before passing this proposal.

Hill Top Bell Lane,

I have already made representations regarding the above, but would like to do so again. The proposed car park would be highly damaging to the existing character of Berkhamsted, a town of some historic importance. The proposed development is clearly contrary to many of DBC's planning policies, and no good case has been made that the building is necessary or even that it will help reduce congestion. If the council gives approval to it, it will be acting with flagrant disregard for the wishes of most inhabitants of the town. To approve the car park would be an act of vandalism which would have a negative impact on Berkhamsted and its residents for decades to come.

River View, Water End Moor, Water End

I am writing to register my strong objection to the planning committee approving the scheme to build a monstrous multi-level car park in Berkhamsted. I do not live in the town, but do live in Dacorum and work and regularly visit Berkhamsted for shopping and recreation.

I understand the area is a Conservation Area. The scheme would not appear to be in keeping with such a designation.

It is disappointing that such unpleasant changes are being considered to accommodate the motor car when more sustainable forms of transport are almost ignored by Dacorum.

Frithsden, Nr Hemel Hempstead

I would like to register my strong objection to the construction of a multi-storey car park next to Waitrose. As a local business we use the current car park on a regular basis and have never been unable to park. Whilst there is no doubt that more car parking spaces are required, I urge the council to consider all other possibilities, before agreeing to his blight on the landscape. Berkhamsted is a handsome town and its facilities should compliment it, thus enhancing visitor numbers to the town and its continued prosperity.

This proposal is right up there with some of the worst planning decisions of the 60's and 70's; one look down the high street and these atrocities stick out like a sore thumb. Please, please consider a more suitable option, such as park and ride or placing more car parking spaces away from the dead centre of town.

4 Peacocks Close

I would like to state my objection to proposed car park to be built beside Waitrose .

I feel it is not necessary as we should not encourage more cars in the town and it will also be an eye sore to the aesthetic surroundings in Berkhamsted.

53 Greenway

I am writing to object to the current plans for the proposed car park on the lower kings road.

The town will not benefit in any way from a huge car park in that spot. It will increase congestion, pollution, cars and concrete, and decrease the attractiveness of the town very significantly. Do you really want to put in another building like the ugly old building just demolished on the cross roads?

Why not be forward looking, community and environmentally friendly as a council?? Please reconsider and put something in that you can be proud of.

4 Grantham Mews

As a resident of Berkhamsted I feel compelled to write to you, to urge you to reject plans for a multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road. My reasons for this are below:

- This type of structure is not at all in keeping with this lovely historic town and conservation area, and the plan is structurally out of scale in comparison to local buildings
- Creation of this car park will increase traffic congestion to Lower Kings Road, which is already one of the busiest junctions in town
- Existing emissions in this area are already dangerously close to EU limits
- Building this structure goes against local feeling, and will be an eyesore upon our small market town

I urge you to consider local feeling, and dispense with the idea of building a multi-storey car park in Berkhamsted.

28 Upper Hall Park

I have already signed the petition against the high rise car park in Berkhamsted but I wanted to write to you directly to express my concern.

I am totally against the proposal. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 22 years and have seen the growth in housing and thus people and parking issues. Whilst the current arrangements would seem inadequate it would be a disaster to opt for the proposed car park. It would not only be an eyesore and totally out of keeping with the historic nature of Berkhamsted, but it would most likely create more problems than it solves. The reason for the latter is one of sufficient access in that the already lengthy queues in Lower Kings Road would actually get worse and even more so, should (as is often this case with these car parks) there be an issue with the entry barrier chaos would ensue.

In the past the high street itself has been subjected to building upper storeys to shops which are out of keeping with the beauty of the building itself eg Clintons opposite the former police station. Towns like Thame however have to their credit preserved the town. I wonder if this is because Oxfordshire takes issues of historical importance more seriously than Dacorum. It is important to remember that Berkhamsted is not Hemel Hempstead and therefore the planning approach should reflect this.

I accordingly strongly urge you to reject the proposal on Thursday.

24 Hill View

I am writing to object about the carpark being built in lower kings road ,berkhamsted. The traffic jams will only be added to, it is already so busy to get in and out of town. The building itself is not in keeping with our beautiful town.

8 Eggesfield Close, Northchurch

I wish to register my strongest disagreement to the proposed multi-storey car park in Berkhamsted. In the interests of brevity, I have bullet pointed my objections. They are in no particular order of priority.

- the proposed design is totally against the style of the town. Starkly different to anything nearby. To paraphrase a prominent member of our Royal Family, a carbuncle!
- the surrounding roads are not capable of carrying the potential increase in traffic volume.
- in this current climate of a crisis in our national health, increases in obesity and type 2 diabetes, we (DBC) should be looking at ways to encourage people out of their cars and onto their feet or bicycles. Improve car free infrastructure with the money instead: cycle paths, pedestrian only areas, cycle parking etc.

Thank you for your time. I hope that Dacorum Borough Council see sense and vote against this poorly conceived idea. It is neither wanted nor needed by many of the people of Berkhamsted.

Kitsbury Road

I understand that there is a vote on the Berkhamsted multi-story car park this week. I have signed the petition opposing this and would formally like to register my opposition to the car park.

I have read many of the relevant policies and have the following specific objections:

1. Why do we need more parking? Demand for parking is unlimited, in particular given the large number of high density developments underway in Berkhamsted and surrounding towns. Dacorum should be controlling the demand for parking, rather than increasing parking supply.

2. What consideration has been given to reducing demand, in terms of park and ride, increased public transport, increasing parking restrictions, increasing the cost of parking? No-one who lives in Berkhamsted wants to see an increase in traffic; an increase in parking availability will increase the numbers of people travelling by car. Traffic management measures would be cheaper, more effective, and more in line with Dacorum's environmental policies
3. I do not see how the car park is compliant with conservation area guidance – relevant quotes include:

"Views

The setting of the conservation area is very important and development which impacts in a detrimental way upon the immediate setting and longer views into and from the conservation area will be resisted."

This development will significantly impact views from both sides of the valley, from Kings Road, and from Canal Fields – how is this consistent?

"Berkhamsted's layout has evolved over time through a series of town planning events relating to the period in which they were set, unlike

villages that appear to have a more 'unplanned' or organic nature. As such, the buildings and ancillary structures within the town contribute to its unique character. Any future development should respond positively to its existing layout /

form. Whilst, there is some scope / opportunity for both small-scale and large scale re-development within the conservation area, **the character of the area has been compromised as a result of some poor quality infilling, large-scale developments and unsympathetic alterations"**

This development is wholly inconsistent with it's surrounding buildings and will permanently change the character of the canal and canal fields area

There are many other points I could raise however please formally recognise this objection. I would appreciate a response to the above points.

The Byre, Church Road, Little Gaddesden

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to build a multi Storey Car park on the site of the existing car park next to Waitrose in Lower kings Road. The grounds for my objection are :-

1. The current car park is currently under utilised and when the new Lidl supermarket between Northchurch and Berkhamsted opens, it is likely to diminish further.
2. The proposed new, extremely ugly, building would be a permanent eyesore in the centre of an historic market town, which possesses a number of buildings of architectural interest.

3. Publicity for this proposal has been poor and there is widespread ignorance of it. Further thought needs to be given as to how existing parking facilities on the outskirts of the town could be improved before the ambience of Berkhamsted is damaged for ever.

1 Castle Hill Close

I wish to object to the planning application for a new car park in Lower Kings Road. The council should be considering its duty to promote:

Sustainable transport

Healthy living

Sensible traffic flows

I consider that an enlarged parking facility would in no way enhance any of the above. In addition, as a regular visitor to Berkhamsted town centre, I observe there to be few occasions when all parking places are taken. There appears to be limited need for additional parking capacity.

18 Cedar Road

I would like to enter a strong objection to the building of a multi-storey car park in the existing car park area at Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted. There seems to have been very little proper consultation regarding the scheme, since most people in the town are totally unaware of what is being planned.

My first reason for objecting is that the proposed building will lie within the heart of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area, and my feeling is that to place such a large building within this area is wholly inappropriate, since it will detract from the setting. The sheer bulk of the building would have an extremely troubling visual effect on that part of the conservation area, placing a 'carbuncle' in the neighbourhood of many listed buildings. Such a developments would be categorically against the guiding policies for conservation areas.

Secondly, it is not clear to me that there is any need for the 200-plus additional parking spaces, since whenever I go through the Lower Kings Road car park there always seem to be spaces available.

Thirdly, there is no mention of any measures being taken to improve traffic flows within the town, and the additional traffic that such a facility will encourage is going to make an already bad situation considerably worse. Quite often there are queues of traffic waiting to turn into the existing Lower Kings Road car park, and this tends to cause a jam for motorists using the road – in BOTH directions – that is, on either side of the existing entrance to the car park and to the 'Waitrose' store's own private car park beyond. In addition to this there is already too much congestion at the Kings Road/ High Street traffic lights in the centre of the town and this situation is

likely to be made considerably worse due to the additional traffic that will be attracted by the 200 additional car spaces.

Fourthly, it has already been established that pollution levels within the town are too high, and in excess of existing limits; to attract even more traffic in this way can only worsen this situation.

Fifthly, the proposed building would seriously affect those townspeople who are currently able to use the existing car park as a short-cut when heading for the North-west part of the Town.

Please would you accept this objection and the above reasons, bringing it and them to the notice of the Council?

36 London Road

I'd like to register my objection to the proposed development of a multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted.

My primary objection is on aesthetic grounds - the proposed height of the building, the materials chosen and the effect of the considerable mass of the building, in what is currently an open area with a pleasant skyline and young trees, is in contravention to the principles guiding development in the Berkhamsted Conservation area.

The current proposal should be reviewed to modify the design to produce a building that will enhance the townscape of Berkhamsted and will be an architectural asset for the future.

Landswood Shootersway

I understand that there is a DCC meeting on Thursday this week where the proposed Multi-Storey car park in Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted will be discussed.

Can I please register my wife and myself's strong objection to this proposal. Lower Kings Road is already a major bottleneck at many times of day - particularly during the morning and evening rush hour when Commuters are traveling to and fro the station. However, it can often be bad at other times with delivery vehicles blocking access and the Traffic Lights having a very limited access time for crossing the major junction with the High Street and Upper Kings Road. I have often experienced long delays transiting Lower Kings Road, waiting for some 3 sets of traffic light changes.

To build an increased level of car parking in the proposed location will lead to grid-lock! I accept fully that there is a need for additional parking in the centre of Berkhamsted, but surely the logical place for a new multi- storey car park is on the other side of Waitrose, where access will be less of a problem. There is also far more space!

I should be grateful if you would formally register this response.

1 Castle Gateway

I am writing in advance of the Council meeting on Thursday, 29 September, which will decide on the planning application in respect of a multi storey car park in Lower King's Road, Berkhamsted. I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to this planning proposal which would alter the character of what is and should remain a small market town of historical significance. To have a modern ugly multi storey car park in the middle of the town can only be described as a blot on the landscape. I fully accept that with the population of Berkhamsted growing with recent developments on the edge of the town that car parking may be becoming an issue for those who cannot walk into town. I refuse to believe, however, that there is no alternative to what is proposed and that additional car parking facilities cannot be provided elsewhere that would not be such an eyesore. Has any research been undertaken as to the optimum number of additional spaces required to match expectations over the coming years. Is it as many as would be provided by a multi-storey car park? Can the car park not be so multi-storey? For instance, has anyone considered increasing the parking available at Canal Fields which is often full and where many parents drive to use the facilities of the playground, skatepark, tennis club and football club. Could not a two-tier car park be located there to serve that area and the town? We also have to remember that Lidl, which is due to come to Berkhamsted, will have car parking spaces from which it will be possible to walk into town. To have a forbidding multi-storey development slap bang in the middle of our ancient town will completely transform the nature and feel of the town. I wish to register my objection.

15 Doctors Commons Road

Please register my opposition to the proposed high rise car park. I would only be in favour of an additional car park if it was built underground. I understand that this would significantly increase the cost but it would also improve the appearance and not detract from Berkhamsted's attractive appearance which would be damaged with this proposed car park.

15 Shootersway Park

I am writing to object to the plans for a multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road in Berkhamsted.

I am resident and have been for over 40 years. Residents have not been consulted on these plans which are not in keeping with this lovely historic town and conservation area. Moreover, it will bring significant additional traffic congestion to Lower Kings Road which is already the busiest junction in the town and existing emission in this area are already dangerously close to EU limits. There are other alternatives to this large 4 storey, 8 floor car park which could be considered and should be considered.

The Courtyard, Woodcock Hill, Durrants Lane

I cannot believe that this Car Park is still being considered.

Here are my objections which I would appreciate if you could add to the long list which you will no doubt already have received.

1. The general Berkhamsted public has hardly been informed about this at all. If this was truly a proposal that you felt there would have been a lot of support for, then the council would have had posters up around the town, maybe a small display in a local area eg. Library so that everyone was made aware of this. Instead it seems like this is “sneaking in” via the back door and only raises the question is there a “hidden agenda” in this proposal.
2. Why can't a building be put up on the other side of the canal, e.g.. near the tennis courts for people who wish to come shopping in Berkhamsted.
3. I feel strongly that if parking is limited within the central areas, it should be given in order of preference to: a) Elderly/ Disabled people, b) Mothers with babies in Prams c) people who do their shopping in Waitrose as it would not be practical to carry heavy shopping over the bridge (although I think Waitrose will still keep their parking areas).
4. A car park of the proposed design would not be in keeping with the architectural nature and “feeling” of Berkhamsted, it could in fact be the demise of Berkhamsted as a unique and original pleasant country town.
5. I feel the proposed placement of the Car Park would lead to horrendous traffic difficulties, and not solve the problem, but only exacerbate traffic flow problems around Berkhamsted.

It is only right that the objections of the public be raised and considered at this meeting - otherwise what is the meaning of democracy!

89 George Street

I was quite shocked to read of a proposed multi-storey car park plan for Lower Kings Road.

I moved to Berkhamsted 5 years ago because I liked this lovely old Norman town, still small, full of character and history and yet offering all necessary facilities. One of the main reasons I chose Berkhamsted was because of the Grand Union Canal running through it and the beautiful Chiltern countryside just outside within easy walking distance, including Ashridge, the largest area of forest in the country protected by the National Trust.

Living in a small 2 up, 2 down cottage in George Street, I can easily walk into town. However, I am retired and have had certain health problems which means that sometimes I do need to drive, and I certainly do if I have a big supermarket shop to do. I have never had a problem parking in Berkhamsted, I have never used a parking meter and only occasionally used a paying car park. My income is very limited so I shop very selectively and carefully mainly at Waitrose.

Having lived in a variety of places in this country, as well as in the developing world, I have never known a junction where one has to wait such a long time for the traffic

lights to change as at the main crossroads in the centre of our town (High Street/Kings Road). Having a huge 8 floor car park down Lower Kings Road would obviously make the wait at this road junction even longer. The emissions from cars, vans, lorries etc using this junction are already extremely high and close to the limits imposed by the EU (whether in or out of the EU this is a danger to the health of the public).

So, I object to this proposal for the following reasons:

1. It is totally unsuitable architecturally for the historic and attractive town of Berkhamsted
2. It is unnecessary and far too big for Berkhamsted
3. Emissions, already dangerously high, would increase
4. Traffic congestion in the centre of the town would increase

Please ensure that my opinion is taken into consideration.

Garden House, Cross Oak Road

I wish to express my strong objection to the planning application 4/00122/16/MFA. Others, including Berkhamsted Parking Forum, will have put their case more eloquently and expertly on planning grounds than I but I would like to make the following points:-

1. There has been a conspicuous lack of consultation with local residents over what is clearly a contentious proposal.

2. The design of the structure proposed takes no account of the conservation area in which it is to be sited. It is grossly overscale, overweening and is intended to be constructed of inappropriate materials, particularly in respect of its external appearance.

3. Its presence will significantly increase the traffic congestion and carbon emissions in an area already overburdened with such problems.

The whole issue of congestion and parking in Berkhamsted needs to be considered as a entity, including the knock-on effects of the level of car-parking charges for commuters at the station, the present lack of restrictions on street parking, particularly after 6p.m. in Lower King's Road, and the increasing prevalence throughout the town of pavement parking to the detriment of pedestrians. While these are not all issues directly connected with this application they are sufficiently important to require address before anything on the disproportionate scale of the present proposal is contemplated.

Not for the first time are the residents of Berkhamsted faced with a lack of consultation on the part of DBC, a wholly inappropriate example of an architect's self-indulgence and a potential waste of public money which could be better spent on retaining care facilities within the town. Furthermore, what is the point in designating Conservation Areas if their principles can be traduced so readily?

16 Lombardy Drive

I would like to reiterate my objection to the proposed car park in Berkhamsted due to be discussed at the council on the 29th September

I have made the reasons for my objection clear in previous emails some of which I reiterate below

1 the proposed development is likely to increase the pull of cars to Berkhamsted so in a few years there will be more demand for carparking the council need to consider alternatives.

2 the research methodology that "demonstrated " the need for the carpark is flawed

3 the proposed style of the car park development is not in line with the character of the area

4 the previous overdevelopment allowed by the council previously took away carparking that it now proposes to replace

I cannot attend the meeting on the 29th but want my objection noted

162 George Street

I am writing to object to the planning application as above on the grounds that the proposal is completely out of keeping with the character of Berkhamsted as an historic town and runs completely counter to the designation of much of the town as a conservation area. The size, and in particular the proposed height, of the development is completely out of scale with the surrounding buildings. I have seen other examples of similar multi-storey car parks built in historic town centres which radically change the existing character of the area. All of them, in my view, have detracted from the previous attractiveness of the local area.

12 Bridgewater Road

I am writing to object to the building of the high-rise car park in Berkhamsted. I feel that this would spoil the character of the town and is unnecessary as the car park seems to function perfectly well at present and I have always been able to find a space there, even at peak times. I hope the council will take my email into consideration

9 Oakwood

I am writing to object to the planned car park on Lower Kings Road in Berkhamsted. This is on several grounds:

- the size of the car park is completely out of proportion for the area
- the design of the car park is completely out of character for this attractive market town

- the location of the enlarged car park is ill-conceived since the congestion it would cause will impact on both trade in the town and commuters to and from the train station

- the area would become less safe for pedestrians (including families with prams and young children)

I cannot imagine that the car park could proceed for any one of the above reasons, let alone for all four reasons above. If parking is an issue for the town, another solution must be found. The town centre should not be compromised in this way.

I would urge you to cease with this proposal.

12 Normandy Drive

I wholeheartedly object to the the multi-storey parking scheme proposed for central Berkhamsted.

The traffic on Lower Kings road is already very heavy and encouraging more drivers into Berkhamsted is obviously not the answer. This proposal flies in the face of most modern town planning policies and is certainly not aligned with any credible modern environmental policy. I also have concerns about safety at night for residents. As for the actual design itself... what were the architects thinking? It is hideous and not at all in keeping with the rest of the town centre.

Has there been a genuine attempt to make all local residents aware of the plans and give them an opportunity to express their views? I only found out about this proposal through a concerned friend. Where were all the notices advising residents of the plans? I certainly didn't see any and yet I walk through the town centre regularly. It seems to me like there has been a deliberate attempt to rush this through behind the backs of locals - probably because the planners knew there would be vociferous objections.

Stop this thoughtless proposal now and please suggest some sensible alternatives.

21 St. Katharine's Way

I am objecting to the proposal to build a high rise car park in the middle of Berkhamsted. Please do not spoil our lovely town in this way.

150 Bridgewater Road

I would like to object to the above proposed development for a number of reasons as below:

- It is unacceptable in terms of it's visual impact on the surrounding street scene. It will be over-bearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity.

- The proposed structure will have a negative effect on the character of the area, turning it from the current small town car park to a much more imposing and overbearing one.

- Adverse impact on highway safety owing to the significant increase in the volume of traffic that this development is likely to cause.

It is my view that there is more than enough available parking within Berkhamsted, including that at the station which has low use over the weekends. As such I do not believe that the proposed development is actually necessary and all it will serve to do is adversely impact on the local area by blighting it with an inappropriate building and generating a significant increase in road traffic which could lead to more accidents.

30 Sheldon Way

I object because it will be an eyesore to the town and will not make a difference to congestion issues in the town - only add to them! Also many rail commuters use the car park as a short cut to the high street on their walks home, and I worry it would not feel safe to walk through in the dark or late at night.

4 Crew Curve

This unnecessary eyesore will blight the historic town of Berkhamsted forever. We need to find ways of cutting down the traffic in town not provide places for more cars to park. Lower Kings Road, which is already congested when people want to enter or leave the car park & Waitrose store, will be a thousand times worse if this goes ahead.

Why do the artists impressions show so few people in this always busy area? Is it an attempt to fool us into thinking it won't be so bad?

The air pollution in that area has already been tested and found to be bad but how much worse it will be with so many more vehicles queueing to get into a high-rise car park.

Is this the decision of people who don't live in the town, like many other recent ones? It should be for the people of Berkhamsted to decide not traders who are only here in business hours making money, or district officials who don't care about us but do want more trade whatever.

232 High Street

Object to this planning application for the following reasons:

The impact of extra traffic in an already congested area has not been properly assessed. There are already queues at busy times of the day, and no tested solution has been put forward. Lower Kings Road is simply not a big enough road to cope with additional traffic as those of us who live and work in the town know.

There has not been adequate consultation with the community that this will affect. The revised plans were sent out without a clear indication of where changes had been made, the public meeting in the summer was held with minimal notice and publicity, at a time when many people were away, and there has been a general lack of engagement with the local community.

The design and size of the building is not in keeping with the character of the town. Environmentally, this is a very poor plan, and conflicts with policies to reduce car usage.

There seems to have been very little work done to assess the likely need for these extra parking spaces in this location. This afternoon there were 70 empty spaces in the car park at 3.30 - not an unusual occurrence.

Basically, this has been a flawed process and there are far too many unanswered questions. For such a large development, which will have a significant impact on traffic and the environment, there should be general support from the local community, but this has not been adequately evaluated. I have no confidence at all in this planning process.

23 Hall Park

It would appear that no proper thought has been given to the serious traffic congestion which will occur in Lower Kings Road. The proposed building is a total eyesore in a conservation area. There has been no proper consultation in the town and among the population of Berkhamsted. It seems that a notice or two spread around is regarded as sufficient consultation. It is not. This is planning overload at its worst.

2 Marlin Copse

I object to this application for several reasons but primarily because it will encourage more cars into the town centre.

The town is already suffering from too much traffic which only gets worse as more homes are built.

The proposal is far too big for a town of this size, will spoil views and remove open space in the town centre.

Instead of this we should be looking for parking on the outskirts of the town to encourage walking into town.

The huge amount of money proposed here could be much better spent on creating parking elsewhere, traffic calming measures, traffic lights at dangerous junctions and generally improving safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

Even funding improved Christmas lights for the next 300 years would be a better use.

43 Ellesmere Road

It will be an eyesore and blight the town forever.

18 Priory Gardens

We object as the proposed development is contrary to the Local Development Plan. First, it will encourage more car journeys, generating more traffic in an area which is already known to be a bottleneck and a risk to pedestrians and cyclists. Policy 11g states a development must not compromise the safe and free flow of traffic on existing roads: this development would.

Secondly, it does not support the council's stated aim of giving priority to walking and more sustainable modes of transport (policy 49 of the LDP). Better cycling routes, or indeed better bus services and a bus turning area would have far less impact than the proposed MSCP.

8 Midcroft House

I am astonished to learn that the Dacorum Planning Officer is recommending pushing ahead with this scheme, in spite of the obvious problems it will add to. I write as both a driver and cyclist, who regularly comes into Berkhamsted (I sing with the parish choir and am often involved in music events). As a driver, I would say that I have never had difficulty parking, though it is clear just how inadequate Berkhamsted's roads themselves are for the levels of traffic they already see, and a multistorey car park will encourage far greater use of roads that are already clogged with traffic. For these reasons I always cycle when possible, but as a cyclist I would add that the current traffic problems make it a somewhat treacherous option and I have real concerns about the safety of the many of us on bikes. Again, why on earth are you even contemplating adding to that problem?

If you have money to spend, there is a clear alternative here, which is to improve the infrastructure for cyclists and discourage car use in Berkhamsted. Perhaps you could also look at doing something about the cycle path up to Tring Station, currently in so dilapidated a state that it, too, poses safety problems, to make a train journey into Berkhamsted a more desirable option as well?

26 North Road

Traffic at that junction in Lower Kings Road. At many times in the day this road is very congested and blocked. More traffic trying to enter and leave the car park will surely add to this. Lower Kings Road is major route in the town leading to the station and an important crossing of the railway.

Winter Cottage, Bell Lane, Northchurch

I would like you to register my objection to the proposed high rise car park that you will be voting on this Thursday. The whole point of conservation areas in our historic town is to prevent people from constructing unsuitable and unsightly buildings in Berkhamsted.

It therefore seems amazing that our planning committee are being encouraged to vote in favour of a high rise car park when it is obviously going to be an eyesore! There is no doubt that there exists a car parking problem in the town but this is not the answer, please reconsider your final decision and vote against this proposal.

8 Coram Close

I am writing to voice my objection in the strongest possible way to the above planning application which has just come to my attention (being very poorly publicized in the town itself). It is unjustifiably large and will detract tremendously from the appearance and character of our town as well as cause serious safety concerns.

It is not at all in keeping with the historic nature of the town - particularly the Conservation area and canal corridor and it's size is entirely out of proportion to any need for additional car parks in the area. The existing car park is rarely full, apart

from the occasional weekend mornings and evening, and even then, an 8 story car park with space for 312 cars is completely unnecessary. As a regular driver in this area, in the 8 years I have been here, have only once or twice found difficulty parking in the town centre. I am unsure who this proposed development is supposed to be benefiting, as certainly not the residents of the town, none of whom I know feel the need for something like this.

The Conservation Area and surrounds are a vital and integral part of the town's character necessary to the heritage, quality and appearance of Berkhamsted, and is one of the primary reasons we moved here. This open space behind the high street, adds light and space to the town. The town centre would only feel more built up, and crowded with a structure of this size here.

Open space and natural light are already at a premium, and the little space that remains is an extremely important asset to the area, and should not be a target of developer's profits. The centre of Berkhamsted needs to retain the space and open air it has; the height of the proposed car park would create an overbearing and dominating impression.

Lower Kings Road and the junction with the High Street is an already congested area - building such a monstrosity will only exacerbate this problem. Other alternatives should be closely examined and discussed. Increased traffic would add further worrying pressure to an already congested area and have serious implications for safety. Additionally and significantly - Berkhamsted is a town full of families and children; this is a heavily used pedestrian area and any increase in traffic will be a serious safety concern which must be addressed.

This plan is entirely against local and national policy which promotes sustainable transport.

There has been no collaborative consultation with residents of Berkhamsted.

The **Berkhamsted Place Strategy** issued by Dacorum Council states that any new development "*respects and protects the built and natural heritage of the town, the canalside environment, and the character of neighbourhoods.*" Clearly this proposal entirely ignores this Strategy.

23 Finch Road

I'd like to voice my objections to the proposed multi-storey car park in Berkhamsted. Not only will this be an eyesore but it will greatly further increase the traffic and pollution problems along the high street, lower kings road, kings road, and at the central traffic lights. Everyone I know who lives in or around Berkhamsted thinks it is

an ill thought out proposal. Please can you pass on these objections to the relevant parties involved. In summary the I object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Not at all in keeping with the historic town and conservation area
- Significant extra traffic, noise and pollution in the already busiest junction in the town
- Emissions may exceed EU limits
- Should be encouraging people to walk and cycle more instead of driving
- Residents have not been consulted widely enough on this matter

15 Queens Road

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed multi-stored car park on Lower Kings Road, Berkhamsted.

I am a Berkhamsted resident and I object for the following reasons:

1. Sticking a multi-storey car park in the middle of a historic town like Berkhamsted is lazy planning and not the right solution to the parking problem in our town. It is an eyesore and will ruin the centre of the town. I don't understand why an underground car park wasn't considered? Surely there are more imaginative solutions that will not completely change the centre of the town.

2. Parking is a problem only at certain parts of the day - for the rest of the time it will stand empty. This means that it could become a crime hot spot, youths congregating. Herts CC should be encouraging residents to be healthy and walk for small items, not jump in their cars.

3. It will cause significant congestions to an already busy part of town and I understand that the emissions in that area are already dangerously close to EU levels

4. It will draw more cars into the centre of Berkhamsted, making the traffic and queuing into the centre of town worse than it already is.

5. The disruption caused during the building process will have a detrimental impact on local businesses and exacerbate the local traffic problem in that area.

Herts County Council have the opportunity to do something really creative rather than plonking an expensive eye sore in the middle of our historic town. I urge you not to go through with this ill-thought out car park.

Hilltop, Bell Lane

I understand that the council will consider the planning application mentioned above this Thursday. I have already made representations but again urge the council to reconsider this proposal.

The proposed car park would be highly damaging to the existing character of Berkhamsted, a town of some historic importance. The proposed development is clearly contrary to many of DBC's planning policies, and no good case has been

made that the building is necessary or that it will help reduce congestion - in fact, it appears highly likely to increase traffic in the centre of the town. If the council gives approval to it, it will be acting with flagrant disregard for the wishes of many inhabitants of the town. Permitting the car park to be built will have a negative impact on Berkhamsted and its residents for decades to come.

8 Kings Avenue

I would like to register my opposition to the proposed multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road, in Berkhamsted.

It's total out of keeping with the general feel of the town.

The traffic entering from Lower Kings Road will lead to congestion, it's busy even now.

118 Firhill Road, London

I would like to object to the proposed plan to build a multi-storey car park in Lower Kings Road.

I do not believe that it would be in keeping with the local area. Berkhamsted is a beautiful town and the addition of an ugly parking structure would be incredibly detrimental to this historic town.

I lived in Berkhamsted up until the age of 18 when I went to university, my mother still lives in the same house that I lived in for my entire childhood. I have a strong connection to Berkhamsted and care deeply for it and sincerely hope these plans are changed considerably as I feel there are better alternatives to a stupidly large unnecessary parking structure.

69 Greenway

With reference to Objection to Car Park Planning Application 4/00122/16/MFA at Lower Kings Road Berkhamsted.

My objection to the scheme is as follows:

Having lived in the town for 30 years and seen it grow and prosper I think it would be a retrograde step to invite even more traffic to park in the middle of the town in the site which you propose.

I do not consider it to be the answer to the town's ongoing parking problems.

My main objection is the amount of traffic it will engender in Lower Kings Road.

I think a more effective answer is to look at a Park and Ride scheme.

Meanwhile the Station car park remains under used.

6 Bridgewater Road

I am writing to OBJECT to the above planning application for the proposed multi-storey car park (MSCP) in Berkhamsted. I am strongly opposed to the plan both in principle and in its present form.

In summary, I object to the multi-storey car park on the grounds that:

- The application conflicts with numerous aspects of key national and local planning policies covering transport, planning, parking and conservation area issues (see schedule attached in Table 1).
- The need for this car park has never been independently established and the case is not proven
- The Transport Assessment supporting this document and on which the assertions of negligible resultant impact on traffic volume and air quality are made, is fundamentally flawed in a number of its assumptions and its evidence base
- Consultation with the local community has been inadequate for a project of this scale, size and impact

Conflict with Planning Policy

There are numerous areas of national and local planning policy with which the application conflicts. Rather than detailing them all here, I draw your attention to the overarching policy objective of sustainable development in the National Policy Planning Framework. The building of a multi storey car park in a historic market town centre is patently in conflict with that guiding principle.

In addition, the application conflicts with all of Dacorum Borough Council's (DBC) stated parking policies which aim to reduce car usage and restrict parking within town centres (for example; DBLP 51 and 57, CS8 as well as appendices 1 and 5 of the Local Plan.)

National and local transport policy is predicated on the need to encourage sustainable modes of transport other than the private car so it is clear again that this application is in direct conflict with those aims.

Furthermore, according to policy, development must deliver transport improvements and this must be improvement first and foremost for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Accommodation of the private car is last in this hierarchy.

Regarding the Conservation Area in which this MSCP would be sited, it is simply the case that putting such a bulky and uniform structure within the conservation context

cannot at any level be said to conserve and crucially, to *enhance* the character of the historic built environment. The proposal takes as its comparator, the adjacent Waitrose building which is not a valid measure. The aim of policy is that any new permitted development in the Conservation Area should ameliorate past planning mistakes, not repeat them.

The MSCP building would be visible from the valley sides and also from the Canal – in direct conflict with the aims of relevant local policy and S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation) Act 1990.

This application conflicts with so many policy positions that this letter would run to tens of pages if I commented on them all here. Suffice to say that the application conflicts either wholly or partly with all policies detailed on the list of applicable policies in Table 1.

No Evidence of Need

Dacorum Borough Council have not established a proven need nor a compelling argument for more parking in central Berkhamsted, nor (if such were needed) how best to meet such a need.

The proposal for a MSCP on this site arose from the embarrassment of the political failure to deliver CPZ/RPZ some years ago. However, there has never been any independent or statistically valid analysis to determine the scale and nature of the true parking requirement in the town nor whether demand could be ameliorated by other measures.

Rather than a logical process encompassing definition of the problem, gathering and analysis of data, identification of the issues and development of a range of possible responses, DBC have progressed straight to this £3.5m capital programme – their ‘solution’ to a problem they have not even defined.

Furthermore, the Applicant’s supporting information shows there is adequate space available in the town’s existing car parks. Pressure on the Lower Kings Road site is only critical during a few peak hours of the week.

Additionally, there is a strong theme evident throughout the objections from the local community which is that local residents and other visitors rarely, if ever, experience problems finding somewhere to park in the town centre.

Further, if there is indeed a proven need for parking for staff working in local businesses, that need should be accommodated within policy ie in long term parking which must not be located in town centres.

The application itself is confused about who the MSCP is designed for. The Transport Assessment lists conflicting objectives for the car park - identifying it first

as being for local workers and shoppers but then basing the projection of future usage on the assumption it will be rail commuters who would use the car park. Given there is a car park on the station site which has plenty of spaces and is no more expensive than the existing long term car parking in the town centre, there is no reason at all why rail commuters would use the proposed MSCP.

Flawed Analysis

The fundamental assumptions of this application are wrong. The supporting arguments take as their starting point that there has been no growth in traffic volume in Berkhamsted over the last 5 years and that there will be no growth over the next 10 years. Therefore, they argue, the proposed MSCP will have negligible impact on traffic volume and the adjacent road network. Following from this, that there will be no adverse impact on the local air quality.

As an example of this, the Applicant's consultants WYG have misinterpreted data from the DfT which they say shows a fall in through traffic in Berkhamsted. The DfT website itself mentions a number of caveats in interpreting this data which WYG have ignored.

WYG's analysis in this regard is fundamentally flawed because it is based on methodological errors that interpret AADF (annual average daily flow) data incorrectly. WYG used figures from 2009-2014 but the Department for Transport (DfT) website states that in 2010 the sample changed : *"In order to correct for any sampling errors, a larger benchmark sample is taken every decade which enables the Department to recalibrate its traffic estimates on minor roads.....***Please note that the sample of minor roads changed in 2010.**" <http://www.dft.gov.uk/traffic-counts/cp.php>

2010-2014 AADF figures actually show a rise in traffic in Berkhamsted, not a fall. WYG predicated their arguments (that the MSCP would create negligible increases in traffic and pollution right up to 2025) on incorrect data.

The DfT website further states: *'Traffic figures at regional and national level are robust and are reported as National Statistics. However, this is not the case for road traffic at a local level. A note of this should be made when publishing these figures elsewhere and taken into account during any analyses'*

No such note has been made in the Applicant's Transport Assessment.

To compound the error WYG added 4 separate AADFs; DfT website states: *"For methodological reasons, the AADFs for different count points should not be added together."*

The supporting documents observe about queues on Lower King's Road. *"The reason for this is unknown but is likely to be due to an abnormal event."*

The event was far from abnormal based on residents' observations. The junction at the entrance to the car parks repeatedly becomes gridlocked with cars trying to turn into the two car parks (Waitrose and the public car park) forming two queues which prevent cars attempting to leave the car parks and turn into Lower King's Road from doing so. Meanwhile, through traffic on the road is unable to proceed because it backs up behind the cars trying to enter the car parks (but unable to do so due to the stationary queue for the free Waitrose car park).

I quote from WYG document, public consultation part 2, The Scheme:

"The transport assessment which has been prepared demonstrates that key junctions surrounding the area of the site would be able to accommodate the additional site-related traffic over the peak hours with a negligible impact."

Anyone who knows Berkhamsted well will find this statement incredible and given the flaws in the Transport Assessment, it is also patently inaccurate. Even WYG's own analysis finds the local road network at capacity. How is it possible for them to draw the conclusion that key junctions and access routes will not be affected.

The so-called mitigation measures identified in the application will do little to deal with this problem and although the Applicants may have ticked the boxes required of them by HCC Highways, residents who experience the current traffic congestion on a daily basis, know that the proposed MSCP will create serious congestion issues. The MSCP will concentrate parking provision on one site at the centre of Berkhamsted where the surrounding road network is limited and pressurised by the specific geographic context (situated on a valley floor bounded by a canal and railway on one side and a hillside of congested residential roads on the other). For Lower Kings Road this means that there are no alternative routes to escape on when there is congestion.

Given that the Transport Assessment has such basic flaws and inconsistencies, it cannot be relied upon in gauging the potential impact of the MSCP on the local traffic. Moreover, it also renders WYG's entire Air Quality Analysis irrelevant too as it is also predicated on no increase in vehicular traffic.

Impact on the Locality

Air Quality

Worryingly, the flawed traffic analysis has led to a flawed approach on Air Quality. Quote from WYG document, public consultation part 4, Environmental Impact:

“Air Quality Assessment has been undertaken and confirms that the impact of the proposed car park, including consideration of the affects upon emissions from the proposed traffic associated with the scheme, will be negligible.”

We know from DBC’s own monitoring data that pollution levels in Lower Kings Road already routinely exceed so called safe levels. When annualised they are on the brink of requiring an AQMA to be declared. In addition the WYG analysis takes no account of the impact of the cars actually in the MSCP in terms of the pollution they will create and also omits important data relating to PM2.5 – particulates associated with respiratory problems.

Conservation Area and Public Amenity

From WYG document, public consultation part 3, the Design:

The car park *“has been sensitively designed to reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding Berkhamsted Conservation Area.”*

“...sensitively designed taking into account the different land levels and building types in the area.”

One look at the drawings of the planned car park utterly refutes this. The size and bulk of it are incompatible with the historic centre of Berkhamsted. It will dwarf everything around it and dominate the setting. The buildings surrounding the site are of differing heights and roof lines (this is not shown in the drawings). There is absolutely nothing “sensitive” about placing a 4 storey car park in the proposed location.

No amount of wooden cladding or green walls will diminish its impact. It is out of scale, far too large and ugly. It will create a tall, dark alley between the Waitrose building and the new structure and dwarf the existing buildings on the High Street and Lower kings Road. Part of the reason why Berkhamsted attracts so many visitors and people like to live here arises from its visual appeal and low-rise, human scale. At present the views in the area of the public car park are open and spacious.

Sterilising this site by building a large cube which takes up the entire footprint of the current car park will eradicate all public amenity from the area. It will close down an open, well used pedestrian route and render a relatively open, pleasant space unusable for anything other than vehicular traffic.

Legacy

DBC hopes it may recover its initial investment over 20+ years; in itself a poor financial proposition. However, developments in the transport field will move much more quickly than that and we are likely to become much less reliant on the private

car by then. Planning law is now relaxed to allow conversion of office spaces into residential units in town centres (a real attraction in a town like Berkhamsted where residential properties fetch way more than average prices). As businesses give up their town centre space for residential development, there will be less demand for on-street and off-street parking. Other local authorities are tearing down multi storey car parks.

DBC is running a very real risk of investing £3.5m of public money in an enormous white elephant. Their legacy will be bracketed with that of the planners of earlier decades who allowed the carve up of the historic High Street.

This proposal has been rushed through without a full consultation of all sectors of Berkhamsted's community and I am very concerned that we are taking a very big decision that will stand for decades and prove to be an expensive mistake.

DBC maintain they have consulted adequately about this proposal but one week's opportunity to review and comment before Christmas is way too little for a decision of this size. This application should be refused and DBC should seek and welcome input from the citizens of Berkhamsted to develop a plan that is acceptable to all. Why did no one in DBC think to ask the residents of Berkhamsted for their input at the earlier planning stages of this scheme? We are the ones who will have to live with the impact of it should it proceed.

Appleby, Wharf Lane, Dudswell

Please register my objection to this most unsympathetic development. I object to the scheme on the following grounds:

- 1) It is unnecessary. I live two miles away and even on a busy Saturday I can find somewhere to park on the existing site by Waitrose, or a short walk away, over the canal bridge by the tennis club.
- 2) The proposed structure is hideous. Car parks such as this have disfigured Hemel which is why its centre is so shabby. Why on earth would Berkhamsted wish to imitate Hemel's decline?
- 3) Berkhamsted people have overwhelmingly objected to this hideous proposal yet the council officers have mysteriously given it the 'green light'. Why, did they not read the petition?
- 4) Minutes of earlier Council meetings claim that the local chamber of commerce supports this measure. This is a group of about 150 firms. I have contacted many members and they are astounded to learn that their businesses apparently support this proposal when partners and owners actually object to it! This can only mean that a small skewed coterie of representatives have responded to DBC without properly consulting all their members fully, first.
- 5) If this is given the go ahead it will fly in the face of the democratic process. Councillors should represent the wishes of their electorate. I have yet to meet a

citizen of Berkhamsted who wants our historic town's centre defiled by this vast post-modern monstrosity.

6) Berkhamsted might have surrendered to William the Conqueror but it has not surrendered to much since.

7). The design allows for many nooks and crannies in which anti-social behaviour could go unseen. If built, it would soon be covered in graffiti , whereas the existing layout is easily monitored and crime free.

Please pass my views to the decision makers, who meet on Thursday.

Cherry Hill, Cross Oak Road

As an Architect and as a resident of Berkhamsted for 28 years, I have come to admire and appreciate the qualities of the town and am horrified by this proposal to which I wish to register my objection.

My objection is based on the following issues;

1. The scale, mass and design of the proposed carpark is inappropriate and is not in keeping with the surrounding buildings (Waitrose excluded) If implemented it would cause **permanent damage** to the Conservation Area.
2. The quality of the proposed design is very poor and the statement in the Heritage Statement "*the structure has also been carefully articulated to create interest and variety across the elevations*" is not supported by the drawings. There is little to no articulation and the random palette of materials, some of which I feel are completely inappropriate, is a poor attempt to break up the mass of the building and try unsuccessfully to create an attractive and sympathetic design.
3. The consultants appointed by the Council are better known for their engineering experience and in my opinion have not produced a proposal that is sympathetic to its location and which lacks the quality and refinement that any work in such a sensitive site as this deserves. Based on my own knowledge of planning applications generally and specifically those in Conservation Areas the quality of the 3D visuals is also very poor and seems indicative of the overall low standard that is being targeted by the applicant.
4. Having an open car deck at roof level is really insensitive and at the very least the opportunity to install either a green roof or photovoltaic panels should be explored.
5. Being a regular visitor to Lower Kings Road both on foot and by car I know that this is probably the most congested part of the town and that cars queuing to enter the existing carpark already stop the flow of traffic in Lower Kings Road in both directions.

Any increase in the number of cars trying to enter the site will just exasperate an already unsatisfactory situation.

6. I appreciate that parking is difficult in the town at peak times, but this is not the right place to put additional parking.

Berkhamsted is an historic town in a valley and both the topography and the evolved nature of its development will always limit vehicular movement and to bring more vehicles into the very centre of the town will only cause more congestion and is the wrong approach.

If additional parking is required it should be positioned further away from the High Street requiring able bodied people to walk to the shops or for electric buses to transport them. This would be in accordance with local and national policy to encourage sustainable transport.

7. Lower Kings Road itself is very narrow with cars able to park on the single yellow lines on both sides of the street. The road is already the major route to the station and the busiest crossing of the High Street. It already struggles to cope with the number of vehicles using it and will not support greater vehicular movement.
8. Pollution levels in Lower Kings Road are already high with cars queuing for the traffic lights and to get into the existing carpark. This would inevitably become worse if more cars are encouraged in to the area.
9. I feel that there has been inadequate consultation with residents, the majority of whom are opposed to this proposal.

I would urge you for all the reasons listed above to recommend this application for refusal.

Heath End cottage, Heath End

As an Architect and as a resident of Berkhamsted for 28 years, I have come to admire and appreciate the qualities of the town and am horrified by this proposal to which I wish to register my objection.

My objection is based on the following issues;

1. The scale, mass and design of the proposed carpark is inappropriate and is not in keeping with the surrounding buildings (Waitrose excluded) If implemented it would cause **permanent damage** to the Conservation Area.
2. The quality of the proposed design is very poor and the statement in the Heritage Statement "*the structure has also been carefully articulated to create interest and variety across the elevations*" is not supported by the drawings. There is little to no articulation and the random palette of materials, some of which I feel are completely inappropriate, is a poor attempt to break up the mass of the building and try unsuccessfully to create an attractive and sympathetic design.

3. The consultants appointed by the Council are better known for their engineering experience and in my opinion have not produced a proposal that is sympathetic to its location and which lacks the quality and refinement that any work in such a sensitive site as this deserves. Based on my own knowledge of planning applications generally and specifically those in Conservation Areas the quality of the 3D visuals is also very poor and seems indicative of the overall low standard that is being targeted by the applicant.
4. Having an open car deck at roof level is really insensitive and at the very least the opportunity to install either a green roof or photovoltaic panels should be explored.
5. Being a regular visitor to Lower Kings Road both on foot and by car I know that this is probably the most congested part of the town and that cars queuing to enter the existing carpark already stop the flow of traffic in Lower Kings Road in both directions.

Any increase in the number of cars trying to enter the site will just exasperate an already unsatisfactory situation.

6. I appreciate that parking is difficult in the town at peak times, but this is not the right place to put additional parking.

Berkhamsted is an historic town in a valley and both the topography and the evolved nature of its development will always limit vehicular movement and to bring more vehicles into the very centre of the town will only cause more congestion and is the wrong approach.

If additional parking is required it should be positioned further away from the High Street requiring able bodied people to walk to the shops or for electric buses to transport them. This would be in accordance with local and national policy to encourage sustainable transport.

7. Lower Kings Road itself is very narrow with cars able to park on the single yellow lines on both sides of the street. The road is already the major route to the station and the busiest crossing of the High Street. It already struggles to cope with the number of vehicles using it and will not support greater vehicular movement.
8. Pollution levels in Lower Kings Road are already high with cars queuing for the traffic lights and to get into the existing carpark. This would inevitably become worse if more cars are encouraged in to the area.
9. I feel that there has been inadequate consultation with residents, the majority of whom are opposed to this proposal.

I would urge you for all the reasons listed above to recommend this application for refusal.

Recommendation

As per the published report subject to deletion of Condition 4.

Item 5b

4/01420/16/FUL - PROPOSED NEW ATTACHED 3-BEDROOM HOUSE AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING AND NEW FRONT PORCH

85 BUCKWOOD ROAD, MARKYATE, ST ALBANS, AL3 8JE

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5c

4/01933/16/FUL - NEW DETACHED DWELLING AND GARAGE WITH VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM ST JOHNS WELL COURT (REVISED SCHEME)

MERRICKS, 328 HIGH STREET, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1HT

Representation from applicant

I am writing in response to your report posted today on the agenda. The internal area of the house has not increased in mass. The measurements have been taken from outside of the piers which are part of the external design to the house.

I am concerned about the twelve conditions attached to this application especially clause 8 taking away our permitted development rights. Our previous passed plans did not have this.

Being able to park easily was one of our main criteria, otherwise we could have simply and more economically moved into any of the many houses in Berkhamsted which only have on street parking.

We have masses of parking - in front of the garage, more than ten cars up our side lane and to the side of the garage an area specifically for parking measuring

approximately 12 metres by 3 metres .

Like a lot of people I have always used previous garages as workshops. This is even more important to me as I would have utilised the basement had we been able to afford to build it.

As our neighbour in St Johns Well Court has requested gates across our entrance we will adhere to his wishes. Bollards have already been installed as requested to prevent unauthorised cars using our lane.

The shared fence to the west between 328 and 330 is currently 1.8m to add more to this will significantly shade our sitting room as the only other window faces North. We do not have the opportunity to install high level windows as there is a bedroom above this room.

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5d

4/01198/16/FHA - FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION. RAISE HEIGHT OF EXISTING WALL TO SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. NEW EXTERNAL WINDOWS AND DOORS TO REAR.

17 CHAPEL STREET, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2EA

See additional information on Anite
19/09/2016 and Daylight & Sunlight Report received

Berkhamsted Town Council

The Town Planning Committee had objected to this application on 6 June 2016. However subsequently the Planning Officer had visited the site and, as the neighbouring ground floor side facing window in no. 18 Chapel Street was not the only window serving the kitchen at this property, and given the distance of the proposal from this window, it was not considered there to be any significant overbearing or loss of light to this neighbouring unit. Therefore the Town Planning Committee was asked to reconsider its initial objection made at the 6 June 2016 meeting.

The Committee suspended Standing Orders to allow members of the public to speak. 3

Jackie Travers, the immediate neighbour to the proposed development, continued to object strongly to the application on the grounds that it would block light to both her kitchen and her hallway. The window in her property mentioned in the Planning Officer's report was not the one affected.

Nick Williams, the co-applicant, maintained that the report he had commissioned on light impact had shown only a 2% reduction in light to the adjoining property. He felt the objections were overstated.

The Committee reinstated Standing Orders and the meeting resumed.

There was debate, following which the Committee **RESOLVED** to maintain its **objection** to the application. It remained of the opinion that the proposed extension to no. 17 Chapel Street compromised the light available to the hallway and kitchen of no. 18. It considered it preferable for DBC's Development Control Committee to determine the application..

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5e

4/01664/16/FUL - FIRST-FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF HALL AND BEDSIT INTO TWO RESIDENTIAL FLATS

31, 31A & 31B HIGH STREET, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 8AB

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5f

4/01097/16/FUL - CHANGE OF USE TO A NURSERY

ISBISTER CENTRE, CHAULDEN HOUSE GARDENS, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1 2BW

Additional Condition to attach to Grant Permission

Prior to the commencement of the operation as a nursery hereby permitted a management plan which sets out what parking provision would be provided

and maintained thereafter shall be submitted, approved and signed off by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the sufficient provision of parking to reduce the impact of travel and transport on the environment; in accordance with policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and saved appendix 5 of the Local Plan (1991).

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5g

4/01864/16/FUL - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE AND INTERIOR/ EXTERIOR REFURBISHMENT OF FOUR STOREY LOCAL AUTHORITY OFFICES INTO A CLINICAL AND ADMINISTRATION HUB & ACCESS ALTERATIONS/ PARKING & SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

41 MARLOWES, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1 1LD

Recommendation

As per the published report
