

4/02993/18/FUL	CHANGE OF USE AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING GROUND FLOOR FROM VETERINARY PRACTICE INTO A TWO-BEDROOM FLAT. ROOF EXTENSION AT FIRST FLOOR TO INCREASE SIZE OF EXISTING FIRST FLOOR FLAT TO A LARGER TWO-BEDROOM FLAT. CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW-BUILD TWO-BEDROOM APARTMENTS TO THE REAR FACING ST.JOHNS WELL LANE. PROVISION OF CAR PARKING FOR FIVE VEHICLES, FIVE-BAY CYCLE STORE AND WASTE REFUSE STORE.
Site Address	320A HIGH STREET, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1HT
Applicant	Mr Williams, 24 Chestnut Avenue
Case Officer	Rachel Marber
Referral to Committee	Contrary views of Berkhamsted Town Council

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 As the retention of the existing veterinary practice in this location is not protected by planning policy and the council would greatly benefit from the additional new homes on this site, the principle of residential development in this area is considered acceptable in accordance with Policies, NP1, CS1, CS4, CS17, of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 10 and 19 of the Local Plan (2004) and NPPF (2018).

2.2 The proposed scheme is considered to secure a good quality development which would not result in detrimental impact to the visual amenity of the area and relevant heritage assets in accordance with the relevant policies of the NPPF (2018), Policies CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policy 10, 18, 21, 120 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004), Berkhamsted Urban Design Assessment (2010), Refuse Storage Guidance Notes (2015) and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2.3 Furthermore, the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the residential amenity of future or adjacent occupiers and would not be detrimental to matters of highways safety. The proposal is therefore also considered in accordance with Saved Policies 57, 58, 99, 100, 118 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS8, CS9, CS12 and CS29 of the Core Strategy (2013).

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is situated on the north side of High Street, Berkhamsted, at the corner of St Johns Well Lane. The application site comprises a modern building (although traditional in form and detailing) of red brick with a slate roof which reflects the character of the adjacent Locally Listed Buildings, but subservient in scale. A

calmer frontage relates to St Johns Well lane in similar materials. To the rear of the site is a small car park. The site falls within Berkhamsted conservation area, Area of Archaeological Significance, sits adjacent to Locally Listed Buildings, and is in close proximity to Listed Buildings (Grade II Listed pub and Quaker House).

The immediate area is characterised by a dynamic mix of active High Street uses, open space and a generally Victorian residential area. The properties are all varied in terms of uses, architectural styles, sizes of properties and heights all with a linear build line.

4. Proposal

4.1 The application seek permission for the following works:

- Change of use to the ground floor veterinary practice into a two bedroom flat;
- Gable roof extension to first floor to increase size of existing first floor flat into a two bed property;
- Construction of two new two-bed dwellinghouses to the rear of the application site;
- Alteration of parking provision for five domestic cars; and
- Construction of cycle store and bin store.

5. Relevant History

4/00929/93/4 ERECTION OF BUILDING FOR VETERINARY SURGERY WITH FLAT OVER
ACCESS AND PARKING
Granted
21/09/1993

Permitted Development Rights for change of use from veterinary practice removed.

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy – (2013)

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS2 - Selection of Development Sites

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 - Sustainable Transport

CS9 - Management of Roads

CS10 - Quality of settlement Design

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS17 - New Housing
CS18 - Mix of Housing
CS27 - Quality of the Historic Environment
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004)

Policy 10 - Optimising the Use of Urban Land
Policy 18 - The Size of New Dwellings
Policy 19 - Conversions
Policy 21 - Density of Residential Development
Policy 57 - Provision and Management of Parking
Policy 58 - Private Parking Provision
Policy 99 – Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands
Policy 100 – Tree and Woodland Planting
Policy 118 - Important Archaeological Remains
Policy 120 - Development in Conservation Areas
Appendix 3- Layout and Design of Residential Areas
Appendix 5- Parking Provision

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (July 2002)
Dacorum Urban Design Assessment – Berkhamsted (2010)
Refuse Storage Guidance Note (2015)

7. Constraints

Berkhamsted Town Centre
Residential Area in Town Village
Area of Archaeological Significance
Berkhamsted conservation area
Locally Listed Buildings- Adjacent
Article 4 Direction- Adjacent
Grade II Listed Building- Adjacent

8. Representations

Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B

9. Considerations

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Principle of Development
- Impact to Berkhamsted Conservation Area, Adjacent Heritage Assets and Street Scene
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on Highway Safety Impact on Highway Safety and Parking Provision
- Impact on Trees and Landscaping
- Archaeology
- Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Consultation Response
- Community Infrastructure Levy

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is a windfall site located within the town of Berkhamsted. As such, the infrastructure in the immediate area has been developed to provide good transport links for existing residents. There are also services and facilities available within close proximity of the site.

Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS1 states that market towns and large villages will accommodate new development for housing, employment and other uses provided it is of a scale commensurate with size of the settlement and the range of local services and facilities; and helps maintain the vitality and viability of the settlement and the surrounding countryside. Policy CS4 states that appropriate residential development within residential areas in the Towns and Large Villages is encouraged.

Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages the provision of more housing within towns and other specified settlements and the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed. Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) also seeks to optimise the use of available land within urban areas.

Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would make a valuable contribution to the Borough's existing housing stock (in accordance with Policy CS17) and complies with the Council's settlement strategy.

Urban Design Assessment (2010) for Berkhamsted Town Centre outlines that the non-

residential land uses should be protected, and the replacement of non-residential uses with residential uses should be discouraged. Flats above ground floor retail uses should be encouraged.

However, the application site falls within a residential area of Berkhamsted town in accordance with Local Plan designations. In this regard, Policy CS4 states that in residential areas appropriate residential development is encouraged. This policy continues to outline that in town and local centres a mix of uses are sought including shopping, leisure, business (including offices), residential and social and community uses. A high density of development, linked to the achievement of sustainability objectives, is generally supported.

Saved Policy 19 of the Local Plan (2004) also states that the conversion of other buildings to incorporate flats or houses will be permitted in towns and local centres and in residential areas of towns and large villages.

The application site does not fall within a General Employment Area and therefore the site use for the existing Veterinary Clinic (which falls under a D1 use class) is not protected for employment use retention. The application site is also not listed for protection as a community asset. In short, the LPA have no control over the loss of this Veterinary Clinic, it could close today without the requirement of planning permission. It is noted that the loss of this veterinary practice (if a suitable alternative premises could not be found) would result in the loss of this business and 11-20 jobs. However, this loss, cannot be controlled by the Council, from both a planning policy and owner decision-making perspective. Weight would also need to be given to the securing of additional homes on a brownfield plot, within a residential area where such development is encouraged. There would also remain one veterinary practice in Berkhamsted, if the application site is lost. Furthermore, there are seven veterinary practices in Hemel Hempstead and one veterinary practice in Tring. Therefore, the proposed development would not result in a loss to the vitality and viability of the settlement.

In conclusion, the existing use of the site as a Veterinary Clinic is not policy protected and the development would be located in a sustainable location with the benefit of additional new homes secured on a Brownfield site; the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Policies, CS1, CS4, CS17, of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 10 and 19 of the Local Plan (2004) and NPPF (2018).

Impact to Berkhamsted Conservation Area, Adjacent Heritage Assets and Street Scene

The specific historic environment policies within the NPPF (2018) are contained within paragraphs 189-202. Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states that in determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. In similar regard Policy

CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 120 of the Local Plan (2004) seek to preserve the setting and distinctiveness of heritage assets.

S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBA) requires that special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBA) requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Core Strategy (2013), Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of high quality sustainable design in improving the character and quality of an area; seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of size, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is reiterated in the Saved Local Plan (2004) Policies of 10, 18, 21 and Appendix 3.

The application site is located within the Town Centre zone in accordance with the Berkhamsted Urban Design Assessment (2010) where the historic character should be protected with a range of land use mixes encouraged. Building up to four storeys on the High Street and low-rise, high density is also encouraged. Traditional brickwork is favoured over modern wirecut bricks. Clay tile or slate roofing should be encouraged, with pitched roofs favoured over 'modern' flat roofs of newer buildings.

In consideration of the application site, the importance of preserving the character of the dwelling and street scene is of augmented importance due to the Local Listed Designation on 320 & 322 High Street. Nos. 320 & 322 High Street are designated as Locally Listed Buildings due to their Architectural Significance. Alongside pairs Nos. 324 and 326; 328 and 330; 332 and 334; and 336 and 338 the application site forms five pairs of attractive villas which appear to have been built in 3 phases with work commencing from the west end in 1891; the detailing to each of the phases reflect subtle architectural changes over a decade or so.

The application site does sit within the context of the Victorian Villas described above however, on St John's Well Lane the site would be read between a 1970s flatted development and opposite a telephone exchange building, which both make little contribution to the appearance of Berkhamsted conservation area. The application is considered a good opportunity to enhance the architectural quality and interest of this immediate area with a more contemporary building, which draws inspiration from both the historic and modern buildings which comprise Berkhamsted conservation area.

From the perspective of Berkhamsted High Street the proposal would retain the same appearance as the existing property. The increase in roof mass to rear projection of the existing building would result in a change in roof form, from a half hip to full gable. This is considered a relatively minor visual alteration which would not harm the appearance of the existing building, or adjacent locally listed buildings.

The two dwellings would be modern in appearance, which is considered an appropriate approach in terms of policy considerations. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2018) outlines that where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development. The new dwellings would be subordinate in form to the existing property and would be stepped down in height in order to reflect the set down in street scene.

Moreover, the proposed two new dwellings would reflect the pattern of built form within the immediate area, such as properties on Park Street, Kitsbury Road and Cross Oak Road which comprise corner plots which have a relationship to both front and side street scenes. A sufficient element of open space would also be retained between the application site, Nos. 25 to 30 St John's Well Court and grass verge on St John's Well Lane in order to maintain the open aspect character of this street scene.

The proposed refuse store would reflect the design and linear build line of the two proposed dwellings and be of marginal scale so as not to appear intrusive within the street scene. The enclosed refuse store would be in accordance with the refuse storage guidance note (2015) which requires bins in conservation areas to be kept out of public vantage points and located in well-designed bin stores. The bin store would be of sufficient size to accommodate the bins required for both flats. A condition has been recommended which requests further details of bin stores for the dwellinghouses.

Due to the sensitive nature of the proposals the DBC conservation officer was consulted and provided the following summative comments:

- The proposal involves the demolition of the rear extension and its rebuilding to tie in with the middle step of the building. This would match in terms of building line, scale, height and detailing. We do not believe that this proposal would harm the character of the conservation area.
- The two new dwellings would be proportionate to the houses seen elsewhere in the conservation area. They follow the pattern within the street of stepping down.
- The majority of the two dwellings would be construction from gable herringbone pattern brickwork which would provide visual interest with the trellis element to help add further interest.
- The new dwellings would differ within the facades, where there are proposed large metal feature elements, which include the windows. Whilst the brickwork, stepping and mass reflect the traditional buildings within the town these elements would express the more contemporary nature of the development.
- Having given particular consideration to the design and detailing of the proposals and new buildings within the setting of the site, on balance, and given the surrounding post WW2 development to St Johns Well Lane, we believe that the proposals are of an acceptable standard of architecture and subject to a material and detailing condition would be appropriate within the conservation area.

The proposed scheme has a density of 71 dwellings per hectare. This is in accordance with the Berkhamsted Urban Design Assessment (2010) which states that side streets within the town centre should have high densities, with the potential for very high densities in block sites; with a guide of 70 units per hectare outlined. Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) also requires optimum use of the land available, whether in terms of site coverage or height and Saved Policy 21 of the Local Plan (2004) outlines that densities will generally be expected to be in the range of 30 to 50 dwellings per hectare net. Saved Policy 21 also clarifies that careful consideration should be given to the density of all new housing proposals to ensure that they make the most efficient use of land available. Higher densities will be encouraged in urban areas, for example at town and local centres. Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy (2013) outlines that new development should promote higher densities in and around town centres and local centres. National Planning Policy also seeks effective use of land in meeting the need for homes, and planning decisions should avoid homes being built at low densities and ensure developments make optimal use of the potential of each site.

Overall, the proposed alteration, and change of use to the existing building to create two flats within the existing building would result in nominal visual alteration to the appearance of the street scene, conservation area and Locally Listed Buildings. The contemporary design of the two new dwellings is considered to relate to the surrounding area in terms of scale, height and plot placement and therefore would not result in detrimental impact to the character and appearance of immediate area, Berkhamsted conservation area and Locally Listed Building. The scheme is considered in compliance with the NPPF (2018), Policies CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policy 10, 18, 21, 120 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004), Berkhamsted Urban Design Assessment (2010), Refuse Storage Guidance Notes (2015) and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The NPPF (2018) outlines the importance of planning in securing high standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact to neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

The proposed alterations to the existing building would not significantly impact the outlook or daylight serving neighbouring residents at No.320 High Street. The 25-degree line as drawn from first floor side facing windows would be maintained and all flank elevation windows would have a similar outlook as currently existing, with the only change in built form being the increased in height of the rear roof form by 2.3 metres (approximately). It is important to note that the kitchen room served by the ground floor flank elevation windows of No.320 are also facilitated by rear facing windows, given the room a two-dimensional aspect which further reduces the harm

which may result from loss of aspect. Furthermore, due to this the marginal increase in building mass, it is not considered that significant detriment in terms of outlook and external amenity enjoyed from the raised rear patio and rear facing library/study room of No.320 High Street would result.

The proposed new dwellings would breach the 45 degree line as drawn from the rear windows of No.320 High Street and create a greater sense of enclosure by extending built form across the side boundary shared with this property. However, it is not considered that a significant loss of outlook to No.320 would result in order to warrant a refusal of the application as the proposed dwellings would only be of 5.5 metre height at this boundary. Furthermore, the ground floor windows and raised patio area of No.320 sit at a 3 metre height above the ground floor level of the proposed dwellings; this further reduces the perceived dominance and bulk the proposed two new dwellings would have on the outlook of No.320.

A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been submitted alongside the planning application which demonstrates that the proposed development would not result in a negligible loss of daylight and sunlight to any windows serving 25-30 St John's Well Court. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment also demonstrates that a sufficient level of daylight and sunlight would be secured to 19 out of 21 windows serving No.320 High Street. The two windows which would fall short of BRE daylight and sunlight standards are the side kitchen door and adjacent window which are secondary windows, with the room also being served by two rear facing windows which ensure the room still meets BRE guidelines for daylight distribution.

The proposed dwellings would not breach the 25 degree line as drawn from the rear habitable windows of Nos. 25 to 30 St John's Wells Court, which indicates no loss of daylight or sunlight would result to these neighbouring residents. The side elevation of flat E would be located approximately 16 metres away from residents at St John's Well Court which an acceptable rear to side separation distance, for which DBC have no minimum policy standard. It is further considered that the 6 metre and 8 metre high foliage at this boundary would help screen the proposal from the perspective of these neighbouring residents.

The side facing windows of Flat A and B which would overlook No.320 High Street have been conditioned as obscure glazed in order to preserve the privacy of these neighbouring residents and to prevent overlooking of their external amenity area.

The parking area serving the development to the rear of the site is an existing arrangement which also provides access to the rear parking area of No.320 High Street. As this parking area is existing no objections are raised in terms of noise and disturbance to adjacent residents. The two new dwellings proposed would be separated from this parking area through the provision of a patio area. Although, the flank elevation of Flat E would be immediately adjacent to the access for this parking area, no side elevation windows are proposed and the movement of 5 cars accessing

the parking area is not considered to be of a significant level that would warrant refusal of the application on noise disturbance grounds.

Turning to the living conditions the proposal would afford future residents. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) states that garden depths equal to adjoining properties would be acceptable with a functional proposed width, shape and size that is compatible with surrounding area. Saved Appendix 3 expands this further outlining that a dwellinghouse should be provided with a minimum 11.5 metre deep garden space; with a larger garden depth provided for family homes. Residential development designed for multiple occupancy will be required to provide a private communal amenity area to the rear of the building at least equal to the footprint of the building. A small communal garden would be provided to the front of the development for the two proposed flats, although this would measure only 35.8 sq.m. No external amenity provision would be provided for the two proposed dwellings. Nevertheless, this insufficient level of amenity provision can be off-set by the provision of public open space in close proximity to the application site; such as Canal Fields which is located a 6 minute walk away. Moreover, the existing flat within the application does not comprise any external amenity provision.

The bedrooms of the proposed development would only have one east facing aspect, which although no ideal the daylight sunlight assessment submitted shows all units to achieve a satisfactory level of daylight and outlook for future residents. Regard also has to be given to 123 of the NPPF (2018) which states that local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site.

On balance, the proposed development is not considered to result in a significant loss of outlook or daylight and sunlight to No.320 High Street to warrant refusal and a sufficient standard of amenity provision would be secured for future residents of the development. The proposal is therefore considered in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and the NPPF (2018).

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking Provision

Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2018) states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and adequate provision of spaces for ultra-low emission vehicles. Policies CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 57, 58 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) promote an assessment based upon maximum parking standards.

The proposal seeks to accommodate four lots of 2 bed units, which would require 1.5 spaces per unit in accordance with DBC maximum parking standards. This would require a total of 6 of street parking spaces. Five off street parking spaces would be accommodated within the rear parking area of the application site. This would fall one space shy of the maximum parking standard. Given the sustainable site location, which is in close proximity to Berkhamsted train station (10 minute walk) and a frequent bus service (routes 29, 30 and 31), this level of parking provision is considered ~~more than~~ sufficient. In addition, the NPPF (2018) states that maximum parking standards should only be applied where there is clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network. Parking provision would be off-set further through the accommodation of five bicycle spaces on-site which would encourage a more sustainable form of transport.

Access to this rear parking area would remain as per the existing crossover however, as site visibility splays would be further restricted by the proposed development and level of vehicle movements would be altered from the existing use, Hertfordshire County Council Highways were consulted on the proposed planning application and provided the following summative comments:

- The existing access on St John's Well Lane will be retained.
- High Street is an "A" classified principal road, the A4251, while St John's Well Lane is an unclassified local access road. Both roads have a speed limit of 30mph. There have been no accidents involving personal injury in the vicinity of the site in the last 3 years.
- Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways.

Therefore, the proposed development is unlikely to result in significant impact to the safety and operation of adjacent highway. Thus, the proposal meets the requirements of Policies CS8, CS9 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), the NPPF (2018) and Policies 57 and 58 and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seek to ensure that retained trees are protected during development and that new planting is a suitable replacement for any removed trees.

The proposed scheme has the potential to provide soft and hard landscaping on site. There are no trees within the site with sufficient amenity value to constrain the development. All boundary planting would be reinforced by the proposed development. The low-level brick front boundary wall is expected to be retained in order to reflect the residential properties in the surrounding street scene and to provide a defining edge to

the proposal. Further details of the barrier to the parking area and boundary treatment would also be required; this has been secured by a recommended landscaping condition.

Archaeology

Saved Policy 118 of the Local Plan (2004) states that County Archaeological Group will be consulted on all planning applications affecting areas of archaeological significance and archaeological potential. Where the Council considers that physical reservation of archaeological remains in situ is not merited, planning permission will be subject to satisfactory provision being made for excavation and recording. As such, conditions have been recommended to secure an adequate archaeological excavation, observation and recording.

Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF (2018) identifies three aspects of sustainable development: social, economic and environmental. Due to the fact that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2018) is engaged. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that decisions should apply a tilted presumption in favour of sustainable development unless policies in protected areas of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; these policies of protected/restricted areas are clarified within footnote 6 as including designated heritage assets.

Paragraph 11 and footnote 7 clarifies that in the context of decision-taking "the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date" when the LPA cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. The most important policies for determining a housing application are considered to be Policies CS1 (Distribution of Development), CS4 (The Towns and Large Villages) and CS17 (New Housing). Policies for the supply of housing should be given less weight where these circumstances apply.

If any adverse impacts from the proposed development are identified by Members of Committee these would significantly and demonstrably need to outweigh the benefits, as outlined in paragraph 11 of the NPPF (referred to as 'the tilted balance' in favour of sustainable development). The benefits of the proposal are considered below.

Environmental

The proposal would be located within a sustainable area on a brownfield site within a built up residential area.

Social

The proposal would make a contribution to the Borough's housing supply, thereby facilitating the Government's aim of boosting the supply of housing.

Economic

The proposal would result in the loss of the veterinary practice which would result in the loss of jobs and student placements. However, the proposal would result in economic benefits during the construction of the units, although this would be for a limited period. In addition, it is likely that future residents would support the local economy such as using the amenities at the Town Centre.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposed development would be realised across the three objectives outlined above and the proposal would constitute sustainable development and the tilted balance in favour of development is applied.

Consultation Response

Several concerns were received as a result of the application. The main concerns are addressed below:

Loss of Daylight and Sunlight: to Nos.320 + 322- This has been discussed within the impact on residential amenity section above. It is acknowledged that the basement living room flank elevation window has been omitted from the daylight and sunlight assessment. However, this is a secondary window, and there are two other primary rear-facing windows (W1 and W2) serving this room which were assessed as meeting BRE daylight and sunlight standard. No. 322 has not been considered within the submitted daylight and sunlight assessment as it is faced away from the application site. Further, if the daylight and sunlight levels are considered acceptable for No.320 (which they are) this indicates that daylight and sunlight levels would remain satisfactory to Nos.322 and 324 as well.

Loss of privacy to No.320 - This has been considered in the impact on residential amenity section above. It is considered that with the recommended condition for obscure glazed western side facing windows no significant loss of privacy to neighbouring residents at No.320 would result from the proposed development.

Loss of veterinary practice, loss of community asset and jobs- This has been addressed within the principle of development section above.

Development of poor design/not in-keeping with conservation area- This has been addressed within the impact to Berkhamsted conservation area, adjacent heritage assets and street scene section above. In short, the development is considered of careful design, which sits comfortably within the surrounding street scene and Berkhamsted conservation area.

Parking concerns (during construction and lifetime of development)- The construction period for the development would only result in temporary harm to the adjacent

highway network. The level of parking provision is considered acceptable and HCC Highways have raised no objection in regards to safety of access and impact on adjacent highway network. Please see impact on highway safety and parking provision section above for full assessment.

No new flats/homes required in Berkhamsted- The Borough is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, requiring new homes on windfall sites to be secured when they come forward. The new Single Local Plan, which is still at consultation stage, is working towards a new housing target of 10,940 homes for the plan period of 2013-2036, of which 600 homes would be located in Berkhamsted.

Community Infrastructure Levy

Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on the 1st July 2015. This application is CIL Liable.

10. Conclusion

10.1 As the retention of the existing veterinary practice is not protected by planning policy and the council would greatly benefit from the additional new homes on this site, the principle of residential development in this area is considered acceptable in accordance with Policies, NP1, CS1, CS4, CS17, of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 10 and 19 of the Local Plan (2004) and NPPF (2018).

10.2 The proposed scheme is considered to secure a good quality development which would not result in detrimental impact to the visual amenity of the area and relevant heritage assets in accordance with the relevant policies of the NPPF (2018), Policies CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policy 10, 18, 21, 120 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004), Berkhamsted Urban Design Assessment (2010), Refuse Storage Guidance Notes (2015) and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

10.3 Furthermore, the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the residential amenity of future or adjacent occupiers and would not be detrimental to matters of highways safety. The proposal is therefore also considered in accordance with Saved Policies 57, 58, 99, 100, 118 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS8, CS9, CS12 and CS29 of the Core Strategy (2013).

11. RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the reasons referred to above and subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

No	Condition
1	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>
2	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>Daylight and Sunlight Report 15th November 2018 Design and Access Statement 30th October 2018 Rev 02 Supporting Planning Statement November 2018 Historic Area Appraisal November 2018 Existing Elevation 01 + Street STJOHNS/PA/007 Rev 03 Existing Elevation 02 STJOHNS/PA/008 Rev 03 Existing Elevation 03 STJOHNS/PA/009 Rev 03 Existing Elevation 04 STJOHNS/PA/012 Rev 03 Existing Section AA STJOHNS/PA/010 Rev 03 Existing Section BB STJOHNS/PA/011 Rev 03 Proposed Elevation 01 + Street STJOHNS/PA/019 Rev 03 Proposed Elevation 02 STJOHNS/PA/020 Rev 03 Proposed Elevation 03 STJOHNS/PA/021 Rev 03 Existing Section AA STJOHNS/PA/022 Rev 03 Site Location Plan STJOHNS/PA/002 Rev 03 Existing Site Plan STJOHNS/PA/003 Rev 03 Existing Ground Floor Plan STJOHNS/PA/004 Rev 03 Existing First Floor Plan STJOHNS/PA/005 Rev 03 Existing Roof Plan STJOHNS/PA/006 Rev 03 Proposed Site Plan STJOHNS/PA/013 Rev 03 Proposed Ground Floor Plan STJOHNS/PA/015 Rev 03 Proposed First Floor Plan STJOHNS/PA/016 Rev 03 Proposed Roof Plan STJOHNS/PA/018 Rev 03 Cover Sheet STJOHNS/PA/001 Rev 03</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p>
3	<p>No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The materials submitted should include details of:</p> <p>Bricks; Brick Bond Mortar; Rooflights; Roof Tiles; Joinery; and Rainwater Goods.</p>

	<p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to ensure high quality, satisfactory appearance to the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area; in accordance with Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.</p> <p>Informative</p> <p>Please do not send materials to the council offices. Materials should be kept on site and arrangements made with the planning officer for inspection.</p>
4	<p>No development shall take place until details of all external metalwork, finishes and detailing including feature bronze panels, the windows and trellis features hereby permitted, shown at a scale of 1:20, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to ensure high quality, satisfactory appearance to the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area; in accordance with Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.</p>
5	<p>The windows in the western elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwelling; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).</p>
6	<p>Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted a long term Green Roof Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall detail the long-term maintenance and specification of the green roof hereby permitted on the development. Details shall include cleaning and general maintenance works/checks which shall commence throughout the lifetime of scheme.</p> <p>Maintenance and up-keep of the green roofs shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for the life-time of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in the long-term; in accordance with Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).</p>
7	<p>Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:</p> <p>hard surfacing materials; the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected; soft landscape works which shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass</p>

	<p>establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works; storage of refuse provision for the dwellinghouses; proposed finished levels or contours; and scaled drawings and details of the barrier to the parking area.</p> <p>The approved landscape works shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area; in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).</p>
8	<p>All planting, seeding or turfing and soil preparation comprised in the approved details condition 7 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following one year post implementation of the development hereby approved; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from this date die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation. All landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the guidance contained in British Standards unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the amenity value of the development and visual amenity of the surrounding area; in accordance with Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).</p>
9	<p>The proposed parking spaces shall have measurements of 2.4m x 4.8m respectively. Such spaces shall be maintained as a permanent ancillary to the development shall be paved and shall be used for no other purpose.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of off-street parking at all times in order to minimise the impact on the safe and efficient operation of the adjoining Highway; in accordance with Policies CS8, CS9 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).</p> <p>Highway Informatives</p> <p>1. The Highway Authority requires the alterations to or the construction of the vehicle crossovers to be undertaken such that the works are carried out to their specification and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.), the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. The applicant may need to apply to Highways (Telephone 0300 1234047) to arrange this, or use link:- https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/droppedkerbs/</p>

	<p>2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/ or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p> <p>3. Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/ or by telephoning 0300 1234047</p>
10	<p>No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording 2. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording as suggested by the evaluation 3. The programme for post investigation assessment 4. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording 5. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation 6. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation 7. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation. <p>Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to record archaeological evidence; in accordance with Saved Policy 118 of the Local Plan (2004).The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.</p>
11	<p>i) Demolition/development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 10.</p> <p>ii) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 10 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.</p> <p>Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to record archaeological evidence; in accordance with Saved Policy 118 of the Local Plan (2004).The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been</p>

agreed by the applicant.
Article 35 Statement
Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through early engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage which lead to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 39 - 42) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

Appendix A

Consultation responses

Herts Property

Hertfordshire County Council's Growth & Infrastructure Unit do not have any comments to make in relation to financial contributions required by the Toolkit, as this development is situated within **Dacorum's CIL Zone 1** and does not fall within any of the CIL Reg123 exclusions. Notwithstanding this, we reserve the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels.

I trust the above is of assistance if you require any further information please contact me or the planning obligations team (growth@hertfordshire.gov.uk).

HCC Highways

Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS:

1. The proposed parking spaces shall have measurements of 2.4m x 4.8m respectively. Such spaces shall be maintained as a permanent ancillary to the development shall be paved and shall be used for no other purpose.

Reason: The above condition is required to ensure the adequate provision of off-street parking at all times in order to minimise the impact on the safe and efficient operation of the adjoining Highway.

4. Before the premises are occupied all on site vehicular areas shall be surfaced in a manner to the Local Planning Authority's approval so as to ensure satisfactory parking of vehicles outside highway limits. Arrangements shall be made for surface water from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into

the highway.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction, and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the premises.

The Highway Authority would ask that the following note to the applicant be appended to any consent issued by the local planning authority:-

INFORMATIVES:

1. The Highway Authority requires the alterations to or the construction of the vehicle crossovers to be undertaken such that the works are carried out to their specification and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.), the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. The applicant may need to apply to Highways (Telephone 0300 1234047) to arrange this, or use link:- <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/droppedkerbs/>

2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

3. Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047

COMMENTS

The above proposal is for Change of use and conversion of existing ground floor from veterinary practice into a two-bedroom flat. Roof extension at first floor to increase size of existing first floor flat to a larger two-bedroom flat. Construction of two new-build two-bedroom apartments to the rear facing St. John's Well Lane. Provision of car parking for five vehicles, five-bay cycle store and waste refuse store.

ACCESS

The existing access on St John's Well Lane will be retained. No new or altered pedestrian or vehicle access is planned and no works are required in the highway.

The site is on the corner of High Street with St John's Well Lane. High Street is an "A"

classified principal road, the A4251, while St John's Well Lane is an unclassified local access road. Both roads have a speed limit of 30mph. There have been no accidents involving personal injury in the vicinity of the site in the last 3 years.

PARKING

The proposal is to provide 5 car parking spaces, along with a secure cycle store for five bicycles. There is no provision for visitor or disabled parking.

REFUSE

The proposal also includes an area for the storage and collection of refuse, from St John's Well Lane.

CONCLUSION

Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways, subject to the conditions and informative notes above.

Trees and Woodlands

There are no trees within the site with sufficient amenity value to constrain the development. As such, I have no objections and recommend approval.

Herts Archaeology

The proposed development is located within Area of Archaeological Significance no. 21, as identified in the Local Plan. This covers the historic core of Berkhamsted, which in its current configuration has early medieval origins, including a significant motte and bailey castle. Considerable archaeological evidence from earlier has been found within the town and its environs, however, particularly dating from the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods.

The proposed development area has previously been subject to archaeological evaluation, prior to the construction of 320a High Street (Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust 1993a). This identified Roman and medieval features. The footprint of the building itself was fully excavated (Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust 1993b), revealing several ditches, pits and post/stake-holes containing significant quantities of 12th-14th century pottery and animal bone, and small quantities of iron slag, brick, and tile (Historic Environment Record no. 7369).

Within the area to the rear of the current building (i.e. the proposed development area) Roman and medieval features were identified by the evaluation, but preserved in situ under the car park rather than excavated. These archaeological remains will be disturbed by the proposed development.

The medieval features may be related in some way to the St John the Baptist Leper Hospital, a 13th century hospital that stood circa 25m to the east along the High Street (HER no. 4142). Over 250 human skeletons were discovered at the former hospital prior to the construction of a mixed-use development in 2014 (HER no. 9182). The extent of this cemetery is uncertain, and while no human remains have previously been found during excavations at 320a High Street the presence of such remains is not inconceivable.

I believe therefore that the proposed development is such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest and I recommend that the following provisions be made, should you be minded to grant consent:

1. The archaeological evaluation, via strip map and record, of the development area, prior to any development taking place;
2. such appropriate mitigation measures indicated as necessary by the evaluation.

These may include:

- a) the preservation of any archaeological remains in situ, if warranted, by amendment(s) to the design of the development if this is feasible;
 - b) the appropriate archaeological excavation of any remains before any development commences on the site;
 - c) the archaeological monitoring and recording of the ground works of the development, including foundations, services, landscaping, access, etc. (and also including a contingency for the preservation or further investigation of any remains then encountered);
3. the analysis of the results of the archaeological work, with provisions for the subsequent production of a report and an archive, and the publication of the results, as appropriate;
 4. such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the archaeological interests of the site.

I believe that these recommendations are both reasonable and necessary to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications of this development proposal. I further believe that these recommendations closely follow the policies included within Policy 16 (para. 199, etc.) of the National Planning Policy Framework. and the guidance contained in the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide.

In this case two appropriately worded conditions on any planning consent relating to these reserved matters would be sufficient to provide for the level of investigation that this proposal warrants. I suggest the following wording:

Condition A

No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording as suggested by the evaluation
3. The programme for post investigation assessment
4. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
5. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records

of the site investigation

6. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation

7. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Condition B

i) Demolition/development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).

ii) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

If planning consent is granted, this office will be able to advise further on the requirements for the investigation and to provide information on accredited archaeological contractors who may be able to carry out the work.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information or clarification.

Berkhamsted Town Council

Objection

The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the local community by removing a valued service. Furthermore, the loss of the Veterinary practice would reduce the mix of properties in the town, impact the spread of job opportunities and lead to loss of employment in the local area. Additionally, the proposed development is of poor design and not in keeping with the Conservation Area.

P120, CS4, CS8, CS12, CS14, CS15, CS23

DBC conservation

The site is located at the corner of St Johns Well Lane and the High St in Berkhamsted. It is within the conservation area. At present there is a modern building (although traditional in form and detailing) which forms this corner site. It is of red brick with slate roof and addresses the corner with the façade relating to the high street and reflecting the character of the adjacent buildings but subservient in scale. A calmer frontage relates to St Johns Well lane in similar materials. To the rear of the site is a small car park. Opposite is the somewhat harsh single storey telephone exchange, which is out of place within the conservation area. To the rear are flats, which dates to the second half of the 20th century, which is of lesser architectural merit. There is some planting to both the high street and the lane, which softens the boundary.

The proposal is in essence in two parts. The conversion of the existing and rebuilding of the rear extension and the new dwellings.

Existing building

As stated above this sits comfortably within the streetscape. The proposal involves the demolition of the rear extension and its rebuilding to tie in with the middle step of the building. This would match in terms of building line, scale, height and detailing. This would align with the 3 storey rear extensions to the adjacent Victorian properties. We do not believe that this proposal would harm the character of the conservation area. The scale, mass, design and detailing are appropriate and would not cause harm to the designated heritage asset. As a local authority we have a duty under the act to preserve or enhance the conservation area. We believe that this proposal would preserve this part of the conservation area and therefore would not object to this element of the proposals.

2 new dwellings.

The proposed new dwellings are attached to the rear of the existing structure. They would be constructed of brick with green roofs. Substantial bronze or bronze coloured metal clad elements added to the street frontage. To the gable (which would be visible from St Johns Well Lane) the brickwork is detailed to a herringbone pattern. With this and to the rear trellises are to be added to the upper elements to encourage plant growth and soften the scheme.

These buildings are proposed to be constructed in a contemporary style however they do follow the rules of other buildings within the conservation area. The scale and mass of the houses are in proportion of those seen elsewhere in the conservation area and are in essence relatively modest 2 bedroom properties. They follow the pattern within the street of stepping down. The parapet height for the upper building sits below the eaves height of the adjacent traditional style building. The other dwelling steps down from this. The majority of the structure is brick and to the gable herringbone pattern brickwork would provide visual interest and the trellis element would cover part and help add to this interest. Where it differs is that within the facades there are proposed large metal feature elements, which include the windows. Whilst the brickwork, stepping and mass reflect the traditional buildings within the town these elements would express the more contemporary nature of the development. This reflects the repetition seen elsewhere abet in a more contemporary manner and in part gives the central element a focus when viewed against the backdrop of the brickwork.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Having given particular consideration to the design and detailing of the proposals and new buildings, within the setting of the site on balance and given the surrounding post WW2 development to St Johns Well Lane we believe that the proposals are of an acceptable standard of architecture and subject to a material and detailing condition would be appropriate within the conservation area.

Recommendation We would not object to the proposals. For the extension to the existing building all external materials, detailing, joinery and finishes to match existing.

For the two new dwellings Bricks, mortar subject to approval. Rooflights and door details subject to approval. Green roof specification and maintenance plan subject to approval. All external metalwork, finishes and detailing including

feature bronze panels, windows and trellis features subject to approval of detailing at 1:20 scale or as appropriate. Doors subject to approval. Hard and soft landscaping materials and details subject to approval.

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Address	Comments
24 CONNAUGHT GARDENS, BERKHAMS TED, HP4 1SF	I wish to object to this proposed development. I have been a client of St John's Veterinary Surgery for many years, and they provide a very valuable service to the local community, in this convenient town centre location. This location is predominately commercial, NOT residential. The property owner is putting personal financial gain ahead of the good of the local community. Clients of the surgery can arrive with their pets on foot, but if the practice is driven out of town, everyone will end up needing to make car journeys to take their pets for medical attention. Surely we don't want even more car journeys in this crowded town? Please refuse permission for this development, and please refuse permission for any change of use of the current site.
33 CROSS OAK ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3EH	I wish to object to the proposal for the following reasons:- 1 Change of use 320a is currently used as a veterinary practice. As one of only two practices in the town it provides a valuable service to its many users and is an important amenity in the High Street. This proposal will lead to the loss of the practice, reduce the range of services in the High Street and replicate existing housing. The other practice in the town is already well used and without this practice in this location current users will have to travel to nearby towns for veterinary services. 2 Design The proposed design is not sympathetic to the surrounding Victorian Villas, it will obstruct the view of the villas and the materials proposed are not in keeping with the area.
St Johns Veterinary Surgery, , , ,	No notification of planning application. I am sending you this for and on the behalf of St Johns vets St Johns vets has been in Berkhamsted since 1950s it was serving surrounding farms and a small in house surgery. The current building was purpose built as a veterinary surgery by Waitrose for us so they could have our old site (1995). has been the principle vet for 35 years and took over the

	<p>business in 1995 after retired. Soon after retirement passed away and the building was left to his extended family members, with the practice St Johns vets as their Tenant for the last 23 years.</p> <p>employs 11 vet and nurse staff, with other part time, locum, and admin staff totalling at around 20. She has a disabled member of staff (double leg amputee) who has worked for the practice as a vet nurse for the last 30 years and has been registered disabled for the last 3. St Johns has currently 3 local school pupils from Ashlyns and Berkhamsted collegiate schools seeing practice at any one time, and one has just started at Bristol university training to be a vet. On top of this St Johns is a registered training practice with the 'Royal Vet Collage' and the 'Collage of animal welfare', currently offering 12 X 2 week places a year for uni students to gain experience and skills. (fully taken with students till 2020) this is all done with no charge or cost to the students and often providing accommodation as well.</p> <p>We have thousands of registered clients, a few of whom are registered blind or disabled and come to us because they find the location with the bus and private carpark better for their needs and their working dogs. Many clients are able to walk to the surgery and being so close to the canal we have regular clients who come to see us who live on the canal boats. We support local charities by collecting food and bedding for them, and we often find ourselves assisting with re homing pets or looking after local wildlife in distress especially from the canal.</p> <p>The landlord wishes to sell the building with planning permission to change and increase the existing building from vets practice with staff /vet student accommodation above to 4 dwellings. The building was purpose built as a veterinary surgery and would be very difficult to move to new premises. In the planning statement submitted for this application it states :- 6.1 The loss of the veterinary practice is not considered contrary to local planning policies. There is no specific local policy requiring the retention of such a facility and in any event, the practice will be relocating and not lost. This statement is not true, at no point has the landlord discussed with us about the relocation, we feel the this vet surgery is an important service to Berkhamsted and the surrounding community. We object to this application because if the building acquires change of use we simply could not find or afford to move to a new location, and would result in the end of 70 years of St Johns and unemployment for the staff.</p>
Cedarwood, Darkes	I wish to object to the proposed change of use. St Johns

<p>Lane,Darkes Lane,Potters Bar,,en6 1da</p>	<p>Veterinary Practice provides an invaluable service to the local community. Relocating the practice would not be satisfactory as not only is it purpose built, but it is also in an ideal location for its clients. It is unfair and unnecessary to discriminate against members of the community who, for whatever reason, do not have the use of a car and who have relied on the central location of the practice for many years.</p>
<p>CLAMBER COTTAGE,NORTHCHURCH LANE,ASHLEY GREEN,CHESHAM,HP5 3PD</p>	<p>I am in complete agreement with others who have objected to this development.</p> <p>320a is currently used as a veterinary practice. It is one of only two practices in this rapidly expanding town and provides a valuable service to the community. This proposal will lead to the loss of the practice and reduce the range of essential services in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The centre of the town is in a valley and is already congested. The proposed dwellings are in a busy and noisy commercial area, which is not ideal for residential accommodation. Furthermore, the proposed alterations and enlargement of the building is unattractive and out of keeping with the character of the area. Too much development if this nature in the centre of town will destroy the character of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>As a final comment, it is disappointing that the landlords did not have the decency to inform the practice of their intentions and I am concerned that if they are given the go ahead to develop, they may push through other unforewarned changes.</p>
<p>51 THE LAWNS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP1 2TE</p>	<p>The proposed building of flats is detrimental to the current aspect and nature of this area of Berkhamsted and especially the characteristics of the high street. The vets is an established and independent business providing a valued service to the town and employment to local residents. To lose yet another small business will irreparably change the town which we do not want to do. Reject the proposal and keep Berkhamsted interesting!</p>
<p>18 VERNEY CLOSE,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 3JS</p>	<p>It would be a massive loss to Berkhamsted if this went ahead. St John's Veterinary surgery is a caring professional service who I myself have used for many years.</p>
<p>7 NORMANDY DRIVE,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 1JW</p>	<p>I have used St John's Vets since I came to Berkhamsted over 28 years ago for my various pets. I strongly object to the change of use because a) I do not believe that we need any more flats in the town and b) the vets plays a vital role/service to the pet loving community. It is well placed for older people to access it with their pets either on foot or car/taxi and it serves the community at that end of town extremely well. It is important that</p>

	Berkhamsted stays relevant with local services and the vets does just that. I feel very strongly about this and believe that the planning application should be declined.
15 OAKWOOD,BERKHAMS TED,,,HP4 3NQ	The team at St. John's vets have served the local community in these central premises for a long term and should be allowed to continue.
21 CROSS OAK ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 3EH	<p>I object to the removal of a helpful local amenity, and its replacement by yet more housing - Berkhamsted is already overcrowded, and does not need more housing stock. The town already has a healthy property market with plenty of houses and flats for sale/rent. Addition of parking spaces for five more vehicles will also add to the overcrowding, when the town already has more cars and is, ludicrously, trying to attract more with the absurd decision to build the multi storey car park.</p> <p>The corner of St Johns Well Lane and the High Steen is already a traffic choke point because of the mini roundabout and the access to M&S and Waitrose, and adding a dwelling on the corner instead of the vet's surgery will cause further congestion and traffic issues. Although I understand this is not a matter which you will take into consideration, the proposed construction work on that corner will inevitably cause major disruption and inconvenience and will result in major congestion for those turning into the M&S and Waitrose access road. The harm to the surrounding area is obvious, particularly with the current vacant buildings, the Lamb public house and the former Porter's restaurant, both of which also seem likely to involve major building work in the near future. At what point will this stop?</p> <p>So, i object, and though I fully expect that objections will be ignored and the over-development of Berkhamsted will simply continue, I did at least want to register my objections.</p>
4 CAREYS CROFT,BERKHAMSTED ,,,HP4 1SB	<p>I have used this vet practice since getting my dog as a puppy. The location is not only really convenient for owners by car or by foot but also enables owners to use shops whilst in town bringing business to the high street. This practice was purpose built and provides a valuable service to the local community. The council should look at the town as a whole and not just a dumping ground for housing. There is not enough in the way of services or infra structure to support all this extra housing.</p> <p>The design of the proposed building is ugly and out of keeping with the surrounding area. This is clearly an attempt to make money at the expense of ruining what should be an attractive historic market town.</p>
OLD GROVE FARM,66	We have been customers at the St. Johns Well

<p>GROVE ROAD, TRING,, HP23 5PD</p>	<p>Veterinary practice for over 20 years and Jane and her team of dedicated Vets have provided superb service to us and many more in the local community over that time. To lose such a precious community asset to an over-developed housing site would be a travesty of how we want our community to be structured for the future.</p>
<p>3 BECKETS SQUARE, BERKHAMSTE D,,, HP4 1BZ</p>	<p>There is too much development from businesses, which employ people, to residential. I consider that flats will lead to more cars on an already congested high street. This will leave one vet practice in Berkhamsted which is not enough for the growing town.</p>
<p>44 Lynch Hill, Kensworth,,, LU6 3QY</p>	<p>I have worked at this surgery for over 30 years (it was at 254 High Street before it was moved to the present site when Waitrose was built). The surgery has not received official notification of this planning application. The surgery was purpose built in 1994 when Waitrose wanted to use the previous site. Finding new premises would be difficult and installing the equipment prohibitively expensive. Granting change of use would probably mean the end of St Johns Veterinary Surgery and the loss of 12 jobs. One of the staff is disabled and would have great difficulty finding another position. The surgery provides an invaluable service to the local community especially those that don't drive or have disabilities. The surgery also provides training for veterinary nurses and veterinary surgeons. The surgery was built to blend with the adjacent houses, I don't feel that the apartments to be built in the car park are in keeping with the main building. These will provide more expensive private dwellings which I don't feel Berkhamsted needs.</p>
<p>24 CHILTERN PARK AVENUE, BERKHAMSTE D,,, HP4 1EU</p>	<p>I object to this development. The veterinary practice is a necessity for the community. Berkhamsted is already over developed and lacking in other amenities/services without losing another one. They offer fantastic services in a convenient location with limited parking facilities. It would be a great loss to the families/pets in Berkhamsted if this development goes ahead.</p>
<p>HORSEBLOCK FARM, HEATH END, BERKHAMSTED,,, HP4 3UF</p>	<p>I object to this application because:</p> <p>1) OVERDEVELOPMENT OF SITE AND NOT IN KEEPING.</p> <p>Over development of the site with too many flats that are not in keeping with the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>2) PARKING</p> <p>This does not meet the minimum parking requirements</p>

	<p>for new build properties. Berkhamsted already has a parking issue-we do not need to add to that by keep on building residential properties with less than the minimum requirement-even more so, in such a central location!</p> <p>3) CHANGE OF USE</p> <p>This is a purpose built vet practice providing a needed service to an ever-expanding town. Change of use will lead to the unemployment of its veterinary staff, as re-location to a building in such a central location and with its own parking will not be possible.</p> <p>Is the gain of only 3 flats worth the loss of employment and the service it provides?</p> <p>4) SETS A PRECEDENCE FOR DEVELOPING TOWN CENTRE</p> <p>Its sets a precedence for developing commercial premises off of the main high street, with a loss of service and of shops. There are other less central areas available for building residential property.</p>
<p>59 MEADOW ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 1JL</p>	<p>As a point of law, I feel that there may well be covenants in place regarding the change of use which Waitrose would have imposed when funding the original build of the surgery. This would be to stop the building being sold in the future for profit and turned into residential use as is now proposed.</p> <p>St Johns Vets is one of only two vet practices in Berkhamsted. It is however the ONLY independent vets in the town. As an independent vets it frequently goes the extra mile in offering its clients a personalised service. It is a busy surgery all year round and Berkhamsted would struggle enormously if left with only one practice. I have been a client for over 11 years and have found all the staff to always be extremely helpful and caring. It would be a tragedy for yet another independent business to be lost in the town.</p>
<p>56 KINGS ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 3BJ</p>	<p>I strongly object to this proposal - this Practice is essential in supporting the community and access / location meets the needs of the town. With Berkhamsted growing in size the town needs this practice and I don't feel that there is a need to increase property on this site when we have so much land already being developed upon .</p>
<p>LITTLE</p>	<p>I strongly object to this proposal.</p>

<p>CORNER,CROSS OAK ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3NA</p>	<p>This is only of only two veterinary practises serving a growing town. Its loss would be significant to those using it's services today and it's likely that one practise could not cope with the increase in clients.</p> <p>The other practise is also at the other end of town - this would create increased car journies which area already increasingly fraught in a town not designed for the current population with a single road sitting in a valley.</p> <p>This is a local business providing local jobs. These should be protected.</p> <p>Development of flats on this plot is not in keeping with the overall location and other properties on the high street. It</p>
<p>3 Greencroft Cottages,Mount Nugent,Chesham,,HP5 2XJ</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed planning application. As I understand it St. John's vet's practise has already had to move a number of years ago due to redevelopment. When this happened they were moved into a PURPOSE built surgery which is their current location now again under threat. The vet's practice has clients from a wide area not only Berkhamsted. People come from Chesham, Hemel, Tring, and out lying villages. It is also used by people living along the canal due to the practice's close proximity to the water, means they can register their pets with them. I understand that Berkhamsted has another vet's practice but both are incredibly busy so to lose one of them would be a great loss for the town. St. John's practice has parking which means clients don't have to use other public carparks or side roads causing cogestion. I am sure there are other areas of Berkhamsted that can be redeveloped without losing a much needed business and the jobs that accompany it. For the sake of a few more flats in Berkhamsted which won't go much towards any numbers required by the 'Local Plan' the loss of the vet's practise would be of far greater detriment to the town. Infrastructure MUST also be considered, services such as the Vet's should NOT be under threat.</p>
<p>3 Greencroft Cottages,Mount Nugent,Chesham,,HP5 2XJ</p>	<p>I should also like to add to my previous comment that I am in agreement with all the other objections listed and looking at the plans am horrified at the design which clearly doesn't fit in the surrounding area. Berkhamsted like Chesham is an historic market town and as such should be treated with some respect.</p>
<p>3 Greencroft Cottages,Mount Nugent,Chesham,,HP5</p>	<p>I would like to object to the above planning application, St Johns is a long established vets that has provided employment for many years, and they serve a wide area.</p>

2XJ	<p>If they were forced to close that, I understand, would leave one vet in berkhamsted, nowhere near enough for a town that is growing as Berkhamsted is at the present time. I understand the reasons, I believe the applicants were left this property and obviously want to make a quick buck to maximise their good fortune, no crime in that, however this would have far reaching consequences to pet owners for miles around, and put an excellent and caring veterinary team out of employment.</p> <p>One other thing, the design is hideous, is that the best an architect can do, did they actually visit the site? There are some fine villas in the vicinity, so even if the planning consent is given, and I do hope it won't be, the design should be thrown out.</p>
46 WOODLANDS AVENUE, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2JQ	<p>I am a long time user of this surgery, from even before the last time it had to relocate. At least the relocation created a purpose built facility that benefits the town and provides an excellent service. As far as I am aware there are only two veterinary surgeries in Berkhamsted. A relocation will probably be outside the town or even risk closure. The other surgery is unlikely to be able to absorb all the existing clients. Vets are part of the essential infrastructure a town needs and for the reasons above, the application should be refused.</p>
25 BRIDGEWATER ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1HN	<p>This is the only remaining independent veterinary practice in Berkhamsted and as such remains a valuable asset to the town. We have used the practice for nearly twenty years and can vouch for the professionalism of all the staff. Access to the centre, almost opposite the service road/parking area is already congested and the addition of extra housing will only exacerbate this problem.</p>
White House Parrotts Lane, Cholesbury, Tring, HP23 6NY	<p>This Building has been used by St. Johns Veterinary practice for many years. They have invested in the building to provide a top veterinary services to people in Berkhamsted and the surrounding area. The Business is in an ideal local for people in the area to reach.</p> <p>If this planning application goes ahead and the vets has to move it will have a damaging affect to the economy of Berkhamsted. It will also have a large widespread negative effect on a substantial number of people who use the services provided from this building to look after their animals.</p>
25 BRIDGEWATER ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1HN	<p>St John's Veterinary Practice is the only remaining independent practice of its sort left in Berkhamsted and as such is a real asset to and part of the character of the town. We have used the practice for nearly twenty years and always found all the staff very professional and helpful. Is there any provision for the relocation of the</p>

	<p>practice? We are assuming that the original convenient under which the site was developed by Waitrose as part of its displacement from its original site allows for this change of use. The road leading to the practice, St. John's Lane, is already extremely busy as it caters for both Marks and Spencer's and Waitrose traffic and the additional traffic generated by the proposed development will only add to this congestion.</p>
<p>7 Yew Court,The Crescent,Sidcup,,DA14 6FD</p>	<p>It would be a real shame for the residents of Berkhamsted if this proposal was to go ahead. This veterinary practice has served many Berkhamsted pet owners for many years and it is situated in such an ideal location in the centre of town, with lots of people in walking distance. To replace it with flats would be a great loss to these people and to the vets who work here.</p>
<p>40 UPPER HALL PARK,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 2NP</p>	<p>Could we please consider the way of life for Berkhamsted residents, rather than endless commercially motivated development. This veterinary practice is an outstanding, long established and much loved part of the community. Preserving facilities such as this should be the top priority in any planning review.</p>
<p>30 WESTFIELD ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 3PN</p>	<p>This is a good vets and is well valued and area is kept tidy</p>
<p>HILLCOTE,DOCTORS COMMONS ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3DR</p>	<p>A centrally located veterinary surgery such as the St John's Well Road practice is an amenity the town can ill afford to lose, especially as it would leave only one veterinary surgery for a growing town. The practice offers employment to local people as well as an excellent service to many local pet owners. This practice has already relocated once and it is unlikely that a small business could weather such an upheaval again, even if suitable premises could be found. To swap a veterinary practice for a small number of new flats does not seem to me a good decision by planners on behalf of the citizens of this town.</p>
<p>COWPER HOUSE,7 COWPER ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3DE</p>	<p>The veterinary surgery that is there is a busy practice. It is ideally situated for its customers to get to, with its own carpark, or within walking distance from many houses. Berkhamsted has many flats already.</p>
<p>14 HALSEY DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP1 3SF</p>	<p>I wish to object to the proposed change of use from a veterinary surgery to residential use. For the past 20 years I have taken my pets to this surgery and the vets and nurses provide an invaluable service. The building was purpose built to be a veterinary surgery and should remain as such.</p>
<p>21 ST KATHERINES WAY,BERKHAMSTED,,, HP4 1DA</p>	<p>Facilities in Berkhamsted are already stretched beyond breaking point and MUST be balanced against the increasing population of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Halving the veterinary services of Berkhamsted for more</p>

	<p>housing is therefore indefensible...</p> <p>I note that the Town Council's aims are to ensure Berkhamsted:- Is a desirable and thriving place in which to live, work and visit. Has a safe, active, healthy and sustainable community. Retains its unique historic and cultural identity and vibrant town centre.</p> <p>This proposal would break all 3 of those aims...</p>
<p>3 CHALET CLOSE, BERKHAMSTED ,,HP4 3NR</p>	<p>The application makes great play of other sites where Dacorum policies on such things as parking and community space have been relaxed. Each site is individual and precedence should not be used as a justification for ignoring planning rules which are there for good reason.</p> <p>There is insufficient parking and no visitor parking which will inevitably result in parking in the spaces for the blocks of flats at the bottom of the road. There are public car parks close by, but we all know that nobody pays if they can park for free - just look at the side streets off the high street.</p> <p>The "refuse" area does not have enough bins - no green bin even though there is a garden for the front 2 flats and adjacent planting.</p> <p>Insufficient area for bin/ delivery lorries to turn, which will result in parking on St Johns Well Lane which is the main access route to/from Waitrose, M&S and the main town car park. This in turn will potentially result in more congestion on the high street as traffic backs up to the mini roundabout, and blocked access to the M&S carpark and for BT vehicles which park at the adjacent Telephone exchange. This will be even more of a problem during the construction phase. Additionally Construction traffic and delivery lorries will need to drive round the public carpark via the Waitrose access road to exit the site. Delivery lorries parked outside the garden centre often limit the width of this road, and there is often traffic queuing to Waitrose car park. The Corners on this road, adjacent to the Waitrose car park are also very tight and there have been occasions when lorries delivering to the garden centre have been unable to get round until parked cars have been moved - thinking brick delivery type vehicles, or low loaders with plant would have problems</p>

<p>85 CHILTERN PARK AVENUE, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 1EY</p>	<p>I object to this proposal. The veterinary surgery have been an outstanding service to Berkhamsted for some time, and I believe it's loss would have a massive impact on pet owners in the area. It is easily accessible by foot and road from the town centre, and its closing would be a great loss for the community.</p>
<p>20 PRINCES CLOSE, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1JS</p>	<p>St John's Veterinary Surgery provide a very valuable service to the local community, in a convenient, predominately commercial location.</p> <p>The practice provides employment for several local residents as well as training opportunities and work placements for the next generation of veterinary practitioners.</p> <p>Clients of the surgery and their pets can visit the current surgery on foot or by car but it is difficult to see that there is a suitable property elsewhere in the town should St John's be forced to close. If forced to move from the current premises to an out of town location this will be a considerable loss to the community and everyone will end up needing to travel by car - surely we should be trying to reduce car use not increase it?</p> <p>This corner is a busy area of the town with people parking at M&S and, Waitrose and the general car park; further congestion by vans and larger vehicles during building work would add to this and increase the likelihood of accidents.</p> <p>I hope this application will be denied</p>
<p>85 CHILTERN PARK AVENUE, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 1EY</p>	<p>As a business premises this property is occupied in business hours meaning it is peaceful for neighbours outside of these hours. The dedicated parking also means the vet practice is able to deliver a service to their clients with minimal disruption to the rest of town. There are few other suitable premises for such a business within the town centre and losing this fantastic practice would hugely impact the pet owners of Berkhamsted</p>
<p>44 GAVESTON DRIVE, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1JF</p>	<p>I strongly oppose this idea for several reasons.</p> <p>The current occupiers of the building are St Johns Vets. A team of the most incredible people who have been here for as long as I have lived in Berkhamsted (over 10 years) and it will be such a shame for such a highly regarded practice to move to a different location one potentially without the ease of reaching it on foot, and without the ample parking.</p> <p>I have personally had such a positive experience from the practice. I did a week of work experience and got</p>

	<p>offered a job working there as a "Saturday girl". during my time here I applied to vet school and successfully got offered a place and secured it. I could not have done it without the experience and knowledge I gained from firstly working in a practice and from the team who have so many contacts that were essential for me to gain the right work experience placements for me to pursue my aspirations.</p> <p>During my time working 3 other students also volunteered and worked at the practice. Where schools failed to fully understand the demands of pursuing a goal in Veterinary Science St Johns vets provide the knowledge, guidance and support to students pursuing dreams of becoming not only Vets but Vet Nurses too and animal based occupations.</p> <p>The reputation of the practice is one of respect and admiration. The ease of access to so many people, due to the location in the town center is one that will be hard to reproduce anywhere else. Being central to the town means that any clients with an emergency issue can easily get to the practice in more ways than one if they cannot drive.</p> <p>These reasons are why I strongly object to this planning permission and urge everyone else to do the same.</p>
<p>2 Bishopstone,Aylesbury,,, HP17 8SE</p>	<p>I object to this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St John's Vets has been an independent practice serving Berkhamsted and the surrounding area since the 1950s. The building they lease was purpose built as a veterinary surgery by Waitrose in 1995 in order for Waitrose to build on their old site. St John's Vets have been tenants of the building for the last 23 years. A similar premises within the town simply does not exist and certainly not one with parking for clients - which is essential when transporting sick and injured animals. If planning were granted it would force the practice to either close or move out of town. The latter option would incur the huge expense of moving, developing the new site to meet the needs of a veterinary practice and inevitable loss of clients unable or unwilling to travel out of town. Moving is unlikely to be financially viable and force a long established, highly regarded and much used community asset to close. -St John's Vets employs 11 veterinary staff, with various part time, admin and locum staff from the local area taking the total to around 20. Several staff members are in their 60s and 70s and would struggle to find

	<p>employment elsewhere. St John's also employs a disabled staff member (double leg amputee) who has worked there as a nurse for the last 30 years (registered disabled for the last 3).</p> <p>-St John's is a registered training practice with the Royal Veterinary College and College of Animal Welfare providing essential placements for student vets and nurses - being fully booked with students until 2020. In addition 3 local school pupils from Ashlyns and Berkhamsted Schools that aspire to be vets are currently gaining experience after school and at weekends for their university application. St John's does all of this for free and for the benefit of the profession and local community.</p> <p>-Thousands of clients are registered to St John's Vets, including some who are registered blind or disabled. The practice provides parking for clients and those wishing to walk or needing to use public transport can do so easily. Clients living on canal boats are also able to readily access the practice being located so close to the canal.</p> <p>- The planning application states 'The loss of the existing veterinary practice does not breach local planning policy' yet there is no specific local policy regarding veterinary practices. This community asset should be considered in the same bracket as a doctors surgery with registered clients and a duty of care.</p> <p>-Berkhamsted is not short of housing - especially apartments. There is simply no need to lose this essential community asset for housing. It is a greedy overdevelopment of the site that benefits few, at the expense of so many.</p> <p>-Even if the development were justifiable, the proposed design of the two new apartments is frankly an insult to the surrounding historic architecture. Modern architecture can marry old and new so beautifully but sadly this design is neither interesting or sympathetic. Two crumpled cardboard boxes piggybacked onto the end of a Victorian building is a disgrace to the conservation area within which it is situated and surely cannot be allowed. I sincerely hope common sense prevails and the planning officers recognise what is right for the community of Berkhamsted by rejecting this application.</p>
<p>8 MOREFIELDS, TRING,,, HP23 5EU</p>	<p>I am very much in objection to this proposal. There are so many new build flats being constantly constructed in the surrounding area , which offer no character or history, and offer nothing to the community in the terms of local amenities. Berkhamstead is very much a community and this vets is very much part of that, So many vets are being bought out by corporate companies and this practice, which is still independent should be supported in staying where it is. The building was rennovated to be</p>

	<p>a veterinary surgery. It would be a devastating decision to make this close after many years of being a successful family run passionate vets.</p>
<p>8 MOREFIELDS,TRING,,, HP23 5EU</p>	<p>Berkhamstead already has plenty of flats, it doesn't need anymore. If an animal has a heart attack, for example, then they would have to have to drive to the other side of town and could waste time.</p> <p>Our vets is an important part of berkhamsteads community, plenty of people at my schools animals go there.</p> <p>Many vets and vet nurses jobs will be lost, including my mums, if the vets get changed into flats and they will have trouble finding another job close to home.</p>
<p>14 Green Lane,WEST MOLESEY,,,KT82PN</p>	<p>Please do not uproot this much needed veterinary practice!</p>
<p>17 BOXWELL ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 3EX</p>	<p>I object to this development. It would represent the loss of a vital small business that has been in the town for over 50 years. St John's provides an important service to Berkhamsted and the surrounding community. The practice was purpose built and is in an ideal location allowing clients to access on foot and to make use of other local amenities.</p> <p>St John's is a small local business providing employment for approx 15-20 staff. It also provides vital work experience for young people from Berkhamsted schools who want to become a vet. It is a registered Training Practice for the Royal Vet College.</p> <p>Berkhamsted doesn't need any more flats. The town is already crowded and this is overdevelopment on a dangerous corner.</p> <p>We have used the Practice for over 12 years and rely on the practice.</p> <p>So I object on basis of change of use:</p> <p>320a is currently used as a veterinary practice. As one of only two practices in the town it provides a valuable service to its many users and is an important amenity in the High Street. This proposal will lead to the loss of the practice , reduce the range of services in the High Street and replicate existing housing. The other practice in the town is already well used and without this practice in this location current users will have to travel to nearby towns for veterinary services .</p> <p>And Design</p>

	The proposed design is not sympathetic to the surrounding Victorian Villas, it will obstruct the view of the villas and the materials proposed are not in keeping with the area.
14 Green Lane,West Molesey,,KT8 2PN	Local jobs over housing. Maintain and sustain!
8 LOCHNELL ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 3QD	I do not think flats in this area will be very in keeping with the Victorian style and class of Berkhamsted. With lots of new build properties in the area I feel more flats in this location are unnecessary and will cause the entrance In to the car park and beginning of town to be even busier and off putting to go to my local town! St. John's is a great vets and has offered so much to the locals throughout the years.this business has work well for over 20 years and is apart of BERKHAMSTED as an asset to the community.
ASHTON,64 GROVE ROAD,TRING,,HP23 5PD	A fabulous long-established vets that has served the local community for years should not be replaced with yet more ugly flats
2,Star cottages,Bierton,,Hp22 5dp	It would be a real shame for the Berkhamsted community to loose St Johns vets, it has been an established and independent business providing a valued service to the town and employment to local residents for many many years. The new build flats would also not be in keeping of the Victorian character of Berkhamsted and look completely out of place as many of these new builds do to local communities.
16 ADAMS WAY,TRING,,HP23 5DY	The veterinary care currently provided at this location is an important and very needed part of the local community. Such expertise are not available elsewhere for the community. It would be a terrible loss to see the veterinary practice close for one additional flat when so many others have been built in the area recently.
44 Morefields,Tring,,HP23 5EU	Such a shame to close an excellent centre that serves the community to build yet more homes.
HIGHFIELDS,SHENSTONE HILL,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 2PA	I do not support the change of use application. The veterinary practice must remain in the building.
HIGHFIELDS,SHENSTONE HILL,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 2PA	The vets must remain
St John's House,Chesham Road,Berkhamsted,,HP4 3AF	St John's Vets is a vital and valued service for the town. This application will remove a much respected business and service. The clients and animals will be devastated at its loss.
7 CHAPEL STREET,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 2EA	A terrible shame to lose such a wonderful independent business from the town.

20 HAYNES MEAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 1BU	I strongly object to the destruction of a thriving veterinary business for flats.
5 BECKETS SQUARE,BERKHAMSTE D,,,HP4 1BZ	Please do not proceed this is a very good business & provides a vital service to this town. The site in particular is a terrible place to put residential properties
52 PHEASANT CLOSE,BERKHAMSTED ,,,HP4 2HH	Not only is this veterinary practice providing the community of Berkhamsted with a vital and dedicated service for our pets it is also very much an institution of Berkhamsted in its own right. I personally take my pet there as it is easily accessible and the staff are truly dedicated to their jobs and their clients. I object to this planning application due to the loss of this vital and dedicated service for our community. It will be tragic for many pet owners if this practice was forced to move to a less convenient location that would compromise its clients.
1 PARKLANDS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP1 3SJ	Long standing friendly local business would be lost if this went ahead.
13 FARLAND ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4RS	I use this vets, and feel it is a huge asset to the community. It will be really sad to see it disappear. We need this vets as there are not many independent vets in the area.
4 ILEX COURT,MONTAGUE ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3DY	The junction where this site is located is very busy. Adding so many residential flats will create further congestion. There is no need to build more residential accommodation in the town centre-it should be for businesses. In addition, the current use as a veterinary practice is a vital community facility. Loss of this business will result in considerable loss of jobs, and considerable inconvenience to local residents. It may result in local people taking their business out of the town, rather than supporting local business (it is highly unlikely that the other veterinary practice could cope with more patients).
1 COVETOUS CORNER,HUDNALL COMMON,LITTLE GADDESSEN,BERKHA MSTED,HP4 1QW	I like to lodge my objection to this planning application. We are clients of the St. Johns veterinary surgery and have been for more than 20 years. To allow the change of use on this building into a residential property, I feel would be a further nail in the coffin the High Street. This veterinary surgery provides essential care for animals, in a convenient and central location. Although there is another vet surgery in the town, I am certain that they wouldn't have the facilities to take on a vast number of extra patients if St. Johns' Veterinary Surgery were forced to move to an alternative location. There has been a massive amount of residential building in and near the town centre, some of which has already taken away businesses that previously enhanced the town. The vets is a central and essential service for pets and their

	owners. We don't need more housing in the town centre, we need to retain independent and essential businesses.
320 High Street Berkhamsted,,,,	<p>Objection (as summarised)</p> <p>Appearance of new apartments are out of character with Berkhamsted conservation area and would result in a loss of space at the side of St John's Well Lane.</p> <p>The main windows of the extension are only 4.5 metres away from main family living space and would result in a loss of privacy.</p> <p>Parking exit/entry into the development is dangerous. No space for turning around within the site.</p> <p>Loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring property and garden area. Ground floor area and key rear window by rear steps omitted in submitted Daylight and Sunlight assessment.</p>
74 CROSS OAK ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 3HZ	<p>I object. Provision for 5 parking spaces with a potential for 8 cars or more with the amount of bedrooms is insufficient and will lead to further parking problems in surrounding areas.</p> <p>St Johns Vet is a vital business, providing services to the local and surrounding village communities and employing a large number of staff. The likelihood of them finding suitable premises with sufficient parking is slim and would be a significant loss of a business in the High Street.</p>
3 WHITEWOOD ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 3LJ	<p>I wish to object to the application on grounds of change of use as a client of the practice and member of the community.</p> <p>The current building is purpose built to house a veterinary practice, with dedicated parking for staff and visitors. The practice provides an essential service to the local population and employment for the staff. The practice also provides training for veterinarian students.</p> <p>Changing the use of the building to a residential property would mean that the practice may be forced to close down, removing a valuable facility for the people of the town and neighbouring villages, and potentially result in loss of employment for those who work there. The only alternative would be for the practice to relocate to new premises, which would represent a considerable expense to the practice and be challenging given the pressures on development in the town.</p> <p>From an environmental perspective, relocating the practice would be wasteful in terms of adapting a new building to suit the requirements of the practice, and journey times for people who would no longer be able to</p>

	walk to the town centre location.
STONYCROFT,9 SHRUBLANDS ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3HY	I write on behalf of the BCA Townscape Group, of which I am Chairman. The Group wishes to OBJECT to this application as containing elements not complementary to surrounding buildings in the conservation area, neither enhancing nor conserving. The proposed design of the new builds are out-of-keeping with the original house and others in that terrace.
43 BLACKWELL ROAD,KINGS LANGLEY,,,WD4 8NE	I Object to the conversion of the veterinary practise, not only will people loose their jobs and clients loose a veterinary surgery the plans do not fit in with the current buildings in Berkhamsted. The already busy junction will soon become a danger with all the added traffic.
Tall Trees,,Church End,Edlesborough,,LU6 2EP	I live in a village about 9 miles from the vet's but due to the superb care the staff give their animal patients and their owners I choose to travel to this practice. I used this practice for some years when I worked in Berkhamsted during the early 80's and have continued to use it with my various pets over the years. I did try a nearer vet for a while but was so unsatisfied with their care I returned to St John's. It seems to me that Berkhamsted has grown considerably since I first worked there mainly with houses being built on open sites and a lot of infill building and to allow this practice to be shut down to the detriment of the town and surrounding community, for the sake of more housing would be a grave injustice, let alone making many people redundant.
92 cromwell road,caterham,,,CR3 5JB	I visit the area regularly and do not agree with the conversion of this building into residential flats. We need businesses in the are for the infrastructure to exist and this means businesses and tis he reason why locals and myself use the area. Please don't let this conversion happen.
The Marches,Englefield Green,,,TW20 0RT	It would be a tragedy for this to be allowed to happen. The vet's is a pillar of the local community and is a hugely popular service. It would be yet another nail in the coffin of the local town and would in my opinion be a very short sighted decision should this be granted. There would almost certainly be job losses and I feel that the local community deserves better from their local council.
ORCHARD HILL,CROSS OAK ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3JB	We are concerned that such an essential local service is being closed against its will - we rely on its proximity. Regardless of right of renewal, allowing developers to close community services/businesses is depriving Berkhamsted town centre of its life and character.
119 middle road,Shoreham,,,Bn43 6ll	Vet practises are vital to the community this is an established business I use them when I am on holiday visiting friends and family in the area
8 MOREFIELDS,TRING,,,	the vets is a important part of the community and should stay where it is. We should be supporting local

HP23 5EU	<p>businesses. many children at my schools pets go there. If the vets get changed into flats, then the vets and vet nurses, including my mum, will lose their jobs and have to find another job.</p> <p>If a dog has a heart attack, for example, then they would have to drive to the other side of town, and could waist time.</p>
Milford,Bigbury,,,TQ7 4AW	Much needed service in area.
HOLLYDENE,SHOOTER SWAY,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3ND	<p>We have used this veterinary practice for over 12 years. It is a hugely convenient location at the heart of town and has a dedicated team of professional vets and nurses who look after the town's animals. Not only will this development affect their livelihoods, it will also inconvenience many, many pet owners in Berkhamsted who rely on them for pet food, advice, emergency checks ups and routine appointments. Dacorum council should be encouraging small businesses and allowing them to thrive rather than supporting this application which inconveniences hundreds of local people in return for three additional dwellings.</p>
158 FENNYCROFT ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP1 3NR	<p>I oppose the development of St John's Veterinary Surgery and tbe site, for the following reasons.</p> <p>It's one of the last remaining independent Veterninary practices in the area. Berkhamsted has many independent businesses and that's part of its attraction and charm!</p> <p>The surgery is a purpose built building, built by Waitrose over 20 years ago, when it re located it from what is now part of Waitrose car park. It was an important part of the community then, as it is now!</p> <p>What happens to all the staff who are employed at the surgery? Is The loss of all their jobs worth just four properties?</p> <p>The practice supports students from the local schools, inviting students to see work experience, as well as vital training to Veterninary students from Universities.</p> <p>Many clients combine visits to the surgery with shopping in the high street, therefore supporting local shops and cafes.</p> <p>I believe the development of the site would not provide enough parking for four flats. Many household have two cars and what happens when they have visitors? This would put an additional strain on the high street and surrounding residential roads.</p>

	<p>St John's is a friendly, well known and well loved surgery for Berkhamsted and surrounding areas. Clients find the location perfect as it provides parking for staff and clients. It also allows clients who live on boats along the canal, a convenient surgery to take their pets for treatment. We should be supporting local businesses, not pushing them out!</p>
<p>Johns Lane Farm,Ashley Green,Chesham,,HP5 3PT</p>	<p>This planning application is totally unacceptable and is going to harm a viable and very well supported veterinary practice.</p> <p>If my memory serves me correctly on condition of waitrose being built nearby they moved the existing veterinary practice which would have been in waitrose car park into this current building built new for them on the condition that it always remained as a veterinary practice.</p> <p>Therefore i totally disagree with this planning application.</p>
<p>11 COBB ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 3LE</p>	<p>This is a well loved veterinary surgery that is needed in our town. We do not need anymore flats.</p>
<p>CHERRYCROFT,TROOPER ROAD,ALDBURY,TRING,HP23 5RW</p>	<p>The current use as a veterinary practice is a vital community facility. Loss of this business could result in considerable loss of employment, and considerable inconvenience to local residents. I live in Aldbury and drive into Berkhamsted to use this Vet. The journey to the Swing Gate end of town to use the alternative Vet could take in excess of 30 minutes due the slow moving traffic along the High Street at peak times.</p> <p>I think that it would not benefit the whole community to grant this Change of use and Conversion application.</p>
<p>23 AUBREYS ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP1 2JP</p>	<p>This is a well established and loved veterinary practice I have taken my dogs to this practise since it opened and before it moved to it's present location, it's always been a very helpful and supportive practice which is what you need when your pet is sick. It's as though the flats are going to be for social housing it's just another money making project at the expense of much needed business.</p>
<p>64 ELIZABETH II AVENUE,BERKHAMSTEAD,,,HP4 3BF</p>	<p>I have no issue with more homes being built However, Berkhamsted simply will not cope with the loss of one of only two veterinary surgeries in the town I have used the other vet, Clarke & Marshal, for the past ten years and I can tell you they are always extremely busy 70% of Berkhamsted residents own a pet How many residents are there in Berkhamsted expected to use just one Veterinary surgery ?</p>

	You do the maths
40 LOWER KINGS ROAD, BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 2AA	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I am extremely upset to learn of the reference number 4/02993/18/FUL.</p> <p>I have worked in Berkhamsted for many years and find it very important to support the high street business which Dacorum Borough Council should also support especially when the high street business pay business rates. I work in a firm of solicitors based in Berkhamsted and support the high street shops/business.</p> <p>I have been a client of St Johns Vets for over 18 years and have built up a good client relation with the staff which work in the vets and in fact some of the staff have also been clients to our business so we try and support one another.</p> <p>This application is unfair and I therefore object.</p>
33 ELIZABETH II AVENUE, BERKHAMSTE D,, HP4 3BF	<p>St Johns vets has been in Berkhamsted for the 28 years we have lived in Berkhamsted, giving brilliant care to pets adn owners alike and it woudl be a considerable loss to the community if it were to be lost due to this application. It is unlikely that if this planning request were permitted that a new conveniently placed and purpose built premises would be built . The current building was purpose built as a veterinary surgery by Waitrose and should remain so and it is a facility that is needed in the town, it is always busy as is the second alternative vets at the other end of town. Location at both ends of town are perfect to serve the community</p> <p>They employ local people and look after staff animals and owners well. In addition they provide opportunity for the training of new vets as well as encouraging local opportunities.</p> <p>The proposed flat design is not in keeping with the surrounding residential properties and does not serve the local requirements for the community.</p>
Wpgc, Studham Lane, Dagnall,, Hp4 1rh	<p>This property was purpose built for veterinary purposes. If the vets no longer wished to use the premises then I would not object.</p> <p>This is a convenient location and has parking in the town. It's full of great people whose lives and jobs will change significantly just to put further flats on.</p> <p>We need to preserve our high streets and this application certainly doesn't do that.</p> <p>Save the vets..</p>
322 HIGH	I live within 20 metres of this proposed development, but

STREET, BERKHAMSTE
D,, HP4 1HT

no notice of it has been received at my address.

However, I have recently been informed of the proposal and have seen the documents on the website. I object to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. The design is inconsistent with the character of the Conservation Area

The development is in the Berkhamsted conservation area and neighbouring houses are now protected by a local listing which indicates the importance of the buildings to maintaining and enhancing the character of the High Street and the town. Being close to the amenities of both the canal and the High Street makes this a sensitive area. This development appears inconsistent with the character of the area and will adversely affect its appearance from almost all angles. The new buildings do not appear to be in keeping with their surroundings in appearance or in scale.

2. The new buildings will block sunlight from and overlook our and other neighbouring properties

The Design and Access Statement 3.0 states that "the site could accommodate a higher building at this location without having a negative impact on the setting of nos 320 to 338." Although that is arguable to the extent that it applies to the increase in height of the existing building, it is not true for the new buildings. The back windows at the rear of our house benefit from sunlight only in the mornings and the new buildings will directly obstruct that light.

The windows in the new buildings will also overlook the living area in the rear of our house.

Although a sunlight report is included in the documents, the effect of the proposal on the light on our house does not appear to have been considered in the application. It should be noted that the house numbers appear to have been incorrectly labelled in the report (see Appendix 1).

3. There will be a loss of local amenity

There is a range of shops and business premises in Berkhamsted High Street which are valued by residents and visitors, and an important source of local employment. It will be a blow to lose a small business through a change of use to more residential accommodation. The vet's practice has been a valuable amenity for many over the years, and it is important to keep available premises for any small business which could add to the resources available to the community. The Council needs to encourage the growth of local

	<p>amenities like this one.</p> <p>4. The access arrangements are inadequate and potentially dangerous St Johns Well Lane is already busy and much used by pedestrians. Being a family area, these include many young children and old people, vulnerable to the many vehicles on the road. The road has no pavement on the north side, which has been a serious concern for several years. There is also a large difference in level between the car park and the ground floor of the existing building and the road and the new buildings will be even closer to the road than the existing.</p> <p>The proposal makes this bad situation worse, with significant obstruction to the view around the entrance to the development. Driving in and out of the entrance will be potentially dangerous for those on the road and for those entering or exiting the car park. Also, the car park looks too small to turn a car around in easily, so vehicles are likely to reverse out into the traffic and probably across both lanes in order to access the roundabout on the High Street.</p> <p>5. Building works There does not appear to be any consideration of how the construction will be undertaken, where contractors will park, where materials will be stored, etc. A building project of this scale is likely to cause considerable disruption in a busy town centre.</p>
<p>89 Crispin Field,Pitstone,,LU79DX</p>	<p>I OBJECT to this proposal. Whilst I don't live in Berkhamsted I choose to travel to St John's Vets for all my pets' needs owing to the dedication, care and support that these highly skilled people provide. The closure of the practice, which will be the consequence if this development is allowed, will be a huge loss to the area, encompassing the town, surrounding villages and canal residents, where overall there is an undisputable high population of pets. In addition, it is ideally located for people to walk to but can also provide on-site parking when required, which is a huge benefit in a town where this is virtually impossible to do at the best of times. In addition it is a sad and inevitable fact that the closure of this practice will not only hurt the community but also that local people will have to face the hardship of losing their jobs. All that the greed of these four flats will bring is further strain to the local roads and services, including the other very few Veterinarians in the area.</p>
<p>2 CHALET CLOSE,BERKHAMSTED ,,HP4 3NR</p>	<p>I object to the change of use. The vet practice is a vital service for the town . It is important to retain such a business on the high street. If the practice goes then the</p>

	<p>existing clients will probably have to travel outside the town . The practice is an important employer in the town. The proposed scheme does not have adequate parking and is not in keeping with the neighbouring houses . The current building was purpose built as a surgery and should be kept as such .</p>
8 meadow way, Bedmond, Watford,, Wd5 0rd	<p>I strongly object to this proposal if the building is sold berkhamstead will lose a vital business to the residents and local community as St John's will have to close and cannot relocate</p>
Evergreens, Main Road North, Dagnall, Berkhamsted,, HP4 1QZ	<p>St John's Vets provides an essential service to pet owners from Berkhamsted and the surrounding areas. It is conveniently situated at one end of the town with it's own client parking. The fact it is in the town means it is part of the community and part of the High Street, allowing shoppers, local residents and people from outside a further reason to visit Berkhamsted, keeping the High Street alive.</p> <p>The building from the beginning was a purpose built Veterinary Surgery designed with a layout best suited for the animals, clients and staff and is kitted out with essential equipment and appliances.</p> <p>It not only provides an essential service to it's clients but gives employment to 12+ local people who are dependent on the Vets remaining open.</p> <p>The current impact of the building itself is that it fits in (was built over 24 years ago). To build more housing on this site and provide adequate parking would be totally unreasonable.</p> <p>It would therefore be ridiculous to change the use from the current Veterinary Surgery for the sake of four residential dwellings.</p>
FOX MEADOW, WATER END ROAD, POTTEN END, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2SH	<p>This development will mean the veterinary practice will have to close. The vets practice is needed much more than 4 new flats. When Waitrose was built a condition of the planning permission was that the vets practice on the site had to be found a new home. Which it was in St Johns Well Lane. Surely it goes against the original Waitrose planning permission to now allow it to be swept away.</p> <p>I am a dog owner and regularly use this practice.</p>
324 HIGH STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD,, HP4 1HT	<p>We are three buildings along from the proposed development. We object on the grounds that our garden will be overlooked and much needed light blocked, given that we are north east facing and have limited sunlight to the back of the house. We further object to the increase in traffic which would occur in what is an already</p>

	congested area. We often have traffic jams in front of the house.
23A OAKWOOD,BERKHAMS TED,,,HP4 3NQ	<p>The proposed development, with provision for just five parking spaces, would potentially increase traffic and parking congestion close to a junction already dangerous for both pedestrians and vehicles.</p> <p>St Johns provides a vital service to the town and surrounding area, employing a number of friendly and committed professionals. I'm sure the cost involved in relocating to suitable premises, with similar access for the local community, would be prohibitive and we'd lose this well supported, independent business.</p>
35 Byslips road,Studham,,,Lu6 2nd	I would like to object to the change of use and development of this site. The vets practice is a valuable asset to Berkhamsted and the surrounding villages. It would be wrong to replace this wonderful service with yet more flats.
4 Greene Walk,,,,	Loss of veterinary practice would be mistake. Lots of flats already in Berkhamsted. Vet contributes to town economy.
20 WEST ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 3HT	<p>This veterinary practice provides a vital service to pet owners in this town. In a town of this size we need more than one veterinary practice.</p> <p>If planning permission is granted, this practice could close down if no alternative accommodation is found.</p> <p>I strongly object to even more flats being built.</p>
Felden Lane,Felden,Hemel Hempstead,Hertfordshire ,HP3 0BB	<p>Objection (as summarised)</p> <p>Much loved veterinary practice which loss of staff would have far-reaching consequences. Veterinary surgery provides placements for student training. Proposed development out-of-character with the surrounding properties.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is severely congested and is danger of suffocating under the pressure of over-development. Businesses should be allowed to continue to provide the services that are required by the town and wider community.</p>
BRACKENLEA,DUDSW ELL LANE,DUDSWELL,BER KHAMSTED,HP4 3TQ	<p>Apart from making a very good Vets homeless. It is not the best place for more flats etc,</p> <p>Jane and her team have always been there for me, when various animals needed them. I wish I could do more to help them.</p>
GAYWOODS,NETTLED EN ROAD NORTH,LITTLE GADDESSEN,BERKHA MSTED,HP4 1PE	This practice has been here for at least 25 years serving Berkhamsted, it is probably the only independent vets in the area, and we cannot afford to lose it. It was purpose built to serve the town, moving to it's present site when waitrose was built. More flats squashed into a small area

	with insufficient parking will do little for the area. Small independent business should be supported not destroyed.
303 HIGH STREET, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1AJ	I want to object to the change of use and conversion of the property. The vet has been there for many years and has been an invaluable service to the community, and ourselves, over that time. I understand that it was originally purpose built as a veterinary practice.
35 HOLLY DRIVE, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2JR	Apart from the invaluable Veterinary Practice and huge resource to the Berkhamsted Residents, the further development of housing in this already over congested part of the road, has a significant impact on the local environment and traffic congestion. With all of the development completed and underway in Shootersway and Durrants Lane, the Town is becoming increasingly 'gridlocked'.
Sunnyside Cottage, Buckland Common, HP23 6PF	Taking services out of a town greatly changes its character. It is also easy to combine a pet's visit to the vet with doing shopping in the town. Some people living in a town don't own a car so wouldn't be able to access the vets if it moved elsewhere.
55 Bower Lane, Eaton Bray, LU6 1RB	<p>St Johns was purpose built to meet the needs of the town and the surrounding villages. And there seems no justification for the change of purpose.</p> <p>The proposed development would provide little towards the housing needs of the local area, yet permanently remove a valuable service from Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The loss of St Johns would also result in the loss of the last independent practice in the local area.</p>
71 COVERT ROAD, NORTHCHURCH, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3SS	The practice is a vital part of the community servicing pet owners in Berkhamsted, Northchurch and surrounding areas. We need the vets (there is only one other in town) not more housing in an already overcrowded town. Thank you for taking this into consideration.
14 TREVELYAN WAY, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1JG	<p>We object to this proposed development on two grounds -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Change of use. 2) Proposed design. <p>1) Evicting this incredibly valuable business asset makes no sense. Jane and her team have looked after all our pets since we came to Berkhamsted some thirteen years ago, and we have nothing but praise for them. It seems that the cost of relocation would be prohibitive, which would result in the loss of all those jobs as well as the service they offer. The other vet in Berkhamsted would clearly be overwhelmed by the extra workload, and as a</p>

	<p>result our pets will suffer.</p> <p>2) The proposed design is completely out of character with the area. In addition, the access in and out of the properties would be problematic. There would be NO pedestrian access. Vehicles going in to the parking spaces would hold up traffic while the barrier is being raised. Coming out of the parking space, the driver's visibility would be seriously restricted by the buildings.</p>
7 COOMBE GARDENS, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3PA	<p>Berkhamsted needs this veterinary practice to continue its vital support to the ever growing community. I believe this well established business has been in the area for 50yrs and on this site for around 25. To lose this site would be a great disadvantage to many people from Berkhamsted and surrounding area. It would also be a massive loss to the local businesses which draw people into the town. I beg you to consider declining this planning application which would be a great disadvantage to hundreds of people and businesses, against the construction of a couple of flats.</p>
LITTLE FARM, HEMP LANE, WIGGINTON, TRING, HP23 6DW	<p>The proposed development constitutes gross over development of a very small site. The proposed parking (5 spaces) is insufficient for the increase in size of the residential dwelling. The vets practice currently on site was purpose built when they were forced out of their original accommodation by Waitrose. There is no other suitable site available in town with appropriate parking for the vets to relocate to. Local independent business should be supported, not squeezed out by further unnecessary residential redevelopment. Vet services are a vital community facility and the remaining vet practice, Clark & Marshall at the Swing Gate Lane roundabout, would be put under unreasonable pressure if St Johns was forced to close.</p>
5 THE FIRS, WIGGINTON, TRING, HP23 6DZ	<p>I would like to object to the change in use because I use St John's Veterinary Practice to care for my two cats. I am a wheelchair user and St John's is an accessible practice, unlike my nearest practice in Tring which has a number of steps up to the front door. At St John's I am able to park next to the practice in the disabled parking space and wheel straight into the waiting room with the cat carrier on my lap. I can then access the consulting room without support. I am not sure how I would be able to arrange for my cats to see the vet without an accessible veterinary practice nearby.</p>
2 Hill Farm Cottages, Northchurch Common, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire, HP4 1LS	<p>My husband and I are shocked and distressed to read of the planning application involving the premises of St John's Veterinary Surgery in Berkhamsted. We find it hard to believe that the proposed extension to</p>

	<p>the current premises would be either a practical or attractive proposition. The site is not ideally located for entry/exit – and constantly under the threat from oncoming traffic from the High Street and from the St John's Well Lane car park – all of which travel at speed; and the site itself is actually quite small, and therefore residents would only always see (at quite close range from their windows) constant traffic movement if the proposed alterations were, as also suggested in the planning application, to face St John's Well Lane.</p> <p>Additionally – as clients of the surgery since its inception – we cannot believe that the Council would wish to 'banish' a major support feature for Berkhamsted's animal population. The St John's surgery is exceptionally well qualified and staffed, helpful, friendly... and always busy – a sign of its value and importance to the community it serves.</p> <p>Losing the practice would not only be a major concern for us personally and, we believe, all animal-loving Berkhamsted residents, but might also, we suspect, represent a problem for the veterinary incumbents to relocate within the area. We sincerely hope it would not therefore mean complete closure of the enterprise. We hope you will encourage the planning permission applicant to discontinue the proposal in the interests of Berkhamsted's extant animal-loving population. We look forward to hearing from the Council in due course – hopefully with positive news for the vets.</p>
<p>8 OAKLANDS,BERKHAMS TED,,HP4 3XZ</p>	<p>The town is already overcrowded with a lack of infrastructure, losing the Vets for another set of flats makes no sense.</p>
<p>12 Church Close,Studham,Beds,,LU 6 2QE</p>	<p>We sincerely hope this and other written protests which I am sure must have been received may dissuade the council from making a decision granting profiteering over local services.</p> <p>I am writing to you in some dismay, having heard to the proposed planning application for the current building used by St Johns Veterinary Surgery.</p> <p>St Johns provides a crucial service to Berkhamsted residents, and those in the nearby villages. We personally travel from Studham to see them when our animals are in need. They provide vital care and surgery to animals, and we have received the most excellent support from them many times, particularly when our dog was involved in a horrific accident, when Mrs Wighton and a veterinary nurse stayed very late and did their best</p>

	<p>to save our dog. We are definitely not the only people to have received this level of service. People have the utmost trust and respect for everyone working in the surgery, and I am sure this is just one of many emails you have received, desperately hoping this planning application will be refused, and this most vital and treasured surgery be allowed to remain in their premises.</p> <p>I cannot stress how important the surgery is to Berkhamsted. I sincerely hope the application will be refused.</p> <p>If there is any other information I can provide which will strengthen the case for them, please let me know, and I will be more than happy to provide whatever is needed.</p>
<p>44 CHARLES STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 3DJ</p>	<p>We strongly object to the the change of use of this property from a much loved and heavily used Veterinary practice to build a couple of flats. The need of this service heavily outweighs the need for a few SMALL flats - and we certainly don't need any more cars.</p> <p>We have been using this practice for past 15 years - they are extremely good, have helped us through thick and thin, and are much valued members of the local community. This town has seen an increase in the number of pet owners, and losing this practice would be detrimental to the the whole of Berkhamsted and surrounding villages as there are not many local vet practices. It's in walkable distance for many, cutting down on car usage, and we fail to see the logic in granting this application.</p>
<p>2 Jubilee Cottages, Basingstoke Road, Riseley, RG7 1QG</p>	<p>I would like to object to this application.</p> <p>This is a change of site from business to residential. I believe the local policy is to keep commercial use in certain areas and promote residential elsewhere. This is the reverse. Surely the council would want to promote small independent businesses in the area. Moving St Johns Vets out of town would have a devastating effect on both the business and the local clients and I fear the vets maybe forced to close for good.</p> <p>The building was purpose built for a veterinary practice after Waitrose was built on the old one. It would be hard to find such a suitable building in the area, to replace what this well established business has.</p> <p>The proposed design would have an overbearing effect on the side road (which is very busy) due to the proximity of the road and size of building. It appears to be an overdevelopment of the site.</p>

	<p>Car parking provision appears inadequate for the number of bed spaces provided.</p> <p>I worked at St Johns Vets for over 7 years, I would be very disappointed if the council would be in favour of losing such an important business to the area. Please reject to this proposal and support small local businesses.</p>
3 BIRTCHNELL CLOSE,BERKHAMSTED ,,HP4 1FE	I object to the application. We have too many new builds recently in Berkhamsted which is becoming overcrowded. I have used the vets for the last 6 years, and the vets is vital to people with pets in and around Berkhamsted !.If a pet is ill then you need somewhere on your doorstep, you don't want to be driving miles in busy traffic to reach a vets. Its an asset to the town, and it just seems soooo wrong to replace it with more flats !!!
14 VALLEY ROAD,NORTHCHURCH, BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 3PY	This much loved veterinary practice provides a vital service to pet owners in this town and surrounding villages, and the loss of and her wonderful staff would have far reaching consequences. Berkhamsted is an extremely congested town and we do not need more flats with insufficient parking. I cannot stress how important this surgery in Berkhamsted is and I sincerely hope this application will be refused.
51 LOWER KINGS ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 2AA	I object strongly. The vet has been there for years and should be supported as a small independent business.
15 ALYNGTON,NORTHCH URCH,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3XP	The property at the moment is used well. However more property in such a small area would put a greater strain on the current infrastructure.
6 MIDDLE ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 3EQ	We strongly object to this change of purpose application. The St Johns vets offer an amazing service and cover a vast geographical area. They are highly recommended and have excellent provision, not equalled elsewhere. To close this service would be detrimental to the welfare of many animals in the area. We except more affordable housing is needed however not at this location.
22 HAYNES MEAD,BERKHAMSTED,, ,HP4 1BU	<p>I strongly object to the planning application to convert the premises from the current Vet surgery to residential housing.</p> <p>St John's Veterinary Surgery is a much valued asset to the local community. It is very convenient located for local animal owners and offers a outstanding level of service.</p> <p>The loss of the St John's Vet's at this location and possibly the loss of the St John's Vets altogether would</p>

	be very detrimental to the local community.
1 Malting Lane,Dagnall,Berkhamsted,,HP4 1QY	I am strongly objecting to this planning application as it is contrary to the Dacorum Borough Council stated initiative to preserve and enhance Berkhamsted's varied business community. The high street is already suffering from empty units and loss of a variety businesses under the strain of increased rates and changes of use, it is changing the face of this historic market town and atmosphere for the community. The veterinary surgery premises was purpose built and is an integral part of this animal-loving area, semi rural / rural area. It would be both disruptive and possibly prohibitively costly for the current business to move premises and they would struggle to find another property which would serve them as well; particularly with private parking which does not interfere with the soon-to-be- abysmal traffic flow. The surgery serves a huge number of households and if they had to close permanently there would be an increased strain on other surgeries and increased costs for customers as they will potentially have to travel further and more local surgeries will no doubt reach capacity very quickly. The closure of this premises serves only the financial interests of the owner and does nothing for the local community.
77 Wenwell Close,Aston Clinton,,HP22 5LG	This is a well used service provider in the town and we do not need more in filling of property further damaging our high street. It is a purpose built facility which supports the local, and wider, with the care of their pets and it's loss would be effect many people.
BERKHAMSTED TOWN COUNCIL,CIVIC CENTRE,161 HIGH STREET,BERKHAMSTED,HP4 3HD	Objection The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the local community by removing a valued service. Furthermore, the loss of the Veterinary practice would reduce the mix of properties in the town, impact the spread of job opportunities and lead to loss of employment in the local area. Additionally, the proposed development is of poor design and not in keeping with the Conservation Area. P120, CS4, CS8, CS12, CS14, CS15, CS23.
152 BRIDGEWATER ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 1EE	I strongly object to this planning application on the grounds that St John's vet is an important part of the local community. Without which many local animal owners will have to travel some distance to find an alternative practice.
BRAMBLE COTTAGE,BRIAR WAY,BERKHAMSTED,,	I object to the scheme for the following reasons: 1. Change of use to residential conflicts with dacourums police of preserving the diversity of the high street

HP4 2JJ	<p>2. The existing unit is not a vacant unit it is a well used business that supports the residents of the town and outlying areas. People with accessibility issues in the town are easily able to access this facility for their pets, who without access to a car may not easily be able to get to the next town for a sick beloved pet.</p> <p>3. The loss of this well used facility will result in increased vehicle movements to access pets services in other towns. Once you start using another town for this service it will be easier to do other retail errands there</p> <p>4. The commercial use adds to the high street and acts as anchor to bring people to the high street- people using the vets services go on to use other retail facilities</p> <p>5. Loss of local employment. The supporting document rather broadly state the surgery will not be lost it will move - where is the supporting evidence of other possible locations that will serve the requirements of the residents, maintain employment and preserve the diversity of the high street.</p> <p>6. The proposed development provides 8 bedrooms in 4 flats with 5 parking spaces. This does not provide adequate visitor parking, visitors will inevitably use the public parking facilities adding further pressures to the demand for parking which will not be fully alleviated by the new parking facility. Whilst the local authority might not mind as long as they are getting money for the space these visitors primary aim will not be to use the high street and add to the local Enoch. Residents from outlying areas will find it easier to go to Hemel Hempstead rather crawl around the car park berkhamsted on the off chance someone vacates a space. The developer is seeking to maximise development space at the expense of the provision of adequate parking facilities for the number of units being created.</p>
STONYCROFT,9 SHRUBLANDS ROAD,BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3HY	Further to the BCA Townscape comment of 2.1.19, we wish to add the following objections: insufficient car parking spaces for the total number of bedrooms proposed in the development; and loss of Social Infrastructure, in the form of local veterinary care for the animals of vulnerable residents, as outlined in CS23.
1568 High Street,Northchurch,Berkh amsted,,HP4 3QU	I gather there is a request to close this surgery and convert it to flats (yet more flats in town many of which are not selling anyway) I would like to oppose this planning request and ask that the vet surgery remain. It is a much needed facility and also employs many people. They have looked after our pets for many years and provide a fantastic much needed service in the town

Supporting

Address	Comments
---------	----------

Commenting

Address	Comments
---------	----------