

Appendix B

Building	Public Consultation Response	Council Conservation Team Response
16 Kerry Avenue, Stanmore	Call from Mr Ian Scheer on 21/11/2012 requesting the draft local list description.	Emailed draft local list description to Mr Scheer on 21/11/2012.
Harrow College, Brookshill	<p>Email from Director of Finance and Resources, Harrow College on 14/12/2012:</p> <p>‘Further to your letter regarding consultation over addition of our property, Harrow College, Brookshill, Harrow Weald HA3 6RR to the register of locally listed buildings, the College supports addition of the 1930’s building to the front of the site (which has also been proposed by a third party for Grade II listing, although no decision has yet been made by English Heritage) to the list. We note that there are no additional planning controls over locally listed buildings.</p> <p>It should also be noted that there are no other buildings of historic or architectural interest on the site, and it should therefore be made very clear that it is this building alone and not the entire college that is being included on the local listing’.</p>	The proposed local list has now been clarified to state that ‘it is this building alone and not the entire college that is being included on the local listing. Remainder of site not surveyed’.
The entrance gates, stone walling, pillars and decorative railings, Pinner Road	Email from John Orchard on 22/11/2012 stating: ‘The entrance gates, stone walling and pillars and decorative railings together with the gate-lodge and chapel at Pinner Cemetery, Pinner Road, Pinner could be worth considering for local listing’.	These buildings were already on the list of proposed additions to the Local List and remain as recommended Locally Listed buildings.
Sans Souci, South View Road, Pinner	Email from Jim Sutcliffe on 23/11/2012 stating: ‘As you know, the reason that this property is of interest	The building is no longer being proposed for local listing.

	<p>is because it was built by/for the Nazi ambassador to the UK who was later hanged at Nuremburg. We have always tried to keep this link out of the public eye because it tends to attract nasty racist interest. Would it be possible for us not to be on your list, please?’</p>	
<p>26 and 28 Gordon Avenue, Stanmore</p>	<p>Two emails from Mr Overlander copying in Mr Sharkey. The first on 2/12/2012 stating: ‘I am somewhat confused as to the process that has determined this recommendation given that the original letter written by Ms Lucy Haile on 3rd January 2012 suggested that English Heritage would be considering this matter for inclusion in the national listing. Does this mean that English Heritage do not intend to list the building or have yet to determine its importance from an architectural perspective? Does English Heritage’s decision or lack of one, not suggest there is insufficient evidence as to the actual identity of the original architect thereby prompting the question of the building’s actual historical importance?’</p> <p>I am further confused as to what level of responsibilities may fall to owners of both properties given the possibility that both English Heritage and Harrow Council list the house. Perhaps you would be kind enough to shed more light on this matter. This really is of great importance to us as both properties have suffered several events of subsidence over the last 20 years that have required both underpinning and demolition as well as building of extensions.</p> <p>We believe the house was divided into 2 homes in the</p>	<p>The first email of response objected given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage had not determined the request for national listing. • Confused as to responsibilities for local listing to homeowners. • Building has been divided and changed over the years. <p>Email from the council to the homeowner addressed concerns by stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage advised that whilst not considered worthy of national the building is important in the local context to Harrow due to its association with the Waterhouse practice, Waterhouse being one of the leading architects of the Victorian era. • In November 2011 the Council went out to consultation placing an advert in the local paper and sending letters to local groups requesting suggested additions/amendments to the local list of buildings. A Stanmore Society representative responded stating they supported the local listing of 26 and 28 Gordon Avenue. Following a site visit and

	<p>1920's and extensive remodelling and character changing extensions have been added since. Further development has been authorised by the Council in recent years including the very recent development of a modern property on land immediately outside number 26 thereby changing not only the immediate outlook and character of the house but also bringing in to question the rational between on the one hand permitting development whilst at the same time seeking to protect adjacent properties</p> <p>The speed in which the Council propose to conclude this matter gives both owners considerable anxiety especially as we are somewhat confused as to the process employed in determining this position. In the first Instance we would ask for a deferral of this decision so that we may have the opportunity of taking legal guidance on this matter as well being able to seek further evidence from your good selves as to the validity of the historical research previously carried out'.</p> <p>The second on 4/12/2012 stated:</p> <p>'Many thanks for your very prompt and detailed response. Given your comments as to the limited restrictions that may be put upon us and the owners of number 26 I am inclined to accept that these would be little more than what we would normally expect without the inclusion of any local listing.</p> <p>I note that you have also highlighted the point that the building would not be "protected" from any demolition,</p>	<p>local history research, a draft local list description was formed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report to the Local Development Framework (LDF) panel meeting recommended a group of buildings be locally listed (including 26 and 28 Gordon Avenue). This was agreed subject to consultation. • Explained: no additional requirements for planning permission if a building is locally listed over those not locally listed. No requirements for planning permission for demolition works. If locally listed, only additional consideration in terms of planning is that policies relating to heritage assets apply. So, consideration will be given to whether or not proposals for alterations and extension preserve or enhance the special interest and its setting. <p>The second email from the owner following the council's response stated there was no more objection so the recommendation to Locally List this building remains.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>and again I would expect any subsequent rebuilding scheme to have first received local planning approval.</p> <p>Given that I have understood the points clarified in your reply yesterday, I would no longer feel the need to lodge any request for a deferral’.</p>	
Safari Cinema	Email from agent on 17/12/2012 stating ‘I write to request an extension to make representations. I suggest until 7th January 2013. Please confirm’.	An email of response was sent 17/12/2012 stating this extension to public consultation was fine.
Safari Cinema	<p>On behalf of the owner, letter received 4th January, 2013 (included in full below) from Heritage Collective with main objections to Local Listing summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not think building warrants Local Listing given how little is left of its most interesting part, the front façade (photographs enclosed) and is in very poor condition. • This 1936 cinema designed by F.E. Bromige, for the Dominion Group was built to accommodate 2,500 seats and renamed the ABC in 1962, at which point the front façade was encased in the current metal cladding. Divided in 1972 to form Gala bingo hall (left side when looking from the road within the original stalls) and a cinema and café. Café converted in 1983 to a second screen. • New walls and structural supports were inserted into the building to enable the subdivision (see photographs) compromising the original façade, as has covering up, so only a limited amount left 	<p>Site visit conducted 9th January, 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge little of historic interest visible inside, though not all the interior was accessible for inspection. Occasional details such as cornicing. Interior is clarified as of little importance in draft Local List description. • The original frontage is described within ‘Cathedrals of the movies, A History of British Cinemas and their Advances’ by David Atwell as having a ‘magnificent Art Deco façade designed to consist of numerous alcoves with columns, windows which curved around corners and the name ‘Dominion’ set above the entrance. This design remains externally and is likely to be quite unaltered, though it remains hidden’. • January 2013 site visit allowed access behind the metal cladding at first floor level

	<p>and what is there has been cut into with new air vents, pipework and structural supports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite visit to inspect the interiors. Interior described within draft listing is no longer readable due to the subdivision and destruction. For example projection room has been inserted at front, crudely created with a breeze block wall which is visible within the remains of the original façade directly behind an original window which has now lost its glass. • Carried out masters thesis on this building type I appreciate the interest it would have had had if it survived in anything like its original condition but too little left to warrant local listing. • Considering local list criteria the building does not have sufficient interest to warrant addition. In its present form the building lacks townscape merit, due to its inappropriate metal cladding and dominating presence. It has some limited historical interest due to its association with Bromige, who designed other cinemas in the borough and in other London boroughs. His work is seen to much greater effect at the Rayners Lane Cinema which is statutorily listed. • This cinema has severely suffered from the presence of the VUE cinema close by, so it is reliant on rental income from the Gala bingo to survive. The Gala bingo lease will end in five years. There is an expectation that it will not be renewed, causing the building to become redundant as the cinema use will no longer be 	<p>at three points along the frontage. At each point the original frontage appeared substantively intact (with views up towards the roof).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontage remaining is consistent with the historic photographs including curved walls, windows and balconies that you can walk onto. • Nevertheless there is clearly a need for maintenance, repair and refurbishment to restore the frontage to its former glory given the building was cut about, air conditioning units added, window glass broken in places and metal frames required attention. • State of repair is not a consideration for national listing and Harrow's local listing criteria reflect national criteria. • The full extent of the original frontage is unknown as complete access was not possible meaning potentially more may be revealed. • Curves reaching above metal cladding at roof level show more is present. • The ground floor frontage has been bricked over but curves to walls inside the building e.g. at entrance to Gala bingo hall suggest this original front is present behind. • The original entrance doors on the east side of the frontage are still present. • Acknowledge that in its present form the
--	--	--

	<p>viable. Due to the smoking ban and the rising number of online bingo sites, bingo halls have suffered and it would be unusual to find a new bingo operator to fill the current space given the downturn in attendees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owners wish to redevelop the site when current uses are no longer viable and are concerned about the effect of Local Listing on potential for redevelopment. Although this is not a primary consideration for the Local Listing it is a consideration for the owners and for the potential for this site to positively respond to the surroundings in which it is viewed. Currently the building makes no such contribution to townscape. 	<p>building lacks townscape merit but its large scale intended to give townscape presence remains and removal of metal cladding would reveal much of the original landmark frontage. The potential for refurbishment would allow the building to respond positively to its surroundings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment would not have to retain the same use and the draft local listing has been amended to emphasise that only the frontage is significant. This could be refurbished in whole or in part (depending on what is revealed underneath the cladding) and used to accommodate any number of new uses. • The building is identified within the adopted Development Management Document entitled the Area Action Plan as a building of townscape importance as it states ‘the Council will seek to realise any opportunity that emerges to remove the existing cladding from the Safari cinema building and restore the Art Deco façade’. This can be seen as an opportunity to gain support for proposals to redevelop the site as long as they utilise the distinctive frontage.
Safari Cinema	<p>On behalf of the owner, letter received 14th January, 2013 (letter given in full below as Letter A) from solicitors objecting to local listing as follows:</p> <p>‘We do not consider that the site is of significant interest</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The frontage of the building’s compliance with local listing criteria (architectural interest, townscape value, historic interest and associations) has been clarified by the amended draft local list description.

	<p>to deem it of historical or local interest for it to be considered as locally listed.</p> <p>We understand that the building was built in 1932. It is understood that in 1963 the building was surrounded by the blue metal covering. It is understood that this was undertaken to stop the building from further deterioration. The property is in need of significant renovation and development work. The façade under the blue steel structure is in a poor condition.</p> <p>We represent that the building is an eyesore and in need of significant development and updating.</p> <p>It is the intention of the owners to redevelop the property into an updated and modern building.</p> <p>In light of the above and the fact that the property does not externally show any of its original features, we object to the application to locally list the property.’</p>	
Winsor and Newton	<p>Letter received from heritage consultants 11th January, 2013 (letter given in full below as Letter B) on behalf of the owner ColArt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not contend local listing but recommended amendments to the description • Set out brief history of site, identifies 3 groups of buildings on site. • Recommended local list description amendments: • Correcting dates of construction • Cabinet Factory near Bruce Road entrance clarified as being of no interest. • Industrial buildings attached to office as of no architectural interest although is of historic interest. • Features of architectural interest for the office building do not relate to its railings; front elevation lettering or scale. 	Suggested amendments to local list description have been made.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The office building has townscape interest but not a landmark presence.• The office building's set back and screening and scale at 3 storeys, just above surrounding 2 storey buildings, means it sits comfortably in its context.	
--	---	--

Letter A – full letter of response concerning Safari Cinema, Station Road

Letter B – full letter of response concerning Winsor and Newton buildings, Whitefriars Avenue