

Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses

Consultation respondent	Full consultation response	Summary of consultation response	Council response to consultation
<p>Andrew Reed, representative of the Royal Institute of British Architects for the Council's Conservation Area Advisory Committee</p>	<p>Objection via email of 20/11/2012: 'I do not think any of the additions are worthy of inclusion as none demonstrate exceptional merit.</p> <p>The 'A' shaped area between Grove Hill and Station Road is a motley collection of buildings nearly past their sell by date. They are separated from the true Conservation Area by the main road. Their relevance is more to Harrow Town Centre. There is merit for them to be locally listed or itemised as frontage value, but no merit in their inclusion in the Conservation Area. The relatively modern building excluded merely reinforces this view.</p> <p>The other inclusions are similarly irrelevant to the core of the Conservation Area. Had they been worthy before they would be worthy now.</p> <p>Let sleeping dogs lie and move on to more important issues'.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection given the view that the buildings have insufficient quality and cohesive character, a character relating more to the town centre than the conservation area and if worthy would have been included already. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the proposed additions bar two are locally listed. many as groups or pairs, indicating their architectural and historic merit and cohesiveness. • Those along Peterborough Road and Grove Hill Road do adjoin the town centre so have a slightly higher density but equally the former houses (now flat conversions) along Grove Hill Road is in keeping with other conservation area houses. • The commercial element proposed is akin to commercial properties within the conservation area along Lowland Road. • Omission from the original conservation area boundary does not necessarily mean they are not worthy of inclusion since conservation areas are continually reviewed resulting in boundary amendments including extensions most recently Tookes Green (2009), West Drive (2006) and Little Common (2003). Roxborough Park was extended itself already in 1991. The potential of this area for extension was first identified within the Roxborough Park and the Grove Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy which was published by the Council following public consultation and approval by Cabinet in 2008. This stated the extension would be subject to careful survey and review.
<p>John Orchard representative of the Twentieth</p>	<p>Support via email dated 7/12/2012: 'Perhaps the empty corner plot and the two individually designed detached</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support given the view that the buildings have merit, good detailing, the stable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposal links in to the criteria for conservation area status. • Consultee suggested two additional properties and

<p>Century Society for the Council's Conservation Area Advisory Committee</p>	<p>houses and gardens at the bottom of Roxborough Park should be included in the proposed extension of the conservation area. The three properties will link up with the conservation area in Lowlands Road and Whitehall Road. The three plots are prominently positioned at the entrance to Roxborough Park and some conservation/planning control over the plots will ensure an attractive 'gateway' to the conservation area is maintained'.</p> <p>11/12/2012 via phone: 'The proposal has merit and there is scope for increasing the conservation area as proposed. The good detailing on the window heads of the buildings in the triangular area shown on Peterborough Road in the proposed extension to the conservation area is noted. It is noted that the flats along Grove Hill Road would once have been houses in keeping with others in the conservation area. The low lying office building stable development is a good building and development. The other houses are similar to those within the existing conservation area. The proposed extension has rightly not included the commercial building along 1 Tyburn Lane'.</p>	<p>development is particularly good, and buildings link in to houses within the Conservation Area,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested two additional buildings (51 and 53 Roxborough Park) and an empty plot be included. 	<p>empty plot be included in the conservation area which was considered but these do not meet criteria for conservation area status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the buildings are of similar form to those within the conservation area, they are not of any particular architectural or historic significance in and of themselves unlike their neighbours. • The empty plot is bounded by a large modern advertising hoarding adjacent relatively modern development. • It is agreed that these plots mark a gateway into the conservation area and so it is important that development here preserves the conservation area setting e.g. maintaining medium scale and density of development. But existing planning controls ensure this is a material planning consideration as national and local planning controls ensure development within the setting of conservation area should preserve or enhance the setting of that conservation area. This is under relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan, Harrow Core Strategy, and the saved Harrow UDP. It is also ensured via guidance contained within English Heritage's document entitled: 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' published 20/11/2011.
<p>Joanne Verden representative of</p>	<p>Support via email dated 17/12/2012: 'Since this is near the town centre it</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposal links in to the criteria for

<p>the Pinner Association for the Council's Conservation Area Advisory Committee</p>	<p>would benefit from being a conservation area. The buildings therein and the surrounding area have distinct physical identities and cohesiveness, which should be maintained.</p> <p>Any area near a large bridge and roundabout needs to care for its architectural integrity'.</p>	<p>extension to the conservation area relates to the view the area is close to the town centre and have a distinct physical identity and cohesiveness.</p>	<p>conservation area status.</p>
--	--	--	----------------------------------