

APPENDIX 1

Date received	Name	Consultation Response	Council Response	Conservation Area
17/06/2013 (by phone)	Benjamin Mire	The Council has severely affected the appearance of Canons Drive and surrounding roads with the introduction of the CPZ with additional street furniture i.e. signage and road lines. This is doing far more damage to the longer term appearance of the estate than any building alterations. Either these should be removed or the Estate should be de-rated as a conservation area	Whilst the controlled parking zone has brought additional signage and road lines these do not conflict with the CA character as this is kept to a minimum and is necessary for safety reasons.	Canons Park CA
23/06/2013 (by letter)	Anne and Eric Morgan	<p>We have looked at the above document on line and would like to make the following comments:-</p> <p>Picture 2.8 — this is wrongly captioned as 1-4 Hillcrest — it actually shows 1-5 Pinnacles Place and Park House, all of which are listed.</p> <p>Para 2.25— states that the southern part of Green Lane “is not busy”. Green Lane is one of the busiest roads in Stanmore. There is currently a plan for traffic calming in the road which will entail road humps, speed tables and additional signing. The person in charge of this at the Civic Centre is Johann Alles.</p> <p>Picture 2.30— the small green at the junction of Green Lane and Stanmore Hill is now adopted and maintained by a volunteer group of residents of the conservation area which was in a neglected state due to lack of maintenance by the Council. It is much improved from the state shown in the picture. Much litter is cleared on both this and the Pinnacles Place Green by residents to keep it looking tidy.</p> <p>Para 2.31— what are the ‘commercial uses’ at the top of Green Lane that are mentioned? We know of no commercial uses there. Green Lane is purely residential.</p> <p>Para 2.35 —shops on Stanmore Hill do not survive very long, suffering as they do from low footfall and difficult parking conditions. In the latter case the Abercorn customers clog available parking at the top of Green Lane in the evenings to the detriment of the residents. During the day parking meters on Stanmore Hill (recently installed) are largely un-used as people park at the top of Green Lane for free.</p> <p>Pictures 2.41 and 2.48 —the turret on this building has plastic windows —how were these permitted to be installed?</p> <p>Picture 2.55— these are not Chart Cottages — they are Pinnacles Place</p> <p>2.58— Park House has one blind window not some.</p> <p>Pictures 2.67 and 2.81 are actually in a small side-road and are Park Cottages (there are 4 cottages in this small street) but they are not in Green Lane.</p> <p>Under the title ‘Maintaining Stanmore Hill’s Townscape and Built Character: Item ‘j’ — refers to satellite dishes — we have letters dated 29 October 2012 acknowledging our enquiry regarding the placing of satellite dishes on the front of several of the Green Lane Cottages — we have heard nothing since.</p> <p>It would also be interesting to know what happened as a result of the Policy Statement of 14 October 2003 which already covered many of the same points as the current Supplementary Planning document. This has presumably been carried out by consultants at some cost to the Council.</p> <p>Unfortunately we will be away on 8 July so will not be able to attend the consultation at the library and we hope our comments are useful. For your information, we have</p>	Factual corrections made. Unauthorised works being investigated by enforcement. The document was created in-house so costs were covered in existing budgets.	Stanmore Hill CA

		<p>been residents here since 1976 and have seen the deterioration of the quality of life in Green Lane due to the increase of the traffic using the lane as a cut-through to avoid congestion in Church Road.</p>		
<p>24/06/2013 (email)</p>	<p>Rex Holmes</p>	<p>Dear sir, I refer to the above document Appendix 2 --Page 177</p> <p>Specifically regarding the green space between Stanmore Hill and Green Lane:</p> <p>The proposals are (paraphrased) Re-siting benches and introduction of substantial hedge and picket fence</p> <p>Background--I would indicate that I am a member of a voluntary group who under Adopt-a-Bed scheme have maintained The Green for the last 2 years and would comment as follows: When we adopted this Green it was in a very neglected state due to mismanagement and neglect by Harrow Council over a number of years--this neglect is still being suffered today -viz the annual weeds which require considerable maintenance on a regular basis and for the foreseeable future (7 years of seeds in the ground!!).</p> <p>Re-siting Benches--one of our major problems is the incidence of general litter exacerbated by the lack of a rubbish bin (which has been requested on a number of occasions and not supplied by Harrow Council). This litter problem occurs with very limited pedestrian access onto the Green --- The re-location of benches will certainly increase this litter problem which will require regular clearing up and disposal by Harrow. The re-siting of benches was discussed with Harrow Parks Dept. 2 years ago who agreed this would not be a good idea.</p> <p>Introduction of substantial hedge and picket fence--The current Green is already delineated by a low but wide euonymus fortunei hedge which successfully separates the Green for perambulatory access from the pavement but concurrently does provide for a splendid spectra from the both Stanmore Hill and Green Lane. A high pyracantha hedge separates the end of the Green with Newsagent and the adjacent house.</p> <p>The introduction of a high hedge and picket fence will effectively turn the Green into an enclosed space not visible from road and thus destroying the visual benefits and counter productively providing the ideal place for nefarious activities.(access is open 24 hours a day)</p> <p>I would therefore object to the proposals contained in the Draft document</p> <p>Our Proposals would be:</p>	<p>The revised draft omits reference to resiting the benches and changing the hedge and proposes consulting with Parks concerning ways to address litter and weeds, including the possibility of a litter bin and the possibility of some geotextile with bark chippings to suppress the annual weeds. This was put forward to Parks via email on 7th November, 2013.</p>	<p>Stanmore Hill CA</p>

		<p>-Supply of a litter bin to be sited adjacent to the existing seating (space already there) and regular emptying by Harrow</p> <p>-supply of some Geotextile to suppress the annual weeds</p> <p>-supply of bark chippings to disguise the textile</p> <p>In this way the Green can be enjoyed by all members of the Public</p> <p>yours faithfully</p>		
26/06/2013 (phone message)	Mrs Berwald	There is no crossing on Stanmore Hill beyond the library and Bushey Heath.	This is a safety issue and was reported to traffic by email on 7 th November, 2013.	Stanmore Hill CA
27/06/2013 (email)	David Cooper	<p>Just to say I'm also a volunteer for the garden at the top of Green Lane and agree with the points Rex has raised. Unfortunately I'm unable to attend the meeting, as I'm not home until after 7pm.....will these points be raised and discussed should any of the team be unable to attend?</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	See comments above.	Stanmore Hill CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting)	Mark and Mandy Blank-Settle	We consider our building (Woolombe Cottage) to not contribute to the Conservation Area's character - could the level of controls attached to our building be reduced in light of the fact that we do not have any original features or features in keeping with others in the area? * Green Lane is a rat run for traffic. Proposals for traffic calming put down by the Council run contrary to this. The proposals make one way at the north half and include speed bumps and speed limit signs. Then there are proposals to limit parking which could lead to Pay and Display parking which has already happened at the top off Stanmore Hill which is not very attractive.	It important to retain the existing level of CA controls relating to this building since it is sited in the midst of the CA so it is very sensitive to any changes due to the impact this would have on the wider area. The proposed traffic calming for Green Lane is subject to a separate public consultation by the Council's Highways department. It is considered that measures proposed would preserve the character of the CA but these concerns have been forwarded to Highways.	Stanmore Hill CA

11/07/2013 (public meeting)	Rex Holmes	The proposal on the green for a higher fence where there is now a low hedge and to turn the seats around is undesirable. But we do need a bin by that seat. * Part way down Stanmore Hill next to the park was a studio for the house opposite. The person living in the studio recently died. If it was converted to a dwelling house it would not be in keeping with the area as there should be a lot of greenery here. * A residential house would not be in keeping because that is an open area and the pavement is quite narrow.	The proposals for the green are now omitted and this section has been amended to propose a new bin. There are currently no proposals in to redevelop the site of the Studio on Stanmore Hill but if and when they are submitted these would be judged on their own merits and there would be public consultation on this as part of the usual planning process. The general area is already referred to for the importance of its greenery within the draft document and therefore it is not considered necessary to make any amendments to the document in response to this consultation response.	Stanmore Hill CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting)	Mr Peretti of the Stanmore Society	There ought to be a limit to the height of trees so that views can be protected.	It is not possible to impose a limit on the height of trees.	Stanmore Hill CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting)	David Sassen	There is a not a symmetrical layout to the buildings as described within the Canons Park Conservation Area Appraisal along Powel Close in paragraph 6.33. Powel Close is spelt incorrectly in the document. See paragraph 6.33 and picture 6.23	The revised draft now omits reference to this.	Canons Park CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting)	Robert Graham and Myra Stephens	Unless the rules are applied for building conservation and trees the document is not worth it. We refer to the tree removal at 3 Rose Garden Close. We have concerns about the proposed garage at 6 Rose Garden Close. * We have concerns about the modern materials at 40 Canons Drive. We believe this should be refused and publicity maximised on making them rebuild. We are supportive of this document. * 6 Rose Garden Close is meant to put up a fence and vegetation. Water is now also leaking out from under the gabion wall to such an extent that our path around the lake is dangerously waterlogged. Something must be done by the property owner to address this problem. * 54 Canons Drive were meant to put wall back but are only just doing this. They have painted their drive black and a case should be created for this. * We are supportive of the Article 4 direction for windows. * 23 Dukes Avenue have a moderndoor and drive installed. * We would support an extension of the conservation area to include Cavendish and Dorest. * We should be on the Canons Park Estate Association consultation list.	The importance of addressing unsympathetic, unauthorised works is recognised as the draft SPD states that unauthorised works will be referred to planning enforcement and it will be ensured that action is taken where appropriate. These unauthorised works have been referred to enforcement. The proposed extension of the CA is not considered appropriate since the buildings in these areas are not as of good or cohesive quality as those within the CA so would undermine the CA's value. They are already afforded some protection in any case by being within the CA setting. They have been added to the Canons Park Estate Association list.	Overarching SPD and the Canons Park CA

11/07/2013 (public meeting)	Mr Levene	The grass on Little Common is not being cut. Stones are hidden, posts are on the floor and concrete is sticking up. They do not sweep up the grass and do not use a small mower just strimmer. *The Cottage facing the main road had a poor planning decision with rooflights being allowed but a dormer not.	The grass cutting issue was reported to parks on 15th July 2013. Question of the posts included in the CAAMS. Justification for each planning decision is provided within the planning report for each case available via the Harrow planning webpages at www.harrow.gov.uk/planning once the address has been entered into the search engine.	Little Common CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting)	Carole Lis of the Elm Park Residents Association	* For Bernays Gardens a new doorway in the wall to the park is proposed for safety reasons. I would object to this as this is the longest unbroken stretch of wall around. * For Wood Farm we fought this proposal but it was overturned by the planning inspectorate. It is on Green Belt land. * Think urban townscape garden near to the conservation area should be the Wood Lane treatment of wild flowers. * Towards Cloisters they have taken a low picket fence from Cloisters Wood and replaced it with tall fences. * Alf Porter the ex-Chairman of Stanmore and Harrow Historical Society says that at Edgware High Street Conservation Area on the corner of Whitchurch Lane there is a fruit and vegetable store that has encroached out by installing a stall serving kebabs * At the back of 4 Elm Park they have converted windows backing on the conservation area and built a 2 storey garage.	The Listed Building Consent and Planning Application for the new doorway in the wall to Bernays Gardens has already been determined. Similarly the proposal for Wood Farm has already been approved. The importance of addressing unsympathetic, unauthorised works is recognised and so the overarching SPD states that unauthorised works will be referred to planning enforcement and it will be ensured that action is taken where appropriate. The unauthorised works have been referred to enforcement or have been dealt with under separate planning applications.	Old Church Lane Conservation Area, Edgware High Street Conservation Area, Little Common CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting)	Tony Raymond - President of the Stanmore Society and Chairman of the Harrow Environmental Forum	* Made a specific request for a copy of the document. * Paragraph 6.1.1.3 Green Lane is used as a rat run. With the proposed new supermarket this is a disaster waiting to happen. There is no need for another supermarket. * At the top of the hill with the new RNOH redevelopment. This is proposing to move the entrance into Wood Lane. This would increase traffic to unmanageable levels. The entrance should stay in Brockley Hill. * At the bottom of Stanmore Hill the traffic lights are badly arranged. Can the Council use their influence to improve this?	A paper copy of the document was provided. Reference has been made to the traffic issue along Green Lane in section 2.25. Comments on the individual planning case for RNOH was referred to the relevant case officer. The proposed supermarket would be assessed on its own merits in relation to its affect on the setting of the CA. That the impact on the setting of the CA is a matter for consideration and guidance on how to consider this is already covered by section 2.4.6. The possibility of rearranging traffic lights at the bottom of Stanmore Hill was discussed with Traffic but is not an issue for the CA.	Stanmore Hill Conservation Area and Little Common CA

11/07/2013 (public meeting - in person)	Mrs Delys Ronson - Hill House	Can Hill House be de-listed? Can alterations be done? Trees in the garden overhang her garden. Is Stable Cottage in a conservation area? Where can funding for repairs be received?	An explanation was provided as to how to apply to de-list the building but that it was unlikely to succeed. In terms of tree queries she was referred to our tree officer. An explanation of the sources of funding was provided.	Stanmore Hill CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting - in person)	Maxine Ferrar	* The Abercorn - parking is very bad around there. There is consultation for double yellow lines going on further down the hill. * Street cleaners have been taken away from Stanmore shops which is a very shop term view to take this away as keeping them there shows the council is doing something.	Reference is now made to the parking as an issue near the Abercorn and a suggestion for addressing this is made. The matter of street cleaners was reported to street cleaning.	Stanmore Hill CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting - in person)	Tony Etherton of the Little Common Residents Association	Little Common - Stanmore A conservation area under the protection of the London Borough of Harrow. Issues: *potholes in gravelled areas * redundant signposts * more signposts than the M1 * Foul smells from Raw Lasan Restaurant - ongoing problem for years * New hand car wash in car park at Raw Lasan * Scout hut has been broken in to. It has been derelict for years. * There has been no action from the Council on an application to use the Scout Hut as an Arts Centre * A picnic table has been stolen from around the ponds and still not been replaced. It was on the far side near the rugby club. * Permanent problem with cars parked around Little Common - request for yellow lines * More and more satellite dishes are going up * Concrete posts are missing from the grassed area outside Raw Lasan restaurant - request for new ones. * Grass cutting is not well organised.	Specific reference is now made to potholes as an issue but it is clarified that the land in Little Common which has potholes is not owned by the Council. The paths crossing the Common are the responsibility of the Council but the gravel drive is excluded from the Common Land area and is unadopted land. The Council therefore does not have direct responsibility for the drive and care falls to all users (including the council). The Council is one such individual but has no more responsibility than any other of the circa 30 other users. To resolve the potholes therefore the matter is stated to need to be one that is discussed between all users. It is mentioned though that, on a non prejudicial basis the Council undertook remedial works to Little Common last year to allieviate the pothole issue at that time but there needs to be discussion as to the ongoing maintenance. The issue of signposts is already addressed by the draft document in section 1.115 and guidance section 1.145.so no amendments have been made in response to this consultation response, although it has now also been referred to Highways. The matter of the stolen picnic table is now included in the document where it is stated this is being replaced by the Council as part of the	Little Common CA

			<p>Green Grid project. It has been reported to Parks. Smells at the restaurant is an ongoing issue with Environmental Health. Reference is made to the Scout Hut as an issue within the document and the matter reported to Property Services. The parking issue has been reported to Highways and Parks. Specific reference is now made in the document along with considerations that would be required for resolving the issue. Satellite dishes are now referenced as an issue and it is stated that unauthorised works will be referred to enforcement . The grass cutting matter has been reported to Parks. The missing concrete posts are now referenced as an issue along with the recommendation that they be replaced. Grass cutting has been reported to Parks</p>	
11/07/2013 (public meeting - in person)	Ann Bilten	<p>* There are no yellow lines for local residents apart from the local school which is a good thing but current proposals would add to this. * The grass at the top of Green Lane is not being cut.</p>	<p>A separate consultation is being held by Highways over the proposed parking controls near Green Lane and so such responses have been forwarded to them. Management of the green space at the top of Green Lane has been identified as an issue in the draft document as are suggested ways to maintain this area which have been reported to Parks via email on 7th November, 2013.</p>	Stanmore Hill CA
11/07/2013 (public meeting)	Barry Dancer	<p>* The mini-cab company in Stanmore Station has been thrown out. They now park in Kerry Avenue and urinate on the land and leave their rubbish out. For 2 hours of the day parking restrictions say that they can't park there but the Parking Wardens say that they can't write a ticket as they go away straight away but do not understand this - why can't they issue a ticket? Complaints go to Andy Applebee. A complaint has been made to Councillor Hussain. Residents propose a sign on the existing saying no commercial or business parking can be there. * The roads become a cut through. Couldn't Glanleam and Valencia Roads be part closed to prevent this. Along Kerry Avenue rather than being two ways it should be closed on one side to make it safer.</p>	<p>Reference is made to the volume of parking, particularly taxis, and the issue of litter as an issue and recommendations are made for managing this. The matter is one for Highways and has been referred to them.</p>	Kerry Avenue CA

<p>11/07/2013 (public meeting - written and photographic submission)</p>	<p>Marcea Kuperberg, Lesley de Meza representing 1-32 Kerry Court) and Evelina Huang</p>	<p>Written submission: Minicab parking is detrimental to the Conservation Area because: While waiting for fares, these cars now use Kerry Court/Kerry Avenue as a dumping ground and private parking lot. 1. Rubbish/litter is dumped by parkers in Kerry Court and Kerry Avenue e.e. packaging from 'take-away' food including non-biodegradable Styrofoam), drinks cans, plastic bottles, crisp packers, sweet wrappers, cigarette butts, misscellaneous litter when the drivers clean out the inside of their vehicles. 2. This littering has greatly increased since minicabs working for Jubilee Cars, office at Stanmore Station, have been outsted from the station forecourt. The bin placed in Kerry Court by the Council has been ineffectual and is not cleared frequently, nor sufficiently regularly. 3. These Jubilee minicab drivers park here regardless of the restrictions. When the traffic warden arrives on his motor bike, drivers often exchange a joke/word with him - occasionally moving offfor a minute - returning as soon as the traffic warden has fone. This attracts other parkers. 4. The minicabs add to the eyesore of other parked cars in this precious conservation area - the situation is exacerbated when there is an event in Wembley. (Wembley Park Station is only 4 stops from Stanmore on the Jubilee Line). 5. Minicabs could just as easily park in nearby non-conservation areas that comprise Zone H - where their presence would not be so detrimental to local residents or the area in general. Solution: A cheap and easy answer: Photographic (mock-up) example provided: A small additional plate added to each of the existing sign posts in Kerry Court and Kerry Avenue could ensure these commerical an dprivate hire vehicles are banned from parking in this conservation area. NOTE: It is of concern that over the last 2 years there has been a vast increase in traffic parking in Kerry Avenue South and Kerry Court. Quite apart from the rubbish these vehicles (including the minicabs) deposit creating an eyesore in the area - they also represent a log jam of vehicles in and about the once pretty central green that lent the conservation area a 'boulevard' feel and also to the semi-circular green with its established trees on Kerry Court. This is now largely lost - and past efforts to suggest that this are might better be designated a discrete and separate parking zone are worthy of revisiting. If one wishes to retain and maintain the conservation area in a sympathetic manner, real efforts should be made to keep it clear of unwanted traffic congestion and the detitus and disrepair that this brings.</p>	<p>See comments above. In terms of the request that Stanmore Station has a lift - this is not a matter for this draft document but has been referred to TFL.</p>	<p>Kerry Avenue CA</p>
<p>11/07/2013 (public meeting - in person)</p>	<p>Marcea Kuperberg</p>	<p>There is bumper to bumper car parking and when there is a Wembley Event you can't get up Kerry Avenue because of the parking. Fire engines and ambulances can't get in. This is exacerbated by the mini-cabs. Jubilee cars used to be around the station car park but they have now been ousted. Now they are parked opposite Kerry Court and Kerry Avenue. They disregard parking restrictions and picnic there, litter and cigarettes, crisp packets, bottles and non-biodegradable litter. The litter bin is not emptied. Why can't they park elsewhere? We pay for permits and taxes so we have more rights to be there as residents. * Zone H was increased against residents' wishes. Why can't there be a sign there and make Kerry Avenue and Kerry Court a separate zone. This matter has been ongoing since 2008 but it has got worse in the last 2 years given out of borough drivers and more drivers generally. They are effectively running a business out of a conservation area which is not right and does</p>	<p>See comments above. The litter bin not being emptied has been referred to the waste department.</p>	<p>Kerry Avenue CA</p>

		not preserve the character of that conservation area. There is more time spent talking to the drivers than booking them.		
26/07/2013 (email)	Jacob Levy	Dear Lucy May I also take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts. It is much appreciated especially since we are so keen to preserve this wonderful conservation area. Regards	N/A	Kerry Avenue CA
26/07/2013 (email)	Marcea Kuperberg	Dear Lucy, Thank you again for taking note of our great concerns re the conservation aspects of the Kerry Avenue Conservation area and for forwarding our concerns to relevant people in the Council. We very much wish to work with you to try to preserve what could and should be a unique and beautiful gem in the heart of Stanmore. Unfortunately, as you know, Kerry Avenue and Court have become little more than a rubbish dump and parking lot for bumper-to-bumper parkers and minicab drivers. For your information, since the Council purple van with cameras attached to its roof, has been parked at the beginning of the morning restricted hour, 10.00 a.m. to 11 a.m. minicabs have vanished for this short period, returning at 11 a.m. promptly - one look at the Harrow van is enough for them (unlike the quick 'pass by' of the traffic warden on his bike after which they return within minutes if leaving at all). Of course, this can only be a very short term measure. We have discovered that it is not only minicabs working for the Jubilee Car office at Stanmore Station (although this constitutes the majority of cab parking). We have been informed by Jubilee that there is a another minicab company that has a contract to pick up passengers from the Royal Nat. Orthopaedic Hospital on Brockley Hill (outside Zone H), which has instructed its drivers to park in Kerry Avenue as a 'wait-for-a-fare area' (!). Also black cabs have informed us that Kerry Avenue is a designated black cab parking rank as well! If the Council is genuine about trying its best to preserve this precious conservation area, and we believe it is - in view of the restrictions it places on current building/decoration aspects of modernist homes within this area - we find it extraordinary that hire cars and taxis are allowed to use this area in this way, both within and outside the restricted times. This is even more extraordinary when one considers that nearby Morecambe Gardens is usually empty of cars when Kerry Ave/Ct, is nearly full. Please see evidence in photos attached. In the photos it can be seen that Kerry Avenue is even more full within the restricted time than Morecambe	See comments above. In terms of banning taxis from the conservation area it is noted that this is not possible according to Highways.	Kerry Avenue CA

Gdns is, outside the restricted time!

Morecambe Gardens is not a Conservation Area, it does not have houses which front the road and are disturbed by parkers, it is as close as Kerry Ave/Ct to the Station (but not as obvious). Surely this would be an ideal area for the Council to designate as a Taxi Cab rank for minicabs working for Jubilee Cars or other companies (and black cabs). The rank would then operate as other ranks do in central London i.e. cars take their places on a first come/first served basis, moving up the rank in line when the first car moves out. In these circumstances, mini cabs and taxis should be barred from parking at all times in the Kerry Avenue Conservation Area.

For your further information I attach two photos taken within 20 minutes of each other, showing parking in Morcambe Gardens (one or two cars) and Kerry Avenue (nearly full). Again, note that Kerry Avenue has more cars despite the photo being taken inside the restricted time than Morecambe Gdns has, taken outside the restricted time.

We urgently ask for your help in instigating a proper parking area for minicabs and taxis in Morecambe Gardens after which time, banning them at all times from the Conservation area of Kerry Avenue/Ct.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Marcia Kuperberg on behalf of Kerry Avenue and Kerry Court residents.

Photo of Kerry Avenue taken at 3.52 p.m. on Wednesday 17 July 2013.
Note that this shot has been taken *inside* the afternoon parking restriction hour.



Photo of Morecambe Gdns taken same day, 20 minutes later, *outside* the afternoon parking restriction hour – 4.12 p.m. virtually free of cars. **We propose that part of this road be designated a general cab parking rank after which time cabs and minicabs be banned at all times from parking in the Kerry Avenue and Kerry Court Conservation area.**



<p>26/07/2013 (email)</p>	<p>Nick Bishop, English Heritage</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting English Heritage on the draft Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Area Appraisals for the LB Harrow.</p> <p>As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment English Heritage is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. We welcome production of this SPD which will assist the borough in conserving and managing the conservation areas concerned.</p> <p>Having review the document we wish to make the following observations: Page 8 (paragraph 3.1.2.1) – the National Planning Policy Framework defines settings as “the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced.” Impacts on settings, for example, development in open space immediately surrounding conservation areas, should be managed based on an understanding of the contribution made by the setting to the conservation area’s significance, as set out in English Heritage’s Guidance on the Setting of Heritage Assets. To reflect this we suggest altering paragraph 3.1.2.1 as follows: A conservation area’s setting often contributes to its architectural or historic interest and as such development within the setting will be expected to respect its qualities and special interest. The setting is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework as the surrounding in which a heritage asset is experienced. This can include, for example, usually land which obviously bounds the conservation area or but the setting may also include areas not immediately adjacent but areas further away that impact on views into or out of the area. Where the setting can be described as open space this is likely to offer protection to the conservation area and therefore development may not always be appropriate in areas where this is the case. Open space forming the setting of conservation areas can often make a contribution to their historic significance and development in such areas may therefore be inappropriate.</p> <p>Page 30 (paragraph 6.3.2.2) – it should be noted that conservation area consent is to be merged with Planning Permission once the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act comes into force.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion</p> <p>Page 6 (paragraph 2.3.1) English Heritage confirms that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of this Supplementary Planning Document is not required since the document supplements policies which have already been subject to SEA.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>We hope that these comments prove useful in strengthening the SPD. In the meantime we would like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by you. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, where English Heritage consider it appropriate to do so.</p>	<p>The references to the setting of CAs has been amended in line with English Heritage’s comments and reference to Conservation Area Consent has been omitted.</p>	<p>Overarching SPD</p>
<p>August 2013 (via Objective)</p>	<p>Marcea Kuperberg</p>	<p>Section 6</p> <p>The environment of the Kerry Avenue conservation area is currently badly affected by the commuter and especially minicab parking - bumper to bumper around the Kerry Avenue Island and Kerry Court. Rubbish is thrown onto road & island. Existing restrictions have no effect on minicabs who are awaiting fares from both the Jubilee</p>	<p>See comments above.</p>	<p>Kerry Avenue CA</p>

Car office at Stanmore Station. The council should designate a minicab & taxi rank at Morecambe Gardens, a non conservation area. Also Zone H was extended to reach as far as Canons Corner causing additional commuter parking in K, Avenue. Kerry Avenue & Court should be a separate Zone with separate parking restrictions limited to residents only, minicabs banned from parking at all times.

6.1 transport

Traffic in the Kerry Ave conservation area has increased a great deal in the last 5 years - caused by minicabs no longer being allowed to park in the Stanmore Station forecourt. Instead they park at all times of day and night around the Kerry Avenue Island, causing detriment to his precious conservation area by their encouragement of additional parking and the rubbish they dump while waiting for fares from their office at Jubilee cars.

Cars regularly park at the Station end of Kerry Avenue, on the double yellow lines while waiting to collect people from the Station - causing lack of visibility to cars approaching from both sides of Kerry Court and both sides of Kerry Avenue - a very dangerous traffic hazard.

6.1.3

Stanmore Station should have a lift. This is desperately needed for those with physical disabilities. It is no good arguing that there is another route via the car park, or up the lesser steps at the side, as this is useless for wheelchair users and it is ridiculous to have to telephone (who?) to be able to get access. Kingsbury Station was given a lift, whereas Stanmore, the nearest station to RNOH has no lift!!!! Parking and especially minicab parking is a visual eyesore in the precious conservation area of Kerry Avenue and has caused this area to be a car & minicab parking lot and rubbish dump.

6.2 Views

The Kerry Avenue Conservation area is a precious gem in the heart of Stanmore, but is currently ruined by bumper to bumper parking of commuter cars and especially minicabs which have been moved from the forecourt of Stanmore Station. A minicab & taxi rank should be installed in nearby Morecambe Gardens, a non conservation area as close to the Station as Kerry Ct/Ave, and minicabs & taxis should then be banned from Kerry Ave Conservation area.

8.2 Dev Overview

If the Council is really serious about maintaining the special character and layout of the beautiful and unique character and road layout of the Kerry Avenue Conservation area, it should finally do something to reduce the bumper to bumper commuter and especially increased minicab/taxi parking around the Island which is currently a car park lot and rubbish dumping ground for minicabs and commuters.

8.4 maintaining Greenery

Kerry Avenue has a beautiful central island of grass and trees which is being totally spoilt by the bumper to bumper car parking and minicab parking with consequent rubbish dumping onto the island. Kerry Avenue and Kerry Court should be a separate zone. Minicabs should be moved to a designated minicab rank to be placed in Morecambe Gardens which is as close to Stanmore Station as Kerry Ct/Avenue.

14/07/2013 (email)	Rex Holmes	<p>Thank you for seeing me on Thursday in the presence of the Chairman of the Stanmore Society.</p> <p>I was pleased to see that the proposal, referred below, to enclose The Green at the junction of Green Lane and Stanmore Hill was unlikely to proceed.</p> <p>You also noted that we, as volunteers have been requesting a bin to be sited on the vacant space adjacent the bench and that you would try to facilitate.</p>	The amended draft recommends a bin is installed here.	Stanmore Hill CA
22/07/2013 (email)	Darren Simons	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond the Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document</p> <p>As a resident of Canons Park Estate I fully support the importance of conservation and the avoidance of modifications and extensions that do not sit with the existing layout. However, I do think there needs to be more segmentation given to different parts of the estates.</p> <p>Referring to specific points in the Appendix 6:</p> <p>6.111 - Removal of chimneys - this makes sense for Canons Drive but less so for houses on streets off Canons Drive (such as Dukes Avenue, Lake View, Rose Garden Close, where the building styles vary considerably. There is a house in Rose Garden Close which is, I think, art deco in design and completely different to the rest of the estate, far more so than chimneys. Mention is given in various parts of the document (notably 6.118) that Lake View has had considerable replacement work over time and I would suggest chimneys be included in this exception.</p> <p>6.134 - Driveway paving - again, this makes sense for Canons Drive but not Lake View which already accomodates a number of cars and in many cases (especially on the north eastern side of the middle section) has no grass area at all. Section 6.95 refers to this but I think it should be detailed in 6.134 as well.</p>	The draft has been amended to clarify that an Article 4 Direction cannot require permission for removal of a chimney but can do for alterations to one. Also, since it is acknowledged that Lake View is so altered it is not proposed to introduce this Article 4 direction on this road. However, chimneys are still a common feature of the Tudor Revival and Vernacular Revival houses elsewhere and therefore it is still proposed to introduce the Article 4 Direction for these, with the exception of the property on Rose Garden Close which is of Modernist design and so has no chimneys. The hardsurfacing control is an existing control that has been in place since 1988 and has helped to preserve the character of the conservation area. For those driveways that have no soft landscaping left, encouragement can be given for some to be introduced in future. Recent appeal decisions support the importance of this Article 4 direction. Therefore it is not considered appropriate to remove this.	Canons Park CA
30/07/2013 (letter)	Dr Ronald Cormack	Request for the council to put forward their building for national listing.	Outlined the procedure for putting forward buildings for listing to the owner.	Little Common CA
29/08/2013 (email)	Robert Graham	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the above document.</p> <p>I am a resident of the Canons Park Estate, and the Chairman of the Canons Park Estate Association (CPEA), and I have therefore focussed my attention on Appendix 6 which cover the Canons Park Estate Conservation Area.</p>	A preference for dormers over rooflights is not expressed in the draft document since it is considered that either can be appropriate depending on circumstances and this view is	Canons Park CA

I am broadly in agreement with the Management Proposals (see Section 6.4.2) in relation to each of the problems identified in the document (see Section 6.3.2), but I would make the following comments:

Loft Conversions – If a loft extension is permitted I would generally prefer dormer windows rather than flat roof lights or "Velux" windows, which I would suggest are generally completely out of character. I entirely agree that the dormer windows should not be too large and that "boxy" roof extensions should be avoided at all costs.

Windows – I agree that existing windows should be used wherever possible. Where uPVC windows are used that should be of a classic design to blend in as far as possible with the materials used in the original construction of the property. The use of double glazed units within original (or replacement) wooden frames should be encouraged as an alternative to uPVC.

Front Door – I agree that replacement front doors should match the material and design of the original property. The use of plastic / uPVC front doors with inappropriate modern door furniture should be prohibited.

Garage Doors – The replacement of garage doors is discouraged by implication in the document (with the exception of Lake View). I don't have a problem with the garage door being replaced, given the unsuitability of most of the original garages on the Estate due to their small size, as long as the look of the windows and materials used to replace the doors is sympathetic to the look and feel of the original property. It seems to me that the insistence on retaining the doors even when the garage has been converted to a room is unnecessary.

Driveway paving – I entirely agree that the maximum amount of soft landscaping should be retained. I would however disagree with the colour to be used on the hard surfacing (see section 6.5.11) should generally be "grey, light or natural colours". I think it depends on the tone of the brickwork. Where the brick work has a strong reddish tone, pink or red paving could be more effective. I do however ever agree that in almost all circumstances red, bright or black surfacing would be inappropriate. I would also make a further point in relation to the proposals regarding the bricks and roof tiles used in the construction of extensions in the Conservation Area.

I believe there should be a presumption against the use of modern bricks or roof tiles. In almost all cases, the use of old stock bricks or original clay roof tiles would be more appropriate. Modern so-called "heritage" products should not be considered as a suitable replacement – they usually just look like modern products that are meant to look old.

I would however like to make a more general point about the proposals which is equally applicable to the current Conservation policy.

The Canons Drive Estate is indeed an outstanding area of architectural interest in Harrow but the features that make it so unique will only be preserved if the Council actually enforces its policies. There are too many examples of properties on the Estate where the Conservation rules have been ignored and the Council has demonstrably failed to take any action to enforce the relevant planning restrictions.

I have attached photographs of some recent examples:

<<2 Lake View.jpg>>

presented and justified. The document does not preclude the use of UPVC but simply provides guidance that like for like replacement is encouraged. The document allows for replacement of garage doors but encourages the original and traditional style to be maintained where possible. The comment that red or pink driveway surfaces can be appropriate is accepted. The guidance allows for this by stating that usually this is inappropriate though as it can clash or compete for attention with the house. The importance of addressing unsympathetic, unauthorised works is recognised and so the overarching SPD states that unauthorised works will be referred to planning enforcement and it will be ensured that action is taken where appropriate.

2 Lake View

- Excessive hard surfacing

<<5 Dukes Avenue.jpg>>

5 Dukes Avenue

- Excessive hard surfacing

<<3 Chestnut Avenue.jpg>>

3 Chestnut Avenue

- Excessive hard surfacing

<<6 Powell Close.jpg>>

6 Powell Close

- Replacement property on grander scale than the original. Large dormer window.

<<60 Canons Drive.jpg>> <<62 Canons Drive.jpg>> <<54 Canons Drive.jpg>>

54, 60 and 62 Canons Drive

- Replacement properties on grander scale than the original. Large dormer windows.

<<18 Lake View.jpg>>

18 Lake View

- Use of inappropriate materials that do not match with the original brickwork.
- Excessive hard surfacing
- uPVC windows

<<40 Canons Drive.jpg>>

40 Canons Drive

- Use of modern bricks and roof tiles which do not match the original construction (NB This is currently the subject of a retrospective application for planning permission).

<<23 Dukes Avenue.jpg>>

23 Dukes Avenue

- Replacement of garage doors with inappropriate and unsympathetic materials.
- Application recently refused for excessive hard surfacing.

Unless or until the Council actively enforces its Conservation policies and sends a message to house owners that applications for planning permission will not be approved unless they are strictly in compliance with the restrictions.

Too often planning applications are submitted (and approved) on a retrospective basis – especially for hard surfacing – after the event and too often these applications are just nodded through. The Council needs to make a statement by forcing a householder to reinstate a soft surface, or replace roof tiles, to make it clear that breaches of policy will not be entertained.

I hope this is helpful. Please let me know if you wish to discuss this further. My contact details are below.

Yours sincerely

Via Objective	Dr Michael Fenster	6.1.1 It is odd that the document comments on Green Lane, Stanmore, but not on Wood lane. Wood lane also suffers as a rat run as traffic avoids the congestion in Stanmore town centre, and at canons Corner, and the planned siting of the main entrance of the new RNOH on Wood lane will contribute to the increase of traffic on both Wood Lane and Green Lane	Reference is now made to Wood Lane as well as Green Lane in this context.	Overarching SPD
31 st October, 2013	Tony Raymond, President of the Stanmore Society	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Paragraph 3.1413 Relating to the obelisk. This is in the RNOH site. 31416 talks about an ancient monument and the redevelopment of the RNOH. This should not affect the Brockley Hill Settlement. SULLONICAE. The RNOH has much more significance to the obelisk contained in 31414. The Obelisk is towards the middle of the RNOH grounds. 2) P28. paragraph 6111 mentions in 5th line down mentions Honeypot Lane this should be Marsh Lane. Further down that paragraph it mentions Honeypot Lane which is correct. 3) P.29 6132 Stanmore Station and the DDA but it may be worth mentioning that it is not DDA compliant. 4) P.31 6341 says grills but it should grilles. 5) P.34 paragraph 671 it says former mission hall and scout hut. 6) P.63 Paragraph 113 Domesday is the correct word. 7) P.74 onwards. Where Summerland appears it should be Summerhill 8) P.77 Paragraph 159 top of the page. The whole site has been sold off and ten houses will be erected there and the rest of the land will be an extension of Stanmore Country Park. This will make it accessible green belt. Across London to the Downs. Two old cottages in Pear Wood falling down 9) P211 Bernays Gardens in Old Church Lane CA. This mentions the Cowsheds and the shelter. Not sure if it was just meant for cows or just a park shelter. Now sold off. 10) P98 section 1.141 it mentions the Stanmore Association it should be the Stanmore Society 11) Unsure if the cow sheds were originally intended as cow sheds or just intended to mimic them. <p>The rest I agree with. It is an extremely useful document.</p>	Factual errors corrected and minor additions made.	Overarching SPD and Little Common CA