

Appendix 1 – Consultation responses to draft Locally Listed Buildings SPD

Name	Consultation Response	Council Response
1) Mr John Orchard	Pinnerwood Farm and Pinnerwood Lodge are in Woodhall Road not Woodhall Gate as indicated below some of the photographs (5.1, 5.14, 5.16).	Noted Change: Factual corrections made.
2) Councillor Bill Stephenson	Requested printed copy.	Copy provided.
3) Mr Paul Myers	Disagree with local listing of 24 Uxbridge Road given the quality of the building and development that has taken place near it over the years. The only people that can see this building are in the flats.	Upon review officers consider this building is no longer worthy of local listing. This is because its special interest related largely to its semi-rural setting and this has been significantly undermined since local listing. Change: The Council will consult with local and national conservation groups on the proposal to de-list.
4) Mrs Bennet	Requesting information on what the consultation was about.	This information was provided.
5) Mr Reed	Overarching opinion is that the document is unnecessary and that the document is trying to upgrade their status to an unsuspecting audience	The SPD is intended to provide good practice advice and guidance to the owners and occupiers of locally listed buildings for their maintenance and conservation and also to provide advice on the relevant planning controls. Given the contribution these buildings make to Harrow's sense of place and to local distinctiveness, the Council considers their recognition in an SPD is appropriate, ensuring the Local List is a material consideration when considering planning applications relating to these buildings. However, the Council does agree that the SPD needs to be clear about the status of a building on the Local List. Change: The introduction to the SPD has been amended to clarify the purpose of the SPD and to distinguish the legal and planning status of a locally listed building from that of a List Building.
5) Mr Reed	You allege that historic maintenance repair and materials help preserve its value and I doubt if this can be substantiated which might lead to legal challenge against the Council.	Additions and alterations that are clearly out of character with the historic fabric of a building can certainly diminish from the building aesthetic appeal and may impact on its value. However, the Council agrees that this is difficult to substantiate. Change: Delete references to impact on property values
5) Mr Reed	I hope that Harrow Council's description of a locally listed building is the same as the national description.	Harrow Council's description of a locally listed building is in accordance with English Heritage's 'Good Practice

		Guide for Local Listing'. No change
5) Mr Reed	The document needs to be clear about the legal and planning status of locally listed buildings. It then could give practical advice to owners or occupiers, but I think the document is rather a confused jumble of mixed messages.	Agreed. Change: The introduction to the SPD has been amended to distinguish the legal and planning status of a locally listed building from that of a List Building.
5) Mr Reed	The document is too long and cumbersome to find the information.	Agreed. Change: The document has been substantially revised, reorganized and its length shortened.
5) Mr Reed	Are you saying that a locally listed building is a heritage asset as described by National policy?	Change: The SPD has been amended to clarify that locally listed buildings do not share the same status as statutorily designated heritage assets.
5) Mr Reed	I think the photos are rather arbitrary.	Disagree. The photos help provide context. No change
5) Mr Reed	The photo on page 8 is Pinnerwood Cottage not Pinnerwood Farm.	Noted. Change: Correct the photo caption on page 8.
5) Mr Reed	You are constantly updating your statutory listing and this should be dictated by quality. A locally listed building will not be included if it is not worthy and therefore they should not be upgraded for any other reason	Agreed. Change: References to the upgrading of locally listed buildings to Listed status have been removed.
5) Mr Reed	Page 10 – listed buildings are quoted twice – this does not refer to “locally” listed buildings and is therefore misleading.	The quote was from the Local Plan policy DM7. As stated above, the SPD has been amended to clarify that locally listed buildings do not share the same status as statutorily designated heritage assets, and therefore the reference to this section of Policy DM7 has been removed. Change: Delete reference to Local Plan policy DM7 at page 10 of the SPD.
5) Mr Reed	What research shows that buildings which retain their historic features in good order hold their value better than those which have been unsympathetically altered or repaired? This should be noted. Also I do not believe it holds true in some parts of Harrow and I feel it is a dangerous statement for you to make.	Additions and alterations that are clearly out of character with the historic fabric of a building can certainly diminish from the building aesthetic appeal and may impact on its value. However, the Council agrees that this is difficult to substantiate. Change: Delete references to impact on property values
5) Mr Reed	Please either have locally listed buildings with or without capitals but be consistent.	Noted
5) Mr Reed	Page 14 critell should read Crittal.	Noted. Change: Correct the spelling
5) Mr Reed	Page 14: Since when did lightweight secondary glazing improve significantly in appearance as well as performance? You give too many opinions that are not enforceable.	The options provided are not intended to be enforceable but rather guidance on alternatives so that owners may make informed decisions before replacing existing windows and doors. No change
5) Mr Reed	I do not agree with 5.8. The Council cannot consider the options given if there are concerns about the ongoing consideration of	Agreed. Change: Section has been deleted. Article 4 directions

	the special interest of a locally listed building.	are dealt with in the context of Permitted Development rights.
5) Mr Reed	5.9. should say that in some instances permission is not required to alter the exterior. The omission is misleading.	Having regard to the previous comment made, this section has been deleted. Change: Section is deleted, no further change is therefore necessary
5) Mr Reed	5.12 – Any building (not just locally listed buildings) has more planning controls protecting it. Your statement is misleading and intending to frighten people with locally listed buildings.	Having regard to the previous comment made, this section has been deleted. Change: Section is deleted, no further change is therefore necessary
5) Mr Reed	Page 23. What is this for?	It was intended as a glossary but is unnecessary. Change: Delete page 23
6) Andy Tilsiter	<p>Generally support the draft but in my view there is a major omission that needs to be urgently addressed. I am an owner of a locally listed building and I write to you with firsthand experience of someone who has recently sought planning permission to carry out a small extension. I can do no better than attach the following documents:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning refusal date 7th June 2012 2. Notice of Appeal dated 9th July 2012 3. Report of Architectural Historian, Mr Havey Van Sickle dated July 2012 4. Decision of Planning Inspector dated 18th September 2012 (Appeal Allowed) <p>It will be clear from the above documentation that the conservation officer and planning officer made a mistake about the architectural history of my property, over estimated the extent of the original form of the house and above all failed to appreciate that the entire rear of the property (to which the extension was proposed) was an existing 1970s extension. As upheld by the inspector, the small extension to the rear of the property, had absolutely no impact on the front of the house.</p> <p>In my view, the both the former local policy and the current draft fail to highlight the fact that just because a building is locally listed does not mean that all of it is of architectural interest. The draft needs to make this clear and also needs to set out clear guidance as to how this should be dealt with. I respectfully suggest the following wording should be added:</p> <p>It should be noted that just because a building is locally listed</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Change: The SPD has been amended in a number of places to clarify that whilst the whole building may be locally listed there may be parts of it that are not of interest. See new para 3.3</p>

	<p>that this does not necessarily mean the whole of the building is of architectural or historic interest. For example, the front elevation of a property might be Victorian and have local importance to the street scene but the rear of the property may have already been extended or adapted at later dates. As such the Council should have regard to the precise nature of any applications for alterations or extensions and in particular whether they affect all or part of the subject building. If the proposal only relates to part of a local listed building the focus should be on that particular part of the property.</p> <p>This paragraph should be inserted in section 5, perhaps below section 5.6. I also think it would be sensible for the draft to not only provide good practice to owners and occupiers but also to the Council itself. Perhaps it should require the Council to consult external experts where it is necessary and appropriate to do so. I say this because I spent considerable time in making the above appeal and incurred considerable expense in commissioning an expert report in order to correct something that was clearly wrong from any reasonable conservation assessment.</p> <p>The local conservation policy is vitally important to our neighbourhood but the right balance must be struck and the policy framework must be clear to reflect all scenarios.</p> <p>Please can you confirm my views will be taken into account. Furthermore, I would also like to attend at the relevant Cabinet meeting and make my representations verbally to the committee. Please can you let me know when this will be.</p>	
7) Ms Lisa Jacks	Requested 66 Hutton Lane be removed as the whole house has been double glazed with a new front door and the porch has been removed so the house is now the same as the whole street and would not be of historical interest.	Officers have reviewed this property and in light of recent changes removing features of special interest that did not require planning permission it is considered that this building is no longer worthy of local listing. Change: The Council will consult with local and national conservation groups on the proposal to de-list and then make a recommendation to the next LDF panel.
8) Luciana Snowdon	I am all in favour of this draft being recognised – I am owner/occupier of a flat in Roxborough Park.	Support for the SPD is noted and welcomed.

9) Masha Myers	Requested 24 Uxbridge Road betaken off the local list as it is not worthy.	Upon review officers consider this building is no longer worthy of local listing. Change: The Council will consult with local and national conservation groups on the proposal to de-list and then make a recommendation to the next LDF panel.
10) Georgie Housley	I am writing in response to your letter of 18 July, in which you ask for opinions on the above. As a resident of West St, I am totally supportive of all efforts to preserve the character and nature of the locality - one of the main reasons that I moved here initially. My only comment is that I think the council should spell out in the SPD that solar panel installation, particularly on the front elevation of houses that are within a conservation area, are not permitted. I refer to the absurd situation that is ongoing regarding the solar panels at no.81 West Street, and to that end, I would be grateful if you could let me know the outcome of the independent panel review which took place in Bristol recently to consider the owner's rejection of the council's refusal to grant retrospective planning permission for the solar panels.	Existing section on energy efficiency has been amended to include consideration of micro generation equipment. It is clarified that such measures are encouraged where they do not harm special interest and that factors such scale and siting are considered so that solar panels on the front elevation of locally listed buildings are unlikely to be appropriate.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	It is good to have this guidance even though it seems that the owner of a locally listed building can ignore it.	Support for the SPD is noted and welcomed.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	page 4 para 3.5 - lines 11-16 repeat lines 5-10	Agreed - para 3.5 has now been replaced by a revised para 2.1 but much of the original content has been omitted.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	page 7 picture 4.1 I cannot find Capel Gardens on the local list. Am I wrong?	Agreed. Upon review the Council notes that that was because it was mis-typed Chapel Gardens Change: Correct spelling to Capel Gardens
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	page 8 picture 5.1 is Pinnerwood Cottage, not Pinnerwood Farm	Noted Change: Correct the photo caption on page 8.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	5.2 sentence 5, line 6; 'However, if the building is a residential dwelling, or a building that is not a dwelling house or adjoining a dwelling house' does not make sense.	Agreed - para 5.2 has now been replaced by a revised para 3.24, which has been amended to take account of the comment. Change: Amend para 5.2 to clarify the position on the demolition of Listed and locally listed buildings.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	page 9 5.3 "the majority of Harrow's Locally Listed buildings lie within one of the 28 Conservation Areas in the Borough, which means most locally listed buildings within the borough require permission to be sought prior to their demolition". Is not this an	Agreed. Change: Amend the section on demolition completely to provide greater clarity

	overstatement, because you show 369 within conservation areas, leaving 357 outside them (total given as 726 on page 3, 2.2	
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	5.4 "Where retention is impossible" means, surely, "if the owner wishes to demolish the building" does it not?	Agreed. Change: Amend the section on demolition completely to provide greater clarity
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	page 13 picture 5.6 is Pinnerwood Farm, not Pinnerwood Lodge	Noted Change: Correct the photo caption.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	page 14 picture 5.8 Crittall, not crittall	Noted Change: Correct the spelling.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	picture 5.9 is of Pinnerwood Farm, not Pinnerwood Cottage	Noted Change: Correct the photo caption.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	page 19 picture 5.14 is Pinnerwood Farm, not Pinnerwood Lodge	Noted Change: Correct the photo caption.
11) Pat Clarke Pinner Local History Society	page 20 5.11 first line imminent, not immanent	Noted Change: Correct the spelling.

<p>12) Lisa Hawes</p>	<p>FIRST RESPONSE: I received a letter from you dated 18th July 2013.</p> <p>I have read and re-read it. But I don't understand what it is going on about. Having asked other people, they don't either. I assume that the response you receive to this letter will be low and I wanted to let you know that this is because it is very hard to understand it. There are people that believe that you are doing this deliberately in order to pull the wool over our eyes. If there is to be something that affects my home, then I would like to know about it and I would like also to "get involved"</p> <p>Please provide me with a link where I can read the changes that you are proposing. The link that you have provided does not do so – it sends me to a generic page about conservation in Harrow.</p> <p>Please also provide me with the date and venue for the public consultation as I would like to come and state openly that we have not actually been consulted with any degree of transparency.</p> <p>SECOND RESPONSE:</p> <p>Thank you. It would be great if it was called the same thing, so that people can understand.</p> <p>Please can you provide me with the document/rules as it was previously so that I can understand any changes that are being suggested? A stand-alone document is of no use to us residents – it is only be comparison that we can see the changes that the council are suggesting and how they will impact us.</p> <p>I am very upset with many of the changes that Harrow council have forced upon us where we live, and it is becoming a more and more inhospitable place to call home because of Harrow Council. I know that several of my neighbours feel the same, and that is becoming like we live on a tiny island. We do not trust the council to act in our interests or even to be transparent and allow us a say.</p> <p>I do not know what the rules were before. I found your letter to be very un-user-friendly. And, I do not trust Harrow Council to protect my interests. So, I would really like to see the rules before and the proposed changes so that I can stand up for myself and explain to my neighbours too.</p>	<p>Emails of clarification sent by officers on the nature of the consultation and requested any response on the document. It was stated that this is a first draft and so there is not a document to compare it with. There was no guidance document on Locally Listed Buildings before this draft. Any comments on the document were requested.</p>
-----------------------	--	--

<p>13) Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited,</p>	<p>Please find below an initial response to the Draft Guidance Note that is proposed to form the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that you have sent for consideration. This is by no means exhaustive and we reserve the right to raise additional concerns or objections in the future. We object to the document in its current form.</p> <p>The Board and residents of Capel Gardens are gravely concerned by the contents of the SPD, both in its entirety and with many specifics. Whilst almost all owners in Capel Gardens choose to live here due to the history, look and feel of the Art Deco building and well-maintained grounds, we have found none who expected its locally-listed status to impose an expectation on them that they would be forced to live in an unsafe, unhealthy and environmentally costly situation. In this document the Conservation, Environment and Enterprise Department has so far paid no heed to these issues and given sole priority to how the exterior will appear to any person walking by with total disregard for the people living within.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Council recognises and acknowledges that it is a balancing act between encouraging preservation of these buildings whilst also enabling owners to adapt them to be more energy efficient and to provide improved living conditions.</p> <p>Change: The SPD has therefore been amended to clarify that the SPD provides guidance on best practice on how locally listed buildings may be adapted but does not seek to impose controls beyond this where unsupported by planning policy or regulations. It is hoped that the advice provided within the SPD will aid in the owners and occupiers of these buildings making informed decisions as to the suitability of proposed alterations and repairs.</p>
<p>13) Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited,</p>	<p>Indeed this SPD provides no representation to the people living inside these buildings, nor the unsafe and unhealthy living conditions that such planning restrictions perpetuate. It even seeks to extend these restrictions in a way that we believe is far beyond the Council's remit and the original purpose of the locally-listed policy.</p>	<p>Agreed. See comments above</p>
<p>13) Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited,</p>	<p>As a specific example point 5.7 (sic) 'double-glazing' (with which Capel Gardens is particularly concerned). The request for integrated glazing bars and a cross-section diagram appears to specifically and definitely exclude uPVC as a replacement option. This blanket approach is untenable as each planning application should be treated on its individual merits and consider all options. We do not agree that the Nationally-listed buildings guidelines should be directly applied to the locally-listed planning process as this SPD suggests.</p>	<p>Noted. The document does not specifically preclude the use of double glazing but rather highlights that double glazing (if done poorly) can significantly detract from the local historic merit of the building.</p> <p>Change: The SPD has been amended to clarify the issue of 'double glazing', offering alternatives and design matters for owners consideration in an effort to ensure that where windows are replaced, the replacement is in keeping with the original windows.</p>
<p>13) Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited,</p>	<p>The Board have already raised with the Director of Planning, Stephen Kelly, the serious and urgent issues of the poor health and safety of the living environment within this locally-listed building (Capel Gardens). However, we do not see that a single one of these is considered in this document. It appears that the default Planning Application process for locally-listed buildings</p>	<p>Agreed. See comments above</p>

	is to begin with a 'no-change' response to planning applications rather than individual assessment based on need, safety, environmental and economic considerations.	
13) Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited,	The Council's view of the environmental issues involved with replacement within the SPD is naive, one-sided and incomplete. There is no mention of lost energy through aged, damaged, single vs double-glazed nor ill-fitting windows. The advice given on repair and restoration is patronising. Does the Council not appreciate that the owner would do all that they can to retain the aesthetics that they enjoy and were an integral part of their purchasing decision? All of the residents would love to keep the existing fittings but they are simply too dangerous and ineffective and as the Council is fully aware, would not pass the current environmental regulations.	Agreed. Change: As stated above the SPD has been amended to offer alternatives and design matters for owners consideration in an effort to ensure that where windows are replaced, the replacement is in keeping with the original windows.
13) Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited,	Of greater need is for the Council to stem the piecemeal and poor application of Planning considerations within the borough. As a very recent example the George IV Public House in Pinner has been allowed to be completely demolished despite its rich history that pre-dates the entire Metropolitan Line and as a Coach-house and site of a Workhouse. In addition, The Lodge building, built as a part of Capel Gardens in the same Art Deco Verdigris design has been allowed double-glazing and to replace its matching green-tiled roof. Indeed there are many examples in the borough of similarly designed houses having installed sympathetically designed double-glazing that adds to the character of the building.	Noted. The merits of individual applications are outside the scope of consultation on this SPD to address. While the Council acknowledges there are many good examples of replacements windows being installed in both Listed and locally listed buildings that are sympathetic to the style of the original windows there are numerous examples across the borough where this is not the case. Change: The amendments clarify that the Council encourages owners to consider sympathetically designed replacement windows, where it is deemed by the owner as necessary to replace the original wooden or metal windows. They also seek to highlight the issue with unsympathetic replacement of windows, typically using off-the-shelf generic standard framed windows that result in the new windows looking completely out of place and significantly detracting from the local heritage value of these unique buildings.
13) Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited,	The Board has to challenge the SPD's view of the (increased) valuation of a locally-listed building. It is contradictory to the empirical evidence and expertise that we have received from numerous Estate Agents who state that the value of Capel Gardens has not appreciated in the last decade or so in the same way as its environs specifically because of the poor quality of its single-glazed Crittal Windows.	Additions and alterations that are clearly out of character with the historic fabric of a building can certainly diminish from the building aesthetic appeal and may impact on its value. However, the Council agrees that this is difficult to substantiate. Change: Delete references to impact on property values

<p>13) Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited,</p>	<p>Finally, the Board can find no request for permission to use the photographs 4.1 and 5.8 of Capel Gardens that were clearly taken from within the private grounds. The Board must insist that the Council remove these images from the SPD document and cease and desist from all future use unless and until permission has been granted.</p> <p>The letter sent to residents does not indicate the next steps in the process of ratifying this Guidance Note into any SPD. We would appreciate a detailed description of the entire process including all stages where there may be objections or challenges filed.</p> <p>We would appreciate an acknowledgement of receipt in writing and a reply to our specific concerns at your earliest convenience.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council apologises for using the photographs of Capel Gardens without seeking permission and has removed these from the document.</p> <p>A letter indicating the next steps of the process of ratifying this Guidance Note into any SPD was been sent in response to this request.</p>
---	---	--

<p>14) Ancient Monuments Society</p>	<p>We commend the intention to publish the SPD and comment only on matters of detail</p> <p>1. Firstly two typos have crept in :</p> <p>a) Plate 5.8. page 14 - "Crittall"</p> <p>b) 5.11. in text "imminent"</p> <p>2. 5.7. Delighted to read the entirely commendable objections to uPVC on page 12 and can see why it appears under "Materials....". However, it is chiefly used for windows and doors. Does it not therefore sit better on page 13 ? Certainly there should be cross-referencing. And surely in the bulletpoint para presently on page 12 there should be reference to metal windows, whether Georgian iron casements or 20th century Crittalls.</p> <p>3. 5.10 Sadly, EH have recently made it much more difficult to apply for spotlisting - and the phrase "applications are given due consideration" is too kind on EH. Unless the structure in question is transparently listable, under acute threat or falls under a project promoted in the NPPF, it will be rejected under the new regime. Given that, might it be worthwhile asking those putting buildings forward to seek the views of yourselves or one or more of the National Amenity Societies ? This would prevent wasted effort but also allow hopeful cases to be supported.</p> <p>4. page 22. Thankyou for the reference to the AMS. Might it be possible to add : "(The AMS is concerned with listed buildings of all ages and all types)" ?</p>	<p>Factual corrections and minor amendments made.</p>
--------------------------------------	--	---

<p>15) A L Pollard</p>	<p>FIRST RESPONSE:</p> <p>In the current economic situation there seems to me to be an increased risk that when work is undertaken on a locally listed building less regard will be paid to guidance which impinges on cost than normally. Therefore I think that the SPD should be strengthened. Although it is implicit throughout the word 'responsible' does not seem to appear in the draft document. I suggest that in the first sentence after 'buildings' should be inserted 'in carrying out their responsibilities for'.</p> <p>Further I note that local listing does not add any further requirements for planning permission but I suggest that in para 5.1 should be added a statement to the effect that work which does not require planning permission should not detract from the features of the building which qualified it for local listing. Ironically, I see that at the flats in Capel Gardens, which feature in 2 photographs in the draft paper, although the TV dishes which have been added are comparatively inconspicuous the cabling has been done with no regard for the architecture of the buildings by, for example, running it behind down pipes or in recesses. The cabling to No 2 is particularly obtrusive.</p> <p>REPLY SENT: 23/08/2013 Thank you very much.</p> <p>I have recently received a response from the Board of Capel Gardens (Pinner) Residents Limited which expresses views that differ so I take it the board represents many but not all residents.</p> <p>All comments received will be taken into account.</p> <p>SECOND RESPONSE: Sent: 23 August 2013</p> <p>The Board of Capel Gardens did not consult the residents of the flats nor have they advised us of their comments so you are undoubtedly correct in assuming their views do not necessarily represent those of all the residents.</p>	<p>Since there is no legal requirement to care for a locally listed building it has been decided not to include reference to 'responsibilities for the locally listed buildings'. The document clarifies that works carried out that are unsympathetic to character of the locally listed building undermine their special interest.</p>
<p>16) J Ranson</p>	<p>Support the draft SPD document. Very important to have it.</p>	

<p>17) Mr James Mcandrew</p>	<p>We do not feel 40 Belmont Lane warrants being locally listed. The current criteria is too broad. Our property is not of historic significance to warrant it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed criteria for local listing are consistent with those held since 2004 by the Council within the recently superseded Harrow Unitary Development Plan. This document was superseded in May this year by the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan which does not contain criteria for Local Listing since such criteria is the place of this draft Local Listing SPD. The criteria have been reviewed since and are considered to remain appropriate as they are in line with the English Heritage's 'Good Practice Guide for Local Heritage Listing' May 2012 but have also been expanded in line with this English Heritage guidance to include the more relevant 'additional factors' for consideration such as rarity, their relationship to designed landscapes, evidential value and technical significance.• This building's local list description reads: 'brick rendered building designed in 1912 by Goddard of Goddard, Paget and Goddard. The house has an unusual south elevation with arched window to end gabled wall on which rests a wide chimney. Canted bay with vertical tiling to upper part of gable and six paned timber casement windows'. This local list description shows that there was architectural interest in the site. A recent site inspection confirmed that this remains in tact and therefore the local interest remains. It is therefore considered that this building still meets the criteria for local listing.• The Council will consult with local and national conservation groups on the proposal to de-list and then make a recommendation to the next LDF panel.
------------------------------	---	---

18) Mr. Jim Moir	Support the draft SPD document. The Lawn Elm Park Road. It should be Lawn singular not plural on the local list of buildings available online.	Factual correction made to the document.
19) Mr Anthony H Woodley	Thank you for your letter 18.7.13. Please keep me advised on the outcome of the consultation as I am the owner of a locally listed building.	Will update respondee accordingly in due course.
19) Mrs Ruff	I am pleased to note we are included in the locally listed buildings list. I hope you will continue to provide guidance and protection for Quadrangle Mews and other properties in Belmont Lane.	Noted.