

Appendix 1

Summary of responses following the public consultation for Harrow on the Hill Conservation Areas SPD and Harrow on the Hill conservation Areas SA

1.1 The Harrow on the Hill Conservation Areas SPD incorporated 10 public consultation questions, a number of which have generated responses. These 10 questions are relayed below, and below each is a summary of any comments received.

- Public Consultation Question 1:

1.2 Have we covered every environmental issue affecting Harrow on the Hill's conservation areas, or are there other issues that we need to consider?

1.3 Traffic and parking: Double Decker buses on the Hill's narrow streets have damaged the CAs; strengthen the document to include problems with speed; commuters to Harrow on the Hill or South Harrow station park all day; problems around St Dominic's RC School and John Lyon School; proper traffic control along High Street required; idea of CPZ with 1 hr time restriction in middle of the day; new schemes to consider car clubs as part of sustainability measures; developers should ensure that traffic surveys are not carried out in summer term/school holidays to get a more realistic picture.

1.4 Public Realm: lack of provision for young children; no public play space; opportunity for public amenity; mention valuable open spaces too, like Church Fields; cleanliness of streets lacking; better maintenance required; LA fail to keep streets clean and fail to maintain the grass strip on Peterborough Rd; antisocial behaviour on open spaces, including littering, setting of fires on and around Church Fields; strengthen policy 14 (street furniture); consider amenities for visitors, e.g. more benches etc; pressure for hardsurfacing of front gardens; stress desirability of porous alternatives.

- Public Consultation Question 2:

1.5 Have we covered every economic issue affecting Harrow on the Hill's conservation areas, or are there other issues that we need to consider?

1.6 Main employer is Harrow School, whose employees and pupils form important part of customer base for shops and restaurants on the Hill; important economic issue is the continued success of the school.

- Public Consultation Question 3:

1.7 Do you think that it is acceptable for the core shopping area of Harrow on the Hill to become predominantly food & drink oriented, or should a mix of commercial uses be maintained? Do you agree with the principle or boundaries of the core shopping area?

1.8 Yes, but there is pressure for pubs/restaurants to increase opening hours, in conflict with residential nature of the area.

- Public Consultation Question 4:

1.9 Are there any other social issues that we need to consider?

1.10 Pressure for greater numbers of satellite dishes; take into account the forthcoming digital TV switch over; Sky may be only option if reception is poor so potential for greater numbers of satellite dishes or higher, bulkier aerials; planning controls should be more flexible.

- Public Consultation Question 5:

1.11 In connection with Question 3, is policy 16 appropriate, particularly for the Core Shopping Area?

1.12 Yes, and removal of A5.

- Public Consultation Question 6:

1.13 Do the above policies mentioned in this document cover every aspect of development affecting the Hill's conservation areas, or are there other aspects that we need to consider?

1.14 No specific response was received

- Public Consultation Question 7:

1.15 What are your views on the merits and problems of the planning control methods mentioned in this document? Are there any other forms of planning controls that could be applied to the Hill's conservation areas?

1.16 Requires policy relating to the setting of the conservation areas; reiterate key planning consideration *to preserve and enhance*; refer to PPG 15 in relation to proposed demolition; refer to PPG 16 in relation to archaeology.

- Public Consultation Question 8:

1.17 What are your views on the merits and problems of the enforcement powers mentioned in this document? Are there any other forms of planning enforcement powers that could be applied to the Hill's conservation areas?

1.18 Conservation enforcement cases should be prioritised for action above other cases; publish list of breaches and recommendation to act or not; act on temporary permissions; publicise enforcement complaints will be kept anonymous.

- Public Consultation Question 9:

1.19 What are your views on the merits and problems of enhancement and promotion initiatives mentioned in this document? Are there any other enhancement and promotion measures that could be applied to the Hill's conservation areas?

1.20 Develop Estate Agent welcome pack with Harrow Heritage Trust; mention supporting the Forum and Harrow Heritage Trust and work they do; mention Tourism Strategy; keep website updated with Hill information; on balance, tourists coming to the Hill damage the environment; parked coaches and crowds of visitors on narrow pavements are negative factors.

- Public Consultation Question 10:

1.21 Do you have any other comments or queries relating to this draft document?

1.22 No specific response was received

2.0 Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategies

2.1 A number of responses were received for Appendix 4 of the SPD, which encompasses the linked Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Strategies for each conservation area. Responses for each are included below:

2.2 Roxeth Hill CA Appraisal and Management Strategy

2.3 Agree with boundary changes; could consider removal of development around Siddons House; consider what properties could potentially be included within an Article 4 Direction; should clearly show how the area has changed, especially in relation to Harrow Hospital and Siddons House developments.

2.4 Harrow School CA Appraisal and Management Strategy

2.5 No comments were received.

2.6 Harrow Park CA Appraisal and Management Strategy

2.7 No comments were received.

2.8 Harrow on the Hill Village CA Appraisal and Management Strategy

2.9 Documents should be limited to history, pattern of growth, general character or character of individual roads, protection measures, examples of good/bad development; disjointed thinking makes them bland and lacking status; preferred previous comprehensive documents; now no teeth to contribute to the preservation or enhancement; gaps; not enough maps; need positive, neutral and negative map and topography map; not enough good pictures; need to show MOL and Article 4 areas; irrelevant to mention the Hill in its wider context; possibly irrelevant to mention the history of St Mary's and Harrow School since they are outwith CA; 1864 map and views from town centre are irrelevant; more emphasis required for traffic pressures, café culture and what will happen to retail units; greater need for tree management; strengthen architectural qualities; note that there is not much street greenery; Design Guide be updated; Shopfront Design Guide should include disabled access; in relation to neglected buildings on West Street, need to make the LA's resolution even stronger, including time line to do something; unacceptable that such prominent site is not given more assistance.

2.10 Sudbury Hill CA Appraisal and Management Strategy

2.11 General support for both documents and section on MOL in particular; support for the management strategy's opposition to the subdivision of properties; enforce repairs through Article 4 Directions; mention how significant views are being marred by traffic flow and parking, specifically in relation to St Dominic's RC School; change photograph on page 11 to a more indicative busy street scene that shows the adverse impact of traffic, and general environment from overdevelopment at the school; support management strategy where it says it will strengthen the protection for buildings such as St Dominic's Chapel; make clearer what protection there is, and for what buildings; recommend the MOL area includes all of the slope; strengthen section 9.2 about the detrimental impact of the development at St Dominic's and

pressure for further development; should recommend no further expansion and stricter controls at the school; regarded single largest threat to CA.

2.12 South Hill Avenue CA Appraisal and Management Strategy

2.13 Question subjective definitions such as 'historic', 'architectural importance', 'well designed', 'positive' and 'detracting'; show more clearly the architectural and character differences between South Hill Avenue and Mount Park Estate; road traffic safety measures are necessary; school is willing to liaise with LA to ensure replacement street furniture are of a better and possibly more appropriate type; stress continued care of such a large proportion of land (playing fields); on balance the study is too restrictive; does not recognise that buildings in the area need to change to adapt to differing circumstances.

2.14 Mount Park CA Character Appraisal and Management Strategy

2.15 Factual corrections received.

2.16 Roxborough Park and the Grove CA Character Appraisal and Management Strategy

2.17 Should address disparity between the CA's character and railway station vicinity; Lowlands Recreation Ground makes little contribution to the CA and is physically and visually disparate to the surrounding MOL and CA located south of Lowlands Rd; poor quality of MOL and subsequent diminished contribution to the CA should be emphasised; should the college building get permission, the CA boundary should be redrawn to exclude this, instead being redrawn around the reconfigured MOL.

3.0 Harrow on the Hill Conservation Areas SA

3.1 Comments for the SA Document included the following responses:

3.2 The neglected buildings on West Street seriously damage the appearance of the Hill; there is lack of recognition of other heritage assets, such as listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, and archaeology; it would be helpful to assess the impact of the conservation areas on their surroundings and vice versa; comments on the quality of the public realm are limited; needs to consider all spaces.