


Comments received for Public Consultation 19<sup>th</sup> May to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2009

Date received	Name	Address	Question to which comments relate	CA to which comments relate	General comments	Comments
1) 19/05/09 (by phone)	Michael Ballons	66 Marsworth Ave			General	Modern materials should be allowed in conservation areas. Controls are too restrictive.
2) 26/05/09 (by email)	Cliff Lichfield	The Gables Church Lane Pinner HA5 3AB Tel 020-8868-4041		Tookes Green		<p>I found the Draft Pinner Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document a fascinating read and I will comment in more detail via the web site. There are just one or two small errors that you may wish to correct on Appendix 8, the Tooke's Green CA, so I thought it better to write to you rather than via the web site.</p> <p>Picture 8.5 This is The Grange (not Mulberry Cottage); 8.2.4 Locally listed - Elmdene is Elmdene and is in Church Lane, not Nower Hill; 8.40 is Welle not Wells Cottage</p> <p>Clearly a lot of work has gone into the document which makes it clear what the council's objectives are and it will make us (local residents) more likely to be aware of any changes that might alter the character of the CA and know that we have the council's support should we object to detrimental development. I plan to circulate the web site link to Neighbourhood Watch members.</p>
3) 26/05/09 (by email)	Ruth McNeil	<a href="mailto:rmcneil@tiscali.co.uk">rmcneil@tiscali.co.uk</a> Mayfield House, 20 Nower Hill, Pinner, HA5 5QS, UK 0208 868 5653 or 07721564994		Tookes Green		<p>I am sending some pictures of the verges and flower beds along Church Lane and Nower Hill - taken in June last year. To show you what I mean about the disgrace of the way that these are kept - and in a conservation area. Can these be added to be the public consultation collection of comments please?</p> <p>These used to be flower beds - Pinner 2008, Conservation area (Tookes Green/Church Lane). A complaint was sent to the Harrow Gardens unit in the Borough but no reply. It would be good to think that the concern to retain the conservation areas would extend to proper tendering of the roadsides and due care to the aesthetics - so neglected at present. One resident has even started doing the road side plots outside his house on Church Lane himself in desperation!</p> <p>I just wanted to ensure that you know that broadly I and my husband are delighted to hear about the planned concern and care for the Pinner Conservation areas. We are pleased that you are looking to extend rather than just maintain your remit. I am a member of Save Pinner Gardens Group and as a group we are wholeheartedly behind what you are suggest in your proposals.</p>
4) 17/06/09 (by email)	Howard Miller	hdmiller@hotmail.co.uk		PWPE		I have lived on this estate for 30 years. I am in favour of the conservation area, but not the restrictions on windows. There are already precedents for non wooden windows in this area which have been installed post article 4 and which are totally in keeping with the conservation area.
5) 13/06/09 (by email)	Teresa Miller	paulandteresa.miller@googlemail.com		PWPE		I would just like to voice my opinion on the above conservation area. I believe it is important to keep the houses looking like their original state, however plastic windows should be allowed to replace the wooden ones if people wish to do so because of the cost implication. If people can't afford to replace wood with wood the windows will look awful and hence the houses and the general areas will look scruffy and run down. Obviously the plastic windows must be the same design as the original one. Also houses should not be allowed make there front gardens into full tarmaced parking lots.
6) 12/06/09 (by letter)	John and Margaret Crush			PWPE		<p>We write in response to your letter of 15 May, and our visit to Hatch End Library yesterday, for a meeting with Lucy Haile. We have been resident at the above address in the Pinnerwood Park Estate for 35 years, and are concerned that the appearance of the conservation area should not change. However, effective property maintenance is necessary, and during our time here, new materials have become available. There is an increased interest in environmental developments which need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Our main concern is that of windows. Manufacturers are now able to use modern materials (in PVC or aluminium) to reproduce the original wooden frames, without altering the appearance in any way. The wood currently on the market does not last as long as that used in the 1930's - it is not the same. We have already replaced one front window three times with new timber. Fitting double glazing, which is not currently recommended, would significantly enhance energy efficiency. We ask, plea, request, that the SPD be amended so that future planning applications will take into account the above comments.</p>
7) 12/06/09 (by email)	Mr J.S. Dennett			PWPE		We received the May 2009 Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area Residents Association newsletter and were surprised to learn that the elected councillors on the Harrow Planning Sub-Committee had insisted that the wood-only policy for replacement windows was to be retained. We are in the same position as many others on the estate who will need to replace the windows at the front of their properties before long. We do think that windows made of materials other than wood would be quite in keeping, provided that the basic design of the windows was retained. We would therefore much appreciate a rethink on wood-only policy to accommodate the wishes of what we believe to be a majority of the Pinnerwood Park residents. It would appear that many people who have replaced their long-lasting original windows with wood have had to have repairs made after only a few years. If necessary a ballot of all the residents would seem to be in order.

8) 10/06/09 (by email)	Helen Miller			PWPE		I am strongly in favour of the conservation area and have been since inception. However it is now 2009 and I really think we should be sensible about the window situation in the conservation area. There are so many good choices for replacement windows that are not wood. If this is 'policed' properly, surely residents should be allowed to replace old wooden frames with more suitable double glazing which could fit in with the ambiance of the estate. It is just a matter of common sense, which sadly is sometimes lacking.
9) 08/06/09 (by email)	P Day			PWPE		I have read through the above copy and I am very disappointed to read that Mrs Ashton and her committee are still insisting on wood and only wood as replacement windows. As you know, the residents committee have worked very hard over the last few years trying to find suitable either UPVC or Aluminium replacement windows that are virtually maintenance free and far more secure than the wooden windows that the Planning Document insists on. I did get a quote for wooden windows from a company that was on the list which your department supplied to us some time ago and was quoted £15,000 for just the front of my house, so I am afraid that when the time comes to replace my windows I will be putting in windows that match the existing windows as near as possible that I can afford and if it is in UPVC or aluminium that it what they will be. If the planning department are still insisting on wood and only wood, I will not be applying for planning consent. I am sorry to say, I will just go ahead and install them.  As I am sure you are aware, No 22 Albury Drive were granted permission to replace their windows in aluminium and I believe that the planning department stated that this decision would not set a precedent but it has and if it is OK for one resident, then we should all be treated the same. I am sure you will agree.  It would be nice if the planning department abided by their own rules and replaced the grass verges which have been tarmaced over as stated in the document, but we all know that will never happen. Please feel free to pass my comments on to Mrs Ashton and her committee.
10) 09/06/09 (by email)	Mr Morgan			PWPE		I am writing to express my concern over the policy concerning window replacement in the Pinnerwood Park conservation area. As a resident of the area I am faced, along with many others, with deteriorating, wooden, south facing front windows. These are original windows having been in place for over 70 years and have reached the stage where maintenance is a continuing and expensive worry. The energy loss and poor security offered by the current windows is dire and the cost of replacement in wood is prohibitive and their life is limited. I have been quoted £7000 for a single window.  Many residents are similarly placed and, as a result, the appearance of the estate is gradually deteriorating with peeling paint and rotting windows widely in evidence. The current policy in respect of window replacement is clearly not having the effect we are all seeking; to conserve a unique and attractive estate.  As you are aware many houses have replacement aluminium, double glazed windows which are almost indistinguishable from the originals and can, in my opinion, enhance the look of the houses and streets when compared to the rather run down appearance of original windows.  I understand, and very much support the need for planning controls but I would ask you to seriously consider a change to regulations which would allow for energy efficient, secure window replacement in modern materials at a reasonable cost.
11) 1 <sup>st</sup> library day – (in person)	Clive Bridgeman	0208 866 7404		Waxwell Close		p.98 should be up-to-date and artisan; Pic 3.3 Recommendations for parking to be strengthened 'must be kept clear' (strengthen wording); Continuous eu hedges ditto pic on page 109; P.110 the covenant requires the right of access down the right side on foot and by vehicle. It's 2 to four cars are parked along Waxwell Close not just a couple as stated. Something is needed to enforce the parking. p.114 adviCe; p.116 f) NOT impede views; p.117 Should there be mention of archaeology here; Policy 8c – such as street lamps should perhaps be replaced with word gates.
12) 1 <sup>st</sup> library day – (in person)	W Thompson	11 West Towers, Pinner, 0208 868 8400		West Towers		Pavements need repair. Would Highways notify us when this is meant to occur. This should be like for like. Patching with tarmac does not look good. Would like to enclose porch and double glaze windows. The roofs of the garages are asbestos can the council do anything about this. Advised that as privately owned the council cannot become involved. Porches and windows – several have changed without planning permission. What is policy towards double glazing? Loft conversion at the side would be preferred. Advised this is not going to be allowed.
13) 1 <sup>st</sup> library day – (in person)	Henry Rockwell	5 Eastglade, Pinner, Middlesex, HA5 3AN Tel: 0208 866 1561 <a href="mailto:henryrockwell@tesco.net">henryrockwell@tesco.net</a>		East End Farm		re: Eastglades, Woodpeckers. Following the appeal we want to make sure issues are addressed. The TPO at the entrance of Woodpeckers we are very concerned the owner might try and do something to that tree. We think that he is about to launch another plan in the next three to four weeks. We need to make sure issues are addressed. We need to be sure Russell is on the case. If you have not published anything you could alter update in light of the decision.  We recommend more publicity: Advertising in the: Pinner Observer; Harrow People; In the noticeboard at Pinner Library; Say on the consultation documents that this is urgent.; Sending email to Henry Rockwell who will forward it to SAVE Pinner Gardens. We have to make sure developers do not build on that site. Therefore need to look again at what might be allowed. We want to make sure the council is prepared. There should have been a consultation letter to Mr. Rockwell. We need to consider the affect on 4 Paines Close as it could damage it and 5 and 3 would have a slight problem. Concerning the cemetery the inspector made a comment about it being a view from the conservation area but perhaps this could be included as part of the conservation area.  We are aware Cecil Park is being considered for conservation area status. We are concerned about building in back gardens with flats on both sides of the roads. There should be correspondence out to day that we are looking at extending the East End Farm conservation area. And beefing up the document. Look carefully at what the inspector said was allowed and what he said was not allowed. Russell needs to check the TPO in the Woodpeckers Garden. Please send Henry Rockwell the date of the next Pinner consultation meeting.
14) 1 <sup>st</sup> library day – (in person)	r.krishnan	23 West Towers 8 357 6614 <a href="mailto:Krishnan_radha@hotmail.com">Krishnan_radha@hotmail.com</a>		West Towers		Parking is difficult. Parking on kerbs is damaging the kerbs. Consult with Highways on this. Cannot really park under trees as these attract birds. So people are avoiding trees. The trees are not trimmed regularly. The document puts a lot of onus on the residents but more onus should be placed on the council.

		<a href="mailto:ail.co.uk">ail.co.uk</a>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paving slabs are broken. The crossovers are not in character as these are tarmaced. The council ignores its own responsibility.</li> <li>The council is unsympathetic to growing families. They should come up with more imaginative responses in terms of extensions. (He was advised to consult with a good architect to come up with imaginative extension ideas).</li> <li>Will public comments be listed somewhere?</li> <li>Energy conservation is important and with these conservation controls there are difficulties with costs. Government gives grants for cavity wall insulation. There should also be funds for the conservation side of things.</li> </ul>
15) 1 <sup>st</sup> library day – (in person)	Mr. Wooster	13 West Towers		West Towers	<p>For the front walls I would like to see castellation detail. Windows have been replaced in some cases not with the same detail they have been double glazed in plastic. Some antennas are visible on the roof. Often roofs get redone without permission. One garage has been demolished in West Drive. Shame people can't use their garages as a garage. At islands buildings are set back and some garages are set back. Could other garages be set back as much? (Advised that this was unlikely). Change doors – porches.</p> <p>6) Pavements need repair. 11 West Towers Pinner Will highways be notified of this document? We would like to double glaze windows in same design is this ok? We would like to enclose porch? Advised this was not okay. W. Thompson 0208 868 8400 Several have altered porch and windows without permission. Patching with tarmac is not acceptable yet Highways often do so.</p>
16) 03/06/09 (by email)	Henry Rockwell	<a href="mailto:henryrockwell@tesco.net">henryrockwell@tesco.net</a> <b>5 Eastglade,</b> <b>Pinner, Middlesex HA5 3AN</b> <b>020 8866 1561</b> <a href="mailto:henryrockwell@tesco.net">henryrockwell@tesco.net</a>		East End Farm	<p><u>Points raised by Edwin Lucas and I, Henry Rockwell with you on behalf of "Save Pinner Gardens Action group [SPGAG]" at Pinner Library, May 28, 2009 in connection with Appeal &amp; Cost Decisions. Inquiry held on 24,25,26 and 27 February 2009, APP/M5450/A/08/2064293, APP/M5450/A/08/2072269, APP/M5450/A/08/2084841</u></p> <p><u>Woodpeckers , 9 Eastglade</u></p> <p><u>1] <i>Publicity of May, June 09 as well as Oct, Nov 2008 Consultation insufficient.</i></u></p> <p>Seemingly no letters received by affected residents Moss Lane, Paines Lane and Eastglade as well as the hundreds of others who wrote objection letters in response to the original applications and the three appeal applications [except some living within East End Farm Area].</p> <p>No notice seems to have been afforded to those who attended the February 2009 hearings. We suggest advising Press, Council Urban Living, Pinner Association [G.T. Wheal], Pinner Local History Society [Pat Clarke], Harrow Heritage [M. Verden] as well use all available notice boards and more. Both the Council as well as the community spent a large amount of money on the applications, appeals etc. I did receive a note from Lorna that I will be kept informed after I had sent my comments in November 2008.</p> <p>We would like to see your intention to revise East End Farm Conservation area to be firmly set up before further development applications.</p> <p>Library sessions were not advertised widely enough, mainly on lamp posts in very small type; only one copy laid in Pinner Library, apparent without web address.</p> <p><u>2] <i>SPGAG summary comment on Inspectors decision report:-</i></u></p> <p>The Inspector thought Nr 9 could be taken down, hence left open possible sanction of a new road instead of Nr 9 off Eastglade with 2 new houses, plan C . There would be restrictions on a new road which would be difficult to meet but this needs thinking about to ensure there are not loopholes which could be easily applied to other similar type properties adjoining or abutting conservation areas or could detrimentally make conservation areas look out of place.</p> <p>Sadly he seemed not too impressed with the East End Farm Conservation Area; thought that the idea of further enhancement planned by Harrow Urban Living not relevant to this inquiry as it had been published after the publication of the appeal inquiry date.</p> <p>Can the Council offer any suggestions to avoid repeat if developer makes new application?</p> <p>SPGAG believe that Village Homes will reapply with modified proposals on plan C [two house].</p> <p>3] We understand that "Harrow People" May/June issue might carry an article on SPGAG work in helping the Council win the three appeals.</p> <p>Please consult your notes as to whether I have omitted any other points made during our meeting. I will mail you some of the Pinner Observer cuttings as they do not scan well.</p> <p>We are very grateful that you were able to devote time to us.</p>
17) 08/06/09 (by email)	Malcolm England	<a href="mailto:malcolm.england@talktalk.net">malcolm.england@talktalk.net</a>		PWPE	<p>I see the issue with window replacement still seems to be dragging on. I find it hard to believe that the council still seem to think it is acceptable to insist on wood.</p> <p>As a resident in the area, I have seen many double glazed windows and have not seen any problems with it except in the odd case which could be</p>

					<p>avoided with stipulation of an approved list of installers. Indeed, I have seen far more windows of wood which look terrible due to rotting and poor maintenance which I suspect in many cases is due to repair being cost prohibitive.</p> <p>I for one, am totally opposed to this ridiculous insistence that wood is the only acceptable material. While I am all for the conservation of the properties, it must be applied with some flexibility and the rules must make allowance for changing technologies and the benefits it will give us all. Applied with common sense and proper guidance, I believe modern materials will benefit rather than detract and would be welcomed by the residence who have been fighting against this policy for far to long. I would also add that it devalues our properties and puts off many buyers for obvious reasons.</p> <p>Surely, it is better to make some controlled concessions and gain a happier resident that will work with the council rather than against it!</p> <p>I sincerely hope the Council will re consider this matter and allow the approval of other materials within suitable guidelines which I have no doubt have been established in previous meetings.</p>
18) 08/06/09 (by email)	Hitesh Patel	<a href="mailto:h1teshpatel@o2.co.uk">h1teshpatel@o2.co.uk</a> 5 Old South Close Pinner Hatch End Middlesex HA5 4TW		PWPE	<p>I have lived in Pinner Wood Park for over 14 years now and like most residents in this conservation area we bought into it as it guaranteed that the area would look and feel the same well into the future. Whilst we have no wish to allow any changes that would in our opinion degrade the beauty of our conservation area I like many other residents have been considering replacing our windows. I understand that the review does not in fact take into consideration this particular issue which i know has probably been on the top of the list for many residents like myself. I will not go into the reasons as you have probably heard this a 100 times before but i would strongly recommend that this is rectified before the review is finalised. If the council in its review policy states acceptable criteria for modern materials then this standardisation will ensure that the area retains its character and helps us save money and reduce our carbon footprint for the future.</p> <p>I trust that you will follow up on this and let us know if the amendments are not made what the reasons were for the final decisions made. I hope that we can finally make some progress on this and hope the council take into consideration the wants and desires of those of us that live in this area.</p>
19) 08/06/09 (by email)	Subhash Malhotra	<a href="mailto:malhotra_subhash@hotmail.com">malhotra_subhash@hotmail.com</a> 020 84213705		PWPE	<p>I write to you with reference to the letter from Harrow Council and the recent Draft Supplementary Planning Document. First of all I would like to thank you for the amount of work which has been required to prepare this document. However I would like to make the following points with regards to this matter:</p> <p>The document is very long and complicated and perhaps it will discourage many people to respond. Because the information is not clearly presented.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With regards to replacement windows, I do not understand why the council is being totally unreasonable and keeps insisting that any replacement windows should be using wooden materials. This is not practical because the wooden windows are; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very expensive to install and maintain</li> <li>• Not at all energy efficient- Because even with heavy curtains there will always be draft. Besides in winter it is not practical to draw curtains.</li> <li>• Secondary glazing is not practical because there is not enough room on the inside window ledge to incorporate secondary glazing frame.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>To maintain wooden windows it is very expensive and time consuming. This particularly applies to Southernly exposed windows. The current Harrow council policy is very ineffective as I have seen many replacement windows in our area which are either aluminum or UPVC. This you know is unlawful and generates ill feeling towards the council and the neighbours. After all why should there be one rule one and another rule for others? What is council doing about the unlawful replacement windows?</p> <p>Finally I do not understand, why the council is unreasonable and obstructive with regards to windows replacement materials, when there are available perfectly modern and similar in appearance materials which are cheaper and more energy efficient than wood.</p> <p>I hope, like others, as a person who has worked hard to buy his home, the council will not be unreasonable and obstructive when all I wish to do is to improve my home and make it more comfortable and energy efficient which, after all, can't be bad for the environment.</p>
20) 17/06/09 by email	John Orchard	"John Orchard" < <a href="mailto:john@orchardassociates.com">john@orchardassociates.com</a> >		PWPE	<p>Whilst I know that the Pinner Association will be commenting directly to you I have read the various management studies, appraisals and policies for the Pinner Conservation Areas and think that Lorna and Lucy have produced some extremely comprehensive and well detailed documents and should be highly praised for their hard work. My only comment is to highlight the problem of poorly sighted and visually obtrusive air-conditioning equipment. Whilst the studies cover micro-generation equipment and satellite dishes, air conditioning equipment has posed problems in Pinner High Street and the siting of such should be controlled in all Conservation Areas.</p>
21) 19/06/09 by email	Mr C Mercer	70 Marsworth Ave, Pinner, HA5 4TT		PWPE	<p>My family has lived in the Conservation Area at this address for the past 14 years. I would like to make known my own views on the proposals being made by the elected council representatives on the Planning Committee, seemingly with scant regard for the residents' wishes. I have no time to read the document which is available on the Council's web site –indeed I have been unable to find it in time, but I understand it is large.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Front Elevation/Side Elevation</li> </ul> <p>Windows – it is not acceptable to propose “wood-only” because their cost is prohibitive; the planners must remember that owners are not made of money; there are alternative materials which blend very well with the current “look &amp; feel” of the estate; the proposal if implemented is only going to result in more antagonism between residents and council. The window design (sash/casement with cross-hatching) should be kept. The councillors</p>

					<p>should remember that they are accountable to the electorate and they can be voted out next time around if they don't listen. In general people who live in the Conservation Area do so because they are committed to the homely, integrated nature of the estate, and this is the most contentious issue on the estate and has been ever since I arrived.</p> <p>Front Doors –wood only should be the policy and not any plastic/aluminium varieties;design must match original , plus letter boxes etc must be matched with the original</p> <p>Other – satellite dishes/tv aerials must not be fixed to these elevations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Front Gardens</li> </ul> <p>Must not paved over more than 50% of their area, and must be done so in "sympathetic" materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hedges &amp; Fences</li> </ul> <p>Must be retained and replaced when at end of life in keeping with original specimens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees -the householder has a duty to maintain and replace these as necessary, but I find the council very ready to chop down those in the street which it says are "diseased", which are then NOT replaced ever; I note several locations along my road where street trees are missing. The council cannot promote 1 law for us, and then a different one for themselves</li> <li>• Garages – I object to the conversion of garages into living accommodation because the garage is an integral part of the façade of the houses and changing the door for windows as part of this process ruins the look and feel of the estate. I have no view on the design of garage doors because so many are now metal "up and over" whereas I guess the originals were wooden side-opening</li> </ul>
22) 19/06/09 by email		<p>Clive &amp; Carole Franklin 16 Broadm ead Close Hatch End Pinner Middles ex HA5 4PS &lt;candcfranklin@talktalk.net&gt;</p>		PWPE	<p>With regards to the consultations going on with regards to the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area, I would like to make a few comments, which I hope you will take into account in making your final decision.</p> <p>Mainly regarding to the replacement of wooden windows.</p> <p>I am 66 years old and certainly not in the best of health. The front south facing windows of my house have now deteriorated to a point where they need to be replaced. I now find it impossible to repair or paint them myself. And the cost to get them repaired and painted would be prohibitive.</p> <p>If they were replaced in wood, which is extremely expensive, they would still need painting every year or two. And more importantly they would not offer any reasonable amount of security or heat conservation. I know it would be possible to replace them in double glazed aluminum. Making sure that the design virtually replicated the original windows. I certainly do not want to ruin the appearance of the area.</p> <p>It has been suggested that the use of secondary double-glazing would be an answer to the conservation of heat. Considering that the walls are of 9inch solid brick, which is a poor insulator in itself and by its own nature allows moisture through causing a damp environment, using secondary double glazing only adds to this problem by causing more condensation especially on the glass which in turn causes the wooden frames to rot even quicker by not being allowed to breath. In fact some of the windows do not have the space to fit secondary glazing.</p> <p>It has also been suggested that we should use heavy curtains, drawn across the windows to conserve heat.This will only work if the curtains are such a fit that they fit floor to ceiling and wall-to-wall to stop the movement of the cold air from around the windows migrating into the room. Thus burning even more electricity, and depriving us of daylight. Who on earth in the council, that we the ratepayers pay wages to, comes out with these stupid suggestions?</p> <p>I would like you to reconsider your proposal that only wood should be used. If say aluminium were to be allowed and you were to keep a check on their design and installation. Then the area would look good and lose none of its original features.If you do not I can see the area deteriorating as people will just let their windows rot which is what is happening now and what you are advocating.</p>
23) 21/06/09 by email	A n t h o n y  C a l l i a g h a n	<p>7 Broadmead Close Hatch End Pinner HA5 4PS  <a href="mailto:a.calli@ntlworld.com">a.calli@ntlworld.com</a></p>		PWPE	<p><i>As a resident of Pinnerwood Park Estate I would like to raise the following issue regarding Appendix 9 - (sub appendix window replacement). Within the Pinnerwood Estate conservation area there are different requirements relating to both core and outer area window replacement, I believe the requirements should be standardised, allowing both front, back and side elevations to use modern plastic windows matching existing design, detailing and configuration which would not be detrimental and would still preserve and enhance the look and feel of our conservation area.</i></p> <p><i>Reasons for change:</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance costs are prohibitive with more exposed windows requiring constant attention.</i></p> <p><i>Wooden windows replaced now are unlikely to last as long as the originals.</i></p> <p><i>Energy performance of the original windows is less than satisfactory.</i></p> <p><i>The conservation area 'street scene' would not be substantially different or detrimentally affected if non-wooden replacement windows were allowed along with Article 4 controls to regulate design.</i></p> <p><i>The current Harrow policy is ineffective. Few residents have chosen to replace windows using wood, most continue to patch them up.</i></p>
24) 21/06/09 by email	Mrs E Crutchley	42 Marsworth Avenue , Pinner, HA5 4TT		PWPE	<p>Further to your letter dated 15th May 2009, I would like it noted that we object very strongly with all its contents.</p> <p>When we bought our property 30 years ago, we believed it to be ours. Since these silly rulings (Conservation Area and Article 4) it appears not the case</p>

		<Trutchl@aol.com>			<p>as you seem to have more control over our property than we do. AND WE OWN IT. Having lived here for nearly 30 years, and had the original conservation area put on us without much consultation, I (Mrs Crutchley) actually thought your minds were already made up. Then you imposed an Artical 4 on us in much the same manner in my view. Now it would appear to me that you want to impose even more restrictions on us. If you take our house as an example there are 17 windows and 3 external doors. All possibly need replacing soon. They have been maintained every year since we moved here, but the cost and work involved is astronomical. We find ourselves in a position where we like to maintain our property to a much higher standard but are restricted by yourselves and cost you impose by your restrictions. Most property in our CA seem to me to be crying out for a decent standard of maintenance.</p> <p>I bet you don't even live in one of these houses. They are hard to heat and the windows are really cold and draughty. Single brick so we can't have cavity wall insulation as the Government suggests. And no double glazing which you object to. The Government are telling the population to insulate and cut the carbon/energy for the planet, and one of their own councils is ignoring this and making us use more energy for heating. Let us have double glazing, and/or modern designs of georgian designs similar to ours. (Secondary glazing is so ugly from both inside and outside). Also maintenance costs are prohibitive and windows are now reaching the end of their useful life. It costs a fortune to maintain these windows, and in today's economic climate, who will pay for this? Your department? On mass for the estate? Who is going to help with the heating bills here? Your department? On mass for us all? Perhaps if your department were made to help out, you would feel as we do. Perhaps we can go to the Government and ask them to make local councils that impose these restrictions pay a 1/4 of the heating bills for all conservations houses. And the same for maintenance. The same goes for gates, fences etc.</p> <p>All of this was foisted upon us, after we had moved here 30 years ago, with no help from the Council. Start putting your hands in your pockets and help us out if you will please with maintenance and heating. We need to cut the energy we use as a local authority, government and country as a whole.</p>
25) 22/06/09 by email	Patricia A. Clarke for Pinner Local History Society	pat.a.clarke@btinternet.com			<p><b>GENERAL POINTS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Frontages are such an important part of a conservation area that much of its protective power is futile if there is no article 4 protection for the frontages. Your proposals to put these in place is important.</li> <li>2. Archaeological priority areas (page 28) All medieval curtilages should be APAs. Listing does not give enough protection to parts of those sites which have been hived off. Can anything be done? Are these sites on the Sites and Monuments Record? SEE East End Farm CA, p 223, 6.69</li> <li>3. periodic photographic surveys. Has the council agreed time and money for this? Will owners/occupiers permit it?</li> <li>4. With one or two exceptions I have corrected spelling only where I think a spell check will not pick it up.</li> </ol> <p><b>OVERVIEW</b></p> <p>p24, 3.2.1.1 last sentence I found nothing overtly 15th century at Church Farm. Nos. 4-6 (Victory) and 33-35 are same era as 25-27 so classifiable as 15th century. And see your para. 4.46.</p> <p>p27, 3.3.1.8 line 2 - 1986, not 1896.</p> <p>p 28, 3.3.3.2 There are several chalk mines hereabouts. Could I suggest "...extensive, the deepest being at about 35m."</p> <p>p 33, picture 3.5 The 7-9 acres of ancient woodland at Pinner Hill Golf club have not been coloured green on this map - see p 376, your para 10.86/</p> <p><b>WAXWELL LANE CA</b></p> <p>p76, 2.12 last sentence - Oak Cottage is 25-27. Hillview is number 29 and in this context it ought to be given its street number (there is no name plate). 33-35 Waxwell Lane should be 31-35.</p> <p>2.13 para 3, line 2 - I think 'borough' should be replaced by 'Pinner'. Ellement has work in the Pinnerwood Farm CA , and outside the CAs. [I do not know of his work in the Tookes Green CA and would be pleased to know for my own information].</p> <p>line 8 - nos. 33-35 should be 31-35. No. 31 was built as the MUIOOF Meeting Room; initially single storey. It was heightened in the 1990s (see pic. 84 in "Pinner, Hatch End, North Harrow and Rayners Lane" P. Clarke, Phillimore 1994). It still has the original name-stone and that ought to be pointed out.</p>

					<p>Reference to the Gregory family is enigmatic, as only Pinner aficionados will know who they were.</p> <p>p82, pic 2.10 The view north along Waxwell Lane of numbers 60-66 is an important closing one to the CA</p> <p>p85, 2.41 Would it not be a good idea to give the house numbers, 7-17?</p> <p>2.42 This is number 21, not 5.</p> <p>p87, 2.2.5 Where is the historical development section with the milestone detail? Last sentence "peeling" not pealing.</p> <p>p94, 2.59 fifth sentence - Little Common was never part of Pinner Common, but always private land. I do not know the origin of its present name.</p> <p>2.61 last line "effect" not affect p94, 2.4.3</p> <p>Review of CA boundary I seems to me that that no extension is proposed. I think both the rest of Little Common and nos. 60-66 Waxwell Lane should be included.</p> <p>p 96, 2.68 f) insert NOT as first word. NOTE THAT IN EVERY CA EXCEPT ONE (RAYNERS LANE) THIS SAME ERROR OCCURS</p> <p>g) does the reference to original design features cover all of them, even if a particular type is not specified in this paragraph e.g. the fancy ironwork on the veranda of 10 Elm Park Road? (This applies to each CA.)</p> <p><b>WAXWELL CLOSE CA</b> p 113 'Gravel driveway' and 'Garages' seem to be in particular conflict here. (also Question 4 re Man Strategy at p 118.) Is it proposed to prevent parking in front of the houses and also the building of garages?</p> <p><b>PINNER HIGH STREET CA</b> p 121, 4.11 Towers and east windows do not accommodate increasing populations. Does the reference to the east window refer to the probable lengthening of the chancel in 14th or 15th century? Why not just call the "Church Lane site of worship" the "parish church"? After "" I should think all that needs to be said is that the church was largely rebuilt and reconsecrated in 1321, the tower and porch were added in the 15th century, and the chancel may have been lengthened then also.</p> <p>p 122, 4.14 the date 1633 should be 1635 as in your para. 453</p> <p>4.16 Which buildings were refronted with plaster after 1700? Plaster was a normal part of the original exterior of timber framed buildings.</p> <p>over the page No Regency houses prior to the 19th century, by definition - do you mean Georgian?</p> <p>p 126, pic 4.10 landmark buildings Pinner Vicarage has been coloured landmark instead of Pinner House</p> <p>p 127, pic 4.11 what is the red block immediately adjoining Pinner House at the right?</p> <p>p 129, 4.26</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Third sentence contradicts the fourth, saying that the area behind Church Farm and UF Church has openness and greenery and then saying (correctly) that it is "sadly lost".</p> <p>p 132, 4.31 Do you really mean "(particularly on the south side)"? It seems to me that what you say applies rather more to the rear of the northern side (odd numbers). Would the use of street numbers make things clearer?</p> <p>4.32 The ends of the High Street are east and west. The sides are north and south.</p> <p>p 133, 4.35 The United Reform Church is now known as The United Free Church. pic. 4.20 should be United Free Church.</p> <p>p 134, 4.37 Substitute "surrounding" for 'to surround'.</p> <p>4.38 Very hopeful!</p> <p>p 136, pic 4.26 no. 20 should be coloured 'hair and beauty' no. 58 (L'Orient) is coloured pink (what is that?) - should it not be red?</p> <p>p 138, 4.50 third sentence is wrong. Numbers 29, 31, 34-36, 58 and perhaps Chestnut Cottage were built with chimneys. Of the others: - Church Farm began as a smoke bay house (see your para. 4.51), 9-11 was an open hall house (see your para. 4.52). There is insufficient remaining of numbers 7 and 26 to tell the original construction.</p> <p>fifth sentence. I strongly doubt that any of the existing houses, as distinct from their predecessors, were built with thatched roofs at this date in this area. Steepness of pitch is a very rough guide, and these are not particularly steep - see the medieval wing at Headstone Manor for steepness.</p> <p>p 139, 4.59 7th sentence is unnecessary. Neo-classical is a late 18th century style, not prefigured by Wren. The central bay adds a baroque element to the facade.</p> <p>p 140, 4.20 The final sentence should go under 20th century.</p> <p>4.62 Do you mean no. 39, rather than 38? 38 High Street should go into the 19th century section. It was built 1820-22. I think that the shop front is of third quarter, not early, 19th century.</p> <p>4.63 41 High Street was built in 1850s.</p> <p>p 142, 4.69 4th sentence. Both 16 and 213 are older than 1-14, and 21-23 predate no. 16. (For sequence see my earlier notes - 41, 21-23, 16, 38, 62, 8-14, 13, 15-19, 1-5.)</p> <p>p 143, 4.72 Howarth House is probably early 19th century. Omit "in 1878" from the end of 2nd sentence. Final sentence - "which was enlarged" not 'and was enlarged'.</p> <p>p 145, Listed Buildings Church Cottage is not statutorily listed. 2 High Street is not statutorily listed.</p> <p>p 147, 4.86 Last sentence "free at this point FROM" not form.</p> <p>p 148, 4.89</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



					<p>Third sentence. Should the final word "with" be omitted?</p> <p>p 149-150 pics. 4,34,and 4.35 are duplicated.</p> <p>p 152, 4.92 final sentence - "CEDAR" not ceder.</p> <p>Pinner House should be white, not blue like its rear extensions</p> <p>p 166, 4.108 2nd sentence - The northern "side", not end.</p> <p><b>MOSS LANE CA</b> p 181, 5.30 2nd sentence does not make sense.</p> <p>p 193, 5.76 Should be "the garden at number 77" not 83. It is at the corner of Moss Close.</p> <p><b>EAST END FARM CA</b> P 211, 6.30 Tudor Cottage is of two storeys, and has two and a half bays and a cross wing.</p> <p>p 214, 6.42 line 2 "(see picture 6.15)" not 21</p> <p>6.44 Should you not give the date of The Pump House (barn A)?</p> <p>p 215, 6.48 Third and fourth sentences. Could I suggest - The southern two and a half bays comprise a smoke bay house of the early or middle 16th century. The jettied cross wing was added in the early 20th century, made of reused materials from elsewhere. The combination has produced a quaint composition, enhanced by the high wall of irregular flints along the Moss Lane frontage. The date 1592 was affixed in 1929.</p> <p>p 216, 6.2.5 PREVALENT, not prevelant. This spelling mistake has again occurred in several places.</p> <p>p 223, 6.69 Archaeological potential. Yes, it is important that the whole of this CA should be designated (and see General Point 2 above).</p> <p><b>WEST TOWERS CA</b> p 235, 7.32 last sentence, "areas" is plural, no apostrophe.</p> <p><b>TOOKE'S GREEN CA</b> p 268, map 8.3 The house Blackgates should be shown as post WW1, not 19th century</p> <p>p 269, 8.15 Ninth sentence. In my earlier notes I should have added at the end "now Grange Cottage."</p> <p>p 270, 8.17 last sentence. Omit "and".</p> <p>p 278, picture 8.14 18 Nower Hill - is shown as neutral, although at 8.54 on p 281 you pick it out as an attractive bungalow, with illustration. Would it not be better shown as positive unlisted?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>20-20a Nower Hill - would it not be better shown as positive unlisted instead of neutral, as a late 19th century building (c.1885). Is it because it has been painted white?</p> <p>696 Pinner road and 2-4 Nower Hill - these are blank, what does it mean? See para. 8.53 on p 281.</p> <p>p 281, 8.54 last sentence - it should be picture 8.22, not 2.14</p> <p>p 282, 8.57 fifth sentence 'TUDORBETHAN' not Tuderbethan</p> <p>p 290 Potential Locally Listed Buildings Are the two paragraphs in the Description column wrongly placed?</p> <p><b>PINNERWOOD PARK ESTATE CA</b> p 296, 9.5 FELDEN, not Feldon</p> <p>p 298, 9.11 FORMERLY, nor formally</p> <p>p 300, picture 9.4 this is a duplicate of one on p 299.</p> <p>p 304, 9.19 DRIVE, not Driven</p> <p>p 309 J GAUGED, not gauge</p> <p>9.31 line 4. What does "of handed design" mean?</p> <p>p 320, picture 9.43 Does the caption mean anything?</p> <p>p 323 Pressures Add - the random painting of oak front doors</p> <p><b>PINNER HILL ESTATE CA</b> p 351, 10.17 TOOKE, not Rooke</p> <p>10.18 SAMCUN, not Sameun</p> <p>p 353, 10.20 LAMMAS not Lammus</p> <p>10.22 expand Country Estates Ltd to Country Garden Estates Ltd.</p> <p>10.24 LA CORBIERE, not La Coriere</p> <p>p 355, 10.30 line 3 POTTER STREET HILL, not Potter Heights Close</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>10.30 line 3 POTTER STREET HILL, not Potter Heights Close</p> <p>10.42 line 8 POTTER STREET HILL, not Potter Heights Close line 9 POTTER STREET HILL, not Potter Heights Close</p> <p>p.360, 10.44 picture should be 10.26, not 2.21</p> <p>p 367, 10.65 This wholly repeats the last five lines of 10.64</p> <p>10.67 line 3. Would "detailing and use of banded brown" be better than 'detailing for using banded brown'?</p> <p><b>PINNERWOOD FARM CA</b> p 387, 11.1 NORTH WEST of borough, not north east</p> <p>p 396, 11.02 The brown and white areas have been transposed in titles</p> <p>p 401, 11.44 Could I suggest - "Two of these houses were built by Arthur Tooke, and one, Pinnerwood Lodge, by either his son William or daughter Alice. They display ...."</p> <p>p 403, picture 11.25 GRANARY, not granery</p> <p>p 404, 11.56 the last five words are nonsense.</p> <p><b>RAYNERS LANE CA</b> p 415 box at foot STREETS (plural) not Street's. No apostrophe.</p> <p>p 417, 12.8 Final sentence. Rayners Lane itself is an ancient roadway which has linked Pinner and Roxeth since medieval times.</p> <p>page 430 Black bollards. Is it really necessary to remove these? They protect the condition of the CA just here. Is their appearance worse than periodic damage to, or parking on, the pavement?</p> <p><b>EASTCOTE VILLAGE CA</b> p 437, 13.13 Last sentence. Do you really mean "over the following decade"?</p>
26) 22/06/09 by email	Mr. & Mrs. N. Coumbe	7 Old South Close, Pinner. HA5 4TW		PWPE	<p>I am writing with regard to the Draft Supplementary Planning Document with particular reference to the Pinnerwood Park area. Both my wife and I have not had time to study the vast document but I would like to lodge our objection to the proposed section dealing with replacement windows. In this day and age I cannot believe that a modern replacement windows that replicate the originals are not allowed under the current or the new regulations. The majority of the existing windows in the area are considerably old and falling into disrepair. the cost of refurbishment is prohibitive and even then provides poor heat retention. I am under the impression that the government and local councils have agreed to cut the amount of carbon emissions from houses and introduced HIP's in order to assess individual houses performance. This seems pretty pointless if the home owners have their hands tied. I would propose that the planning department approach a number of window suppliers and ask to see some draft designs and costings and started working to improve life for the council tax paying residents rather than producing huge documents that basically propose to do very little. To clarify, I am in favour of having the conservation areas but we must also live in the present and use available technology that will benefit both the occupiers and the environment. I look forward to your response.</p>

27) 1 <sup>st</sup> library day Hatch End	James Cox	Owens: 45 Marsworth Ave Lives: 105 Royal Lane, Hillingdon Tel: 01895 253961 07778 4225696		PWPE		In support of timber windows
28) 28/06/09 by email	David Wild	tel: +02084284814 mob: +07798855297 "David" <david_wild@btinternet.com>		PWPE		<p>Below is a copy of my response to the current consultation on the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area proposals:</p> <p>"Re consultation issues 1 to 4 on page 335:</p> <p>1) I agree with items 1 to 3</p> <p>2) re item 4 (Management Strategy) I would like to make the following observations:</p> <p>a) the policy to approve only wood replacement windows is outdated, costly and impractical. Wooden replacements are generally not a good match and are unlikely to last half as long as the original ones and this together with the additional cost of wood over aluminium/upvc makes it an unattractive proposition to most residents.</p> <p>b) properly regulated non-wood replacements would not at all undermine the existing character of the estate. In fact some of the non-wood replacements (such as those recently approved for 12, Evelyn Drive) do not detract from the overall street scene.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to say that as a resident in the Pinnerwood Park Conservation area for 33 years I am being denied reasonable choice in the upkeep of my property. I am as keen as anyone to preserve this lovely area but feel that the current, and proposed, restrictions make little sense in the 21st century. Reasonably controlled modernisation within keeping of the conservation principles would be a very welcome step forward."</p>
29) 28/06/09 by email and letter	Anne Swinson for the Hatch End Association	6 Thorndyke Court Westfield Park Hatch End HA5 4JG				<p style="text-align: center;"><b>HATCH END ASSOCIATION</b></p> <p><b>Comments on the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Pinner Conservation Areas June 2009</b></p> <p><b>General:</b></p> <p>1. We agree that the document clearly outlines its purpose and how it relates to wider conservation related planning policy.</p> <p>We support the continuity of material based on the garden suburb model as well as a high proportion of original features, interesting street layout, attractive open spaces, mature trees and grass verges, and landscaped front gardens with minimal parking of vehicles.</p> <p><b>Appendix 9 Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area</b></p> <p>Question 1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. We are aware that our members in the conservation area are being encouraged by the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area Residents' Association committee to support a petition to relax the policy on Wooden windows and doors in favour of more modern materials such as PVC.</p> <p>While we understand their concern about the cost and insulation effects of wooden framed windows, we consider it would be a retrograde step and damaging to the quality and appearance of this conservation area, which over the last twenty years has maintained its quality, in the main, by the efforts of the Council and its conscientious residents. .</p> <p>It is by coincidence, that this week, English Heritage has published its annual register of historic sites at risk and included for the first time conservation areas, where by far the greatest threat is plastic replacement windows and doors. The report has been widely publicised in the national press and television. One article highlights a similar artisan area, Noel Park in Haringey; but this site has cope with problems of being an inner city area unlike Pinner.</p> <p>We continue to support the policy on wooden windows and doors but we are pleased that this will no longer apply to side windows except on corner houses and those interfacing with public parks etc at the rear.</p> <p><b>Appendix 11 Pinnerwood Park Farm Conservation Area</b></p> <p>We agree with questions 1-3.</p>

					4 We would support statutory Listing on Pinnerwood Farm House  <b>28.06.09</b>
30) 28/06/09 by email	Tanya Singh & Jeremy Sassen	37 Woodhall Gate		PWPE	<p>I am responding to the recent invitation to take part in the public consultation on a draft supplementary planning document for Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>*</p> <p>At the fore, I must say I completely agree with retaining the character of the area and in most part agree with the conservation policy. However, I understand the original draft drawn up by the Conservation Officers would have allowed for the use of materials such as aluminium on the proviso that the designs match the originals. From my reading of the new draft this has been changed and this provision is no longer available.</p> <p>*</p> <p>I am extremely disappointed with this blatant disregard of the resident's requirements. Having attended many meetings with the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area Residents Association, this has been a bone of contention for all. There have also been members from the Conservation Area Department at this meeting.*I have received several quotes for replacement*wood only windows and would need to literally take out*a loan in order to afford this. The quotes came in at around £30,000 to £40,000. The companies providing these products are well aware of the predicament we face in the conservation area and the prices reflect this.</p> <p>*</p> <p>With the emphasis on protecting the environment and retaining heat within the home, this is impossible with the 4mm thick glass that currently exists within the timber frames.</p> <p>Whilst I am completely in favour of retaining the charm of the area and preserving the features, I disagree with holding the residents to ransom. Either we pay exorbitant prices for new timber windows or we loose money and heat through our windows. It is very kind of the SPD to advise us on how to retain heat in the home through thick curtains or loft insulation but Unfortunately, we have both and these still do not work especially in the winter. Secondary glazing is not even an option as it is unsightly and causes condensation which in turn will ruin the wooden windows.</p> <p>*</p> <p>It is bizarre that Harrow Council puts increasing emphasis on recycling yet cannot change the rules in order for the conservation area residents to heat their homes in an environmentally friendly manner.</p> <p>*</p> <p>I understand that the idea of redrafting the rules is to make things clearer and simplified but I feel that the windows issue has been ignored and the residents are forced to fork out unrealistic and exorbitant prices for timber double glazing which will need regular maintenance. We are forced to recycle or face fines but we are unable to heat our homes in an efficient and environmentally friendly manner.</p> <p>*</p> <p>I hope the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area Residents Association and the residents of Pinnerwood Pak have been able to emphasis the gravitas of this point in order for the draft to reflect these changes.</p>
31) 28/06/09 by email	Colin Lee	<a href="mailto:sandralyn.lee@virgin.net">sandralyn.lee@virgin.net</a> 38 Evelyn Drive Pinner Middx HA5 4RS		PWPE	<p>Dear Ms Pearce</p> <p><b>Re: your letter dated 15.5.09 - Pinner Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document</b></p> <p>We were very alarmed and puzzled to learn that the long-awaited and very welcome decision allowing the replacing of wooden windows with more modern materials has apparently been withdrawn.</p> <p>Our house is just one of many in the conservation area where wooden windows are rotting, constantly requiring renovation and repainting, especially as in my case, when the front of the house is south-facing. There is a sloping roof immediately under one of the windows which makes it inaccessible without hiring scaffolding, which again adds to the cost (and postponement) of maintenance.</p> <p>The windows are impossible to open during the winter months which surely is a health and safety issue? Double glazing cannot be satisfactorily installed and the draughts from these wooden windows means that extra heating is required to keep the house warm.</p> <p>There are two houses close by which have recently installed approved modern windows (two different manufacturers) - they look very attractive, and match the design criteria set down.</p> <p>Also close to my house is a house with wooden windows which were replaced several years ago; apparently approved by the council. Although these windows were certainly replaced with wood, the proportions in several respects do not in any way coincide with acceptable specifications.</p> <p>I hope the Conservation Committee can give some serious consideration to adopting, once and for all, a controlled acceptance of the use of modern materials.</p> <p>I have read much publicity about 23,000 (?) or so trees which are to be planted in the borough, surely some of that number can be ear-marked to replenish the depleted number of trees in Pinner's conservation area. Opposite my house an elderly tree came down three years or so ago. The tree and trunk were removed; that tree and others in Evelyn Drive have not been replaced.</p> <p>Ten years ago I was asked to pay half the cost (and did so) of replacing a tree on the grass verge outside my house which had come down in a storm. A conversation several years ago with Mr Roger Shrub revealed that the council now has no budget for replacing trees - yet these are essential for</p>

					<p>preserving a vital feature in retaining the rural aspect of the area.</p> <p>The council dictate which trees must be preserved and are willing to give advice on pruning but make no contribution to the actual cost - why not some help here?</p> <p>Finally the pavements. I understand the policy of replacing with tarmac dangerous paving stones which have been damaged by tree roots. I have caught workmen busy removing paving stones which are nowhere near trees and only require re-laying with sand, yet they are replacing them with tarmac. Cable laying and various road works have spoilt the appearance of many of the pavements already.</p> <p>Use of 4x4s has destroyed many of the verges at the sides of drive entrances - they are often a deep sea of mud for many months, and unsightly for the rest of the year. I was told several years ago that this matter was 'being looked into', but as yet, nothing.</p> <p>People are very willing to cooperate on preserving the uniqueness of our development but expect the council to play a more positive and active role too. A working partnership is essential, but a series of imposed regulations which take too little notice of residents' wishes, and offer too little input from the council, will surely defeat the object of the whole exercise.</p>
32) 26/06/09 by email	Gila and Christopher Reid	<gilapaget@hotmail.com>		PWPE	<p>As a resident in the Pinnerwood Park conservation area I have been advised to email you with my concerns about the Draft Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>I am living at 45 Evelyn Drive and currently have very old wooden windows in the front and side of the house. The wood is rotting and some of the glass is loose. In the winter it is bitterly cold and you can actually feel the draft coming through. Even with thermal lined curtains our house is drafty and our heating bills are enormous. I want to move our son into the front bedroom but don't feel I can until the window has been replaced. We got quotes for wooden double glazed windows and were told that it would be £4000 for just one window. This is well beyond what we can afford. We are reluctant to replace in wood not just because of the cost but because it isn't as effective and doesn't last as long. In the days when the government are trying to make everyone more energy conscious I can't understand why this restriction is still in place.</p> <p>I know that a lot of people have replaced their windows in UPVC without permission. Some of them look terrible and nothing has been done about it. Some of them look brilliant, you wouldn't even know the difference.</p> <p>I would like to see the rules simplified to say that any material can be used as long as they look exactly the same.</p>
33) 25/06/09 by email	Rose Freeman Planning Assistant	The Theatres Trust 22 Charing Cross Road London WC2H 0QL Tel: 020 7836 8591 Fax: 020 7836 3302 "Rose Freeman" <rose.freeman@theatrestrust.org.uk>			<p>Ref.: RF/2379</p> <p><b>Pinner Conservation Areas</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 15 May and the email from Limehouse of 19 May consulting The Theatres Trust on the draft Pinner Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The Theatres Trust is The National Advisory Public Body for Theatres. The Town &amp; Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995, Article 10, Para (v) requires the Trust to be consulted on planning applications which include '<i>development involving any land on which there is a theatre.</i>' It was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 '<i>to promote the better protection of theatres.</i>' This applies to all theatre buildings, old and new, in current use, in other uses, or disused. It also includes buildings or structures that have been converted to theatre, circus buildings and performing art centres. Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use, or the potential for such use, but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies.</p> <p>Due to the specific nature of the Trust's remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and as this consultation is not directly relevant to the Trust's work we have no comment to make but look forward to being consulted on further planning policy documents especially the Core Strategy Submission stage and other planning policy documents such as Development Control Policies, Planning Obligations and any town centre Area Action Plan.</p>
34) 25/06/09 by email	Tim Ford	2 Evelyn Drive Pinner Middlesex HA5 4RX tel 0208 428 2001 TIMOTHY FORD <t.j.ford@btinternet.com		PWPE	<p>As a resident of Pinnerwood Park, I am concerned to hear that the wishes of the residents may be ignored regarding a change in the policy for replacement windows.</p> <p>I acknowledge that aesthetic considerations are important to conserve the overall feel of this pleasant residential neighbourhood. However, I believe that residents should be allowed to make considered decisions regarding the material they use for replacement windows. Modern materials such as uPVC or aluminium can be both more energy efficient and cheaper, and recent investigations by myself have shown that they are a better match and have substantially longer guarantees than wooden windows.</p> <p>If the planning restrictions are not amended to allow residents to use alternative materials, I believe many will further delay investing in products they believe are inferior, and the continuing decline in property maintenance standards will accelerate, itself leading to deterioration of the environment.</p>

						I urge the council to reconsider their decision, and listen to those who have the greatest investment in the maintenance of Pinnerwood Park as a pleasant place to live; The residents themselves.
35) 23/05/09 limehouse	Ruth McNeil			Tookes Green		<p>This is very thorough.</p> <p>It is of interest to us as we live at 20 Nower Hill - the first house (with 20a) in the Tookes Green conservation area at the start of it on the right hand side of the Nower Hill.</p> <p>We find it odd that you talk about the "soft" landscape, but have just added very modern looking concrete paving stones (instead of the rather worn tarmac). This makes it look more "towny" and less "villagy". However, that is a small matter. More important is to ensure that there are not consistent water and road works - we have had these non stop in the area due to problems over the last 2 years. Additionally, it would be marvellous to see the Tookes Green fountain properly renovated (it is looking distinctly shabby). Finally, and most important, please do look after our verges. Given that this is a conservation area, the verges in Nower Hill and in Church Lane are APPALLINGLY looked after. I have complained a lot about this but to no effect. I feel that the lack of care of the verges and flower beds is a disgrace and pulls down the nature of this pleasant area which we should all try and sustain if we can. Thank you!</p> <p>A last further comment. There has been so much development in and around Pinner. Please help us retain our gardens. I was heartened to see your comments about the value of the trees and the wish to avoid any further infilling. We value the light and the space. I believe that where we have single storey houses these should stay, where we have double storey, ditto and so on. Let us keep the residential feel and the trees and the green. Further development of new housing or undue extensions in the conservation area should be discouraged as should the destruction of too many front gardens for hard landscaping. I am sure the local residents will in the main strongly support you in this.</p> <p>Ruth McNeil</p>
36) 29/05/09 limehouse	Mr Anthony Kay	<a href="mailto:anthony.kay1@sky.com">anthony.kay1@sky.com</a> 48 Woodhall Gate HA5 4TL		Q2		<p>In relation to Section 7.9 having had recent building work to my house in the conservation area, I have found it quite difficult to increase the energy efficiency of my property. This is due to the balance of conservation area needs, the building properties and cost. Unfortunately the only efficiency saving available to me was increased loft insulation. The building construction precludes cavity wall insulation as there are no cavities, double glazing is not possible due to possible conservation restrictions and cost. I would imagine other alternatives such as energy micro-generation would not be in keeping with the area and hence would be precluded. How do existing properties in the conservation area increase their efficiency at a reasonable cost, whilst staying true to the design ideals?</p> <p>In relation to point 7.6.2, satellite dishes. There seems to be confusion on whether planning applications are required to install them. It does seem a little excessive to go through the whole planning process to place a satellite dish onto the rear of your property out of public view even in a conservation area.</p> <p>In relation to point 7.10 I haven't found any specific guidance on the types of tree that should be visible in the conservation areas. When planting new trees should they be in keeping with the area? If existing trees are not in keeping with the surrounding area is there provision to move them within reason? Will trees be assessed for removal if they are damaging conservation buildings\garages?</p>
37) 29/05/09 limehouse	Mr Anthony Kay	<a href="mailto:anthony.kay1@sky.com">anthony.kay1@sky.com</a> 48 Woodhall Gate HA5 4TL		Q4		<p>In relation to section 9.1, CCTV is generally a reactive measure to crime and not a pro-active measure. How do we increase our security and adhere to conservation area principals? i.e. more secure doors\windows, security lighting, home cctv.</p> <p>Is there a plan to "fix and repair" criminal damage in conservation areas such as graffiti ?</p>
38) 29/05/09 limehouse	Mr Anthony Kay	<a href="mailto:anthony.kay1@sky.com">anthony.kay1@sky.com</a> 48 Woodhall Gate HA5 4TL		Q5		<p>In relation to 10.6.1.1 , internet accessibility in the conservation area (especially Woodhall Gate) is poor due to the distance of the exchange from our houses. Internet is an increasingly important factor. How will new technologies be incorporated into the conservation areas? i.e. fiber optic cable, high speed wi-fi zones. These should not be actively discourage, but encouraged to ensure that future generations can live in a beautiful area and still compete technologically.</p>
39) 29/05/09 limehouse	Mr Anthony Kay	<a href="mailto:anthony.kay1@sky.com">anthony.kay1@sky.com</a> 48 Woodhall Gate HA5 4TL		Q5		<p>10.4 - Are there any incentives to re-introduce grass verges in conservation areas where they have been tarmac'ed over and trees removed? This is the case in Woodhall Gate and would certainly improve the look of the area if re-introduced.</p>
40) 11/06/2009	Meeting Hatch End Library	39 West Towers		West Towers		<p>Mrs. Thomas of 39 West Towers enquired of West Towers conservation area whether the new document meant rear extensions were no longer allowed or not. She also stated she also believes secondary glazing is far more expensive than double glazing but she will check the building conservation webpage after the recommendation.</p>
41) 11/06/2009	Meeting Hatch End Library			<b>All of Pinner Conservation Areas</b> Alex Munlean of the Jehovah's Whitnasses		<p>Wished to commend us for our hard work. He wanted us to register that he had visited.</p>
42) 11/06/2009	Meeting Hatch End Library					<p>group of the following from the Pinner Residents Association:</p> <p>Mr. and Mrs Crush Mr. and Mrs Seager of 28 Hallam Gardens +2 others</p>

						<p>They all agreed that they would like 'modern, more durable' materials to be considered, plastic or alternative'. They state that modern timber window do not last as long as old timber windows. They dislike the onerous maintenance required. They cannot afford the new timber windows. One stated he was making a political statement by leaving their windows not maintained as he could not maintain them.</p> <p>One couple stated they did not like front gardens being hardsurfaced more than they are already. Greenery should be kept as far as possible and keep cars in garages as far as possible.</p>
43) 11/06/2009	Meeting Hatch End Library Mrs. Boxhall	23 Marsworth Avenue				23 Marsworth Avenue Mrs. Boxhall would definitely like UPVC windows. Also stated the existing timber windows could not be made secure.
44) 11/06/2009	Meeting Hatch End Library Mr and Mrs Budd	3 Evelyn Drive				<p>Stated that they want to retain the character of the area but want to change their windows to UPVC. They stated the Highways department do not preserve the character of the area by laying tarmac which allows weed to grow through and disrupts the continuity of the area.</p> <p>They would like something to prevent parking on the grass verges. They believe this is a pressure within the area. They would also like the council to draw lines across the front drives of driveways to stop parents of children in the school opposite from parking in front of their drives while they collect their pupils.</p>
45) 11/06/2009	James Cox					Knows many people within the Pinnerwood Park conservation area. He stated he had attended the public consultation with Lorna last week. He stated he was completely in favour of only timber windows and that the Pinner residents association was not representative of views at all and that they had pushed out those who disagreed with them ie not notifying of meetings.
46) 11/06/2009	Mr. Carroll	20 Evelyn Drive				Asked whether he could change his UPVC windows for UPVC again and said that this was not clear within the document and could perhaps be made more clear.
47) 12/12/2009		47 Marsworth				Stated she and her mother at 19 Marsworth Avenue, Pinner would like UPVC allowed for side windows but not on the front elevations.
48) 17/06/09 limehouse	Dr Simon Hodes 34 Evelyn Drive HA5 4RU	simonhodes@hotmail.com		Pinnerwood Farm		<p>You state in 11.6 " The special character of Pinnerwood Farm Conservation Area stems from ..... The boundary treatments and driveways contribute to the soft and informal character of the area. "</p> <p>There are strong restrictions and rules for how residents can treat their driveways and boundaries. Why then is it the case that when the council repair the pavements in this area - you replace with black tarmac, rather than using paving stones. This detracts directly from the aesthetics of the area ?</p>
49) 17/06/09 limehouse	Mr Carl Banton	<a href="mailto:planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk">planningconsultation-@coal.gov.uk</a> 200 Lichfield Lane Berry Hill Mansfield NG18 4RG				<p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving your emerging planning policy related documents; preferably in an electronic format. For your information, we can receive documents via our generic email address <a href="mailto:planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk">planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk</a>, on a CD/DVD, or a simple hyperlink which is emailed to our generic email address and links to the document on your website.</p> <p>Alternatively, please mark all paper consultation documents and correspondence for the attention of the Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department.</p> <p>Should you require any assistance please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority on our departmental direct line</p>
50) 20/06/09 limehouse	Mr Radha Krishnan	krishnan_radha@hotmail.co.uk 23 West Towers HA5 1TZ		West Towers		<p>I attended your consultation open day held in Pinner Library on 28/5/09 and gave my verbal comments to your conservation officer. I wanted to ensure my comments are not only taken down by her in her note book but also recorded formally and responded. She took my contact details and I have not had any communication on my comments.</p> <p>My were comments were as follows:</p> <p>1. Loft Conversions</p> <p>The conservation order imposes restrictions on dormer windows hence limiting the efficient use of the largespace available in the loft. We would like to move but the costs are prohibitive. A loft conversion within the present conservation order is not viable considering cost vs the additional accommodation. There are already several loft conversions with dormers to the side of the roof. Some consideration should be given either to relax the rules or providing us with an acceptable solution which meets our aspirations as well and not just the stringent rules which may only preserve the area but not meet the</p>



					needs of the residents. 2. Need to conserve energy The government wants every one to conserve energy and one of the best ways of doing this is to install double glazing. Unfortunately the conservation order works against this by imposing that new frames and windows should maintain the original character. The costs of complying is excessive and beyond my means. I feel it is unfair that the council has taken this decision without looking in to the costs imposed on its residents and expecting the residents to foot the bill. The council should share the cost of this and make grants available to residents and not leave us to bare this huge burden. I also like to note that it is a legal requirement to provide independant energy ratings if we want to sell our houses and definitely puts us at a disvantage and will have an impact on price of our properties. 3. Council's responsibilities with respect to the conservation order As a resident of this area for a considerable period of time I am sad to say that the council has not made a full contribution in complying with the order to maintain the original character of the area. Examples: 1. When paving slabs are broken they replaced with tarmac 2. We welcome the trees which have been planted but they have not been pruned regularly. Some of the trees attract birds and others have some kind of resin both leave enduring damage to paint work of cars. This is a nuisance and naturally the residents want avoid parking under these trees and have to be selective where they park and this does cause major inconvenience wit respect to parking. 3. The two round abouts or green areas ar not maintained. 4. Many of cross overs, kerb stones and paving are is disrepair.
51) 28/06/09 limehouse	Mr David Wild	david_wild@btinternet.com 12 Marsworth Avenue HA5 4UB		PWPE	Re consultation issues 1 to 4 on page 335: 1) I agree with items 1 to 3 2) re item 4 (Management Strategy) I would like to make the following observations: a) the policy to approve only wood replacement windows is outdated, costly and impractical. Wooden replacements are generally not a good match and are unlikely to last half as long as the original ones and this together with the additional cost of wood over aluminium/upvc makes it an unattractive proposition to most residents. b) properly regulated non-wood replacements would not at all undermine the existing character of the estate. In fact some of the non-wood replacements (such as those recently approved for 12, Evelyn Drive) do not detract from the overall street scene. Finally, I would like to say that as a resident in the Pinnerwood Park Conservation area for 33 years I am being denied reasonable choice in the upkeep of my property. I am as keen as anyone to preserve this lovely area but feel that the current, and proposed, restrictions make little sense in the 21st century. Reasonably controlled modernisation within keeping of the conservation principles would be a very welcome step forward.
52) 29/06/09 limehouse	Mrs Catherine Gleeson	holmes_gleeson@hotmail.com 6 Woodhall Drive HA5 4TQ		PWPE	9.5.6 Windows I think that UPVC windows should be allowed however they must be in keeping with the style of the original windows. With rising energy costs people are under increasing pressure to reduce the heat lost from their homes and I don't believe using thicker curtains or installing secondary glazing are as effective as double glazing. Wood frames do require ongoing maintenance to ensure they are properly protected from the weather whereas UPVC is virtually maintenance free – in a time of recession and with an aging population I think it is important to think of the practicalities of maintaining wood v's UPVC frames. If UPVC windows are not allowed I think there is a risk that people don't change their windows at all (because of the higher cost of wood frames or because they do not see any benefit from changing from wood frame to wood frame) and there is a risk that properties look run down as a result – not the purpose of a conservation area.
53) 30/06/09 limehouse	Mr Tim Owen	tim@eastendpinner.co.uk East End House Moss Lane HA5 3AW		SPD in general	Overall I think the document is very good. It sets out the policies coherently and then links them effectively to the features and the issues facing each of the CAs. I therefore have no substantive comments to make on the questions posed in the consultation. I am however submitting below a few detailed comments on the main statement and the appendix relating to the East End Farm CA.
30/06/09 limehouse	Mr Tim Owen	tim@eastendpinner.co.uk East End House Moss Lane HA5 3AW		Environmental Issues	Para 7.1.1.4: pinch-points have been introduced in Waxwell Lane and Paines Lane (not Moss Lane).
30/06/09 limehouse	Mr Tim Owen	tim@eastendpinner.co.uk East End House Moss Lane HA5 3AW		Section 10 Managing Pinner's CAs	I found the distinction between "Overarching Policies" (as developed in sections 10.2, 10.8, 10.9 and 10.13) and "Policies" (as developed in sections 10.3 to 10.6) very confusing. It was not clear to me what the difference is between these two levels of policy – what do the first set "overarch" that the second set don't? Also, shouldn't sections 10.11, 10.12 and 10.13 be a part of section 10.10 (Enforcement Powers)? Overarching policy iv seems to apply to all of them, not just 10.10. Similarly, shouldn't 10.8 and 10.9 be a part of 10.7 (Protection Measures)?
30/06/09 limehouse	Mr Tim Owen	tim@eastendpinner.co.uk East End House Moss Lane HA5 3AW		East End Farm	1) The cross-references to pictures need to be checked. The picture numbering has changed from the previous draft, but several of the references have not been updated. .... 2) Para 6.25: the last two sentences largely duplicate each other. .... 3) Pictures 6.15 and 6.17 could usefully be updated now that the scaffolding has been removed. .... 4) Picture 6.22 shows important boundary treatments. Could I suggest adding to that the hedge between East End House and East End Farm Cottage, facing across to Pump House and Barn B? This is more substantial, more prominent and closer to the heart of the CA than some of the ones shown on the plan. I am also concerned that there is a rumour that the owner of Woodpeckers may submit a further planning application for the tennis court land, with access along the existing road past East End Farm Cottage and Dormer Cottage. If such an application were considered, there could be pressure to cut back the northern end of this hedgerow in order to ease the turning circle for large vehicles. .... 5) Para 6.60 Should the reference to "south west" near the end of para 6.60 be "south east"? ..... 6) I wonder whether the drainage ditches running round the south side of Woodpeckers' garden, between East End House and Woodpeckers gardens and between East End House and Tudor Cottage gardens merit a mention somewhere? Within section 6.2.7? ..... 7) Para 6.62 has an updated picture reference of 6.22, but this should be 6.23.
54) 30/06/09 limehouse	Mr David Hamilton	david@dhamilton.co.uk 20 Albury Drive HA5 3RE		General	Draft Pinner Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document With regard to the above and request for feedback from residents I provide the following: Public Consultation Questions Question1 – Response

					<p>I agree that the document summarises the special interest of the conservation area.</p> <p>Question 2- Response I agree that that the document sets out the character of the area.</p> <p>Question 3 – Response I agree that the document provides a good summary of assets of the area, problems/pressures and identification of opportunities for enhancement.</p> <p>Question 4 – Response As a new resident (2 years) to the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area I was surprised and saddened to see what I believe are the detrimental effects of the application/enforcement of the existing policy on replacement windows. This has resulted in the approval of window replacement using wood even if it does not match the original design and the approved use of modern materials (aluminium or upvc) if the windows being replaced were non wooden on the grounds that it would look better overall.</p> <p>At present casement windows are a mixture of original wood types, replacement wood types that do not match the originals, older aluminium or upvc designs some of which are no longer very attractive and newer upvc designs that vary greatly in appearance.</p> <p>The proposed policy of 'wood only' for replacement windows does not establish a 'unifying' policy that provides residents the opportunity to investigate/propose superior alternative material solutions (that replicate existing designs) that better match the performance requirements of the home owner.</p>
55) 30/06/09 limehouse	Mr Keith Spence	keith.spence@btinternet.com 11 Marsworth Avenue HA5 4UD		PWPE	<p>Please let me congratulate the council on this document which I hope is adopted in full.</p> <p>Note that a person who I took as a representative of the Pinnerwood Park Association was seeking signatures Sunday 28/06 on a petition to allow plastic/aluminium windows in the front of these properties. He was not interested in getting my signature since I am in favour of retaining the original wooden structure. Be aware there are people like me with a counter view, who may even be the unvocal majority!</p> <p>I really don't know why people move into a conservation area then want to make significant changes to the house which will degrade in part, the asthetic inviroment, which must have been a consideration to moving here in the first place.</p> <p>9.2.7 picture 9.43 does not show the grass verge with street trees outside numbers 18-24 and 17.</p> <p>It gave a symmetry around the small area now taken up by the new house 15a. I would guess that some of the front garden of no15 may also be part of the original green, up to where the trees still exist.</p> <p>Don't get me wrong I am not advocating it being reinstated, but recognition of what exists must be the first step for the rest of the street which is crying out for the replacement of the verge.</p> <p>Please note my earlier comments about the verge related to Marsworth Ave</p>
56) 23/06/09 by email	Mr and Mrs Green	"David Green" <davidgreenuk@hotmail.com>		PWPE	<p>We have lived at no. 51 Grimsdyke Road for 4 years now and ever since we moved in we have tried to get our wooden windows replaced. They are not the safest windows in the world nor are they the most economical as there is a terrible draft coming in from them in every room. Two of our boys have the wooden windows and they are constantly cold.</p> <p>We have to have the heating on most of the year which I'm sure you'll agree is not doing the environment any good.</p> <p>They also get moldy very easily and are simply a pain to maintain. Myself and my eldsest son suffer from asthma and I have in the past been rushed to hospital due to the fungi spores that have appeared on these kind of windows.</p> <p>Apart from the ridiculous cost of having wooden windows installed they are not what we want or need.</p> <p>I would like to request that the antiquated rule on what windows you can and cannot have in our area is scrapped and that we are allowed to choose the UPVC ones instead.</p>
57) 24/06/09 by letter	rs Anne Darbourne	D Albury Drive Pinner Middlesex HA5 3RE		PWPE	<p>am writing to you in response to the public consultation on the SPD for Pinnerwood Park.</p> <p>rstly, I would like to say that I found the consultation process very difficult – it almost seemed designed to deter people from responding. As a retired person fortunate in having time to spare but after about an hour of trying to download the document both from the Council website and the web address in your letter gave up. Even when I managed to access the document, its sheer size and complexity made it difficult to navigate. Most people with less time available would probably have abandoned the effort. Also, the options given in the document for response online were so vague as to be useless – there seemed no way to express opinions on specific issues.</p> <p>urther, I would like to have it noted that the letter from Harrow Council about the consultation process was not delivered to all residents on the estate, potentially jeopardising the legitimacy of the consultation process.</p> <p>would like to take issue with the statement in the SPD that houses are well cared for. In many cases this just not true – walking round the estate, we see houses with rotting wooden windows, broken fences, ill-maintained and rotting garage doors, cracked and potholed drives and, perhaps most telling, inappropriate replacement windows, installed before Article 4 was introduced, that residents will not replace because they refuse to use wood.</p> <p>hile there are proposals in the SPD that are welcome, especially that of restricting Article 4 requirements to the front elevations only in most cases, removing the spurious distinction between the "core" and "non-core" areas, the failure to include the option of using materials such as aluminium for replacement windows is immensely disappointing. It is also, I firmly believe, counter-productive to the long-term aim of preserving and enhancing the area. Many residents have been patiently waiting for this SPD, hoping that commonsense would prevail, and that they would be able to replace rotting windows with appropriate designed, energy-efficient, easy-to-maintain alternatives at an affordable price. With this option removed, many residents are likely to turn their backs on the planning process altogether and simply go ahead with the alterations they wish to make. Those of us who regularly walk around the estate are aware of the changes that have been made to houses over the years which clearly would not have had planning approval. If the SPD is adopted as it stands, without the option of using non-wooden materials for replacement windows, this is unfortunately a practice that is likely to grow in the future, with potentially detrimental effects.</p> <p>he PPCARA Committee has tried very hard to make the Council aware of the views of residents and you must know how irritated and upset the majority</p>

					<p>people are, both with the way in which Article 4 has been interpreted and administered and also the way in which the public areas on the estate have been managed (paving replaced with tarmac, trees not replaced or maintained etc). And you must also know how much resentment there is at the seemingly ill-considered planning approvals that have allowed, among others, the installation of wooden windows that nowhere near match the originals, garage doors that bear no resemblance to the originals, side extensions that destroy the symmetry of a pair of semis and so on. Against this background, most residents find it very difficult to understand the objections to the use of appropriately designed aluminium windows.</p> <p>This SPD was an opportunity for the Council to work with residents to ensure that Pinnerwood Park would be safeguarded. Unfortunately this opportunity has not been taken. What is really ironic is that Conservation and Planning Officers were prepared to listen to residents and accept the use of suitably designed aluminium replacement windows while their elected representatives on the Development Management Committee, as it was then, did not.</p> <p>We hope that, when the consultation process is completed, the Council will think again and reinstate the option of using materials other than wood, in line with the early expressed wishes of the majority of residents.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
58) 23/06/09 by email	Sharon Edwards	"SHARON EDWARDS" <a href="mailto:shazza@davidbowie.com">shazza@davidbowie.com</a> 61, Grimsdyke Road Hatch End	PWPE	<p style="text-align: center;">Conservation Area Review – Article 4</p> <p>There are many issues that affect us with regard to replacement windows, below are just a few and my feelings regarding the points listed, and we thank you for giving us the opportunity to air these views;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Maintenance costs. Front windows that are north facing, get very little sun to dry them out after wet weather, thus rapidly increasing the deterioration of already ageing timber. The cost of replacing like for like is extremely prohibitive with costs in the region of £14,000 for wooden replacement against £7000 for Aluminium/UPVC replacements and this is just for the front of the premises! At present we have significant expenditure on repairing existing rotten timber frames. The proposed particle based wood we have been advised has a lifespan of approximately 30 years and a lesser 20 years for those windows that are north facing.</li> <li>•Energy costs. We do not have central heating nor gas to our premises, any build up of heat escapes through old windows. We cannot have secondary glazing due to condensation build-up leading to rotting frames. Significant expenditure of heating costs that could be greatly reduced by replacement of Aluminium/UPVC windows</li> <li>•Security. We and four of our immediate neighbours have been burgled, easy access being gained via wooden windows being prised open, despite window locks being fitted, leaving us with significant personal and financial loss, all for the sake of "conservation"</li> <li>•There are several premises in Grimsdyke Road alone that have Aluminium/UPVC replacements windows prior to the enforcement that appear entirely in character with their wooden counterparts and look as well maintained as the day they were installed.</li> <li>•We have been made aware by another local resident that properties in both Hallam Gardens and Evelyn Drive have been granted permission and have already had aluminium windows installed, but that one property in Latimer Drive has been refused and is currently subject to appeal, there would appear to be no consistency here. Furthermore we are aware that there is a house in Evelyn Drive that has had UPVC replacement windows, carried out by Harrow Council, the very body opposing these materials in the first place</li> <li>•Whilst being a very desirable estate in which to live, these constraints do place a burden, both financial and emotional, on those residents trying to sell their premises, as prospective buyers do not wish</li> </ul>	

					<p>to purchase a property to which so many restrictions are attached, this does in effect dictate the value of your property. This is the 21st century and we are no longer prepared to accept 20th century materials with which to secure and maintain our properties. Would you?</p> <p>•When article four was introduced, the restrictions were in no way fully explained to residents.</p> <p>To be perfectly honest we are more than a little tired of being cold, not being able to retain heat effectively, not feeling secure from the threat of another burglary, not being able to keep up with repairs to timber and in particular of people who do not live in the area making decision on what residents may and may not do to their own premises.</p> <p>I'm sure the councillors who make these decisions live in 21st century centrally heated and insulated homes with UPVC or Aluminium framed windows that require minimal maintenance and feel secure from the threat of burglary, why can't we?</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to air my views, I look forward to receiving acknowledgement of your receipt of my e-mail by return, but hope that my communication is not in vain and a decision already made.</p>
59) 23/06/09 by email	Mr G R Mathais	<MCElectron@aol.com> Mr.G.R.Mathias. 61, Grimsdyke Road Hatch End Pinner. Middlesex. HA5 4PP	PWPE		<p>Re: Harrow Area Conservation Review – Replacement Windows</p> <p>I have been a householder at this address since my wife and I started out as tenants back in 1951.</p> <p>During the intervening years I have enjoyed living in a well maintained and visually pleasant environment thanks to the efforts of previous Councils. For some time however, there has been an ongoing problem in respect of window replacement in this "Conservation Area".</p> <p>It is appreciated that the council and householders would want the outward appearance of the estate to remain true to its original conception, however existing windows and frames are increasingly deteriorating as they are wood and therefore time expired in many cases. There is little point in trying to paint rotting wood and replacement is now urgent and unavoidable.</p> <p>In this day and age there is a range of alternatives to wood that retain the outward appearance of the originals thus avoiding regular painting and maintenance also giving a longer life. Modern windows also improve energy efficiency one of the areas that the council encourage, with free insulation to those over 70 years of age, but what is the point in free insulation if heat is escaping through by old and now ill fitting windows.</p> <p>I have had a quotation from a council approved glazing company (Swan Windows) in a wooden design approved by the Council at a cost for the only the front of the house at £13,879! As a 90 year old widower this is far too high a price when cheaper, more modern alternatives are available, ones that look the same but provide greater benefits.</p> <p>I trust therefore that the Council will take account of the views of the householders in this area who, like me, wish to maintain their property taking advantage of the higher efficiency of modern materials over wood, whilst retaining the desirable outward appearance, but are prevented from doing so by the present Council's unreasonable and self-defeating restrictions. In view of the amount of homeowner opposition to these restrictions, I trust that their removal can be enacted speedily</p>

60) 23/06/09 by email	Alan Stone	alan stone <alan4jeannine@yahoo.co.uk>		PWPE		please give the residents of hatch end conservation area the right to install aluminium windows instead of rubbish wooden ones which do not conserve heat and soon rot
61) 24/06/09 by email	Andrew Dobinson	"Andrew Dobinson" <Andrew.Dobinson@lcp.uk.com>		PWPE		<p><b>Harrow Local Development Framework: Pinner Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document</b></p> <p><b>Public Consultation Response</b></p> <p>This letter forms my response to the above public consultation document released by Harrow Council during May 2009. The consultation document sets out a vision and objectives as follows:  <i>"To preserve and enhance the architectural and historic character and appearance of Pinner's conservation areas.</i></p> <p><i>Objectives:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>To secure the preservation of Pinner's conservation areas</i></li> <li>2. <i>To identify and encourage enhancement of Pinner's conservation areas</i></li> <li>3. <i>To promote awareness, understanding and enjoyment of Pinner's twelve conservation areas"</i></li> </ol> <p>I would raise the following points in response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I agree with the vision of the consultation document. I agree that maintaining the character and appearance of the conservation areas is important.</li> <li>2. I disagree that the material of an object, on its own, plays a part in maintaining the character and appearance of the conservation areas.</li> <li>3. I believe that this consultation document, if implemented as currently drafted, will prevent, rather than encourage enhancement of Pinner's conservation areas.</li> </ol> <p>Further details on each of these points can be found below.</p> <p><b>1. I agree with the vision of the consultation document. I agree that maintaining the character and appearance of the conservation areas is important.</b></p> <p>I first moved to Pinnerhill Park 2 years ago. It was the character and appearance of the area which led me to choose this area over property in any of the surrounding areas. Therefore, it is important to me that the character and appearance of the area is maintained, and where possible enhanced.</p> <p><b>2. I disagree that the material of an object, on its own, plays a part in maintaining the character and appearance of the conservation areas.</b></p> <p>In some cases, I agree that the material of an object plays an important part in its character and appearance, for example wooden doors that have been varnished. However, where materials have been painted, especially in the case of window frames that have been painted white, it is the dimensions, shapes, and colour which give the object its character and appearance, not the material itself.</p> <p>A clear example of this can be seen at 12 Evelyn Drive, Pinner. The owners were granted permission to install windows with aluminium frames in 2008. This has now taken place, and the windows can be seen in context beside the neighbouring mirror image house at number 14. There is no discernable difference between the windows in the two properties because the dimensions and shapes match. The character and appearance of the property is maintained with these windows and the conservation area is enhanced as a result.</p> <p>The consultation document does not acknowledge that these results are possible with aluminium window frames, thereby ignoring evidence it has already seen and approved. Section 9.99 of the consultation states:  <i>"Commonly plastic or aluminium windows have thicker framing than timber windows and many are hard edged, with two dimensional detailing that fails to replicate the soft edges or mouldings of original timber windows. They are also normally manufactured in standard sizes, which cannot be altered, and their appearance is therefore usually quite different from traditional windows."</i></p> <p>This is clearly not the case at 12 Evelyn Drive. Furthermore, as the application for these windows was granted approved, there is no rationale for rejecting an application for the same windows in the same area. If the council and conservation team can recognise these aluminium window frames as an appropriate alternative to wood, the consultation document should reflect this, and allow such logic to apply to applications made by all residents.</p> <p><b>3. I believe that this consultation document, if implemented as currently drafted, will prevent, rather than encourage enhancement of Pinner's conservation areas.</b></p> <p>My own property has windows in desperate need of replacement. In particular the front bay window:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was permanently screwed shut by previous owners to try to prevent drafts</li> <li>• Has rotten frames</li> <li>• Has frames that were stuffed with an assortment of insulating material and plastic bags by previous owners to try to prevent drafts</li> </ul> <p>When I purchased the property two years ago I was aware of these issues. At the time, I was also aware that a draft consultation on window replacements was being prepared by the council. In September 2008, over a year after purchasing the property, and with no movement on the draft consultation, I submitted an application to install windows with aluminium frames in the front of the property. This application is approaching a year old and is currently on appeal.</p> <p>My application followed the successful precedent application for windows with aluminium frames at 12 Evelyn Drive. As I have said, I am keen to protect the character and appearance of the area, and my property, so my application was for the same window design, using the same manufacturer as approved at 12 Evelyn Drive.</p> <p>I believe that these windows with aluminium frames represent the best available product for my property because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They protect the character and appearance of the area and the property equally as well as a painted wooden alternative.</li> <li>• They are significantly cheaper than a durable and high quality, bespoke, hard wood alternative.</li> </ul>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are significantly more durable than a soft wood alternative.</li> <li>• They require significantly less maintenance than any wooden alternative.</li> </ul> <p>Because of this belief, I will not install wooden windows at any point in this property. I would rather, regrettably, leave the area, than install an inferior product.</p> <p>I believe that this view is held by a large number of local residents. Indeed many residents have invested a significant amount of time trying to work with the council and window suppliers to find alternative materials which will enhance the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The consultation as currently drafted will therefore prevent rather than encourage enhancement of Pinner's conservation areas. Local residents will disengage with the council and the conservation team, resulting in either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents refusing to invest in inferior products as replacement windows and moving away; or</li> <li>• Residents refusing to seek approval prior to installing replacement windows, which increases the potential for the installation of windows which do not have the appearance of the originals. This would potentially take many years to rectify.</li> </ul> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I welcome the opportunity to comment on the Development Framework and welcome the aim and objectives.</li> <li>• I would encourage the council to reconsider the sections of the consultation document that refer to wooden window frames.</li> <li>• I do not believe that the policy, as currently drafted, will help the council achieve the vision and objectives it sets out and indeed I believe it goes a long way to actively obstructing it.</li> </ul>
62) 24/06/09 by email	Henry Rockwell	"Henry Rockwell" <a href="mailto:henryrockwell@tesco.net">henryrockwell@tesco.net</a> Henry Rockwell 5 Eastglade Pinner Middlesex HA5 3AN <a href="mailto:henryrockwell@tesco.net">henryrockwell@tesco.net</a> 020 8866 1561		EEF	<p>I am commenting on my own behalf mostly on the East End Farm Conservation Area.</p> <p>Anything that can be done to make this look more like an ancient farm area must be welcome. I realise that it is difficult to add features that did not exist before. I also fully understand that the buildings cannot perhaps be preserved completely as they were.</p> <p>However it seems very desirable to control new building work not only within but also adjacent to the area. In addition tasteful signs with maps designed by artists, preferably local, might alert visitors to the past use of these buildings.</p> <p>In the long run it would be very desirable to somehow protect this together with the cemetery as and when this is decommissioned.</p> <p>There are records with PA and PLHS, probably also your Council, as to who is buried in the cemetery. Apart from the Nelson daughter and grand daughter there are quite a few eminent former residents who were well known nationally.</p> <p>There is a risk that further planning applications will be made for what must be a cramped area. This despite the fact that there are places in the area where infill may be more viable.</p>
63) 24/06/09 by email	Mr C Pryke	60 Grimsdyke Rd Pinner HA5 4PW "Clive Pryke" < <a href="mailto:ClivePryke@Hotmail.com">ClivePryke@Hotmail.com</a> >		PWPE	<p>With reference to your letter of the 15th May I am in general in agreement with the consultative document. I am however in strong disagreement with the statement in section 9.39 that only wood should be used for replacement windows.</p> <p>Where windows have been replaced with UPVC or aluminium of a sympathetic design they do not detract, in my opinion, from the overall appearance of the estate and in fact are preferable to wooden windows with peeling paint or rotten wood.</p> <p>Wooden windows have several known disadvantages as follows: -</p> <p><b>Energy loss</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- particularly important as heat loss in these houses is high due to lack of cavity walls.</li> <li>- the policy would be irresponsible in view of global warming.</li> </ul>

					<p><b>Cost of replacement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high even with soft wood as replacements have to be custom-made, prohibitive for double glazed or hardwood.</li> <li>- currently available softwood is not long-lasting. Since I have lived in this house one south facing window has been replaced twice also an expensive box bay has needed replacement. In addition all south facing windows have had repairs.</li> <li>- both of the replaced windows are now proving difficult to open and shut.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost of maintenance</b></p> <p><b>Draughts.</b></p> <p><b>Condensation</b></p> <p><b>Continual fight against mould and damage to curtains due to this.</b></p>
64) 25/06/09 by email	Andrew Reed			PWPE	As R.I.B.A.. representative on the Harrow Conservation Area Advisory Committee can you please note my endorsement and support of the Council's proposals to ensure retention or replacement of timber windows on front elevations in the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area.
65) 25/06/09 by email	Alan Flint	6, Hallam Gardens, Hatch End.		PWPE	<p>I wish to make the following statement in response to the PPCA Review.</p> <p>As a resident of the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area I have received a circular from the Pinnerwood Park Residents Association advising that they want to amend the review so that the requirement for wooden windows on the front elevation be relaxed to permit UPVC, Aluminium or other similar materials.</p> <p>I strongly oppose these views and firmly support the Council for timber windows to be retained, in their current design, as a requirement for the front elevations. This conforms to English Heritage Guidelines, and was stated again in articles in The Guardian and the Daily Telegraph dated 23rd June 2009 on Conservation Areas under the heading "Plague of Plastic Windows" and concluded that "83% of conservation areas were being harmed by plastic windows and doors". With the exception of corner houses, I believe the Policy could be relaxed for the side windows. The reason I object is that although UPVC/Aluminium windows have improved over the years, they still do not give the 3D effect on the glazing bars that wooden ones do. This is a major feature of the estate and is clearly stated in the Policy Statement. Section 1.5 of The Statement reads "There have also been sparing alterations to roof profiles and fenestration. These changes when taken together are beginning to erode the character of the area". It is also a requirement on Local Authorities that any changes in Conservation Areas should "improve or enhance the area". There are many companies manufacturing UPVC/Aluminium windows and there is no consistency of design, particularly in the width of the glazing bars, the surrounds and size of the panes of glass. It follows therefore that the appearance and character of the estate will change and could become a mixture of different styles. Such a change in Policy will not "improve or enhance the area".</p> <p>I wish to add that the same objections apply to front doors, garage doors, driveways and fences (also mentioned in the newspaper articles referred to above). If residents wish to change their doors or replace/repair their driveways/fences then they should revert to the original designs in order to keep the character of the estate. The designs for windows, doors and fences are clearly set out in the existing Policy Statement together with photographs.</p> <p>I trust that you will keep the Policy unchanged for these important features or at least consult with English Heritage prior to a decision being made. If eventually it is decided to change, then very tight regulations should be imposed in order to preserve the appearance of the estate. It is inevitable that some residents will go for the cheapest option available and this will be detrimental to the general appearance.</p>
67) 29/06/09 by email	Mr and Mrs Lamb	14 Hallam Gdns "tony & val lamb" <tony.val.lamb@ntlworld.com>		PWPE	<p>My Wife and I have resided at 14 Hallam Gardens, Hatch End, for just over 48 years. The main reason being that we like the style of the estate and are in full agreement with the objective to keep the overall look and standards to the very highest level. As you may imagine we have spent a considerable amount of money over this time in order to maintain our property to a reasonable standard.</p> <p>Our main concern is that we consider that the council have been unnecessarily obstructive over several years in respect of the replacement windows. It is totally unnecessary in our view to insist on wooden replacement windows, providing the style of the existing windows are maintained. The modern materials have all the benefits of saving energy and reducing maintenance costs without changing the overall look of our streets.</p> <p>As far as other controls are concerned for example over the style of</p>

					fencing, garage doors, driveways, front gardens etc. we do consider it appropriate to attempt to have some consistent approach to these.
68) 29/06/09 by email	Caroline and Steve Paul	63 Grimsdyke Rd <stephen.s.paul @gsk.com>		PWPE	<p>We have lived at 63 Grimsdyke Road for the past thirteen years and enjoy our community.</p> <p>We would like to replace our front windows in a Aluminium / UPVC alternative to the wooden option currently on offer. We totally agree with keeping the look and appearance consistent throughout the estate and we would support a style agreed with Harrow Council and might suggest two/three approved installers. The design would be consistent but would benefit from a aluminium / upvc finish.</p> <p>We would support not allowing residents to install any other alternative designs as this would further encourage the proliferation of styles currently on display with some houses having a blend of approved wood and non approved upvc evident.</p> <p>I am sure my fellow residents will have highlighted the benefits of aluminium/upvc and so I will not repeat this aspect but I would ask that you consider allowing Aluminium / upvc as an alternative to wooden replacements.</p> <p>In summary I have not met a resident that supports the current wood only ruling so is this not an opportunity to reflect the opinion of your residents while still maintaining a consistent design to replacing windows</p> <p>If you would like to discuss this please feel free to contact me</p>
69) 29/06/09 by email	Brian J. Tidmarsh	40 Woodhall Drive Pinner Middx. HA5 4TQ Tel: 0208 428 6678		PWPE	<p>Photos enclosed</p> <p>I submit the following comments for consideration during the consultation period on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>In general I support the idea of maintaining the style and appearance of the buildings and the surrounding landscape. I have however some issues with the interpretation of how the style and appearance is maintained.</p> <p>If maintenance is made to be more costly than it need be by insisting on a rigid adherence to materials then it will affect the level of maintenance carried out and the area will loose its charm and will look run down. The whole idea of conservation would then be lost as a result of the planning control.</p> <p>With regard to windows; I disagree with the restriction on replacement with wood only, whether the windows being replaced are wood or more modern materials.</p> <p>Maintenance of the original wooden windows in a good state is difficult and expensive and as a result many are not in good repair.</p> <p>New wooden windows made to match the originals would be expensive and unlikely to last as long due to the quality of the timber that is likely to be used.</p> <p>The energy performance of the original windows is poor, being single glazed and without draft seals, and replacement with wooden windows with double glazing would have a totally different appearance.</p> <p>Sympathetically designed non wooden replacement windows would not have a detrimental affect on the 'street scene' in the conservation area.</p> <p>The following photographs illustrate the points made on the relative designs of windows. The first shows the original windows, note the size of the frames and the glazing bars also the poor repair on the upper floor. The second shows replacement UPVC windows with very similar frame and bar dimensions. The only difference is the lack of a drip on the central casement. The third shows wooden replacements as approved by planning with a very poor match to the original design. This makes nonsense of the current control and the proposal to insist on replacement with wooden windows in order to maintain their appearance.</p>
70) 30/06/09 by email	Ian Joslin	Woodhall Gate Pinner Middlesex  "Joslin, Ian (UK - London)" <ijoslin@deloitte.co.uk>		PWPE	<p>I refer to the consultation currently underway regarding the Pinnerwood Park conservation area. I understand that the deadline for submissions on the consultation is today, 30 June.</p> <p>I understand that the Residents Association (the PPCARA) has provided submissions on various aspects of the current design policy, although there has been a particular focus on the policy relating to replacement windows. At present policy guide permits only wooden replacement windows, and the PPCARA supports a proposal to allow alternative materials such as uPVC or aluminium. As a resident of Pinnerwood Park I wholly support this proposal. I explain why below.</p> <p>The original wooden windows are now more than 70 years old. They are extremely drafty and by modern standards are woeful in terms of energy conservation. Further, they are beginning to rot quite significantly, especially those which are south facing (for us that is on the front of our house). I know from my neighbours that their windows suffer in the same way, and indeed it is readily apparent from a tour of the estate that many of the windows</p>



					<p>are in a poor state of repair. This is having a clear detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the estate. If this situation continues, the estate will inevitably begin to look run-down.</p> <p>The primary reason for this state of affairs is the current design policy which requires windows (to the front and possibly also side elevations) to be replaced with windows made only of wood. I understand that replacement windows are required to be double-glazed in order to comply with current building regulations. This means that if any resident is interested in renewing their windows they have to fit wooden double-glazed windows. Most of the windows are sash windows, and you will be aware of the cost of double-glazed sash windows. By way of illustration, I recently obtained a quote for replacement double-glazed wooden sash windows for our bedroom, lounge and landing. The cost was astronomical - about £15,000. As you can see, that is way above the budget of, quite frankly, most of the residents. As a consequence, and as is evident from the poor state of repair of many windows on the estate, windows are not being replaced. They are simply being repaired with more and more filler. By contrast, the window company advised me that a quote for uPVC windows would be perhaps 1/3 of the cost of wooden windows.</p> <p>When the design policy was adopted in about 1990, double-glazed window technology is not what it is today. The choice of products was much more limited and windows with a profile to match the profile of the original windows were not readily available. Now however, some 19 years on, the ability is far greater to design and construct double-glazed windows to match the profile of the original windows in materials such as uPVC or aluminium. I am absolutely committed to the installation of modern windows which have the same design features as the original windows, but I believe that modern windows can be produced which, whilst having those features, do not need to be made of wood. If the windows are designed appropriately, and perhaps window suppliers could work with the council to agree the exact design, I believe that modern windows made of uPVC or aluminium would look from only a very short distance the same as wooden windows. Thus the character and appearance of the area would be retained.</p> <p>By allowing the use of uPVC or aluminium, there would be the following benefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It would almost certainly lead to many more windows, currently in disrepair, being renewed - which not only protects but in fact will significantly enhance the character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>2 As a consequence, the energy efficiency of individual houses, as well as the estate as a whole, would be significantly improved. Again, with all the current focus on the impact of wasted energy on the environment, this would be a major benefit and would be a significant enhancement to the area. It would be strange indeed if the council were to oppose a change in policy which, whilst having no material impact on the visual character or appearance of the area, would lead to significant energy savings.</li> <li>3 Long term, uPVC and aluminium require far less maintenance than wood. Wooden windows will require regular painting and servicing without which they deteriorate, impacting adversely on the area. As is already evident, they are frequently neglected due to the maintenance costs (painting them can cost a lot of money) and disruption (it is a messy process). With uPVC and aluminium the windows will maintain a much higher standard of repair and will, therefore, over even a relatively short term (let alone long term) will help to maintain the visual character and appearance of the area far more than would wooden windows.</li> </ol> <p>These are major benefits which cannot be understated, and can be achieved with carefully designed and approved uPVC or aluminium.</p> <p>I therefore support the proposed change to allow the use of uPVC or aluminium for replacement windows.</p>
71) 30/06/09 by email	Amanda Long	73 Evelyn Drive, Pinner, HA5 4RL Tel: +44 (0)20 8421 2516 Mob: +44 (0)7958 422 711 Manda Long <manda.long@btinternet.com>	PWPE	<p>I'm writing in response to Harrow Conservation Area review in consultation with the residents, specifically the section relating to replacing the cable sash windows. I am a resident of the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area and I have had experience of having to replace our windows. <b>I strongly object to the proposal that the restrictions on the replacement of any windows, whether wood or more modern materials remains.</b> I strongly feel that PVC windows, provided they meet a certain standard, are an acceptable, if not better option in some cases.</p> <p>As mentioned, we have had some of our windows replaced. It was a very expensive and unpleasant experience. We opted to replace two rear windows with the wooden, cable sash design, even though we didn't have to because they were rear facing. We did this because we could afford to. The cost for two windows was over £4,000. The company we employed made a complete hash of it and it took 18 months to sort the problems out, one of which was the cable sash kept breaking. When we looked at potential suppliers, we felt very restricted by the number of suppliers who could meet your specifications.</p> <p>In short I object to the rules on replacement windows remaining the same because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wooden sash windows are expensive. This is unfair to pensioners or people on a tight budget and may result in them choosing to leave their windows in a state of disrepair because they can't afford to adhere to your rules</li> <li>• PVC windows last longer and need less maintenance</li> <li>• The difference in how wooden vs PVC windows look is not big enough to justify the vast difference in cost</li> </ul>	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rules restrict the number of acceptable suppliers you can ask to quote. By allowing both wooden and PVC, you give people greater choice of supplier.</li> </ul> <p>The person who proposed this rule clearly doesn't live in area where it is enforced. I suggest they investigate costs before trying enforce such an expense on others.</p>
72) 30/06/09 by email	Nick Birkbeck □ Planning Liaison Officer	Environment Agency <b>North East Thames Area Office</b> □ Apollo Court, 2 Bishops Square Business Park, St Albans Road West, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL10 9EX  01707 632407 planning, hb" <hbplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk>		Guidance leaflet in archive	<p><b>Supplementary Planning Document – Pinner Conservation Areas</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on this document. Please find below our comments.</p> <p><b>In response to questions 1-9:</b>  Q1. We agree  Q2. More emphasis should be placed on the landscape value of watercourses which have been running through Pinner since before development took place. Parts of the watercourses may have been culverted in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and these should be restored to enhance the landscape and reduce conflict between, say, 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup> century development and a 1970s culverted watercourse. Where possible rivers should be connected to their historic floodplains. Other benefits of this include the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and reducing floodrisk. It Can also play a role in improving health and wellbeing of the local community. For example a river and wetland restoration project in Lewisham led to the use of Sutcliffe Park, for exercise, increase by over 70%.</p> <p>We are pleased to see in 7.4.2.1 that porous surfacing of front gardens is promoted as a means of reducing floodrisk.</p> <p>Q3. No comment.  Q4. No comment.  Q5. We agree.  Q6. No Comment.  Q7. See comments for Q2 on the enhancement of watercourses and associated land. We would like to see in the document, the promotion of water efficiency measures, which can be retro-fitted to existing properties with little or no impact on the physical appearance of development in the conservation areas.  Q8. No comment.  Q9. See general comments below.</p> <p><b>General comments:</b>  <b>Biodiversity</b>  The strategy for the Conservation Areas should look to create green spaces which are of benefit to wildlife as well as people. This may be achieved through altering management of existing green spaces.</p> <p>All open spaces should act as green corridors allowing for the movement of wildlife, and should make a positive contribution to the native habitats in the borough. Planting of new or replacement trees should aim to use native species where possible. Use of locally native species is essential in order to benefit local wildlife and to help maintain the region's natural balance of flora.</p> <p>The importance to biodiversity of open green spaces should be highlighted in the document.</p> <p>The River Pinn flows though or alongside several of the Conservation Areas providing important green corridors which add to the overall character of the areas. Where the River Pinn is culverted the Borough should seek their removal, in order to restore ecological and landscape value to the river.</p> <p>F&amp;B agree that the amount of open space must not be reduced as a result of other planning issues.</p> <p><b>Water Efficiency</b>  <b>Policy:</b> Full refurbishment and/or conversion of existing buildings to residential units shall be required to comply a high standard of water efficiency.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> Water use in existing residential buildings is having a significant influence on the existing water consumption rates. This policy is required to improve water efficiency and usage within these existing properties.  The local Planning Authority can play an important role by adopting robust planning policies to maximise the efficient use of water. Recent assessment undertaken by the Environment Agency suggest in a typical household, retrofitting simple measures (such as those in the case studies*) can result in savings of 14 per cent of average household water consumption.</p> <p>Adaptation measures for domestic buildings include a range of low-cost options that can be included as part of planned retrofit or refurbishment schemes. For example, the case studies suggest that switching to a low-flow shower head can save 22 litres of hot water per person per day reducing energy consumption by 280KWh per year and so typically saving £26 per person.</p> <p>The project report can be found at <a href="http://www.london.gov.uk/trccg/publications/">http://www.london.gov.uk/trccg/publications/</a>  An information sheet has also been attached. This provides a quick overview.</p>

					<p>The Thames Region (including the Borough of Harrow) has been identified as an area of 'serious water stress' under the Environment Agency's published document 'Water Resources in England and Wales - current state and future pressures'.</p> <p>If you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me. We will be able to provide more detailed guidance on the above comments.</p>
73) 30/06/09 by email	Frank Leonhardt	frank2@fjl.co.uk		Eastcote Village	<p>Please find my response to the proposals to changes to the Eastcote Village Conservation area. I was most disturbed to see that the matter had been brought up again just two years after the council had laid it to rest during a Harrow Local Development Framework Panel meeting in November 2006 under the chair of Councillor Marilyn Ashton.</p> <p>The other local residents are also somewhat concerned and we all seek an explanation as to how this could have come about. I would be happy to discuss this matter with you at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><b>Eastcote Village Conservation Area (Harrow area)</b> <b>Terms of reference</b> This document was created in response to the <i>Pinner Conservation Areas SPD (2009) - Appendix 13 (concerning East Eastcote Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management strategy)</i> by Frank Leonhardt, 2 Birchmead Avenue, PINNER for submission to the council on or before 30th June 2009; the date given as the end of the consultation period.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> It has been proposed in the document <i>Pinner Conservation Areas SPD (2009) Appendix 13</i> that changes are made to the nature of the small part of the Eastcote conservation area inherited by Harrow.</p> <p>The area in question was only placed in the original conservation area as an administrative convenience, in order harmonise the area's border with the Hillingdon Borough boundary. Since the boundary change in 1993, when three houses (six dwellings) were transferred from Hillingdon to Harrow the reason for keeping this section area inside a conservation area has disappeared.</p> <p>A appraisal exercise was carried out in 2006, and it appears that a change of staff has precipitated a repeat in 2009. The author of this new appraisal believes the area has a high quality of architecture. when in fact it contains the same 1930.s semi-detached houses found throughout the area and it is highly debatable that these are even good examples. Furthermore, the dwelling at number 4 Birchmead Avenue has, since 2002, been replaced with a large modern-style six-bedroom house . removing the existing trees and hedges in the process and throwing the look and feel of the remaining dwellings completely off-balance.</p> <p>Existing planning rules require that new developments are in keeping with the character of the area; wasting further time and tax-payers money on further bureaucracy surrounding remains of the Eastcote Conservation Area in Harrow should not be allowed. It would, however, be welcomed if the council took action on its existing responsibilities.</p> <p><b>Specific Concerns</b> <b>Pavements</b> The Council has not managed the existing area in sympathy with its surroundings, and this needs to be reversed. The 2006 report<sup>1</sup> and the current document (page 444, bottom) allude to the damaged pavement outside Number 2. This was caused by development of Number 4 (minor) and the removal of the ornamental cherry tree by the council under mysterious circumstances in 2003. Although a replacement tree was promised, none was forthcoming and the aperture in the pavement was crudely covered in tarmac in 2003 and again in 2009 when the granite kerb stone was replace by a modern concrete one. Further damage to kerbs and hedgerows has been caused by vehicles driving across them, especially since the road level was raised during resurfacing. This happens during .rush-hour. traffic as vehicles vie to turn into and out of Cuckoo Hill, and at other times notable culprits are Hillingdon and Harrow refuse carts reversing to turn around. It may <sup>1</sup> 2006 Strategy, Photographs Page 3 be appropriate to raise this with the police for action; certainly the council.s refuse collection department should be called upon to address it.</p> <p><b>Signage</b> In spite of objections at the time, repeated as part of the 2006 consultation, traditional road name signs have been removed following vandalism and replaced by relocated signs</p>

					<p>of a modern design.</p> <p>In addition, excessively large warning signs have been erected on the verge outside Number 2. High-level signage has since been installed outside Spindle Cottage in spite of complaints that it is out of keeping (in 2007). The 2006 appraisal raised the issue of signage, which has been repeated in 2009 . yet no action has been taken to prevent any further signs being erected (against contemporary objections) and none of the preexisting modern signs have been removed.</p> <p><b>Road Layout</b></p> <p>The road was widened again in 2003 during resurfacing, and this has lead to ever increasing traffic speeds, numerous collisions with the hedgerows, not to mention danger to life and limb . especially considering nature of the area and its use by children and adults for recreation.</p> <p>The high accident rate on this junction is a matter of record and the speed of vehicles has been logged by Hillingdon prior to the bridge works in 2002 (&gt;60mph on a single track road with blind bends and no pavement).</p> <p>In early 2009 a scheme was finally implemented to reduce the speed of vehicles turning into Cheney Street from Cuckoo Hill, which appears to have worked in addressing this specific part of the issue. However, the works were not carried out using traditional materials (concrete kerb stones and tarmac instead of granite kerb stones and flagstones. In spite of its aesthetic shortcomings, this project has had a positive impact on the area.</p> <p><b>Security</b></p> <p>Properties in this area have been subject to an increased number of burglaries, even since 2006. The police have advised stronger gates, better fences in .blind. areas, stronger (modern) windows and doors and the removal of hedges to counter the seclusion that criminals favour. In June 2009, yet another burglary was committed by forcing entry through a hedge which was not reinforced with an adequate fence for .aesthetic. reasons The security of the residents must be of the utmost priority, although this need not greatly affect the feel of the area. Concealing chain-link hedges within fences and fitting secure but sympathetic windows and doors are two options.</p> <p>Latterly the area (including the whole of Cheney Street, Birchmead Avenue and Cuckoo Hill) has suffered a great deal of vandalism and graffiti. The residents. CCTV system has been instrumental in leading to prosecutions of the perpetrators but the councils should be taking its responsibilities seriously in this matter. The Police Safer Neighbourhood.s team is highly critical of the layout of this area in preventing discouraging crime, which need to be addressed by proper consideration in planning, better maintenance by the council and the timely repair of street lighting.</p> <p><b>Fly Tipping</b></p> <p>Fly-tipping is a regular occurrence. CCTV cameras have been installed by residents to record incidents and details passed to the Uxbridge Police, but no prosecutions have resulted in the eight years since the scheme was enacted. Consideration should be given to making the area less attractive to fly-tipping. The area behind the houses (known as The Common) has vehicular access and is a favourite. This area is maintained by Hillingdon Recreation or Hillingdon Highways, depending very precisely where the refuse is tipped, and there are regular proposals to fit lockable posts to prevent access (otherwise required for the gang mower). This would help prevent teenagers driving around the grassy area and dumping stolen cars.</p> <p>Installing extra litter bins in order to counter fly-tipping (as suggested in the appraisal) exceeds the ridiculous. The debris found on the roads is place their by tip-trucks and persons emptying the contents of vans. Smaller items of general litter are thrown from car windows. With few exceptions, pedestrians (the likely users of bins) do not drop litter.</p> <p><b>Planning</b></p> <p>Planning restrictions for the area have worked well since 1928, although the leeway afforded to Number 4 has raised eyebrows locally. Any future developments should be in keeping with the area, and based on precedent. This was agreed upon at the Local Development Framework Panel on 30th November 2006 in the Civic Centre Committee Room 5 at 7:30pm (Chair Marilyn Ashton, present included all residents apart from 4 Birchmead Avenue). See <i>Appendix 1 . Extract from minutes</i></p> <p><b>Maintenance of Hedgerows</b></p> <p>Neither Hillingdon nor Harrow council is prepared to manage any of the greenery in this area, leaving it to local residents. In particular the discontinuation of mowing the area around the Cheney Street bridge, which used to be attractive grass. It is now a mixture of Himalayan Balsam, Japanese Knot Weed, Nettles and Bramble.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>There is also regular littering and vandalism taking place in this area; allowing litter to accumulate is well known to encourage more litter, and it is left to local residents to collect it on a regular basis. Provision of a public litter bin is unlikely to address this problem but arrangements for the collection of excessive litter picked by residents would be appreciated.</p> <p>A great deal of damage to the hedgerow has been caused by vehicles driving at high speed leaving the road and demolishing existing hedges. In spite of considerable evidence, the police have not prosecuted any of the drivers and Harrow Council has not sought damages through the driver.s insurance companies. Neither has Harrow Council done anything to repair the damage.</p> <p><b>Progress since 2006</b></p> <p>The following table summerises the management proposals, which are similar to those suggested in 2006 and many of which were adopted. It shows the council.s action in the left column (nothing, or retrograde with one exception).</p> <p><b>Pressures, Issues and Opportunity for Enhancement:</b></p> <p><b>Address Description Council.s Record</b></p> <p>Street paving Along Birchmead Avenue Consult with Highways concerning replacement Three years, no action. Replacement of original features 4 Birchmead venue Consider the introduction of an Article 4(2) Direction which would require planning permission for such works following a careful survey and justification. Nothing has been done about 4 Birchmead Avenue. Other residents of the area are keen to preserver the appearance anyway. Road signage Junction of Birchmead Avenue and Cheney Street Consult with the council's highways department concerning this issue. More signs have been added since 2006 . none removed. Traffic Cuckoo Hill and junction with Cheney Street Consult with the council's highways department concerning possible unobtrusive traffic calming measures This has already been addressed. Speeding</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>traffic on Cheney Street in the other direction remains a problem.</p> <p>Fly Tipping To the rear of 2-6 Birchmead Avenue</p> <p>Consider the introduction of additional public rubbish bins. Consult with residents about this issue</p> <p>This idea beggars belief. The promised access control bollards are still outstanding.</p> <p>Loss of street trees Birchmead Avenue</p> <p>Consult with the council's highways concerning this issue. Harrow Council actually FILLED IN the tree position in question in around May this year, making re-planting more difficult.</p> <p>Lack of maintenance for hedgerows and green spaces Cheney Street Consult with local residents concerning this issue. Highlight the importance of care of these features to maintain the high quality appearance and character of the conservation area</p> <p>This continues to be maintained by local residents due to the complete lack of action by the council.</p> <p>Outbuildings Throughout Careful consideration will be given to the creation of an Article 4(2) Direction. This would ensure planning permission was required for outbuildings so that any new outbuildings would preserve the character of the Planning requirements should be in line with the rest of the area.</p> <p>Solar photo-voltaic or solar thermal equipment and flues, forming part of a biomass heating system or as part of a combined heat and power system</p> <p>Throughout Careful consideration will be given to the creation of an Article 4(2) Direction. This would ensure</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>planning permission was required whenever solar photovoltaic or solar thermal equipment or flues, forming part of a biomass heating system or as part of a combined heat and power system were installed. This could help ensure such development was carefully sited and sized to ensure the character and appearance of the conservation area is preserved. Cars parked in the street are far more unsightly, and are a cause, rather than a preventer, of pollution. The council's priorities appear skewed. Porches Throughout Careful consideration will be given to the creation of an Article 4(2) Direction. This would ensure planning permission was required for porches. As already agreed by the relevant committee in 2006, normal planning rules should apply.</p> <p><b>Proposals</b></p> <p>Balancing the needs of residents and users of the area with the needs of Council's Conservation Department (and its associated costs) should be possible, especially if the <i>status quo</i> is maintained. Planning issues should be handled by Planning, as agreed by the Local Development Framework Panel in 2006. Given the development at Number 4 it would be ridiculous to alter the conditions on the remaining dwellings (one of which is semi-detached to Number 4) and Article 4 (2) directions would be totally unacceptable as they would cause severe financial hardship to residents (who did not ask to be part of a conservation area) and could not reverse the negative impact of the large number of uPVC windows that the report writer complains about, although local residents have raised no objections. Indeed everyone canvassed regards them as an improvement. No further time or money should be wasted on this matter. Consideration should be given to restoring the street furniture and hedgerows by the Council, where minimal cost is involved. Working with local residents rather than against them would be a good step forward (e.g. by refraining from spraying replanted hedges with systemic herbicide twice a year and instead helping to control the vegetation by gang-mowing at least once a year). This was agreed was all agreed in 2006 but no action has been taken; the person responsible (Tom Woodridge) has apparently left the Council's employ. Harrow's conservation department should seriously consider talking to Hillingdon and Harrow Highways before proposing any further changes. As a complete alternative, the area could be de-classified as a conservation area. Its current classification has not prevented an out-of-character development being made in its centre; nor has it lead to sympathetic treatment by the Council in terms of road layout, trees, signage etc. Given the amount of time and money clearly spent on producing the Appraisal and Consultation documents in 2006 and the latest SPD with yet another appraisal, it is clearly worth considering whether such outlay is justified at all. A variation on this would be to pass the administration over to Hillingdon, so it could be considered with the greater conservation area to which it logically belongs.</p> <p><b>Appendix 1 . Extract from minutes</b></p> <p>This appendix contains the minutes relating to Harrow Local Development Framework Panel meeting on Thursday 30 November 2006, 7.30 pm</p> <p>Present:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Councillor Marilyn Ashton (Chair)  Councillor Robert Benson (Member)  Councillor Manji Kara (Member)  Councillor Eileen Kinnear (Vice-Chairman)  Councillor Keith Ferry (Member)  Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar (Member)  Councillor Navin Shah (Member)  Councillor Paul Scott Guest In attendance</p> <p>The residents of the Eastcote Village Conservation Area (Harrow side) with the exception of a representative from number 4 Birchmead Avenue.  <b>RECOMMENDATION 2 - Eastcote Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy</b>  Minutes:  The Director of Planning Services introduced the report, which included final drafts of the Eastcote Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy, which had been revised following formal public consultation and a public meeting.  The Director of Planning Services explained that, following concerns raised by residents and other interested parties during the consultation, Members of the Panel were being asked to consider rescinding the Article 4(2) Direction that had been served on 20 September 2006. In response to questions from Members, officers advised that removal of the Article 4(2) Direction would mean that residents would not require planning permission to carry out minor alterations such as replacing windows, however, the Management Strategy encouraged the use of certain materials to preserve the character of the area.  During the discussion on the report, Members made a number of suggestions for minor changes to be made to the wording of the draft documents, and requested that officers circulate revised versions to Members of the Panel prior to forwarding them to the Portfolio Holder for decision.  <b>Resolved to RECOMMEND:</b> (to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise)  That (1) the revised drafts of the Eastcote Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report of the Director of Planning Services, and amended in accordance with comments made by the Panel, be formally adopted;  (2) the Article 4(2) Direction be rescinded;  (3) subject to the Portfolio Holder.s agreement to (2) above, the Director of Legal Services be authorised to carry out all necessary works in relation to (2) above as prescribed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, in that respect.  <b>[Reason for Recommendation:</b> The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 advises Local Planning Authorities to review their conservation areas and publish proposals for their preservation and enhancement and the appraisals and strategies within this report seek to fulfil that objective. In addition, Members agreed a programme of completing conservation area appraisals and management strategies and this report seeks to meet that programme as well as seeking to improve the Council.s performance against the new Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI219) which assesses the number of conservation areas with up to date appraisals. With regards the Article 4(2) Direction, the value and impact of the recently served Direction has been reassessed and it is now considered to be unwarranted].</p>
74) 30/06/09 by email	Claire Craig Planning Adviser (London Region) E-mail: Claire.Craig@english-heritage.org.uk	1 waterhouse Sq 138-142 Holborn London EC1N 2ST			<p>Thank you for your letter of 15 May 2009 consulting English Heritage on the Pinner Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the London Borough of Harrow's Local Development Framework. As the government's advisor on all matters relating to the historic environment and a statutory consultee in respect of the Strategic Environmental Assessment of plans, we are keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the Local Development Framework process.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>In general terms, English Heritage welcomes and supports the SPD, which demonstrates a good understanding of historic environment management and has sound objectives for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>In English Heritage's view, the SPD is very comprehensive and we particularly welcome the thorough coverage of the area's archaeology and the full coverage of the range of pressures on the Pinner Conservation Areas.</p>



					<p><b>Specific Consultation Questions</b></p> <p><b>Qu. 1</b> – Agree</p> <p><b>Qu. 2</b> – As stated above in the General Comments about the SPD, English Heritage welcomes the coverage of the major environmental issues that may impact on Pinner’s Conservation Areas.</p> <p>English Heritage would welcome consideration of our <i>Heritage at Risk</i> Register in the context of the discussion Redundant Buildings and Sites.</p> <p>In respect of the energy efficiency and climate change section set out on page 50, regard should also be had to the potential for district wide heating or cooling power schemes and the way in which these might support the conservation areas by providing a renewable energy source that would eliminate the concerns that micro-generation technologies can present. It should also be acknowledged that the infrastructure that such schemes may necessitate could present a further development challenge in the areas. Similarly, climate change adaptation infrastructure in the form of sustainable urban drainage systems or other forms of flood defence or waste management may also require additional infrastructure and this should be considered as well.</p> <p>Furthermore, it would be useful if, in the section on Bins on page 50, the Borough could outline its approach to bin storage within the streetscape with a view to developing guidance for this in the later section of the SPD.</p> <p><b>Qu. 3</b> – English Heritage wonders whether there are any tourism benefits or potential associated with the Pinner Conservation Areas that would benefit from being considered here.</p> <p><b>Qu. 4</b> – English Heritage would encourage the Borough to consider how to more fully integrate the third objective of promoting awareness, understanding and enjoyment of the Conservation Areas in this context. This could be achieved by considering what potential the areas have for education and social cohesion initiatives.</p> <p><b>Qu. 5</b> – English Heritage would encourage the Borough to reinforce the importance of undertaking basic energy efficiency works prior to opting for the installation of micro-generation equipment. Such works include appropriate loft and wall insulation and draught proofing. English Heritage has a range of guidance on the different considerations involved in the use of micro-generation technologies which can be accessed on our Historic Environment: Local Management (HELM) website by entering energy into the search engine in the English Heritage section of the Guidance Library at <a href="http://www.helm.org.uk">www.helm.org.uk</a></p> <p>English Heritage thanks the Borough for referencing the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service at page 60 of the SPD and for including consideration of maintaining/updating the areas’ Archaeological Priority Areas.</p> <p><b>Qu. 6</b> – English Heritage’s recent expansion of its <i>Heritage at Risk</i> Register to incorporate Conservation Areas at Risk should strongly support enforcement activity by the Borough. We also support and encourage the use of Article 4 Directions as proposed in this part of the SPD.</p> <p><b>Qu. 7</b> - English Heritage’s recent expansion of its <i>Heritage at Risk</i> Register to incorporate Conservation Areas at Risk should strongly support promotion and enhancement activities by the Borough by, among other things, helping to target grant funding appropriately.</p> <p>English Heritage notes that education and tourism are covered in this section but would still encourage some kind of links to these matters in respect of Questions 3 and 4 above.</p> <p><b>Qu. 8 &amp; 9</b> – English Heritage is of the view that aside from the points raised above, the SPD comprehensively covers the needs of Pinner’s Conservation Areas.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Finally, it must be noted that this advice is based on the information provided by you and for the avoidance of doubt does not affect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the plan which is the subject to consultation, and which may have adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>I trust that you will find this information of value to your process and please do not hesitate to contact me in the event that you require any further information or clarification of anything in this advice.</p>
75) 30/06/09 by email	Brian Seager	Brian Seager <a href="mailto:brianeseager@googlemail.com">brianeseager@googlemail.com</a> 28 Hallam Gdns		PWPE	<p>Dear Lorna Pearce</p> <p>I have sent the wording copied below to the Consultation website. However, I am sending a copy to you also because I do not know where the responsibilities lie. The Consultation site does ask for comments ON THE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, but nowhere that I can see does it ask for my views on the general subject.</p>

I hope, therefore, that you will be kind enough to read my submission so that you are aware that the views have been expressed, and answer any questions or comment on any points where, you know, the people on the other site will not deal with them.

Thank you,

Yours sincerely, Brian Seager

\*\*\*\*\*

My background.

The picture of my house is your picture 9.3. entitled "Garden Suburb Character". To illustrate that I do care for the appearance of the district I mention that I personally planted the laurel and hawthorn on the left of the picture, digging it up and dragging it to holes which I dug in what was then a field, with my Morris Minor 1000, when my garage was built. I also spent hours of work making specimens with oil paint and arguing with the makers in order to have matching colours for the prefabricated garage.

I am aged 75 (76 next month) and my wife is 73. She is sending a separate letter to you. We bought 28 Hallam Gardens in 1960, many years before the Conservation Area was introduced. We therefore did not bargain on restrictions, and I resent now that you are thinking of imposing - or continuing - in effect retrospective legislation on us.

I urge you to exclude from the provisions of the Conservation Area those people who lived here before the C.A. started on the grounds of natural justice which abhors retrospective legislation. People who moved in since the C.A. started opted into it and so are in a different position.

At the moment our windows are shabby. The reason for this is that about, say, five or ten years ago when painting started to be needed, I really thought that the Council would recognise the folly and injustice of the "timber-only" rule and yield to democratic pressure to allow permanent materials. I have been awaiting the change in vain while the paint peels.

If you do go ahead with these permanent enforcements of your personal tastes, I request that in the documents which announce that, you clarify the following questions as regards TIMBER WINDOWS which are my prime concern.

My wife and I have about £20,000 capital which has to last the rest of our lives. Our sole income is the state pension, giving us together under £11,000 per annum, which means we have to draw on capital for unusual items. At the moment we can pay to replace our windows with UPVC double glazing which will last indefinitely without painting. But we can pay only once.

The questions are these:

1. PAINTING When the timber windows need painting in five years when I am 80, are you going to do the painting for me or give me money for a painter, or do you expect me to go up ladders? Please reply also about when I am 85, 90, 95 and 100.

2. REPLACEMENT Modern timber, which is significantly lighter in weight and of shorter life than the original, will rot in 10 years. I can only afford, from our capital, to buy one set of windows. Since you

					<p>will have forced us to buy these transient windows, will you pay every ten years for replacements? Do you agree that this is only fair since if you will the end you should will the means?</p> <p>I request you to pass the following message on to Councillors. Your enforcement of rotting wood is disastrous to us and I shall find out which councillors voted for it and vote against them, regardless of party, for the rest of my life.</p> <p>If you want shabby houses, your idea of permitting only timber is going the right way about it. When the wood rots and the frames fall out, I shall clip sheets of vinyl to stop the wind and rain in place of the absent frames, and I hope many others will do the same as a political statement. If this is illegal and you take me to court, that will provide good publicity and I will ask the court what in practice I was expected to do when I have no money, and you the Council prevented me from getting smart durable windows when I did have the money.</p> <p><b>BROAD STRATEGY OF THE LDF</b></p> <p>I do have a sense of history, and I once qualified as a London Guide (but never practised for money) simply out of interest. But there is a difference between having monuments such as the Tower of London and St.Paul's Cathedral, and the 3-bedroomed dwellings of ordinary people. I did not buy my house to be a tourist attraction. I did not set out to be like the Amish in America self-consciously living in the past with people gawping and laughing at them. I bought this house primarily as a comfortable place to live. I want double glazing which will not require painting or replacing. I may want a satellite dish, and as we face south and satellites are geostatioary near the Equator, that means I want, if I wish, to have a dish on the front of my house, and I want others to have a similar right. If I wanted to put my car in the garage (a publicspirited thing to do) I would like, if I could afford it, electrically-operated rollerblind-type doors. The people diagonally opposite us have those and I am glad for them.</p> <p>Your strategy is based on A. uniformity - the houses being of the same style - and  B the history of the 1930s so that anything, even an electricity substation - which is, or appears, middleaged is desirable. You may call it "history" but our house was built four years after I was born. Those may be your tastes, but they are not mine.</p> <p>I grew up on a Council Estate, and I disliked then and dislike now the uniformity. All the houses had walls, roofs, chimney stacks etc in the same style. There were differences in individual houses -next door's front door was to the front with rustic wood around, and ours was to the side with a flat canopy above. When I came to Pinnerwood Park the general appearance was pleasant but was spoiled by the sameness, like a Council estate. To my taste, more variation would be an improvement. I do not understand your wish for regimentation.</p> <p>Similarly with things which look 1937-style including electricity substations. I think it detracts from appearance to have such middle-aged things without desirable associations. I particularly dislike your preference for grey ashphalt which I find very dull. I can understand anybody liking a horse-trough, ornamental carvings or Grims Dyke but I think you have no right to impose your whimsical personal taste on us. You are supposed to be the servants of us people, not our masters.</p> <p>You seem to be entirely superficial in your approach, considering only appearance. I think it may very well be that the LDF has been drawn up</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>by people on or above the National Average Income (and that is about four times our income) so they think that anyone can afford a new set of windows every ten years. I notice that you are so impractical that you refer to insulating our walls as though they are cavity though they are in fact solid.</p> <p>In similar vein, your "logic" (9.6.7. Item 1 Windows, and 9.7.1) about having thick curtains and other ways of stopping heat loss as a "reason" for not having double glazing is illogical. If thick curtains etc. are practicable, then they can be used AS WELL AS double glazing. Their existence is no reason at all for refraining from double glazing.</p> <p>Since the Conservation Area is being considered in such an extreme form, I would, if given the opportunity, vote against it - against continuing the Conservation Area at all. I hope that if you go ahead without reasonable liberalisation, a movement will arise, using voting to get councillors out and in, to get the C.A. abolished, and with it the salaries of the officials who want it retained so as to keep their salaries, and who want it expanded so as to increase their bureaucratic empire and therefore promotion. Why should we pay Council Tax for salaries of people who impose chains upon us?</p> <p><b>PRINCIPLE OF DEMOCRACY</b></p> <p>Under 9.6.7 first heading Windows you refer to "increasing pressure on the estate to make homes warmer". Under the second heading "Article 4 Direction" you state "There is mounting pressure from local residents to lessen the Article 4 Direction restrictions".</p> <p>PPCARA have, presumably, informed you of the resolution at the Annual General Meeting when all, without exception, of those attending and voting, voted in favour of the resolution that the Council should allow windows of durable material provided they are visually indistinguishable from the original. The people have spoken. How dare you consider acting against their wishes?</p> <p><b>PRINCIPLE OF CONSULTATION</b></p> <p>I do not consider that the document on the website is adequate to reflect consultation, for two reasons.</p> <p>First, the essence of consultation is to obtain the views of the consultees. But the only provision for that is in 4 questions asking, for example, whether you have fairly described the existing character of the estate. You give no explicit scope for detailed views to be expressed as I have above. Please inform me whether my views herein will be recorded, considered by decision-makers and published at least in summary. (Even if you say my said views will be considered etc., other people do think that you will not consider such views, and thus those people are omitted from your so-called consultation). Please inform me also (bearing in mind the Freedom of Information Act) whether the views I expressed at Hatch End library were recorded and transmitted similarly, as I did not see the young lady who chaired the meeting writing them down.</p> <p>Secondly, crucial lines concerning matters which greatly concern me (e.g. 9.7.1) were rendered extremely difficult to read as the lines of type were wider than the available page. If the beginning of the line was visible, the end of the line could only be read by moving the vertical bar on the right down many lines to reach the horizontal bar, moving the horizontal bar over, then moving the vertical bar back up again so as to see the end of the line. This took me one minute for each line and frankly I partially gave up. This procedure could have</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>been designed to impede would-be readers who are critical of what you were writing. It certainly impeded me and I cannot be sure that I took in what you wrote there.</p> <p>THE DETAIL OF THE LDF</p> <p>1. In Clause 9.39 I disagree with "All windows should be replaced in timber" for the reasons stated. My above remarks bear on 9.36 to 9.39: people should be free to have the windows they want. I do agree that exterior glazing bars look nicer than large sheets of glass visually unbroken. Glazing bars on top of a large sheet of glass look perfectly good. However, window suppliers charge hundreds of pounds just for sticking on the mitre-cut lengths of plastic, and if Harrow Council want glazing bars for the sake of those people of Harrow who pass by, then Harrow Council should pay for the glazing bars or permit the householder to dispense with them. I do not agree that plastic or aluminium glazing bars look inferior to wooden ones. Indeed, those people who only repaint wooden windows after they need it will have shabbier windows than people with windows of durable material which never deteriorates.</p> <p>2. Under 6.3.1. the 6th desideratum is "well maintained houses and gardens". I agree, so you should prefer permanent windows to wooden ones because they will be well maintained since they need no work to maintain them. As I have stated, my windows look shabby, and solely because they are made of wood.</p> <p>SPECIFIC ANSWERES TO THE 4 QUESTIONS SHOWN IMMEDIATELY BEFORE 9.5 "PUBLIC CONSULTATION QUESTIONS"</p> <p>QUESTION 1 I disagree. Objective facts are largely accurate, but I do not agree with many of the value judgments attached to them.</p> <p>QUESTION 2. The answer is as for Question 1.</p> <p>QUESTION 3. The answer is as for Question 1 but I disagree even more strongly with various value judgments.</p> <p>QUESTION 4. a. COMMENTS Yes, thank you for asking. My comments are as stated throughout this my message to you.</p> <p>i Uniformity. I prefer more diversity</p> <p>ii Windows. I think it is absolutely and self-evidently wrong to insist that underneath a top surface of window frames (with glazing bars) where no eye can see the material, that there must be wood which will rot in a few years. This brings trouble and expense to the owner, and in some cases the expense is more money than the owner possesses. You omit to state in your proposal what should happen in that event. Do you require a man of 85 who has lived in a house for more than 50 years, and who had been willing (in earlier years when he had the money) to have smart permanent windows, to sell and vacate the house because of your decision? Apart from the suffering you are inflicting on some owners, you are making the estate unnecessarily shabby when repainting is overdue. Such shabbiness would not occur with permanent materials.</p> <p>iii Satellite dishes. I think these should be unrestricted.</p> <p>iv Garage doors. I think the original Artizans designs are very boring and impracticable and I do not wish to preserve them at all. People should be allowed to have electrically operated ones of any design.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--


					<p>This, to my taste,would improve the estate by diversity, and would give me a nice feeling because I would know the owners were happy, not forced.</p> <p>v Paving I think crazy paving should be encouraged and ashfelt tolerated but not specified. (This applies when paving is indicated; I do not imply I wish to have lawns paved)</p> <p>vi Cars When there are so many cars in a household that they do not get parked in the drive, but there is a garage which is not used for a car, I think it is wrong for one or more cars to be parked in the road. In these circumstances the Council should formulate policy - too lengthy to set out here - regarding paving over front gardens and using garages for non-car purposes. I realise this would involve a Council inspector checking on the usage.</p> <p>vii Fencing. I have heard of a decision that a family who looked along their road and copied an original pattern was made to take it down and rebuild because it was not the pattern for THEIR part of the road. This is the sort of bureaucracy I object to ande I think the whole idea of preserving the estate exactly as it was in 1937 is unfortunate.</p> <p>b ASPECTS OF THE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY WITH WHICH I AGREE. Yes, I wish to have daylight and therefore a limit on building. I wish to have grass and bushes (but not trees which reduce light to windows) to soften and green the estate. I agree that where there is paving it should be permeable to allow water to soak away.</p>
76) 29/06/09 by email	Dr R. Boff, Honorary Secretary, The Pinner Association.	"Ruth Boff" <Ruth.Boff@theboffs.eclip se.co.uk>			<p><b>Draft Pinner Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document</b></p> <p><b><u>Response from The Pinner Association.</u></b></p> <p>The Pinner Association <u>agree</u> with the Policies proposed in the Draft Pinner Conservation Areas SPD, and have the following supplementary comments:</p> <p><u>General Comments:</u> It is praiseworthy that the individual Conservation Area Management Strategies are more detailed than before. It is, however, the new buyers of residences, and other buildings, within a Conservation Area who need these assessments. It should be beholden upon Estate Agents and Solicitors to inform their buyers / clients of the advantages and legalities of moving into a Conservation Area. Could this information be provided as a part of the local authority searches commissioned during the conveyancing procedure?</p> <p>Sufficient local authority resources must be provided for the monitoring and support of the Conservation Areas, particularly the three yearly photographic surveys and the referral of unauthorised developments to Planning Enforcement so that action is taken where appropriate.</p> <p>The Pinner Association strongly supports the proposal by Pinner Local History Society that parts of West End Lane, Pinner, be designated as a new, additional, Conservation Area.</p> <p><u>Comments on Specific Sections of the SPD:</u> <u>Section 7: Environmental Issues:</u> We agree with all the environmental issues raised in this section of the SPD, especially Ref. 7.3 – Pressure for Developments, and Ref. 7.4 – Pressure to Reduce Green or Open Space.</p> <p>Ref. 7.9.1 – Bins: The sensitive placement of litter bins in the public realm should be included in this paragraph.</p> <p><u>Section 10: Managing Pinner's Conservation Areas:</u> Ref. 10.3 - Maintaining Townscape and Built Character: We strongly support the views expressed in this sub-section of the SPD; retaining buildings and structures that positively contribute to the conservation area, maintaining important views, and the retention of single family dwellings.</p> <p>Ref.10.3.5 - Micro Generation Equipment: We support the submission by our Honorary Architect, John Orchard, that there is a problem of poorly sighted and visually obtrusive air-conditioning equipment. Whilst the studies cover micro-generation equipment and satellite dishes, air conditioning equipment has posed problems in Pinner High Street and the siting of such should be controlled in all Conservation Areas.</p> <p>10.4.1 - Protecting Trees: Many people have difficulty in evaluating the benefits of trees, shrubs and lawns within both our built and natural environment. We strongly support the preservation, and when necessary, replacement of trees within Conservation Areas, and would wish this protection to extend to</p>

					<p>boundary hedges and shrubbery, by use of the Article 4 Directives proposed in sub-section 10.8 (see below).</p> <p>Ref. 10.6 - Protecting Pinner's Streetscene: 10.6.1 Telecommunications Equipment, Other Tall Structures and Street Furniture: "Street clutter" is a cumulative detriment to many Conservation Areas, and we would support the policy to reduce the amount of street furniture and utility poles, etc. The local authority should review its own signage and other street furniture in Conservation Areas and remove anything not essential to public safety. We strongly support the policy to presume against proposals for telecommunications equipment and other tall structures which could detrimentally affect the character and appearance of Pinner's Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Ref. 10.8 -Article 4 Directions: We agree that Article 4 (2) Directions should be applied to all of Pinner's Conservation Areas, with Article 4 (1) Directions being used in particularly sensitive sites. Sufficient resources should be made available to take effective and timely enforcement action should such Article 4 Directions be disregarded.</p> <p><u>Appendix 2 and Appendix 3: Waxwell Lane and Waxwell Close Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy:</u> We strongly believe that the Little Common Conservation Area should be extended to the <u>whole</u> of Little Common. The cottages fronting the footpath connecting Elm Park Road and Waxwell Lane should also be considered. 2 – 60 (page 94): This group of houses would benefit from being included in the Conservation Area. The Christian Science Church and Police Station should be English Heritage listed.</p> <p><u>Appendix 4: Pinner High Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy:</u> Ref: Section 10.9.1 and 10.9.2: We are pleased that internally illuminated signage, does not have deemed consent within conservation areas (as they would in other locations) and as such require advertisement consent to be obtained from the local planning authority, and agree that many other forms of advertisement within conservation areas which can be installed without needing consent can have a detrimental impact, particularly within the shopping areas of Pinner High Street. We support the proposal to ask the Secretary of State to approve an Area of Special Advertising Control to restrict the types of advertising in Pinner High Street, subject to consultation. Ref.: 4.29 - Primary Shopping Frontage designation; and 4.20 – <i>“Also since the Second World War the High Street has changed from being a traditional shopping street to one primarily composed of cafes, bars, restaurants and specialist shops.”</i>. There is a currently a problem with the remaining retail premises on the High Street being converted to other uses, mainly café / restaurant, in at least one case without planning consent, which threatens to change the character of the High Street. A mix of uses should be retained and encouraged, if necessary by the effective enforcement of planning law. Ref.: 4.33 – <i>“A Shopfront Design Guide can be found in section 4.”</i> – Is this included in Section 4? If so it cannot be read via the on-line copy of the Draft Pinner Conservation Areas SPD, which does not have a “Section 4” listed in the table of contents.</p> <p><u>Appendix 5: Moss Lane Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy:</u> Moss Lane and Paines Lane: The descriptions of these areas are comprehensive, detailed, and vividly high-light its qualities. The appraisal has stressed that the harmonious linking of nature and buildings, grass verges, mature trees and shrubberies, still retain the charm of a medieval lane. It is important to retain Paines Lane and Moss lane as a whole (i.e. the whole length) as thoroughfares of quality – not just the Conservation Areas. For example – why are the buildings in <u>Paines Lane, of 1890's origin</u>, on the west side, <u>not</u> in the Conservation Area? Forest type trees at the ends of gardens between Moss Lane and Paines Lane must be safe-guarded and replanted <u>when</u> age overtakes them. In Moss Lane the amenity areas of East End Green should be safe-guarded from road planners. Should the Bloomsbury Court / Chiswick Court buildings be altered in any way the views through to Pinner Park should be safe-guarded. The Council-owned high-bank footpaths and shrubbery opposite Blackgates footpath and the ancient chestnuts and lime trees should be conserved, c.f. Policy 14. Moss Lane is used frequently by walkers and runners as a leisure facility; its winding rural nature must be safe-guarded from road planners.</p> <p><u>Appendix 6: East End Farm Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy:</u> The maps (historical) have been translated in this May/June 09 document. They were more legible and larger in the October/ November 08 document. Re.: Policy 18, page 226: It should be spelt out in stronger language how essential to the quality of this area are the surrounding spaces. The hillside is crucial as to how this area is regarded. No high buildings should impinge upon it. In section (c) to use the words “<u>normally</u> refuse applications” is too weak. The proximity of the cemetery, also historic, should guarantee this. It would be far-sighted to think of the surrounding land that is still virgin, to be considered as a possible extension of the cemetery. From a geographic and economical (burial plots are expensive) point of view, it would seem logical to ear-mark land for this future purpose. It is satisfying to record that, after years of negotiations, the officers concerned with East End Farm have negotiated its restoration. We strongly feel that there should be a specific archaeological designation for this area – Policy 19.</p> <p><u>Appendix 10: Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy:</u> Ref.: 10.4.2 - Management Proposals: Boundary treatments within this semi-rural environment should be sympathetic, and we agree that the trend toward the installation of high gates and metal railings detracts from the appearance of the Conservation Area. If security is an issue then wooden fencing with trellis along the top, clothed with greenery, or strong hedges of thorny or spiky shrubs, should be the preferred boundary treatment, especially along the street frontages.</p> <p><u>Appendix 11: Pinnerwood Farm Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy:</u> Picture 11.1 shows barns, but are they still there? There appears to be a new building on that site. Pinnerwood House (the farm house) deserves an upgrade from local to an English Heritage listing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>The footpath leading past the house and towards the fields should be improved and cleared of litter.</p> <p>29<sup>th</sup> June 2009.</p> <p>The Pinner Association. Registered Charity number 262349.</p> <p><a href="mailto:info@pinnerassociation.co.uk">info@pinnerassociation.co.uk</a></p>
77) 26/06/09 by email	Alan Flint			PWPE		<p>There is a letter in today's Daily Telegraph from Mr. G&gt; W Cooper of Corwen Clwyd it reads "... I was a Director of a company that fitted thousands of uPVC windows during the eighties and nineties. I agree that the eventual cracking and discoloration of the profiles is a problem.</p> <p>However it is the breakdown of handles, fittings, hinges, seals and the like that presents the biggest problem. These are often out of production and are irreplaceable soon after installation."</p> <p>These are points that I do not think have previously been considered. He ends his letter "In my view, properly treated soft wood, if maintained regularly, will last almost as long and, in addition to being environmentally sustainable, looks much better".</p>
78) 28/06/09 by letter	S Seager			PWPE		<p>I am writing to you as a very worried resident of Pinnerwood Park because of the present policy regarding replacement windows. I have lived in the same house for nearly 50 years and love the estate, so I am very much for keeping its attractive appearance. I walk along our roads a great deal and can honestly say I don't always know whether the windows are wooden or plastic, and the ones I do know are plastic almost nearly all do not jar. I think many years ago, some replacement windows were not good, but now some companies can produce an excellent result.</p> <p>Please would you reconsider the present policy. I enclose a petition and although some people were for wooden windows and obviously did not sign!, the vast majority were against them and wanted to have plastic, some saying that they wanted to choice of either. If companied could show to the Council their window frames, then those which are very close to the original wooden ones could have your approval to the enormous relief of many residents.</p> <p>Thank you for giving me the chance to express my opinion.</p> <p>P.S. For pensioners, such as myself and my husband, who have very low pensions and a small amount of savings, we just cannot afford wooden windows and keep them in good repair.</p> <p>Petition with 94 households represented.</p>
79) 27/06/09 by letter	Mr R.E.G Peach	3 Broadmead Cl Hatch End HA5 4PS		PWPE		<p>With regard to the draft supplementary planning document drawn up by the conservation officers with approval of the planning office. Within the document the issue of replacement windows was updated to allow better modern materials to be used.</p> <p>It appears that Harrow Planning Sub-Committee insisted that the draft be rewritten without any regard to wishes of the residents association who represent the residents of Pinnerwood Park, at the very least. There should be a referendum on the subject of replacement windows.</p> <p>I personally want to free to choose what I consider to be the best material for the job, i.e. UPVC or aluminium.</p> <p>These materials will be subject to sensible design guide lines laid down by professional people such as the planning office.</p>
80) 25/06/09 by letter	Mr and Mrs J Lowton	5 Bede Close Pinner HA5 4TP		PWPE		<p><u>Heat loss</u> Encouraging the properties to have cavity insulation to help with elements of condensation and heat loss would not be helpful as these houses do not have cavity walls. This is not a solution to this problem.</p> <p><u>Concerns about the wooden only policy on windows</u> The current windows energy performance is appalling and secondary double glazing is not recommended due to condensation, cleaning, ventilation etc. The heat loss from the current windows is colossal, drafty, and poor and this has inevitably an impact on the environment. The loss of heat is expensive especially with the raising coasts of energy and the security of the windows is also a problem. The glass is easily broken and the wood is very weak and not strong enough to with stand force.</p> <p>Repairing the windows provides very little help in reducing the previous problems. Patching the windows is a temporary and an unsatisfactory action. The windows cannot cope with the effects of the weather. This patching up is spoiling the look of the properties. We cannot expect these windows to last longer so a replacement window system is necessary. Replacing new wooden windows is very expensive so an alternative needs to be accepted so that the area continues to look nice because the properties are being maintained properly. The windows will continue to deteriorate over the years and just continue to look bad – which will spoil the conservation area. It would be helpful to all residents in the conservation areas if the council could agree on what materials (other than wooden casement windows) we could use. If this was monitored and a small range was available this would encourage people to improve the windows but likewise conform to the conservation rules.</p> <p>We do agree that we need rules to ensure the properties are kept looking good and keeping the area presentable etc...after all that is why we choose to live in the area. However it is impossible to expect people to live in the 1920's, materials, modern technology, climate change and cost of materials etc have got to be taken into consideration to ensure we maintain the conservation area looks but provide people with decent living conditions and safe housing. Before the conservation area was delacred people had made certain changes to the properties and these changes have not caused the area to look worse.</p>
81) 24/06/09 by letter	Mr and Mrs Black	21 Hallam Gdns Pinner HA5 4PT		PWPE		<p>In reference to the draft supplementary policy document, in our view the existing rules concerning timber windows should remain. This we know is a contrary view to that of the PPCA Residents Association.</p> <p>We replaced the original timber casement windows on this house with identical style timber windows, incorporating small sealed double glazed panes 19 and 20 years ago. These windows have been entirely satisfactory, and there has been no sign of them failing. With normal painting maintenance they</p>



						should last as long as the original ones.
82) 27/06/09	James Cox		105 Royal Lane Hillingdon UB8 3QT  Owner of: 45 Marsworth Ave		PWPE	<p>I am writing in support of the Supplementary Planning Document for the Pinnerwood park Estate.</p> <p>On the issue of windows, I am in favour of retaining wooden ones as I feel that plastic or metal do not replicate the originals. If, however, other materials do become accepted I would want strong controls on matching details. I do not want windows removed from Article 4 controls.</p> <p>I do feel that the council could offer more in the way of leadership and support on this matter. The case of a house in Latimer Gardens (?) in which the wrong windows have been fitted by the local authority and have yet to be replaced sets an awful example of both best practice and enforcement. This was, and still could be, an opportunity to show what can be achieved. Also, a better technical understanding of the problems so as to be able to offer practical advice would be a great help. It may also prevent some of the advice offered, which I appreciate is well meant, being either unconstructive (insulating walls is not cost effective) or sounding a little glib (suggesting tightening screws). Having the documents from SPAB and English Heritage available through the council would be encouraging.</p> <p>Photographic surveys every three years are an excellent idea and I feel that monitoring generally should be increased as a reliance on residents can be divisive.</p> <p>Improving the streetscene by re-introducing grass verges and replacing trees would be excellent.</p> <p>I generally felt that the whole document was clear in its intentions and covered all the relevant issues.</p>
83) 29/06/09 by letter	Terence Lynch	W	52 Moss Lane Pinner HA5 3AX		General	<p>I am very pleased to note that action is being taken to preserve the unique quality of Pinner.</p> <p>I was one of the residents in Moss Lane who appealed against the three planning applications by developers, which had they been successful, would have continued, in my view, the spoliation of such areas as Moss Lane – possibly the most impressive road in Pinner.</p> <p>I also attended the appeal hearing in the Civic Centre.</p> <p>In my view it is vital to preserve the uniqueness of areas such as Pinner in this country- Pinner – the Domesday Book; Tudor cottages; itinerant Bishop's moated house; Tithe barn; chalk mine; Priest's hiding holes – et al!</p> <p>The sentiments expressed in my letters to the local authority regarding the said development plans are repeated. Your efforts to conserve Pinner has the support of myself – and many others.</p>

84) 29/06/09 by email and post	Drivas Jonas for London Fire Brigade					 <p>Conservation, Place Shopping 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor North Wing PO Box 37 Civic 1, Station Road Harrow HA1 2XY</p> <p>Our ref NT/ADI/CM052193</p> <p><b>By email and post</b></p> <p>29 June 2009</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p><b>Representations to the London Borough of Harrow Draft Supplementary Planning Document, Pinner Conservation Area, June 2009</b></p> <p>We write on behalf of the London Fire Brigade to submit representations to the <i>London Borough of Harrow Draft Supplementary Planning Document, Pinner Conservation Area, June 2009 (SPD)</i>.</p> <p>London Fire Brigade (LFB) is run by the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA). The LFB has 111 land fire stations located across Greater London. Two of these are located within the London Borough of Harrow (Harrow) as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harrow: 500 Pinner Road, HA5 5RW</li> <li>2. Stanmore: 650 Honeypot Lane, HA7 1JS</li> </ol> <p>The LFB request that policies address the need to grasp opportunities offered by new developments in Harrow to designing out risks from fire, especially in residential accommodation. In particular, this would include giving consideration to installing hard wired smoke alarms and sprinkler systems where the risks justify it. Efforts to try and reduce crime such as arson through good design should also be promoted.</p> <p><b>Section 7 Environmental Issues: 7.1 Transport, Traffic and Parking</b></p> <p>The LFB wish to be included at the design stage of new and proposed developments to ensure that any alterations to the existing traffic flows in the area provide provision of traffic restrictions, which will still enable the fire brigade, and other emergency services, to respond effectively to emergencies.</p> <p>Access for emergency vehicles should also be considered for new proposals during and after the development to ensure that attendance time for emergency vehicles is not affected. If required, suitable alternative routes should be discussed with the emergency services to ensure that they are appropriate.</p> <p>The LFB believe that the capacity of the key emergency services to improve community safety and maintain a speed of emergency response in line with standards the LFB have set (see the London Safety Plan 2009/2012 at <a href="http://www.london-fire.gov.uk">www.london-fire.gov.uk</a>) is one issue which should take into account when negotiating Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>It is vital to assist the LFB in continuing to provide a fast, effective and resilient emergency response, which can be achieved through financial contributions towards improving and expanding current fire stations facilities and services.</p> <p>We request that we be kept informed of progress with this plus further LDF documents. In addition we wish to reserve our client's position to submit further representations on subsequent LDF consultations.</p> <p><small>London • Paris • Frankfurt • Madrid • Slough • Birmingham • Manchester • Leeds • Glasgow • Edinburgh Drivers Jonas LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales (with registered number OC336200) and is regulated by the RICS. A list of members' names is open to inspection at our registered office, 85 King William Street, London EC4N 7BL</small></p> <p><small>15101424/1</small></p>	
85) 03/07/09 by email (outside the consultation period)	Thamar Maclver	thamarmaciver@hotmail.co.uk		PWPE		<p>I am trying to respond to the consultation re the above area. As a resident I want to express my support for thorough-going enforcement of the conservation area, especially as regards timber-framed windows, as I feel very strongly that plastic ones, even the best, spoil the appearance of the area.</p> <p>Some months back I tried vainly to get a response from a local councillor (using the online system provided by the council) because of my concern to find officers were interpreting the rules to allow the painting, in any colour, of original oak doors. (There are now several newly painted doors in Woodhall Gate, for example.) I was told the only painting barred was the painting of previously unpainted brickwork, and that there was no restriction as to colour. This surprised me, as the guide sent out when the area was established dwelt on the importance to the look of the estate of the original oak doors and of avoiding changing the appearance of the area. Having re-read the various documents now I am confirmed in my view, as the documents refers to the painting of previously unpainted "surfaces". If the officers' interpretation were upheld, surely steps need to be taken to strengthen the rules? If people paint doors, window frames and garage doors every colour of the rainbow (spots? stripes?), and perhaps paint their whitewashed houses orange and purple the area will look very different.</p> <p>This consultation process is very challenging, especially as the web-page failed three times, once as I was submitting comments broadly as above (i.e. wasting prolonged typing). I don't really believe anyone will read this.</p>	

86) 30/06/09 by letter	Mr David Budd	3 Evelyn Drive Pinner HA5 4RL		PWPE		Petition with 91 household's signatures
87) 20/07/09 by email	Nicolas Gilbert	"Gilbert, Nicolas" <a href="mailto:Nicolas.Gilbert@veoliawater.co.uk">Nicolas.Gilbert@veoliawater.co.uk</a>  Planning Co-ordinator Veolia Water Central The Hub Tamblin Way Hatfield Herts AL10 9EZ				am responding to your consultation request for Supplementary Documents, dated 15 <sup>th</sup> May and 9 <sup>th</sup> July. I wished to inform you the Three Valleys Water do not wish to make any comments regarding these documents. May I also take the time to let you know that Three Valleys Water has changed its company name to Veolia Water Central. We have also changed our address so could I ask that Harrow council update their records as documents sent to the old address will shortly no longer reach us.