

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

No.	Date	Comments received <b>(All comments are verbatim as submitted by respondents with redactions where required)</b>	Officer Response	Action
1	25/07/2019	<p><b>Transport for London (HT numbers by stations below)</b></p> <p>The London Borough of Barnet Planning Service has sent me a consultation informing us that, as anticipated, they have nominated five LU stations for local listing as part of their periodic review of their Local List which includes nominations for scores of other currently unlisted historic buildings across the borough. These stations are:</p> <p>Golders Green (page 260) HT01267            High Barnet (p.324) HT01265            Edgware (p, 325) HT01184            Finchley Central (p.326) HT01264            Burnt Oak (p.377) HT01266</p> <p>Note – Colindale station is not nominated.</p> <p>These nominations would join on the Barnet Local List, Woodside Park, Mill Hill East, West Finchley and Totteridge &amp; Whetstone that have been locally listed for many years; and Brent Cross, East Finchley and Hendon Central which are all statutorily listed Grade II since 2011 or earlier.</p> <p>All of the nominated stations are identified in our own LU Station Heritage Register as having significant historic and architectural interest, all dating from the 1920s bar Finchley Central which is much older (mid-Victorian).</p> <p>We won planning approval with ease for our step free access scheme at the already-locally listed Mill Hill East recently (now under construction) and will be seeking planning approval for another SFA scheme at Burnt Oak shortly. I am also aware of adjacent-to-station proposed residential developments at High Barnet and Finchley Central (and beside the already locally listed Woodside Park), and maybe in future years at Golders Green.</p> <p>Local listing does not confer any additional planning authority consent requirements on property owners but is a material consideration as part of the planning permission / other approvals process where we would need to</p>	Comments noted and welcomed	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>demonstrate that our proposals would not harm the character, significance or setting of the locally designated heritage asset..</p> <p>I cannot see any heritage justification for objecting to any of these local listings, but if you have any comments, the consultation period has just opened and runs until September 9th.</p> <p><u>Additional email sent on 02/08/2019</u></p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on additions to your Local List which include five of our London Underground stations (Finchley Central, High Barnet, Golders Green, Edgware, and Burnt Oak) and the Dollis Brook Viaduct (all on our Northern line) which would join those that have been locally listed by LB Barnet for many years including Woodside Park, Totteridge &amp; Whetstone and Mill Hill East; and of course the three statutorily listed stations in your borough (Brent Cross, East Finchley and Hendon Central).</p> <p>.</p> <p>I have consulted various parts of our organisation including LU Station Upgrades (who have an SFA scheme at Burnt Oak as you may know), LU Infrastructure and LU Customer Experience, City Planning (Spatial Planning) and Commercial Development who have proposed schemes at 3 of the stations in question (Edgware, Finchley Central and High Barnet). I met with my Commercial Development colleagues earlier this week to discuss the mooted listings and any implications on their adjacent-to-station development plans (none of these affect the station structures themselves but propose development in the vicinity) . They are to make a representation separately.</p> <p>The LU and City Planning departments have responded to me indicating no objection, so on behalf of TfL (NB Commercial Development's comments to follow) I raise no objection to your proposals and note that all of the nominated stations are identified in our own LU Station Heritage Register as having significant historic and architectural interest, and being good examples of Victorian, Edwardian and 1920s architecture.</p>		
2	26/07/2019	<p><b>59 Oakleigh Park South. N20 9JL- HT01143</b></p> <p>I have two comments on the property description:</p>	Description to be amended to include reference to a	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>1)Technically we are 3 storeys with a basement not 2 storeys as stated.                  2)Secondly I think the property is Victorian not Edwardian according to the deeds it was build circa 1855 on what was originally a much larger plot with various parcels of land being sold off to build surrounding dwellings throughout the 20th century.</p>	<p>basement and that the property is Victorian.</p>	
3	26/07/2019	<p><b>20 Finchley Park- HT00979</b></p> <p>Good morning - In reply to your letter and having visited your web site, well done for including so many of the wonderful buildings in Finchley to be listed for inclusion in our Heritage List. It such a shame so many of these great houses have been altered with no consideration of their heritage..... can you retrospectively require some to revert to their original? For example, no 22 Finchley Park's addition of a bay window just spoils the look of the five cottages sweet little cottages. I am in no 20 and have restored the original windows &amp; front door. How come 13 &amp; 15 Finchley Park were permitted to install ugly ugly porches and windows totally out of keeping with 'heritage'? Whereas 17 &amp; 19 have retained the originals &amp; look wonderful. Surely Barnet can insist we retain these wonderful houses in their original state, especially the frontages. But well done nonetheless!</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed</p>	<p>No action</p>
4	26/07/2019	<p><b>Bedegars Lea - HT00400</b></p> <p>I am in receipt of your recent letter headed Local Heritage List Review.</p> <p>I cannot see why it should be added to the local Heritage List in that it was built at the same time as most of the properties in Kenwood Close, Winnington Road, Ingram Avenue &amp; a number of adjoining streets &amp; has no special features which cannot be found in many other properties.</p> <p>In the light of these comments I hope we have made clear to you that we would prefer not to be added to the list.</p>	<p>This house was added to the Local List in 1986 and is considered to have the required architectural interest to warrant inclusion.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>There have not been any significant alterations nor were any material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
5	26/07/2019	<p><b>5 Turners Wood London - HT00741</b></p> <p>I have just received a letter saying that my property may be included on a local heritage list. I do not wish my property to be included on such a list. I already feel that local covenants, the HGS conservation rules etc are an often unreasonable curtailment of my ability to make sensible changes to my</p>	<p>This house was added to the Local List in 1986 and is considered to have the required architectural interest to warrant inclusion.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>There have not been any significant alterations nor were any material</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		property for the sake of supposedly preserving fake country houses in London. That design feature seems to be a priority over environmental/energy performance requirements. I think nowadays energy performance should be key in all building considerations. I understand the area is unusual and worthy of protection as an area, particularly its completely residential and green nature but that protection already exists. Nothing further is required in my view.		considerations raised against the selection criteria.  Remain on list
6	26/07/2019	<b>No. 5 Creswick Walk - HT00121</b>  On checking the list there isn't an entry for the odd numbers of Creswick Walk. The only entry is for HT00122 which shows a picture of the only house that doesn't comply with the A4 Conservation Order on the road, the extension and carport having been added prior to the imposition of the A4 order.  It seems perverse that the road should be represented by this house, which has features that are expressly forbidden in protecting the architectural heritage of Hampstead Garden Suburb.	Numbers 1-27 (odd) Creswick Walk were added to the Local List in 1986 and are proposed to remain on the list. They were omitted in error but this will be corrected.  The photograph is to be changed to one that best reflects the architectural character of Creswick Walk.	Actioned
7	26/07/2019	<b>53 Lyonsdown Avenue - HT01106</b>  I have tried to find my street as directed on the letter you sent re the Local List consultation, but Lyonsdown Avenue not recognised. Please can you advise me how to proceed.	No 53 Lyonsdown Avenue is within a group of buildings numbered 49-59 (odd) and the entry can be found on page 225 of the document. Respondent will be contacted by email.	Actioned
8	26/07/2019	<b>On behalf of Lodge Lane N12 Residents Association</b>  Dear Sir, in the light of some of the residents receiving letters regarding the above Local Heritage Listing, I am writing to request that you keep the newly formed Lodge Lane N12 Residents Association on the mailing list of updates to this list, if that would be possible. We also believe that, as one of the oldest and narrowest in North Finchley, with many cottages built in the early 1880s for the Northern Line railway workers, on a narrow lane built for carriages, pulled by horses (and not for cars) our road should be considered for listing as a whole, to help preserve its character and prevent Permitted	The properties on the north side of Lodge Lane are of an earlier date (pre-1866) than those on the south, which justifies their inclusion on the Local List.	No action.

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		Development from converting existing offices into residential accommodation, or car parks into retail areas, without careful thought or consultation.		
9	26/07/2019	<p><b>1 Winnington Road- HT00848</b></p> <p>The original house was demolished and rebuilt in 1992.</p>	<p>Trust confirm that this property was rebuilt around 1992. It is part of a group of CH James houses from 1930, Nos 38-44 Lyttelton Road. When it was rebuilt it took a Winnington Road address.</p> <p>As such, it is under the 30-year rule and is recommended for removal from the local list.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>The property has been rebuilt.</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>
10	26/07/2019	<p><b>Gainsborough Court - HT01123</b></p> <p>I am in receipt of notification that this property is proposed for inclusion in the Local List for this area.</p> <p>I hope that helps.</p> <p>I am, incidentally, thoroughly delighted that we're being listed - I think this is a valuable and increasingly rare example of this distinctive style of building that is certainly worth preserving.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>No action</p>
11	26/07/2019	<p><b>9 Raeburn Close - HT00579</b></p> <p>I refer to your letter and to the website entry. The website entry is incorrect in stating that the property has timber-framed windows, whereas in fact they are steel. Otherwise I have no comment.</p>	<p>The Trust have confirmed that the windows are steel. The description will be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
12	26/07/2019	<p><b>No Address provided.</b></p> <p>Received letter through post today telling me about local list</p> <p>It pointed to a website address <a href="http://www.barnet.gov.uk/local-heritage-list">www.barnet.gov.uk/local-heritage-list</a> but that website errors when you go to it</p>	<p>Emailed respondent with correct link to website.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		Please respond to let me know correct address		
13	26/07/2019	<p><b>2 Avondale Avenue- HT00905</b></p> <p>We have checked the draft local listing. The photo referenced for nos. 2-10 Avondale Avenue is incorrect.</p> <p>We would like to know what planning restrictions will be imposed should our property be locally listed- I.e. householder prior notification, permitted development rights, article 4 and planning rights.</p>	Remove existing photograph and substitute correct photograph of this property. There are no additional consents required as a result of local listing although it is a material consideration when determining planning applications.	Actioned
14	26/07/2019	<p><b>Nos 17-25 and 25A Rosslyn Avenue - HT01168</b></p> <p>This collection of properties should not include number 25A, which was a new build in the 1990s and is not part of the older collection of houses not 17-25 which are described in the draft List.</p>	25a Rosslyn Avenue is a modern house which was included in error. It will be removed from the list.	Actioned  Remove the modern house from draft list and correct address
15	27/07/2019	<p><b>69 Mays Lane - HT01113</b></p> <p>I'm writing regarding the Local Heritage List consultation of July 2019</p> <p>My property is apparently being considered for inclusion in the heritage list as part of the current review. I believe there has been a mistake in listing the range of addresses under Reference HT01113. The listing entry states addresses from 17 to 177, however, the description body seems to refer to two separate blocks: 16 to 63 and 83 to 129. Indeed, numbers 65 to 81A consist of properties that were newly built in 2016 and are therefore unlikely to be of historic or architectural value. For reference, I'm attaching a photo. As you can see, it doesn't match neither the picture nor the description in the listing.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe that my property has been erroneously included in the Heritage List Review and I would ask for its removal.</p>	The listing entry will be corrected to show two separate entries, for 13-63 May Lane and 83-177 Mays Lane. It is acknowledged that those properties between 65 to 81 are modern houses. Respondent will be contacted.	Actioned  Remove the modern units from draft list and update the address list entry.
16	27/07/2019	<p><b>2-3 Morland Close- HT00479</b></p> <p>I have received your recent letter concerning the List Review.</p>	Trust have acknowledged that the two properties should be separated and provided a separate description for each	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>On receipt of the letter I found it strange that our property was shown on the letter as Site 2-3 Morland Close and I have therefore I checked on the listing.</p> <p>Nos. 2 and 3 Morland Close are two totally different houses that are not alike.</p> <p>I note that numbers 4 and 5 Morland Close are also listed together but numbers 1, 6 &amp; 7 are listed separately. (Morland Close has a total of seven houses.)</p> <p>Numbers 4 &amp; 5 were originally mirror images of each other, although currently various owners have made some changes. Therefore I can see why these two houses might have been listed together.</p> <p>Numbers 2 and 3 Morland Close are not alike. The description shown under this listing does not fit my property.</p> <p>I believe historically numbers 2 and 3 might have been owned by the same family, but they are uniquely different houses.</p> <p>Perhaps you can let me have an explanation for this listing in due course.</p>	<p>property. An additional entry will be included on the list to reflect this change and the respondent has been emailed.</p>	
17	27/07/2019	<p><b>7 Marriott Road- HT01112</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter received earlier this week. I have looked at the local-list and item HT01112 shows a photograph of my neighbours pair of late Victorian houses The part of the pair my husband and I own looks slightly different as there is no upper story casement window. Numbers 1 to 7 odd are listed as 'nominated'. Given the slight difference in the two pairs you may wish to make this two separate entries for accuracy sake. Houses 1-3 odd, being slightly different to houses 5-7 odd, or you may wish to keep the one entry but amend the text slightly, finally you may feel that without the additional third story window my house is no longer necessary for inclusion. Whichever I am not sure the detail /picture is an accurate reflection currently in your consultation document.</p> <p>Please let me know your thoughts on this matter.</p>	<p>Additional comment in the description to indicate that nos. 1 and 3 have brick built front facing dormers and nos. 5 and 7 do not. Email respondent.</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

18	28/07/2019	<p><b>Edward House - HT00286</b></p> <p>Received with thanks your letter, with regard to including Edward House on the new revised Local Heritage List.</p> <p>It has been an immense battle with Barnet Homes in fighting to keep the beautiful original features of Edward House. It is with great shame that the original leaded windows which matched the listed building of King Edward Hall next door were removed to the front &amp; back of the building and replaced with normal glass. The internal leaded windows lining the hallway to each room remain intact. Included in the interior is a beautiful curved wall feature in the hallway, original fireplaces in all the rooms and I have preserved the original boiler/hot water heating system (so I am told) in the kitchen.</p> <p>The interior of the communal stairwell is made of stone steps with its original cast iron balustrade with a wooden handrail. The upper half of the interior walls are still of its original wooden panelling, all in need of a good clean. I have written on numerous occasions over the years for the interior of the stairwell to be preserved, due to the changes in fire law regulations, and thwarted additions of unsightly signages which were to be nailed down to the stone steps. The interior wooden doors to all 6 flats with their original brass fittings remain in place, although Barnet Homes are intent on changing these to UPVC in a multitude of UPVC colour options! Again I have always written to oppose these changes in the hope that the original features of this lovely building would be preserved. There is a huge attic space which HAS NOT been converted into living accommodation.</p> <p>The original wooden front communal door with its beautiful stone carved 'Edward House' surround has also been in the forefront of change to a UPVC door. I have written on numerous occasions to have this door repaired and painted as it has been left untouched since I became a leaseholder.</p> <p>There is however, an unsightly yellow ramp directly outside the communal front door on the public footpath which has remained in place for the last 3 years despite my many emails and contact to Barnet Homes to have the few glass bricks underneath replaced. It has been reviewed by 3-4 surveyors over the years, but the repair to the public walkway remains in disrepair. This in my opinion does not add to the conservation look of the area.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed	No action
----	------------	---	-----------------------------	-----------

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		I hope in the future, Edward House will be preserved with its original features intact for generations to come.		
19	28/07/2019	<p><b>86 Wildwood Road- HT00818</b></p> <p>This is to inform you to correct your records. The architect for this house was John Soutar in 1921. Mssrs Fox and Guntrip designed the extension and the garage in c 1934.</p>	The Trust have confirmed that Soutar is the architect for this property. The text has been amended accordingly.	Actioned
20	28/07/2019	<p><b>1-27 Odd Creswick Walk- HT00121</b></p> <p>I received a letter about the Heritage List Review. Despite what the letter says, these houses don't appear to be on the list.</p>	These buildings should be on the list which will be corrected accordingly. Emailed respondent	Actioned
21	28/07/2019	<p><u>3 identical emails sent in by 3 co-owners</u></p> <p><b>7 Ingram Avenue- HT00373</b></p> <p>I am writing as a co-owner of the property. I am writing to request that the property 7 Ingram Avenue is removed from the list. The reason for this request is as follows. On 1st December 2006, Barnet Council approved planning consent under Reference C04111M/06 to undertake the following works:</p> <p>“Partial demolition in conjunction with planning application C04111L/06 for part single, part two-storey rear extension, single storey front extension to garage. New basement level with associated lightwells to side and rear. Alterations to windows (including dormer windows) and front porch. Raised ridge height and raising height of existing side addition. Addition of two side rooflights and rooflights to crown roof. Removal of existing rear dormer and replacement with two rear dormer windows and alterations to existing front dormer windows. (CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT).”</p> <p>In reality, this meant that with the exception of principally the front wall, the entire building (including the was demolished and re-built. The building works included the replacement of all the windows, as well as the entrance Porch</p>	Need to consider whether this building should be retained or removed from the local list. Respondent has been contacted to inform them we have received these emails.	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Noted the material considerations and evidence produced.</p> <p>Update the description to make clear it is only the front façade which is of merit and meets the selection criteria.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

	<p>and front door. So, with respect to your factual description of the property as detailed on the Local Heritage List, please note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Plain tile crown roof. The roof was built in 2007/2008 and all the tiles were new. So nothing related to the original 1932 building now remains.</li> <li>(ii) Sprocketed eaves. The roof was built in 2007/2008 and all the eaves were new. So nothing related to the original 1932 building now remains.</li> <li>(iii) Three flat roofed front dormers The roof was built in 2007/2008 and all the dormers were new. So nothing related to the original 1932 building now remains.</li> <li>(iv) Central pedimented doorcase. Again this was built in 2008/2008 so nothing related to the original 1932 building now remains.</li> <li>(v) Red brick quoins. Again this was built in 2008/2008 so nothing related to the original 1932 building now remains.</li> <li>(vi) Gauged red brick voussoirs to windows. The house was effectively demolished and re-built in 2007/2008 so nothing related to the original 1932 building now remains.</li> <li>(vii) Timber casements. The house was effectively demolished and re-built in 2007/2008 so nothing related to the original 1932 building now remains.</li> </ul> <p>The draft description incorporated into the Local Heritage List implies that the building is as built in 1932. This is inaccurate and misleading as the building was effectively demolished and re-built in 2007/2008 in accordance with the planning consent granted in late 2006. The building was built little over 10 years ago. A tiny proportion of the building today incorporates any of the original design and, as a result, I don't see the merit behind including 7 Ingram Avenue on a Local Heritage List. The property 7 Ingram Avenue is less than 30 years old and, therefore, according to the laid out Selection Criteria, should not have been considered eligible for inclusion on the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>In particular, please note the following:</p>		<p>the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
--	--	--	---

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

	<p>(i) I don't concur that a building built in 2007/2008 contributes significantly to Barnet's character and historic identity.</p> <p>(ii) In my opinion, I don't see how the Selection Panel who reviewed the nomination for 7 Ingram Avenue using approved criteria could have been aware that the property was effectively demolished and then re-built in 2006/2007.</p> <p>(iii) I am aware that for inclusion on the List, heritage assets must be of architectural or historic interest, or both.</p> <p>Architectural Interest – Given that the building as it exists today was built little over 10 years ago using materials, design, decoration and craftsmanship of that time, I don't see how 7 Ingram Avenue could be considered to be a well-executed example of a particular architectural style and contribute to local character.</p> <p>Historical Interest – I am not aware of 7 Ingram Avenue being a building which has a close historical association with locally important people, families or events. In addition, I don't see how 7 Ingram Avenue could be considered to be an asset which is representative of a particular phase of Barnet's history, including those with communal, spiritual, cultural or artistic importance.</p> <p>(iv) I reviewed the General Principles of Selection for inclusion on the Local Heritage List and make the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age and rarity: I understand that the older an asset is and the fewer surviving examples of its type, the more likely it is to have local interest. This property is little over 10 years old and therefore is not a high-quality example from the inter-war and post-war period. As a result, according to the set out selection criteria, it shouldn't have been selected. In particular, this building is less than 30 years old and, therefore, should not have been considered eligible for inclusion on the Local Heritage List.</li> <li>• Landmark qualities: The building on 7 Ingram Avenue sits close to the middle of a straight stretch of road. It isn't of any notable visual interest and</li> </ul>		
--	---	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>its position is not on a corner plot where it acts as a focal point in the street scene or on a site where it can be seen in longer views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intactness (state of originality): I understand that a “building’s architectural and historic interest may have been devalued via cumulative intervention and inappropriate repairs. The more intact and ‘complete’ a building is the greater likelihood it is to be considered for local listing.” The only part of the building that remains from 1932 is the front wall (excluding windows and porch entrance). As a result, the vast majority of the building has no direct bearing to the materials or craftsmanship used when the building was originally built.</li> <li>• Group value: The building at 7 Ingram Avenue isn’t part of a larger group of similarly designed buildings or structures, which together create a distinctive local environment</li> <li>• Social and communal value: I am not aware of 7 Ingram Avenue being a buildings which has associations with local social or economic activities, events, traditions, practices or wider history. It is not perceived as a source of local identity, distinctiveness, social interaction or coherence.</li> </ul> <p>Given the above, I’m writing to request that 7 Ingram Avenue is EXCLUDED from the Local Heritage List as the facts included on the draft List are factually incorrect/misleading and because the building doesn’t meet the Selection Criteria for the reasons detailed above.</p> <p>Please contact me should you have any comments or questions.</p>		
24	28/07/2019	<p><b>181 Falloden Way - HT00161</b></p> <p>I have received your letter from the plans for the Heritage list. Firstly I think it is wonderful that Barnet is doing this.</p> <p>My property is on Falloden Way and wanted to know a few things.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What does this mean for us ?</li> <li>2. What do we need to do?</li> <li>3. Will there be and plaques to mark the architectural interest?</li> <li>4 Any other information that as a resident might be useful.</li> </ol>	Comments noted and welcomed	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>5. Do you know who lived there over many years? (back in time?) and also any pictures of the street going back many decades ago.</p> <p>Thanks for your help And again, I think this is amazing.</p>		
25	29/07/2019	<p><b>General comment. No address provided</b></p> <p>I expect that plenty of people have already pointed out that Needham Terrace NW2 6QL is incorrectly classified on the document. The description is not relevant to Needham Terrace and refers to somewhere completely different. The correct description can be found under Campion Terrace or Johnstone Terrace NW2.</p> <p>Does this classification have planning implications?</p>	<p>List description is inaccurate and has been replaced with correct description. There are no additional requirements to apply for permission over and above planning permission. Emailed respondent</p>	Actioned
26	29/07/2019	<p><b>22 Wildwood Road – No HT number</b></p> <p>I have received a letter referring to 23 Wildwood Road NW11 6UL.</p> <p>Number 23 is about a quarter of a mile distant from my house</p> <p>Are you asking about my house or for my opinion about number 23? If the latter, I have no comment.</p> <p>My house is not on the list. If it is being suggested that my house should be added to the list, please send me the specific reasons and justification.</p>	<p>Number 22 is not on the list and remains so. No 23 is on the list and the owner should have been consulted separately. Respondent has been contacted.</p>	Actioned
27	29/07/2019	<p><b>19 a Crescent Parade- HT00204</b></p> <p>I welcome the inclusion of the above mentioned Parade, which includes my house and which has been Grade II listed for a considerable period. The Parade is situated adjacent to the tube station and so provides an important focus point as the 'gateway' to the high street.</p> <p>I note - however - that the beauty of the Parade is significantly diminished by blackening of the front projection and the irregularity of size, style and colour of the signage for the shops on the ground level. Does this listing affect</p>	<p>Nos 1-21 Crescent Parade are not Grade II listed but were placed on the Local List in 2011.</p>	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		signage or provide a budget for cleaning the buildings, which suffer from the high volume of passing cars and buses?		
28	29/07/2019	<p><b>60 Corringham Road - HT00118</b></p> <p>I write to you , as one of your Criteria is Intactness , that there have been at least 2 building permissions granted in respect of this property since 1912 when it was built , the latest one in 1983 and therefore does not qualify under Intactness.</p>	The building retains its original appearance when seen from the public realm and therefore appears to be intact.	No action
29	29/07/2019	<p><b>General comment. No address provided</b></p> <p>Great document – will take me some time to review.</p> <p>However, the index seems to be incorrect. Assume it will be corrected.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. Index will require correction for final version. Email respondent	Actioned
30	29/07/2019	<p><b>35 Lyonsdown Avenue - HT01104</b></p> <p>I recently received correspondence indicating the proposed inclusion of this property on the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>Can you please explain to me the basis on which the building has been proposed. What aspects of the building are of interest in the context of the list.</p>	This property will be reviewed by the review board prior to the final adoption of the Local Heritage List. Emailed respondent	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>However, we have reviewed the previous decision and does not have significant architectural or historic merit.</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>
31	29/07/2019	<p><b>General comment. No name or specific address provided</b></p> <p>Raydene Road</p>	These properties were built in 1967 and designed by the architect John Finlayson. Emailed respondent.	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		I would be interested to find out the name of the architect who designed these houses as according to the folklore of the houses they were the winner of an architectural competition .??		
32	29/07/2019	<p><b>60 The Bishops Avenue - HT00676</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter regarding Local Heritage List Review.</p> <p>I felt the need to express my amazement that you are putting the effort in to the Local Heritage List Review but have let the houses literally rot on The Bishops Avenue, and take no pride or care with the state of the pavements and shrubberies etc.</p> <p>This is not the first time I've had to write about this.</p> <p>If you don't know what I'm talking about I'd be happy to walk you down The Bishops Avenue, which is a national disgrace.</p>	Comments noted.	No action
33	29/07/2019	<p><b>General comment</b></p> <p>A previous Chair of my Association has told me she had received the letter about the local list review, not just in a personal capacity but also as Chair - which she retired from some 9 years ago.</p> <p>My concern is her (Association) contact details must be on a Barnet Council or other database, which is probably used for various purposes. I'd therefore be grateful if you could ask the appropriate person to change the contact details on that database to:</p> <p>Chair, Hampstead Garden Suburb Residents Association</p>	Comments noted.	No action
34	29/07/2019	<p><b>17 Bigwood Road - HT00036</b></p> <p>I am in receipt of your letter regarding the suggested local listing inclusion of my house at the above address.</p> <p>The house is not intact in its original form. Over time it has been extended on 3 separate occasions to provide the inclusion of the garage, an extension the reception room and a further extension to the rear of the extended garage.</p>	The building has been on the local list since 2010 and although it has been extended it is still considered to meet the criteria and therefore warrant inclusion on the list.	No action  Limited material considerations raised against the selection criteria.

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Furthermore there have been a number of skylights and dormer windows added over time.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that that this property should not be included into the local listings and request that it is withdrawn from this list.</p>		<p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Retains the historic intactness.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
35	29/07/2019	<p><b>368 Long Lane - HT01260</b></p> <p>I have received a letter from yourselves regarding 368 Long Lane, N2 8JX.</p> <p>I just wanted to find out if this will have any effect on the buying / selling of this property?</p> <p>Please let me know</p> <p>Many thanks in advance for your help</p>	<p>Comments noted. There are no additional requirements to apply for permission over and above planning permission. Emailed respondent.</p>	Actioned
36	29/07/2019	<p><b>26 Addison Way - HT00003</b></p> <p>I would like responses to the following queries</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is it proposed that all of the houses in Addison Way are to be Listed?</li> <li>2. Why are you now proposing this?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All of the properties on Addison Way are already included on the local list and the majority have been since 1986, including no.26</li> </ol>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>3. Is this proposed to be a full listing and is it under the auspices of English Heritage?</p> <p>4. I understand and appreciate that if a property is listed it can have an impact on any future planning applications so please can you explain if this proposed listing is to be external only.</p> <p>5. Will future planning applications also be referred to English Heritage.</p> <p>6. What is the involvement with HGST?</p> <p>7. If agreed, when will the listings take place?</p> <p>I look forward to receiving responses to the above queries.</p>	<p>2. This is a borough wide review of the local list, the first time this has happened since 1986.</p> <p>3. These buildings are locally listed and not statutorily listed and therefore fall outside the remit of Historic England.</p> <p>4. Only external building works require planning permission and not internal works.</p> <p>5. Works to locally listed buildings will not be referred to Historic England.</p> <p>6. HGST were consulted on and contributed to this review.</p> <p>7. It is anticipated that approval of the reviewed local list will take place later this year.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

37	29/07/2019	<p><b>Garden wall to Sellar's Hall - HT0042</b></p> <p>I would like to express my support for 'Garden wall to Sellar's Hall - HT0042' remaining on the list.</p> <p>As a recent occupant of Lovers Walk, the wall was one of the things that attracted me to the area.</p>	Comments noted and appreciated.	No action
38	30/07/2019	<p><b>15 Brookland Hill - HT00057</b></p> <p>Please would you kindly alter your records for our address. Thanking you for your help in this matter.</p>	Comments noted.	No action
39	30/07/2019	<p><b>18 The Bishops Avenue - HT00665</b></p> <p>See attached regarding 18 The Bishops Avenue.</p> <p>Our house is a modern house. I cannot see that there can be any reason for it to be “listed”. Please confirm it is not intended to be.</p>	16a is not intended to be added to the list. Apologies that a consultation letter has been forwarded to you incorrectly. Respondent has been contacted.	<p>Actioned</p> <p>This is a clerical error.</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

40	31/07/2019	<p><b>128 Friern Park - HT01009</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter. Letter is also attached</p> <p>The property in question is of no historical value or any architectural interest so I am interested in why we have received this letter? Please could you come back to me as to why we have received this. The contact email address is PaulVH@martyngerrard.co.uk who is Head of Property Management.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you soon</p>	<p>The building is considered to have architectural significance and is referred to in Dr. Pauline Ashbridge's book "The old Freehold Houses of Friern"</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>There was not supporting evidence or no material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>This has significant historical significance.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
41	31/07/2019	<p><b>Moat Estate – Property not nominated during consultation process.</b></p> <p>I have just reviewed the List and note that there is no mention of the erstwhile Moat Estate. Please regard this note as a stated intention for the application to arrive with your Department within the next week as I have only just completed the background research for the application which I think you will agree is very strong.</p> <p>You may also be aware of the Prime Minister's recent commitment to developing brownfield sites which the Moat Estate never was: on the contrary it was always pleasure gardens when opened to the public before the Estate was developed and before that was part of the Manor Estate Nursery and Tennis Courts. It is in short not in the same category as Finchley Central Station car park which is currently under consideration for development.</p> <p>RENEWED URBAN TREE PROTECTION POLICY</p> <p>You will also wish to be aware of the recent renewal under the new Prime Minister in the past week of Mrs May's urban tree protection policy drive. I have written to the Greenfield site owner giving him notice that any initiative</p>	<p>Comments noted, however the closing date to receive nominations has already passed. It is not clear where the Moat Estate is. Emailed respondent.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>The nomination process has closed. However, these were looked at against the selection criteria and they do not meet the criteria.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		on his part to cut down historic Moat Estate trees on his property should be sent out to public consultation as any trees are now covered by the Urban Tree Protection policy and will be open to challenge either from the general public or from yourselves.		
42	31/07/2019	<p><b>29 Erskine Hill - HT00147</b></p> <p>Delighted to receive your letter. Support you totally in adding my house together with my Erskine Hill neighbours on your Local Heritage List Review. It is my opinion that the artisan quarter of white painted houses with brick faced houses at junctions and open spaces of the North of the Suburb is quite unique and should be fully protected. I love it.</p>	Comments noted and gratefully received.	No action
43	31/07/2019	<p><b>94 Winnington Road - HT0086</b></p> <p>In principal I object to the Council's proposals.</p> <p>The properties that will be affected by your proposals fall within the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust and consequently are governed by the Management Order issued by the High Court.</p> <p>It seems to me that the Council's proposals are a duplication of the powers enjoyed by the Trust and as such duplicates unnecessarily the bureaucracy governing the planning requirements affecting the properties.</p> <p>The Council's proposals will add an unnecessary layer of burdens and obligations to Home Owners to no good purpose.</p> <p>The Council seem unconcerned with the substantial re-developments of properties in Winnington Road which have been undertaken over a number years. Why, may I ask are you singling out 3 or 4 properties for special treatment?</p>	Comments noted. The respondent has been contacted by phone and informed that the building was already on the list (added in 2010) and is considered to have architectural significance.	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
44	31/07/2019	<p><b>44 Lyttelton Road - HT00432</b></p>	Comments noted. The issues raised relate to Structural problems with the property and trees.	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Further to receiving your letter regarding the review of your heritage list. I write with the following observations. We have recently noticed that the front wall of the property is showing some signs of movement.</p> <p>I write to you immediately on receipt of your letter as although I appreciate your desire for preserving some of the more interesting properties in this area ( as do I ) we may well need to make some changes to the front of this property. I believe that no 40 has already made some large changes to the original front area design without any issue and I may well need to do something similar shortly in order for the house to remain stable for the future.</p>		
45	31/07/2019	<p><b>General Comment. Property not nominated during consultation process.</b></p> <p>I would like to suggest St Mary's Church Hall, Church Hill Road, East. Barnet for consideration It is in sound condition and is also of notable historical interest I tried to summon local support for this earlier this year but met with apathy Please consider this sympathetically Thank you</p>	<p>The closing date for nominations has passed. An application for 'Demolition of the existing Church Hall and the erection of a detached 3-bedroom Curate's house and 3no town houses. New boundary wall at the front' is pending a decision and it is thought that Planning Permission for the replacement of this building is likely to be granted and a new church hall built adjoining St Mary's Church.</p>	No action
46	01/08/2019	<p><b>Nos 15-27 (odd) Hadley Highstone - HT01036</b></p> <p>We recently received the letter relating to the above site and reference with regards to our property being added to the local heritage list.</p> <p>We wanted to understand what the implications were to us for being added to this list further than what was written in the letter if possible.          What does it actually involve for each individual owner like ourselves?          Would it effect the cost of any potential home improvements or home insurance at all?          Are there any other costs involved in our property being added to this list?</p>	<p>Comments noted. There are no additional consents required as a result of local listing although it is a material consideration when determining planning applications.          It should not affect the cost of home improvements or home insurance. Respondent contacted.</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		If you could please let us know ASAP that would be much appreciated.		
47	01/08/2019	<p><b>Letter (abridged) received raising 2 issues</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The inaccurate description for 128 Friern Park - HT01009</li> <li>2. The lack of an entry for New Southgate Cemetery - HT01125</li> </ol> <p>A follow up letter regarding the accuracy of the entry for the Hendon Methodist Church was also received on the 6<sup>th</sup> August 2019.</p>	<p>The description for 128 Friern Park will be amended and the missing entry for New Southgate cemetery will be re-inserted. Contacted by phone.</p> <p>The address and description will be amended in accordance with the proposed text.</p>	Actioned
48	02/08/2019	<p><b>General comment. No address provided.</b></p> <p>Hi could you please out line what the criteria is to become a property of special interest as there are several in Hadley High stone that are not noted yet are of significant historic interest.</p>	<p>Details of the selection criteria can be found in the letter that was sent to owner/occupiers. Emailed respondent</p>	Actioned
49	02/08/2019	<p><b>1 Constable Close - HT00106</b></p> <p>I am in receipt of your advice about the Heritage list which you have compiled and would ask you what are the implications for my property</p>	<p>Comments noted. There are no additional consents required as a result of local listing although it is a material consideration when determining planning applications. Respondent contacted</p>	Actioned
50	02/08/2019	<p><b>1 Finchley Villas - HT00178</b></p> <p>I notice in the recently published local listing my property is no longer listed. IF possible, could we be included in the next listing – our rather unique house is something we are rather proud of.</p>	<p>Emailed response: The property remains on the list and the revised edition will reflect this.</p>	Actioned
51	02/08/2019	<p><b>6-8 Loring Road - HT01101</b></p> <p>I am somewhat surprised No's 6 and 8 are being considered for listing for the reasons below</p>	<p>The building is little altered when seen from the public realm and is considered to meet the selection criteria.</p>	<p>No Action</p> <p>There have not been any significant alterations nor were any material</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. 6 has a loft extension, roof replaced with concrete tiles along with skylights</li> <li>No. 8's roof has been replaced with concrete tiles, all windows to rear and side replaced with UPVC, complete ground floor rear extension, concrete tiled UPVC windows and doors, property converted in to 2 flats in the 1960's and I would not like No. 8 to be considered for listing.</li> </ul>		<p>considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The building remains of architectural merit.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
52	05/08/2019	<p><b>11 Woodside Grove - HT01258</b></p> <p>What a good I initiative to try to keep a hold on assets of interest in the borough I would mention that our house is actually built in1908 --- not the 30s ! Best wishes</p>	Comments noted. The description will be revised accordingly.	Actioned
53	06/08/2019	<p><b>1-38 Needham Terrace - HT00498</b></p> <p>The information about this item on the Local List is incorrect. Needham Terrace is part of an estate of 5 rows of terraced houses built by Midland Railway Co. in the 19th century for its employees. Cecil George Butler was not involved, and none of the architectural features in the description actually</p>	List description of Needham Terrace is inaccurate and needs to be replaced with correct description. Photo for Midland Terrace to be changed.	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>apply. The description is of a different building altogether. The photograph for this listing is of one of the other terraces (Midland Terrace) in the estate; all the terraces are similar. Most of the original architectural features are retained, they just are not the ones you describe. The listing for Midland Terrace has a photograph of a building elsewhere, which is not part of the Railway Terraces. Someone needs to come and look again</p>		
54	06/08/2019	<p><b>16 Games Road – HT00200</b></p> <p>Please can you make the following amendment to REF HT00200. Having received your letter, I have noticed that you have listed the door numbers incorrectly. There are indeed 5 cottages, but the numbers are listed as 10 - 18 in your register. This is incorrect.</p> <p>The cottages are</p> <p>10 Games Road 12 Games Road 14 Games Road 16 Games Road 16a Games Road.</p> <p>10 - 16a</p> <p>Please can you update this</p> <p>Once actioned, please can a copy of page 116 be sent to me for my records</p>	<p>Comments noted, Corrections to street numbering will be made accordingly. Emailed respondent</p>	Actioned
55	06/08/2019	<p><b>Golders Hill Health Centre. Property not nominated during consultation process.</b></p> <p>I was sorry to see my Medical centre wasn't included in your list of Local Heritage sites</p> <p>We are part of a small group of buildings which reflect early 20th century life in the Golders Hill Area</p> <p>Our immediate neighbour is King Alfred School (also missing) but you do include Ivy House (Anna Pavlova's home)</p> <p>I didn't see the Bull and Bush pub listed either</p>	<p>Comments noted. 151 North End Road is an existing entry on the list and has been since 1986. Emailed respondent</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Hillside, 151 North End Road NW11 7HT was the Manor House on the site of what became the Manor House Hospital  The Industrial Orthopaedic Society raised funds to treat war wounded in 1919 and many Londoners continued to be treated at the Hospital until it closed in 1999. People from a range of industries paid a weekly subscription to be treated here before the NHS existed  And the members included Ford workers from Dagenham, Print workers from Fleet street and the Garment trade.  (Octagon developers then built the Manor Heights housing complex).Our house was the Medical Superintendent's home, later part nursing accommodation  And finally administrative offices for the Society running the Hospital.</p> <p>I do hope we can be included in the list</p>		
56	06/08/2019	<p><b>The old builder's yard at the rear of 40 Bohun Grove. Property not nominated during consultation process.</b></p> <p>I know this breaks the rules in terms of a building being intact, but would you consider the old builder's yard at the rear of 40 Bohun Grove?</p> <p>It was built by one of the builders who built the roads when the land was first developed for housing in the 1920s.</p> <p>The builder bought the corner plot (now known as 40 Bohun Grove) because it was a bigger plot and had room for a brick store for his building materials, so it's an original feature of the roads and a lovely - although dilapidated - example of a 1920s brick outhouse.</p>	<p>The nomination period has now closed and no further entries are being considered.  Emailed respondent</p>	Actioned
57	06/08/2019	<p><b>Sharpe Family Monument in St Marys Churchyard Church Hill Road – HT00095</b></p> <p>I have received your request for comment on the addition of the Sharpe monument to the local heritage list.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The closing date for entries has now passed. Email forwarded to CSG in respect of maintenance of the closed churchyard. Emailed respondent</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>I am rather surprised other monuments in the churchyard are not also on the list, especially the graveboards to the east of the church and the Clarke memorial. The Sharpe monument is distinctive, certainly. It is also in poor and crumbling condition. Indeed, I would be grateful to receive more assistance from the council in our care for the churchyard - which as you may know is closed, and therefore is the maintenance responsibility of the council.</p>		
58	07/08/2019	<p><b>9 Spaniards Close – HT00636</b></p> <p>&gt; I have received a letter regarding the Heritage List. &gt; &gt; I can not see the importance of my house being in the List , with planning I have changed the structure of the house and have more works that have been approved to carry out. &gt; The house is not an interest of any architectural significance nor it is in any unique position , I There for invite you to look at the house and take it out the consideration for this list. &gt; We have planned works to be carried out at this house that will &gt; further change its aesthetic merits, for this and above given reasons &gt; since house is already under the the Hampstead Garden Suburb ! 9 &gt; Spaniards Close does not or should not fit in to the Heritage status, &gt; I There for strongly object to my house being listed &gt; &gt; I await to hear from you before I take further advice on this matter. &gt;</p>	<p>This house was placed on the list in 2010 and is considered to meet the adopted criteria and as such will remain on the Local Heritage List. Emailed respondent</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>The property meets the selection criteria. It remains intact.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
59	07/08/2019	<p><b>5 The Drive – HT01209</b></p> <p>I have been advised that my property is being considered for inclusion on a Local Heritage list. Unfortunately, the details are incorrect and do not relate to this address and I do not believe that my property should be included. Before my property is incorrectly included on the draft list, I would to speak to you to obtain further information as I would like to avoid the costs of employing a professional representative.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The property was considered to meet the selection criteria by the review board and the respondent was contacted regarding their concerns.</p> <p>A Freedom Of Information request was submitted by this respondent to which the</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Noted the material considerations raised. The alterations are to the side and rear elevations and removal of the chimney collectively</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Further email received 09/08/2019:</p> <p>Thank you for your e.mail. As I explained, I have tried to speak to the relevant people in your department and others on numerous occasions. I am now preparing a formal response in respect of my particular property</p> <p>In the meantime, I have general enquiries and concerns that any Barnet resident may have regarding the consultation procedure and I should be grateful if you would provide contact details of the individual I should speak to in order to address these concerns.</p>	<p>council have responded. This correspondence is detailed in entry 100.</p>	<p>impact of the value of the property to meet the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>
60	08/08/2019	<p><b>78 Finchley Park – HT00981</b></p> <p>Further to your letter I would like to enquire if our property is currently listed or proposed to be added to the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>If currently listed we had no prior knowledge of this.</p> <p>If proposed we would like to put forward an objection, on the grounds that we are concerned this could affect any applications for planning permission or permitted development and in turn our ability to sell the house in the future if we so wish.</p> <p>I would also be interested to know if somebody has nominated our property in this regard?</p>	<p>78 Finchley Park has been nominated for inclusion on the Local Heritage List. There are no additional burdens placed by Local listing. It has been considered to comply with the criteria by the selection panel and is described more fully on page 98 of the draft document. Emailed respondent.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
61	08/08/2019	<p><b>13 Winterstoke Gardens – HT00872</b></p> <p>My neighbours recently received a letter informing them about a review of the Local List. We didn't. Is there a reason for that? Are we already locally listed? Will we be impacted by this review?</p>	<p>13 Winterstoke Gardens has been on the Local List since 1986 and it is considered to meet with the adopted criteria. Consequently, it is proposed to remain on the Local Heritage List. Emailed respondent.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
62	08/08/2019	<p><b>Friern Barnet Library - HT00196</b></p> <p>I have checked the Library's entry on the list which is fine except for the following sentence:</p>	<p>Comments noted. The description will be amended in accordance with the suggested wording. Emailed respondent</p>	<p>Actioned</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>'1934 by Middlesex County Council the Library contains a lending section, a reference section, reading room and librarian's room'.</p> <p>Could this be re-written? 'Built in' or something similar seems to be missing from the beginning of the sentence, also the description appears to describe the library as it was when built, not as it appears now.</p> <p>Could I suggest 'Built in 1934 by Middlesex County Council, the library contained a lending section, a reference section, reading room and librarian's room. There is a now one large common space which includes a children's area and computer area, and separate kitchen and bathroom facilities.'</p> <p>Nice to see that we make the list!</p>		
63	09/08/2019	<p><b>Highwood Hill Cottage – HT00344</b></p> <p>We have received your letter regarding Highwood Hill Cottage. We are surprised that the Cottage was scheduled in 1986 as we have no record of this. Highwood Ash is,as we know,Listed.</p> <p>As far as the cottage is concerned we cannot understand how this could be described as of Historical or Architectural significance. Please explain the criteria that you have accepted to reach this conclusion.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Highwood Hill Cottage has been on the List since 1986 and is considered to meet with the adopted criteria, as set out on page 186 of the draft document. Emailed respondent</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The rational is included in the listing description.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
64	09/08/2019	<p><b>31 - 33 Wood Street - HT00875</b></p> <p>I refer to your recent letter (undated), where you refer to Nos. 31 - 33 Wood Street EN5 4BE (Barnet Museum). Please amend your records as Barnet Museum is 31 Wood Street and not 33 Wood Street, and the buildings are not connected physically.</p> <p>As a representative of the owners of 33 Wood Street we would not want our building listed, and indeed to not believe that it satisfies your criteria for such a listing as it is only 40 or so years old, has no particular aesthetic merits or</p>	<p>Comments noted and the planning history for this building will need to be verified before a decision can be taken on making amendments to the list. Emailed respondent.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>The description must be updated to make clear the section on new-build that there has been a sensitive re-build.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		landmark qualities or indeed social and communal value - the building is offices.		Documenting correctly the history of the building.  Remain on list
65	09/08/2019	<p><b>2 Raeburn Close - HT00575</b></p> <p>We are objecting to the proposal to list our house at Historical Interest Local List on the ground of the house being renovated and fundamentally changed from its original built and have no special features that merit listing. In addition, we strongly feel that there is no need to give it unnecessary attention that might draw unwanted individuals and put the owners and occupiers at physical risks and mental anxiety.</p> <p>We would like to ask that you please remove the house from the Local List.</p>	This house, along with others in this road have been on the local list since 2010. It is considered to meet the adopted criteria for local listing and is recommended to remain on the Local Heritage List.	<p>No action</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The rational is included in the listing description.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
66	09/08/2019	<p><b>40 Wildwood Road – HT00806</b></p> <p>I am in receipt of your letter relating to the local heritage list review. I would say that I am not pleased with your proposals as houses that have any type of restriction become less valuable to prospective buyers. Listed houses etc frighten buyers away as they know the extra hurdles they need to go through in any form of renovation process. If you wish to make such changes, they should not be retrospective</p>	This building has been on the local list since 1986. It is considered to meet the approved criteria and is recommended to remain on the local heritage list	<p>No action</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
67	09/08/2019	<p><b>59-129 Chalet Estate – HT99999</b></p> <p>Many thanks for your letter regarding the above mentioned List, please find letter attached for reference.</p> <p>Just to let you know that we do not currently own Chalet Estate, therefore please could you kindly remove us from your records.</p>	Comments noted	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		Many thanks in advance and enjoy a great weekend.		
68	09/08/2019	<p><b>No indication is provided of the property being referred to.</b></p> <p>Our house is currently listed on the Local Heritage List. We are perfectly happy for it to continue to be listed. We view the listing, however, with some scepticism as it did not prevent the other half of our property from being extended in a style that bears absolutely no relation to the original architecture.</p> <p>The listing has to have more teeth: residents have to accept the constraints of living in a conservation area. Yes, there are privileges, (green, semi-rural, peaceful environment close to central London) but there are also limitations (early 20th century accommodation). If people cannot accept them there is always the option of living somewhere else.</p>	Comments noted. No indication is provided of the property being referred to.	No action
69	09/08/2019	<p><b>Floral Cottage, Holcombe Hill - HT00358</b></p> <p>Letter received</p> <p>I am writing to you regarding the current heritage listing of this property as there are major errors stated within the listing as follows</p> <p><b>Description</b> The property is described as a two-storey pair of attached cottages. This is wrong, it is a single dwelling. Following building regulations and planning approval in the late 1970's the building was converted into a single dwelling with additional single and two storey extensions. The council rates for the original cottages were cancelled and the new dwelling re-rated in 1980 as a single property. Your statement should be changed to read "Two storey detached single cottage" to reflect the current building.</p> <p><b>Age and intactness</b> The conversion in 1979/80 required the whole building to be gutted both inside and out together with both new single and two storey extensions. The inside layout was completely changed with new walls and room layouts. For</p>	Comments noted. Text will be amended and your comments will be taken into consideration. The property was placed on the original Local List in 1986.	<p>Action</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria.</p> <p>Loss of intactness.</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>the outside the whole of the white weatherboarding was replaced, all the doors and windows replaced together with new additional windows added. All the external brickwork and the rendered blockwork was constructed. The original single ridge roof was replaced with different slates and even the chimney stack was removed and rebuilt.</p> <p>Today only about 2-3% of the current structure predated 1980, almost the whole of the structure was built in 1979/80. Therefore 97% is a maximum of 39 years old.</p> <p>I make this statement from personal knowledge.</p> <p>I enclose a copy of before and after photos, you can clearly see that your statement of Age and Intactness is grossly wrong. Please correct your statement.</p> <p><b>Inclusion in the list</b> After reading your criteria for including a building in the Local Heritage List, how can a new building constructed only 39 years ago have a heritage value. It does not even represent the original building therefore should it not be removed from the list?</p>		
70	10/08/2019	<p><b>9-27 (odd) Willifield Way - HT00826</b></p> <p>I write in reference to the above and wish to query reference HT00826.</p> <p>They are referred to as Geoffry Lucas. I understood that they were under the guidance of Raymond Unwin.</p> <p>Please advise, in particular with reference to original plot numbers 263 &amp; 261.</p>	The name of the architect has been confirmed with the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust.	No action
71	11/08/2019	<p><b>No indication is provided of the property being referred to.</b></p> <p>Our house is currently listed on the Local Heritage List. We are perfectly happy for it to continue to be listed. We view the listing, however, with some scepticism as it other similarly-listed buildings in the vicinity from being</p>	Comments noted. No indication is provided of the property being referred to.	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>extended in a style that bears absolutely no relation to the original architecture.</p> <p>The listing has to have more teeth: residents have to accept the constraints of living in a conservation area. Yes, there are privileges, (green, semi-rural, peaceful environment close to central London) but there are also limitations (early 20th century accommodation). If people cannot accept them there is always the option of living somewhere else.</p>		
72	11/08/2019	<p><b>Numbers 1-49 (odd) Claverley Grove – HT00104</b></p> <p>Can you please confirm the benefit of this consultation and why it only includes even numbers ? ?</p> <p>Also if you walk along Claverley Grove you will see a number of house owners have already destroyed a number of the original features of the houses in this street particularly the replacement of the original sash windows – what happens in this scenario ?</p>	<p>Comments noted. Numbers 1-49 (odd) are on page 60 of the consultation document. They are existing entries and have been on the list since 1986. Emailed respondent.</p>	Actioned
73	12/08/2019	<p><b>25 Rosslyn Avenue - HT01168</b></p> <p>I'm delighted my lovely house is being considered for the Local Heritage List, however would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>25a should not be included as it is a modern house built just 25 years ago. The comment about the garages is inaccurate as when the houses were built they did not have garages - I'm not sure how many cars were on the road in 1907! What my house did have was a low level area in the basement in which a carriage or pony trap could be kept. All the four houses have been added to.</p>	<p>25a Rosslyn Avenue is a modern house which was included in error. It will be removed from the list. The description will be amended.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>
74	12/08/2019	<p><b>1-35 (odd) Hogarth Hill - HT 00354</b></p> <p>Following receipt of your above named letter, I write to express my following concerns regarding contesting my property being included to the list.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The property has been on the list since 1986 and remains suitable for inclusion. Emailed respondent</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>* We are already protected by the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust - if the trust is involved, please advise who our representative is, so that I can liaise with them if they are acting on our behalf in some way.</p> <p>* I would like more information as to why Barnet Council deems it of Council interest in order for there to be on the local heritage review as there is none stated on the letter received as well as the online link stated.</p> <p>On receipt of this information, I will be able to make a more informed comment / response to the letter sent by yourself.</p>		<p>The rational is included in the listing description.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
75	12/08/2019	<p><b>28 Holden Road – HT01086</b></p> <p>The details on my house are correct but you may wish to add the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Noticeable for high ceilings on ground floor at 3.2 metres with ornate cornices and plaster work.</li> <li>2) Six original fireplaces, some with original tiles and brass or metal work.</li> <li>3) Distinctive wooden fretwork in rear ground-floor room and in upper hallway</li> <li>4) Original stained glass windows on staircase and bathroom on first floor</li> <li>5) Original oval fanlight above front door with the house name "Lavendon" in etched glass</li> <li>6) Original front door</li> <li>7) Outstanding exterior brickwork with very fine lime mortar.</li> <li>8) Most of the original chimney stacks</li> <li>9) It is believed that this house and nos 26, 24 and 22 were built in c1908 by a master builder who, on completion, lived himself in no 28.</li> </ol>	Comments noted.	No Action
76	12/08/2019	<p><b>53 Christchurch Avenue – HT00938</b></p> <p>I have received your recent letter re the above. I have checked the list attached and see that CHRISTCHURCH AVENUE is mentioned, but only numbers 16-26.</p> <p>I am confused as to why this number is included. I would appreciate your response in due course. Thank you.</p>	Comments noted. Number 53 has been nominated to be included on the Local Heritage List and will be corrected in future editions.	Actioned
77	12/08/2019	<p><b>St John's Church Mowbray Road – HT01118</b></p>	Comments noted. The hall is not proposed to be included on	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>I refer to the letter received on 29th July 2019 with regard to the Local Heritage Review and the possible inclusion of St John's United Reformed Church Mowbray Road New Barnet EN5 1RH on the Local Heritage List. Please clarify the extent of the buildings on the site which would be included in the Local Heritage List ie would the listing include the 1928 brick built hall (accessed by means of stairs down from the main Church) with pitched/tiled roof and no particular architectural merit or only the main Church building constructed in 1969/1970 and which received a Civic Trust Award in 1970? With regard to the suggested description shown on the website I have spoken to the original Architect and I attach a note with possible alternative wording for the description for consideration by the review panel.</p>	<p>the Local Heritage List. Description will be revised accordingly.</p>	
78	12/08/2019	<p><b>No address supplied.</b></p> <p>Queen Victoria's statue in Friary Park, Friern Barnet Lane deserves inclusion I think.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This is a Grade II listed statue and will not be added to the Local List.</p>	Actioned
79	12/08/2019	<p><b>96 Falloden Way – HT00169</b></p> <p>We have received a letter informing that our property is in review for being removed from the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>I am not clear what the real impact of being in this list is and I was wondering if you could provide some more information about this.</p> <p>Does leaving the Local Heritage List mean we would no longer apply to Hampstead Garden Trust for permission to alter to our property (in addition to the planing permission from Barnet), and instead we would need to follow the planning guide provided by the borough of Barnet and only apply for planing permission from Barnet?</p> <p>Currently I can see our property listed in the "Local Heritage List - July 2019 (pdf 23 Mb)" file with status of "Existing". Does this mean our property is proposed to stay within the Heritage List? Or is our property still proposed for removal from the list?</p> <p>I would appreciate your help with clarifying above and look forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>Respondent contacted: The property has been on the list since 1986 and is not being considered for removal from the Local Heritage List. Alterations to the exterior of the property would still require permission from both the HGS Trust and the Planning Authority.</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

80	14/08/2019	<p><b>8 Ingram Avenue – HT00393</b></p> <p>Re Local Heritage List Review letter received ref HT00393</p> <p>I would like to query our property's inclusion 'Schedule of Buildings of Local Architecture or Historic interest' (known as The Local List):</p> <p>We are aware of the requirement for the protection of the front facade of our property but would query the property's general status changing to the rest of the building having the same protection applied to it.</p> <p>Having recently embarked on an extensive refurbishment and demolition of all of the property excluding only the front facade (due to its place on 'The Local List'), we feel that our property should remain listed only for its front facade.</p> <p>It makes no sense to extend this because the entirety of the rest of the current building is newly built and therefore could not take on a 'listed' status.</p> <p>Please could you confirm that the current local protection of the front facade of 8 Ingram Avenue will remain and will not extend to the protection of the rest of the house, given the circumstances?</p>	<p>Need to consider whether this building should be retained or removed from the local list. Respondent has been contacted to inform them we have received these emails.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Noted the material considerations and evidence produced.</p> <p>Update the description to make clear it is only the front façade which is of merit and meets the selection criteria.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
81	30/07/2019	<p><b>38 and 40 Claremont Park – No HT number</b></p> <p>Thank you for this update it was very interesting reading through the list, I must have walked past many of these places and not noticed them! I hope the LBB accept them all. Just one point I nominated the buildings in the attached photo, see below, but couldn't see them on the list, I think they are nearly in their original condition the best 1930s buildings I have seen for a while.</p>	<p>Properties were nominated but not reviewed by the panel. Taken forward to last review board.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>This is suitable nomination made by the volunteers. An error in the nomination process resulted in this</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Many thanks, please keep me on the list if there are any further updates on the project.</p>		<p>failing to be taken to a review board.</p> <p>The Review Board acknowledged the significant merits of the nomination and it will be considered at the review of the Local List in the future.</p>
82	30/07/2019	<p><b>West Hendon Baptist Church Wilberforce Road – HT01235</b></p> <p>An impressive list and achievement.</p> <p>Just a note to say that HT01235 appears to have the wrong description attached to it.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The description will be amended accordingly. Email respondent.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
83	13/08/2019	<p><b>Comment from volunteer</b></p> <p>I have viewed the list now on LBB website and am surprised at the omission of 'Green View', Hadley Green Road, (Great North Road), Barnet. This has been for sale for some time now, is empty and has very interesting and brick/slate built outbuildings seen from the road and from Hadley Green. The house is at least Georgian with possibly later (early Victorian?) bays added, the front have full length glass windows. I don't believe any changes have taken place after at least the 1920s.</p> <p>Please let me know the reason as I spent some time photographing this particular house as part of my volunteered area. I subsequently had to cease my involvement due to pneumonia.</p> <p>PS: It would help with finding properties on the list if they were divided into areas, eg: High Barnet, East Barnet, New Barnet, Hadley, etc.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed. If the respondent could confirm the precise location of this property, it would be helpful. I have asked Urban Vision to contact the respondent.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>There has been a planning consent that allows the removal of the front garden to be used for a parking area.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

84	13/08/2019	<p><b>5 Raydean Road – HT01159</b> Letter received</p> <p>Thank you for your information regarding the name of the architect who designed the above-mentioned houses.</p> <p>I looked on the internet as suggested. The houses are listed as being built in 1935. No architect is mentioned. The Odeon cinema I also listed as having been built in 1935. The architect was Edgar Simmonds.</p> <p>I also ploughed through the documents relating to the purchase of my house in 1978. They tally with the date. In fact, no. 5 was first leased on September 29<sup>th</sup> 1937 for the sum of £4.10S per annum.</p> <p>I have been told that: “Raydean Road was named after Mr Ray and Mr Dean and is the only road of that name in England “(sic)</p> <p>You are welcome to peruse any documents and drawings I have relating to these houses.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Reference to the architect Jon Finlayson will be removed from the text.</p>	No action
85	14/08/2019	<p><b>59 Lyonsdown Avenue – HT01106</b></p> <p>I have received a letter stating that you are proposing to add our property to the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>I have looked at the website however, can not find any details of what the implications are to me as the owner, of being on the list, and would be grateful if you would clarify this. For example, what type of works will I need to gain approval from the council for etc.</p> <p>What are the advantages of being on this list and what are the differences of being on the list or not being on it?</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your reply as a matter of urgency.</p> <p><u>A follow up email was received on 04/09/2019</u></p>	<p>Comments noted. There are no additional expenses or requirements to apply for additional permission over and above normal planning permission requirements.</p> <p>As the property is not within a conservation area, your permitted development rights are not affected by the inclusion of your property on the local heritage list.</p> <p>Respondent was contacted by phone.</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Thank you for your response, however, I would be grateful if you could let me know what exactly the implications are of being on the list.</p> <p>You say that there are no requirements above those of normal planning permission, does this mean that if on the local heritage list, I would still be able to, for example, do roof repairs (with slates of my choice) or fit new windows (with a style of my choice) etc, without informing the council. Please could you confirm that this would be the case.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you as a matter of urgency.</p> <p><u>An additional email was sent 08/09/2019</u></p> <p>I would like to submit my comments in relation to the proposal to add my property to the local Heritage List.</p> <p>Although I have already communicated with your department several times, I am still uncertain of the full implications of being on the list. I understand that the property is not in a conservation area and there are no expenses or requirements above those of normal planning permission.</p> <p>However, should being on the list restrict or affect my rights in any way outside of or differently to the current requirements of not being on the list, in terms of general alterations, renovations or developments I may wish to make to my property in the future, then I would oppose my property being added to the local heritage list.</p> <p>i would also appreciate clarity on this.</p>		
86	14/08/2019	<p><b>91 Hampstead Way - HT00245</b></p> <p>LOCAL HERITAGE LIST REVIEW 2019</p> <p>This in my response to your letter.</p> <p>As for the above property much of the description on your cite , is incorrect. I do not recognize some very significant parts of your description of my house ,in you" "Local Heritage list Review -information regarding this property".</p>	<p>Comments noted. This property was added to the Local list in 2010 and is considered to meet the selection criteria.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations or evidence raised against the selection criteria.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>(and from what i understand the house in question has not changed since the last owner bought bought 40/45 years ago. and my bee even before that, . and there for it is not what you discribe on your site as resons for listing this house.!!</p> <p>Because of the above i am asking you ; to omit 91 hampstead way nw11 7lg from being listed as " , And Dee list this property from your heritage list proposition.</p> <p>As it dues not comply with the criteria you sate or is needed to merit the listing .</p>		<p>The rational is included in the listing description.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
87	16/08/2019	<p><b>29 Raydean Road - HT01159</b></p> <p>I am responding to your letter regarding becoming added to the local list. I am concerned that if this is the case it will incur :</p> <p>1)additional expenses to my home insurance. 2)Restrict planning permission for future improvement or extension of the house.</p> <p>Please note that several houses at the beginning of the road are already in a poor state of repair and neglected. If the local list is imposed I fear it would have a negative affect on the sale of the properties, since desired improvements will be restricted.</p> <p>Therefore for the above reasons I am opposing the proposition of becoming a listed building.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There are no additional expenses or requirements to apply for additional permission over and above normal planning permission requirements.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations or evidence raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The rational is included in the listing description.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
88	19/08/2019	<p><b>73 Mays Lane - HT01113</b></p> <p>I refer to your recent letter regarding the above.</p> <p>Please would you exclude my property from the properties on Mays Lane which are proposed to be included on the Local List.</p> <p>73 Mays Lane is a recent new-build which is of neither architectural or historic interest, and does not meet the various principles of selection.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is accepted that the description was inaccurate and the entry will be amended to remove the new build properties which had been included.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>On viewing the relevant list entry for Mays Lane, it is clear that the terraced cottages which sit beyond the row of new builds are the subject of the proposed entry, and so my property has been included in the entry description in error.</p> <p>Please write back with confirmation of exclusion of 73 Mays Lane from the proposed entry on the Local List and confirm amendment of the property description in the proposed entry.</p>		
89	19/08/2019	<p><b>236 / 242 West Hendon Broadway - HT01234</b></p> <p>I am writing to you in response to your undated letter proposing to add properties 236-242 West Hendon Broadway, NW9 6AG (which includes the property 238a West Hendon Broadway, NW9 6AG) to the Local Heritage List for Barnet Council. I have examined the proposal and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposal to add these properties to the list. The inclusion of the buildings does not achieve the selection principles stated in the draft Local Heritage List (found here: <a href="https://www.barnet.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2019-07/Local%20Heritage%20list%20july%202019.pdf">https://www.barnet.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2019-07/Local%20Heritage%20list%20july%202019.pdf</a>). Numbers 234 (not included in the proposal) and 236 West Hendon Broadway are set for demolition in approximately October 2019 as part of the Councils regeneration plan for the area. According to my understanding, the reason for this demolition is to widen Station Road and convert it into a road with two-way traffic. I believe all permissions and regulations to implement this have been completed or are in the process of being completed and there is no objection to this action. The 'group value' or 'intactness' that is a mentioned reason for the building's inclusion to the list would not be fulfilled when this occurs and I highly doubt the council would demolish number 234 and 236 if they believed the buildings were worthy of being added to the local heritage list. Furthermore, I find it confusing that number 236 would be included to the list a month before it is to be demolished. Additionally, I would be very interested to know the definition used for 'landmark qualities' as I am very sceptical that the buildings are a landmark or poses any 'landmark qualities'. Its aesthetic merits are fairly standard and can be found on most high streets in North and North-West London.</p> <p>Such a listing will not add to the buildings protection or value but cause further bureaucracy and costs onto the owners and local community. It is an</p>	Note to self. Regen have confirm that these buildings are proposed for demolition.	<p>Actioned</p> <p>These have permission to be demolished.</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>unnecessary and unpopular move by the Council as the buildings have been intact and protected for many years by its owners and residents. What is affecting the buildings is the council's regeneration plan, which has planned to demolish two-fifths of the block of buildings in order to widen Station Road (as stated without our objection due to our understanding for the reasons given). Such an action gives the residents/owners an impression of a double standard where there are rules that only apply to residents/owners and do not apply to the Council (and large property developers). This, in my opinion will breed an environment of mistrust and anger between the Council and Community in Barnet which I do not believe is intentional or beneficial and can be easily avoided.</p> <p>I understand that the owners and residents of the block of buildings in question share these concerns. If this is to be decided by the Council's Policy and Resources Committee, please take this as notice that I would like to speak at the meeting of the committee at which this is expected to be decided. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.</p> <p>Finally, please note that my submission is in respect of the proposed addition of these buildings to the Local Heritage List. While I have taken every effort to present accurate information for your consideration, as I am not a decision maker or statutory consultee, I cannot accept any responsibility for unintentional errors or omissions and you should satisfy yourselves on any facts before reaching your decision.</p>		
90	19/08/2019	<p><b>38 Lyonsdown Avenue – HT01105</b></p> <p>Thank you for your prompt response to my email.</p> <p>I cannot object to something I know nothing about such as-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What is local listing?</li> <li>2) What criteria do buildings have to have to qualify for local listing.?</li> <li>3) How are building chosen to be locally listed?</li> <li>4) Is there any council money available to maintain locally listed buildings?</li> <li>5) What restrictions are placed on locally listed buildings?</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted. Respondent has been contacted by phone and provided with links to where the information can be found on line.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Comments noted. The questions raised do not include any material considerations.</p> <p>Information on how to view the details of the selection criteria, process and rationale were included in the original letter.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>6) What planning restrictions are placed on locally listed buildings?</p> <p>7) Does LB Barnet publish any guidance to owners of building which are being considered for local listing.?</p> <p>8) Can an owner or resident of a proposed listed building have the right to attend a hearing and have their objections heard\?</p> <p>9) Is their a right of appeal against the listing of my house\?</p> <p>10) If there is a right of appeal is it independent of L.B.Barnet.?</p> <p>A follow up letter was received expressing a wish to be removed from the list</p>		<p>The building has architectural merit.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
91	20/08/2019	<p><b>Croft Cottage, 40 Finchley Park - HT00980</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter. My house has been extended at the back (through planning) and therefore it should not be on this list.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The fact that the property has been extended does not exclude it from being on the list as many buildings will have been extended or altered.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Noted the material consideration raised and evidence. The value of the building remains as the project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

92	21/08/2019	<p><b>Woodhouse College - HT00890</b></p> <p>I have checked out listing (ref HT00890) and there are two corrections that need to be made.</p> <p>The building isn't detached – there is a 1960's block attached at the back and secondly the wooden windows were replaced with UPVC sash windows in 2010-2011.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Entry to be amended to correct name of Woodhouse College and removal of word detached.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
93	21/08/2019	<p><b>99 Colindeep Lane - HT00949</b></p> <p>I'm a pensioner with very limited resources and really cannot afford any loss of and/or expenses on the property.</p> <p>So I'd like to know the implications of having my property on the Local Heritage List ?</p> <p>1- How will it affect the insurance ?                  2- How will it affect any future sale of the property, i.e are buyers put off when they see it's on the LHL.                  3- How will it affect any future construction/renovation of the property, like building a loft ?                  4- Does Barnet Council have any provisions to assist financially in maintaining properties on the LHL ?</p>	<p>Comments noted. There are no additional expenses or requirements to apply for additional permission over and above normal planning permission requirements.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
94	21/08/2019	<p><b>Arkley Lodge - HT00916</b></p> <p>I am writing as a co-owner of this house and note that you are considering placing our house on the list of Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic Interest ('the Local List')</p> <p>Please can you confirm that if the house is placed on the list, it will be subjected to the same restrictions and/or protections as a Listed property (Grade 1, 2 or 3)? If this is the case, then we would not want our house to be placed on the list</p>	<p>Comments noted. Unlike statutorily listed buildings no additional consents are required for building on the local list over and above normal planning permission.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Comments raised are about the impact of Locally Listed buildings and the planning restrictions. Confirm to the owner about the material considerations of</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

				locally listed buildings.  Remain on list
95	21/08/2019	<p><b>31 Durham Road - HT00961</b></p> <p>I have been given your name by the Barnet switchboard as the person to contact regarding the Local Heritage List review.</p> <p>We have received a letter (undated) stating that the council is currently undertaking a review of the Schedule of Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic interest (the local list).</p> <p>The letter does not make clear, nor does the list itself, what the implications of this are in terms of permitted development rights, planning and Article 4 directions etc.</p> <p>I would be grateful for the chance to discuss this with you before we make a response to the consultation. The deadline is 9 September.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There are no additional expenses or requirements to apply for additional permission over and above normal planning permission requirements. Respondent has been contacted by phone.</p>	Actioned
96	22/08/2019	<p><b>39 Leicester Rd - HT00410</b></p> <p>Thank you for sending me a letter with the 'Information regarding your property' re Local Heritage List Review.</p> <p>The information in your letter touched on my house and on my neighbour's house. I can only send you my views on 39 Leicester Rd. It was built in 1891, according to the Deeds of the House. It and its neighbour, 41, are the oldest houses of Leicester Rd., hence originally the tallest with three levels.</p> <p>In reply to your proposal to include my property on the Local Heritage List I wish to inform you that I do not wish to have my house listed on the Local List.</p> <p>May I ask you to confirm in writing that my house will not be listed on the heritage List? Thank you very much.</p> <p><u>A follow-up email was received on the 03/09/2019:</u></p> <p>Thank you very much for your reply.</p>	<p>As pointed out this is one of the oldest properties on the road and has been on the Local List since 1986. It is still considered to meet with the selection criteria. Respondent contacted.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Noted the additional information provided which can be used to embellish the description.</p> <p>The building meets the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>It is correct that I pointed out that houses are the oldest houses in Leicester Rd.</p> <p>I have, however, not pointed out that the house has been on the Local List since 1986. This is new to me. Would you be so kind and send me copies? Thank you. I have informed you that I do not wish the house to be on the local Heritage List.</p>		
97	23/08/2019	<p><b>General comment</b></p> <p>The London Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on their behalf in respect of planning consultations.</p> <p>London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust aims to increase knowledge and appreciation of parks, squares, community gardens, cemeteries, churchyards – all those places that form London's open space network.</p> <p>There are 101 borough of Barnet entries on the London Gardens Online inventory. This represents a significant wealth of parks and gardens of heritage, cultural and landscape value in the borough. The LPGT inventory has full descriptions of the value of each site of merit in the Borough.</p> <p>Four sites are on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. None of the remaining 97 sites are on your revised list of local heritage assets in their own right as designed landscapes. In some cases you identify buildings or structures within the landscape but not the value of protecting the landscape itself. Indeed, the list only contains buildings and structures.</p> <p>We request that the Local Heritage List be expanded to recognise the value of the omitted sites which meet the criteria set out by Historic England in 2016. <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/what-is-designation/local/local-designations/">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/what-is-designation/local/local-designations/</a></p> <p>This would redress the imbalance of the current list by including open spaces of cultural, landscape or heritage value.</p> <p>Director, London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust</p>	<p>The decision was made to exclude parks, gardens and other open spaces from the asset types that could be nominated for local listing. It was felt there were sufficient policies and protection elsewhere in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
98	24/08/2019	<p><b>96 Winnington Road - HT00866</b></p>	<p>The property was placed on the local list in 2010 and is considered to still meet the</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No material considerations</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>In reply to your undated letter regarding the review of “The Local List” and your proposal to add 96 Winnington Road to “The Local List” we hereby would like to register our objection to this.</p> <p>Our property already is under the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust authority which has more than adequate control of any planning requirements, approvals and permissions regarding our property. Adding our property to “The Local List” will only add additional unnecessary bureaucracy to any planning approval process which is already covered by the Trust and we cannot see how it could bestow any discernible benefit.</p> <p>We thank you for your kind attention and trust our voice will be given reasonable and favourable consideration.</p>	<p>selection criteria to remain on the list.</p>	<p>raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
99		<p><b>101 Oakwood Rd - HT00546</b></p> <p>I have just become aware of a letter you recently sent to our neighbours at 103 Oakwood Road NW11 6RJ about the Local Heritage List Review. It refers to the site as 97-1-03 Oakwood Road. (This is a 4 house terrace.) I don't yet know whether the owners of the other two houses (97 and 99) have received it.</p> <p>Please advise if we should have been sent this letter, if there is any action we should or can take, and how we can be kept informed of further progress.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Letters were also sent to 97,99 and 101 Oakland.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
100	25/08/2019	<p><b>Windmill House - HT00221</b></p> <p>The Local List currently lists Windmill House as being on Hadley Green West. In fact the address is Hadley Green, EN5 4PT. Can you please make this correction and confirm it to me?</p>	<p>Comments noted. Text will be amended.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
101	26/08/2019	<p><b>5 The Drive - HT01209</b></p> <p>It is clear from the wording appearing in the draft proposal that the relevant inspector, or other person responsible for proposing the addition to the local list, was acting under a fundamental misapprehension that 5 The Drive comprises the whole of the building appearing in the photograph that accompanies the wording. That is not the case. The building shown in the</p>	<p>This matter is being dealt with through an FOI which the respondent has now sent to the council.</p> <p>The response is as follows:</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>photograph was built as a single dwelling, but now comprises two separate dwellings, namely 5 The Drive and 5A The Drive.</p> <p>5 The Drive is a 4 bedroom semi-detached house taking up approximately one third of the footprint of the building. 5A The Drive comprises the remainder of the building, and is separately owned by people who are not connected with me in any way. I have since found out that my neighbours have not received a letter from the Council concerning the proposed listing, and their property is not referred to on the address of the proposed listing.</p> <p>This fundamental misapprehension about “intactness” undermines a principle premise for the nomination of the building, and indicates a casual approach by the planning authority to what, for me, is a very serious matter.</p> <p>To my knowledge, the building was converted into two dwellings (5 and 5A) at some time in the late 1950s or early 1960s. It is evident on proper inspection that at that time and since, many works have been undertaken that have radically changed the building. This started of course with the initial works of conversion into two dwellings, and then continued with various projects, both internal and external, all of which have had highly visible impacts on the building, its curtilage and supposed integrity. The following is a non-exhaustive list of the more obvious items, in no particular order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The roof of 5 The Drive is visibly different to the roof of 5A The Drive because I had to replace it. The tiles are substantially different in age, quality and appearance;</li> <li>2. A new entrance was created for 5 The Drive when the initial conversion took place. This included concrete pillars with brick cladding, and new concrete steps. 5A The Drive has the original front entrance;</li> <li>3. In May this year I had substantial maintenance works carried to the walls around the front entrance to prevent the ingress of water. This included removing a substantial amount of pebble dashing, the consequential removal of the original patina of the brickwork of the affected walls, re-pointing, and the installation of a modern style concrete plinth level. This work also revealed evidence that there was originally a low additional structure that was keyed into the flank wall in front of what is now my front door and its steps. The top of this original feature was clearly lower than the top of my front door;</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All parties mentioned were involved in attending review boards where nominations were assessed as a group exercise. There was no individual written assessment other than a panel discussion considering the photographs of the property together with the description, against the approved selection criteria.</li> <li>2. The adopted selection criteria are contained on pages 2 and 3 of the draft Local Heritage List, which has been the subject of this consultation exercise. The steps undertaken are those outlined under paragraph 4. The steps undertaken to raise public awareness of the project included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A public press notice in the July edition of Barnet Press 2017</li> <li>• An article in the Barnet First magazine, also July 2017 and</li> <li>• A consultation page on Barnet Council's consultation hub, which can be found at <a href="https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/new-local-list">https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/new-local-list</a></li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

	<p>4. The flank wall of 5 The Drive has no original windows, but instead a collection of unsightly and completely unsympathetic windows of no merit whatsoever. The flank wall also shows clear evidence of other works, including stopping up other apertures of unknown use or identity. The flank wall is frankly an eyesore on any reasonable estimation;</p> <p>5. At least one of the original chimneys has been removed from my property;</p> <p>6. All soffits and drain-pipes at 5 The Drive are plastic and not original;</p> <p>7. A utilitarian double front garage (built in the 1960s or 1970s) sits within the curtilage of 5 The Drive, attached to the main building by a garden gate;</p> <p>8. Behind the double garage there is a modern side terrace which is in no sense Edwardian in style;</p> <p>9. The windows in the rear of 5 The Drive (and most of the windows in the rear of 5A The Drive) are all modern and of modern design;</p> <p>10. 5A The Drive has a modern extension on its southern flank wall, comprising a single garage and an extension to the kitchen. That extension is visibly not an original part of the building and has no aesthetic merits;</p> <p>11. 5A The Drive has a basic box-shaped extension at the rear of the property to create a small additional reception area; that was in existence in 1996. 5A also has a new conservatory at the rear of the property. Neither is in “Edwardian style”;</p> <p>12. 5 The Drive and 5A The Drive have obviously different front walls, neither of which is original in any way;</p> <p>13. The original separation works also involved dividing the carriage driveway of the original building.</p> <p>All of the points listed above, coupled with the simple but highly significant fact that the building comprises two dwellings and not one as originally constructed, detract from and extinguish the alleged intactness and aesthetic weight of the building.</p> <p>In all the circumstances I take the view that neither 5 The Drive nor 5A The Drive, whether separately or together, can reasonably be described as being “intact”, or being of any objectively aesthetic merit when examined rigorously and fairly.</p> <p>This brings me to the general approach adopted by the planning authority in preparing the proposed revised local list and launching this consultation. I consider that the consultation is being pursued in a manner that is</p>		
--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>inconsiderate and unfair to all affected parties, very few of whom are likely to have the time or the experience necessary to understand fully the matters in play, or even the possible impact on the value and marketability of their properties. These considerations alone support my first contention that the consultation period is simply too short to enable affected parties to consider or where appropriate safeguard their legitimate concerns and interests. The timetable is inadequate and oppressive.</p> <p>Secondly, the proposal and your covering letter treats the situation with an unhelpfully light touch. The ideas that are involved are likely to be highly technical, despite the seeming innocence of the apparently plain English words involved. As most recipients of the proposals will not be experts in the fields of planning or heritage you should have gone to far greater lengths to explain fully the effects of listing.</p> <p>You should also provide much more substantial and impartial guidance on the ideas of aesthetics and intactness (and the other “grounds” otherwise listed as possible justifications for listing). You should also explain clearly that if any recipients continue to have concerns or grievances about any aspects of proposals and their impact, then they should seek separate advice, as I am doing, and ensure again that there is plenty of space in the timetable to enable this to be done and for people to make representations, and for those representations to be properly considered and addressed by the planning authority.</p> <p>I have tried to obtain additional reasonable information about the consultation process, but without success. The Council will be aware that this is now the subject of a freedom of information request submitted by my solicitors, and I trust that the requested information will be made available at an early stage.</p> <p>In all the circumstances I believe that there is no basis for the inclusion of my property in the local list. Please confirm as soon as possible that my property will not be included in the revised list.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you</p> <p>This email was followed up by the following, sent on the 03/09/2019:</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

	<p>Thank you for your undated letter which I received after 24 July.</p> <p>I further confirm that for a number of reasons I object to the proposed addition of my property to the local list.</p> <p>It is clear from the wording appearing in the draft proposal that the relevant inspector, or other person responsible for proposing the addition to the local list, was acting under a fundamental misapprehension that 5 The Drive comprises the whole of the building appearing in the photograph that accompanies the wording. That is not the case. The building shown in the photograph was built as a single dwelling, but now comprises two separate dwellings, namely 5 The Drive and 5A The Drive.</p> <p>5 The Drive is a 4 bedroom semi-detached house taking up approximately one third of the footprint of the building.                      comprises the remainder of the building, and is separately owned by people who are not connected with me in any way. I have since found out that my neighbours have not received a letter from the Council concerning the proposed listing, and their property is not referred to on the address of the proposed listing.</p> <p>This fundamental misapprehension about “intactness” undermines a principle premise for the nomination of the building, and indicates a casual approach by the planning authority to what, for me, is a very serious matter.</p> <p>To my knowledge, the building was converted into two dwellings (5 and 5A) at some time in the late 1950s or early 1960s. It is evident on proper inspection that at that time and since, many works have been undertaken that have radically changed the building. This started of course with the initial works of conversion into two dwellings, and then continued with various projects, both internal and external, all of which have had highly visible impacts on the building, its curtilage and supposed integrity. The following is a non-exhaustive list of the more obvious items, in no particular order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.     The roof of 5 The Drive is visibly different to the roof of 5A The Drive because I had to replace it. The tiles are substantially different in age, quality and appearance;</li><li>2.     A new entrance was created for 5 The Drive when the initial conversion took place. This included concrete pillars with brick cladding, and new concrete steps (photograph attached). 5A The Drive has the original front entrance;</li><li>3.     In May this year I had substantial maintenance works carried to the walls around the front entrance to my property to prevent the ingress of water. This included removing a substantial amount of pebble dashing, the consequential removal of the original patina of the brickwork of the affected</li></ol>		
--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>walls, re-pointing, and the installation of a modern style concrete plinth level (photograph attached). This work also revealed evidence that there was originally a low additional structure that was keyed into the flank wall in front of what is now my front door and its steps. The top of this original feature was clearly lower than the top of my front door;</p> <p>4. The flank wall of 5 The Drive has no original windows, but instead a collection of unsightly and completely unsympathetic windows of no merit whatsoever. The flank wall also shows clear evidence of other works, including stopping up other apertures of unknown use or identity. The flank wall is frankly an eyesore on any reasonable estimation(photograph attached);</p> <p>5. At least one of the original chimneys has been removed from my property;</p> <p>6. All soffits and drain-pipes at 5 The Drive are plastic and not original;</p> <p>7. A utilitarian double front garage (built in the 1960s or 1970s) sits within the curtilage of 5 The Drive, attached to the main building by a garden gate(photographs attached);</p> <p>8. Behind the double garage there is a modern side terrace which is in no sense Edwardian in style;</p> <p>9. The windows in the rear of 5 The Drive (and most of the windows in the rear of 5A The Drive) are all modern and of modern design(photograph attached);</p> <p>10. 5A The Drive has a modern extension on its southern flank wall, comprising a single garage and an extension to the kitchen. That extension is visibly not an original part of the building and has no aesthetic merits;</p> <p>11. 5A The Drive has a basic box-shaped extension at the rear of the property to create a small additional reception area; that was in existence in 1996. 5A also has a new conservatory at the rear of the property. Neither is in “Edwardian style”;</p> <p>12. 5 The Drive and 5A The Drive have obviously different front walls, neither of which is original in any way(photograph attached);</p> <p>13. The original separation works also involved dividing the carriage driveway of the original building(photograph attached).</p> <p>All of the points listed above, coupled with the simple but highly significant fact that the building comprises two dwellings and not one as originally constructed, detract from and extinguish the alleged intactness and aesthetic weight of the building.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>In all the circumstances I take the view that neither 5 The Drive nor 5A The Drive, whether separately or together, can reasonably be described as being “intact”, or being of any objectively aesthetic merit when examined rigorously and fairly.</p> <p>This brings me to the general approach adopted by the planning authority in preparing the proposed revised local list and launching this consultation. I consider that the consultation is being pursued in a manner that is inconsiderate and unfair to all affected parties, very few of whom are likely to have the time or the experience necessary to understand fully the matters in play, or even the possible impact on the value and marketability of their properties. These considerations alone support my first contention that the consultation period is simply too short to enable affected parties to consider or where appropriate safeguard their legitimate concerns and interests. The timetable is inadequate and oppressive.</p> <p>Secondly, the proposal and your covering letter treats the situation with an unhelpfully light touch. The ideas that are involved are likely to be highly technical, despite the seeming innocence of the apparently plain English words involved. As most recipients of the proposals will not be experts in the fields of planning or heritage you should have gone to far greater lengths to explain fully the effects of listing.</p> <p>You should also provide much more substantial and impartial guidance on the ideas of aesthetics and intactness (and the other “grounds” otherwise listed as possible justifications for listing). You should also explain clearly that if any recipients continue to have concerns or grievances about any aspects of proposals and their impact, then they should seek separate advice, as I am doing, and ensure again that there is plenty of space in the timetable to enable this to be done and for people to make representations, and for those representations to be properly considered and addressed by the planning authority.</p> <p>I have tried to obtain additional reasonable information about the consultation process, but without success. The Council will be aware that this is now the subject of a freedom of information request submitted by my solicitors, and I trust that the requested information will be made available at an early stage.</p> <p>In all the circumstances I believe that there is no basis for the inclusion of my property in the local list. Please confirm as soon as possible that my property will not be included in the revised list.</p>		
102	26/08/2019	<b>60-82 Woodside Avenue - HT01246</b>	Comments noted.	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>I was delighted with the opportunity to own such a house, along with 9 other neighbouring owners. We are all proud of our houses which I believe date from 1910, and built perhaps for the Jewish market - hence the Star of David loft gable window design some of them still have. To have such a set of relatively intact houses and front gardens is surely something special, and I wholeheartedly support this proposal.</p>		
103	26/08/2019	<p><b>General comment – Nominations were received after the consultation period had closed.</b></p> <p>I have number of comments on the consultation draft of the local list.</p> <p>First, the cattle trough at the junction of Hermitage Lane/ Platts Lane is already included in the statutory list grade II. The trough and drinking fountain at The Burroughs is of similar quality an should be added to the statutory list as part of this exercise.</p> <p>Second, as with the statutory list, the local list should not be regarded as definitive but regularly reviewed to permit new additions. A large number of buildings have been omitted, particularly private houses in areas such as Woodside Park and Finchley.</p> <p>Conspicuous omissions include the following. Please add them to the list. See attached photos.</p> <p><b>Postal Sorting Office, Market Place, East Finchley:</b></p> <p>Fine Arts and Crafts postal sorting office erected in 1901. Brown glazed tile ground floor with central canted bay with integral original post box and royal coat of arms. Timber-framed and roughcast upper storey.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Landmark / Intact / Social / Community value</p> <p><b>Former bank building, The Quadrant, Church Lane, Hendon</b></p>	<p>Comments noted. The statutorily listed cattle trough at Hermitage Lane will be removed from the list. Will suggest to Historic England that a number of other cattle troughs are considered for statutory listing.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the period for receiving nominations is now closed. However, some of the following buildings mentioned were nominated and approved at review:</p> <p>Former bank building, The Quadrant, Church Lane, Hendon (<i>Has been nominated and will appear on the revised list</i>)</p> <p>North-East cemetery Chapel and entrance lodge, Jewish cemetery, Hoop Lane (<i>currently being assessed for statutory listing by HE.</i>)</p> <p>Ashbourne Parade, Finchley Road (<i>Has been nominated</i></p>	Actioned.

# Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

	<p>Fine neo-Wrenaissance bank building c. 1920. 7 bays wide with recessed side bays. Continuous arcade of Tuscan columns to to ground floor. Stone architraves to first floor windows with bracketed cornices and triangular pediments to second and fourth bays. Timber, double hung, sliding sashes subdivided by glazing bars at first floor level; replaced at second floor level. Dormer windows with casements and leaded lights to pitched tiled roof above parapet cornice. Two prominent chimney stacks.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Landmark / Intact</p> <p><b>North-East cemetery Chapel and entrance lodge, Jewish cemetery, Hoop Lane</b></p> <p>Chapel to Jewish cemetery on north side of Hoop Lane. c. 1910. Single storey. Brick with painted banded stone and gabled central archway. Entrance lodge, gates, piers and ironwork have group value with chapel. The chapel and lodge complement the grade II* listed Golders Green Crematorium opposite and form part of a wider group.</p> <p><b>856/ 856a Finchley Road</b></p> <p>Parker and Unwin. c.1920 House and detached entrance pavilion forming entrance to Hampstead Garden Suburb. Red brick with tile roof and projecting canted bay to first and second floor levels above ground floor showroom / shop. The house was to form the first of a terrace on the wider site which was never continued. The site was filled in1934 by The Pantiles, now listed grade II.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Landmark / Intact / Curiosity value</p> <p><b>Ashbourne Parade, Finchley Road</b></p> <p>Fine articulated terrace, possibly by Hollis and Welch; c.1925. Ground floor shops with two storeys above faced in red brick with soft rubbed brick</p>	<p><i>and will appear on the revised list)</i></p> <p><i>Street Name Plates (It is agreed that the council needs to adopt a strategy for the repair and maintenance of historic street name plates, although they are not proposed to be included on the local list. Highways officers would be best placed in the first instance, to provide an inventory of where they exist.)</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

# Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

	<p>dressings and rusticated quoins. Double hung timber sash windows subdivided by glazing bars. Dentilled cornice. Centrepiece closes vista from Willifield Way and Garden Suburb CA with central first floor niche flanked by brick pilasters. Some unauthorised and inappropriate window replacements. Forms one of a series of contemporaneous terraces and listed buildings in Temple Fortune. The large sign on the flank reading Ashbourne parade is a prominent local landmark.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Landmark / Group value</p> <p><b>1175-1199 Finchley Road, Temple Fortune</b></p> <p>Terrace c. 1925. Symmetrical composition with centre and end pavilions breaking forward. Red brick, tile roof with painted timber casement windows, some with unauthorised replacements over ground floor shops. Good Portland stone bank frontage to No. 1175 with Tuscan columns, fanlights over the doors and original cast metal glazing bars. Group value with other complementary terraces and listed buildings in Temple Fortune conferring a strong local identity.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Landmark /Group</p> <p><b>Temple Fortune Mansions</b></p> <p>Red brick, two storey terrace over ground floor shops. c. 1925. A long, well-articulated terrace with double-hung timber sash windows subdivided by glazing bars; some with unauthorised replacements. Strong roof line punctuated with occasional pedimented accents over the bays. Continuous timber cornice and prominent chimney stacks.</p> <p>The terraces in Temple Fortune situated on steeply-rising ground confer a strong sense of local identity and complement the listed buildings and CA opposite.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Landmark / Group</p> <p><b>Belmont Court, Finchley Road</b></p>		
--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Long central three storey residential block with end pavilions broken forward above shops / restaurant beneath. c. 1925. Brown brick with red brick dressings. Double hung timber sashes subdivided by glazing bars. Central first floor window to each pavilion and centrepiece semi-circular headed with enriched architrave and intersecting tracery. Scrolled brackets to entrance door cases.</p> <p>Belmont Court forms part of a wider group of contemporaneous buildings in Temple Fortune which complements the adjacent listed buildings.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Landmark / Group</p> <p><b>29 Middleton Road, Golders Green</b></p> <p>Fine Arts and Crafts detached house c. 1920 adjoining boundary of Garden Suburb CA. Roughcast and brick with hipped tile roof. 3 storeys above a sunken basement. Painted timber casements subdivided by glazing bars. Double canted bay windows to first floor beneath secondary tiled roof slope.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Intact / Group value</p> <p><b>969 Finchley Road, Golders Green</b></p> <p>Well-detailed, late Arts and Crafts detached house c. 1930 in brick, timber and render with tile roof. Original oak joinery survives to front boundary wall and entrance gate. Casement windows with leaded lights. Triple hipped roofs to central dormers. Bargeboards to main gable.</p> <p>Aesthetic / Intact</p> <p><b>Traffic Direction Sign, North End Road, Golders Green</b></p> <p>Rare surviving fingerpost traffic direction sign c. 1935 at junction with Finchley Road. (Restoration and reinstatement of missing arm currently under discussion with the Council).</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Aesthetic / Landmark / Social and Community.</p> <p><b>Street Name Plates</b></p> <p>Finally, Barnet has a fine surviving legacy of cast metal street name signs which make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the borough.</p> <p>These were highlighted in a report I prepared for the Public Realm Management Forum. The Council needs to adopt a strategy for their repair and redecoration where they survive.</p> <p>Photos of a number of examples are attached. I would strongly recommend that a generic statement is added to the list indicating that where they survive they are of local architectural and historic interest and deemed to be included on the list.</p> <p>I look forward to the addition of the buildings to the local list. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss any recommendation any further.</p>		
104	Letter sent on the 20 <sup>th</sup> August 2019	<p><b>St Joseph’s Convent, Watford Way - HTO1230</b></p> <p>RE: LOCAL HERITAGE REVIEW:</p> <p>Thank you for your correspondence which is undated relating to the proposal to locally list the above named premises, St Joseph’s Convent which sits in the site of St Joseph’s Roman Catholic School and is owned by the Diocese of Westminster. While the consultation commenced on the 17th July 2019 we have just received this.</p> <p>Under the Historic England Advice Note 7 dealing with local heritage listing, the list is to reinforce a sense of local character and distinctiveness in the historic environment. The listing of a property will be taken into account in planning applications affecting the building or site or setting.</p> <p>The property should have “heritage significance” but nothing is stated in the consideration of this property. As far as we are aware the architect is not a known architect.</p> <p>It is noted that when it comes to planning applications and locally listed buildings they should still be able to be used for a viable use. This property is</p>	<p>Comments noted. Email response.</p> <p>Selection criteria are clearly set out in the introduction to the document and were adopted following a consultation process which included Historic England.</p> <p>Local Listing should not be an obstacle to carrying out repairs to the building in the future.</p> <p>Visibility from the public realm is not a pre-requisite for locally listed buildings and it is not</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Noted the comments made.</p> <p>There were not any material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The building has architectural merit and intactness.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>a convent and home for the nuns who are part of the Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ a registered charity.</p> <p>As stated there does need to be a requirement that the building provides a positive contribution. However, the property is not visible as it sits inside the site.</p> <p>Historic England suggest that a local list may be produced as a supplementary planning document (SPD) giving clarity on the selection criteria of heritage assets. It is unclear this has been established.</p> <p>Our experience of planning authorities and listed and locally listed buildings is that there are obstructions to simple repairs due to a lack of understanding of the works to be undertaken sympathetically to the building to enhance the environment of occupants. The level of bureaucracy and red tape is an unnecessary burden and for that reason we would not want the property locally listed.</p> <p>As the building is in a larger site the boundaries are unclear. As an operational school which the sisters previously operated the boundaries are not distinct.</p> <p>Historic England set out a scope of criteria for a local list. Nothing has been presented. Their list includes rarity, group value, and archival interest amongst other things. The property is not of social or communal value as it is occupied privately. For these reasons the property should not be on the list as its value and positive impact has not been substantiated.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you regarding this matter.</p>	essential that the name of the architect is known.	
105	28/08/2019	<p><b>1541 High Road - HT01063</b></p> <p>I am writing regarding a letter received above. I just wanted to confirm that your letter is only relating to the boundary marker sited outside my property and not the property itself.</p>	The listing only applies to the boundary marker and not the property.	Actioned
106	28/08/2019	<p><b>10 Thyra Grove - HT01216</b></p> <p>10 Thyra Grove is owned by Abbeytown Limited and your letter should be directed to the company.</p>	Comments noted	No action
107	28/08/2019	<p><b>General comment. No address supplied. Nominations were received after the consultation period had closed.</b></p>	Comments noted. Unfortunately, the date has now closed for nominations to	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Just reading consultation and would these houses in High Barnet be of interest</p> <p>35 Moxon Street. A group of Victorian houses that were built for the workers of Hadley wood the wood cutters</p> <p>16 Moxon Street. May well be the oldest house in this area roof timbers are black and one inscribed with name Elizabeth and sightings of a monk</p> <p>[ghost] some say was a public house</p> <p>22 Moxon Street. This detached house use to be red brick before rendered and was home to a member of the charge of the light brigade</p> <p>53 Salisbury Road. Detached red brick under slate roof known as Belvedere house on corner plot a Doctors house and surgery in its day now four flats from 1930s ,the six flats next door known as Holkham house use to be the orchard to the house.</p> <p>Its very good that we are now listing what is left of local heritage and history.</p>	<p>the local list. However, some of the buildings referred to have been included on the draft list.</p>	
108	28/08/2019	<p><b>31 Ingram Avenue - HT00384</b></p> <p>I would like to oppose the addition 31 Ingram Avenue (REF: HT00384), to The Local List. It is a brand new build, completed only 18 months ago. The only feature that remains from the original building is the front facade and even that has been altered due to new stonework around the doorway.</p>	<p>Need to consider whether this building should be retained or removed from the local list. Respondent has been contacted to inform them we have received these emails. However, the description does acknowledge the demolition and rebuild with façade retained.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Noted the material considerations and evidence produced.</p> <p>Update the description to make clear it is only the front façade which is of merit and meets the selection criteria.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

				view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.  Remain on list
109	29/08/2019	<b>10-16A Games Road - HT00200</b>  I was sent a letter asking me to review the information on your Local Heritage List. 18 Games Road was stated as reference HT00200. In fact 18 Games Road is a block of flats next door to HT00200. Please can you alter the house numbers of HT00200 to take off No18.	Comments noted, Corrections to street numbering will be made accordingly. Emailed respondent	Actioned
110	30/08/2019	<b>10 Midland Terrace - HT00483</b>  I am pleased a review has been undertaken including Midland Terrace to The Local List. However I am quite dubious as to the effectiveness of the list regarding the few recent repairs of certain properties on Midland Terrace. The approach regarding these repairs or changes did not take into account the fact that we in Midland Terrace are on the “so called” List!! There was no care at all whatsoever from the landlords regarding the aesthetics merits or even intactness of the properties. Maybe you could enlighten me as to what the Local Heritage List serves the properties on Midland Terrace? I would be more than happy to walk around with you if you were willing to meet me so that we can discuss further that matter? I am looking forward to hearing from you soon.	Comments noted. It is a material consideration when planning applications are received. However, it does not remove permitted development rights so some alterations and changes to building will not require planning permission. Repairs wouldn't normally require planning permission and outside the control of the LPA.	No action
111	31/08/2019	<b>47 Richmond Rd - HT01166</b>  I have just viewed the local Heritage List. I was also one of the private individuals involved in this survey.	Comments are noted. Photographs in document considered to be clearer than that suggested by respondent.	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Now, I am writing to comment on the description and photograph of the house, which is included in the survey. The photograph does not relate accurately to the description of no 45-47 Richmond rd as a pair i.e sole photograph of no.45, which has no full length windows at the front. I also feel the photograph of no's. 53-57 is poor, as it shows only one house taken at an angle. ( difficult to take admittedly now the trees are in leaf.) The above houses were built around the 1870s, as part of a group of 11. The nearby railway line had been extended out of Kings Cross to accommodate the increasing suburban population. New Barnet station is nearby. I am enclosing 3 recent photos, which I think give a more accurate description of the above houses.</p> <p><u>This email was followed up by additional emails with photographs of the property.</u></p> <p>I am sorry, I haven't managed to attach these photos to my recent letter. Hope you can put them together. Going away again tomorrow and not back until 17 September.</p>	Text has been amended accordingly to read "French doors to front ground floor window openings at No. 47"	
112	31/08/2019	<p><b>13 Rowan Walk - HT00611</b></p> <p>Further to your letter reviewing the Local Heritage List. My property is listed with an "Existing Status" as having architectural interest. Could you please notify me when it was included to the list and whether I was ever contacted of this decision.</p>	This property was placed on the Local List in 2010 following the adoption of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Conservation Area Character Appraisal following a public consultation exercise.	Actioned
113	02/08/2019	<p><b>115 Friern Park - HT 01007</b></p> <p>I write to advise that I object in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of 115 Friern Park N12 9lh ref. HT 01007 in the local heritage list. In the description much is made of the 32 surviving houses from "The Old Houses of Friern " originally 256 plots. This establishes that 224 have already gone. Simply that 32 remain does not make them of any significant interest to warrant preservation. I suspect that the nominator of the houses for inclusion in Friern Park is in fact the author of " The Old Houses of Friern " ? Nothing more than a local resident and amateur historian.</p>	These properties have been assessed by the Review Board and it was considered that they met with the selection principles to warrant inclusion on the Local Heritage List.	<p>No action</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The rationale is included in the listing description.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>It may be of interest to learn that the list is incorrect in that ref. HT 01009 carries another description of Nos. 115-121 and not of the house pictured. In conclusion may I express my surprise that you are expending time and effort to list minor domestic properties when an iconic building such as the Institute in Mill Hill can be raised to the ground for a modern development totally out of keeping with the area.</p> <p>My neighbours have asked me to add their voices to this objection and have signed agreement to this effect.</p> <p>Unfortunately my computer literacy does not extend to attaching a copy of this document to an email.</p>		<p>Check that the descriptions and images correspond correctly.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
114	30/08/2019	<p><b>71 Somerset Road - HT01176</b></p> <p>Please find attached a letter with observations and representations in response to your proposal to list 71 Somerset Road, New Barnet, EN5 1JD.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>The letter discusses the property against various criteria and concludes that it should not be considered further for conclusion on the list.</p>	<p>Text to be amended. “A Victorian two-storey house with rendered façade and arched windows at first floor. Distinctive bays to ground floor and central part glazed porch to front entrance. Chimney stacks to flanks. Slate roof”.</p> <p>The property is considered to meet the selection principles and merit a place on the local list.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Amend the description of the asset to reflect the evidence provided. The limited material considerations raised do not warrant the removal. The building meets the selection criteria in terms of architectural merit and intactness.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
115	30/08/2019	<p><b>Letter from 5a The Drive - HT01209 asking for the property to be reconsidered for removal from the draft list. This site has been mentioned previously</b></p> <p><u>Questions condensed</u></p> <p>1. Why has the council made no effort to contact us?</p>	<p>Response to questions in letter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The council unaware that the building was in fact subdivided into two separate properties. For clarification it is</li> </ol>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. What is the legal status and criteria of the Local Heritage List?</li> <li>3. Our property in context to the list as a whole?</li> <li>4. What is the process for inclusion on the list and can it be appealed?</li> <li>5. How might it affect future works we wish to do</li> </ol>	<p>proposed that both properties would be contained on the Local Heritage List being part of the same building.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The criteria can be located on pages 2 and 3 of the draft Local Heritage List. The governments Planning Practice Guidance indicates that it is helpful if Local Authorities keep a list of non-designated heritage assets.</li> <li>3. This property has been nominated along with many others across the borough and has been considered to meet with the approved selection principles that justifies inclusion on the Local Heritage List.</li> <li>4. The process of nominating properties for inclusion on the Local Heritage List came as a result of consultation with local amenity societies and local volunteers. The results of which were considered by a Review Board against the approved selection principles. There is no</li> </ol>	
--	--	---	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

			<p>direct appeal although comments received as a result of the consultation exercise will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>5. There is no specific requirement to apply for permission other than planning permission. The Local Heritage List is a material consideration in determining applications does not prevent any specific building works or alterations. Maintenance work does not normally require planning permission.</p>	
116	30/08/2019	<p><b>Letter received regarding a request to remove 38 Lyonsdown Avenue - HT01105 from the draft list. This site has been mentioned previously</b></p> <p>Letter provided details about the property along with architects plans. Objection based on future ability to develop property.</p>	<p>Respondent has previously been contacted. Text will be amended to acknowledge that the house has benefitted from extensions to both sides of the property, although these are set back from the main front building line and do not detract from the appearance of the property.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
117	02/09/2019	<p><b>Application for Local listing of Moat Park Estate (no HT number as never nominated) with full documentation received in support of the proposal.</b></p>	<p>The respondent has already been contacted to be informed that the closing date for nominations to the Local Heritage List has now closed.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>The nomination period has closed. See previous comments.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		Letters received informing the LPA that she wished to nominate the estate and this was followed up with background information, maps and photos of properties on the estate.	The information submitted will be given due consideration against the approved selection criteria	
118	02/09/2019	<b>Letter received on 02/09/2019 re: 98-94 Hertford Road - HT00296</b>  We would very much like our property to remain on the Barnet Local Heritage List.	Comments noted	No action
119	03/09/2019	<b>Colindeep Lane- No specific address provided</b>  I happen to live in one of the Local Heritage houses in Colindeep Lane. I am grateful for the interest shown by the council relating to the history, and indeed the future of these most delightful properties.	Comments noted.	No action
120	03/09/2019	<b>98 Winnington Road - HT00866</b>  I refer to the recent letter you sent regarding the Local Heritage List Review. Please accept this email as confirmation of my objection to the inclusion of my property in such List.  My property falls within the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust (The Trust), and is therefore already subject to strict control. When applying for any alterations to my property, I am already bound to both apply to Barnet Council to approve the planning, AND to Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust to obtain any consent. The Trust safeguards the look of the neighbourhood, including my property, and I do not therefore see the point of adding additional layers of bureaucracy. This will simply add time and costs to burden the owners, with no good purpose.  I trust my voice, and that of my neighbours, will be given all due consideration	Comments noted. The property was placed on the Local list in 2010 following the adoption of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Conservation Area Character Appraisal following a public consultation exercise. There are no additional expenses or requirements to apply for additional permission over and above normal planning permission requirements.	Actioned  No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.  The rationale is included in the listing description.  Remain on list
121	03/09/2019	<b>The Midland Hotel, 29 Station Road - HTO1292</b>  Your website appears not to be working- nevertheless, I wish to add my support to the nomination for this Local Listing.	Comments noted	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>The Midland is an attractive 1860s building, and the additions made to it later in the C19 are in keeping with its original design. It is the only building of note on an otherwise unremarkable suburban road: a physical reminder of the coming of the railway to our area; of the heyday of the Welsh Harp as pleasure-grounds for Londoners; and of the development of West Hendon as a dormitory for workers in the capital. The Midland was a popular pub and community centre for Victorian residents, and it continues to be so to this day.</p> <p>The Midland was recently threatened with demolition, but the developers- after considerable local protests- decided to withdraw that application. However, the building is still under threat. New proposals suggest that the pub ( with over-powering new blocks of flats behind it) would be allowed to remain, but only with additions and alterations to its structure. These plans would make the functioning of the Midland as a pub impossible, and ultimately lead to its closure. That would be shameful.</p> <p>Pubs are important places. They are not just watering-holes, but also places where all manner of people can meet in friendship. They are landmarks, and visible reminders of how areas have come into being. In the forty years that I have lived in Hendon, most of its pubs have either been demolished or turned to other uses: an irreparable loss. The Midland is a good building and a good and much-loved pub: it must be preserved.</p>		
122	04/09/2019	<p><b>25 Hadley Highstone - HT01036</b></p> <p>I wanted to make comments on the proposal of including my property on the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>As you are aware, my property is already in a Conservation area and there are strict rules and guidelines regarding the appearance of the property. These are adhered to.</p> <p>My concern is we do not need another body telling us how to keep the look of our properties. My understanding is the suggestions were put forward by local volunteers who have little idea on the costs involved in maintaining such properties.</p> <p>Being included on such lists could potentially have a detrimental effect on the value of the property. Who wants to invest in a home where there are many rules and regulations to follow?</p>	<p>Comments noted. Inclusion on the local list does not prevent any applications for planning permission which are always considered on their actual merits.</p> <p>Internal changes do not require Planning Permission.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The rationale is included in the listing description.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Will this list also impact any submissions for internal changes in structure? Please give your decision much thought.</p>		
123	04/09/2019	<p><b>106 Wildwood Road - HT00823</b></p> <p>By post &amp; email 4th Sep 2019</p> <p>I am in receipt of your proposal letter for Local Heritage List Review, wanting to add to your list 106 Wildwood Road NW11 6UD.</p> <p>I have viewed the draft of Local Heritage List on Barnet website. and I note that your have described and listed the building as L shape with Studio designed and built year 1934 .</p> <p>However the H.M.Land Registry deed clearly reads this building address has been first registered on the 19 December 1958 , and this is only for the L shape part of the building and not the later Studio extension. The Studio extension which covers about 1/3 of the total house ground floor was added to the side of the building twenty years before I purchased the house, estimating to year 1972 .</p> <p>With these information in mind it makes the building much more recent built than your estimate.</p> <p>For the above reasons I believe that your information is not accurate, factually misrepresented and not as described and therefore I do not wish to have building be listed under Local Heritage List.</p> <p>Please advise accordingly.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The HGS Trust have confirmed that the house was built in 1922.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Comments noted the HGS have confirmed the building was built in 1922. RE-check the date with the HGS and confirm the correct date in the description.</p> <p>The material considerations raised against the selection criteria do not warrant removal.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
124	04/09/2019	<p><b>57 Lyonsdown Avenue - HT01106</b></p> <p>I have no objection in principle to being added to the list in future, but would like to object if it may impact decisions to any planning work I am hoping to commence in the near future. The description provided in the draft local heritage list describe features visible from the front of the property and I have no intention to change or impact these. However, I am currently planning an orangery-style extension to the rear of the property and believe it will be</p>	<p>Comments noted. Although inclusion on the list is a material consideration in determining planning applications it does not prevent extensions or alterations providing they are respectful of</p>	<p>Actioned</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>designed tastefully and in keeping with the style and without any disruption to the original features of the building or descriptions pointed out in your list.</p> <p>I enclose for you the intended plans and conceptual drawing. Please advise if further information is required and if inclusion in this list would affect planning decisions to the rear of the property. If you believe this may delay or impact any planning decision, and since I am already going to great expense here and started this process long before the letter received, would it be possible to defer any decision on my property's inclusion to the heritage list to your next review period?</p>	<p>a buildings character and appearance. Unfortunately, it is not possible to comment on the merits of your proposed orangery as that would be subject to the normal planning application processes when it will be judged on its individual merits.</p> <p>We do however welcome your comment that there will not be any disruption to the original features of the building.</p>	
125	04/09/2019	<p><b>Midland Hotel - HT01292</b></p> <p>I am writing to you as the Labour parliamentary candidate for Hendon in support of the inclusion of the Midland Hotel on the local heritage list. The Hotel is a critical part of the fabric and history of West Hendon. It is by many accounts the oldest pub in the area and one of the few surviving Victorian pubs in the constituency. It is also nearly unique in the extent to which it is intact. It is a well known local landmark and one of the defining features of West Hendon.</p> <p>It is an important local hub that we have used for social events and get together on a number of occasions and plays an important role in the community.</p> <p>I know local members would absolutely support this view and I would ask that it is added to the local heritage list.</p>	Comments noted	No action
126	04/09/2019	<p><b>11 and 13 Woodside Grove - HT01258</b></p> <p>In relation to the proposal for the above properties to be added to the list here is some further information that might influence your decision, pertaining to 13 Woodside Grove:</p>	Comments noted.	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Almost all the windows and exterior doors are recent replacements and are double-glazed, primarily uPVC.</p> <p>The front porch was enclosed in the 1980s, so it's appearance is much altered from the original.</p> <p>A kitchen window was extended to incorporate a door instead.</p> <p>The roof was completely replaced about 10 years ago.</p> <p>The interior has been extensively altered and modernised.</p>		
127	04/09/2019	<p><b>Midland Terrace - HT00483</b></p> <p>I think the choice of photograph poor. Nos. 26, 27 and 28 show additional features to the original features mentioned in the document and are more aesthetic. They show the original brick shed with flashings and the doors to the privy and the coal bunker.</p> <p>Consequently, a photograph of 26, 27 or 28, in my opinion, would be better and I think there should be a mention of the original use of the sheds as a place to store coal, as well as use as an outdoor privy.</p> <p><u>Additional email sent 05/09/2019</u></p> <p>The text is inaccurate. I think it describes Hampstead Garden Suburb maisonettes. The Railway Terraces, of which Johnston Terrace is one, are late back-to-back 19th century workers cottages - as described in our Barnet conservation appraisal document. There are no flat roofed dormers or recessed arched entrances as described.</p> <p>If you wish to check with the other terrace entries, they are Midland, Johnston, Gratton and Campion Terraces.</p> <p><u>Additional email sent 05/09/2019</u></p> <p>Apologies, in my previous email, I made a mistake. I'm commenting on the Needham Terrace entry, not Johnston.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We agree that the choice of photographs could be better and will now be replaced. Suggested text amendments will also be made.</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>However, in addition to my previous comments, I notice the photograph purporting to be Needham Terrace is not. The houses in the photograph are in Midland Terrace and the lawn is between Midland and Johnston Terraces.</p> <p>Needham Terrace does not have 'communal' lawns. Needham Terrace has individual little gardens, as the gardens were originally. A point perhaps worth noting.</p> <p>The photograph and text need to be changed to make the Needham Terrace entry accurate.</p>		
128	05/09/2019	<p><b>General comment in support of nominated public houses</b></p> <p>I am pleased to see many public houses listed in this list. I trust they will all go forward.</p> <p>As you know we have lost many pubs to redevelopment in recent years so Campaign For Real Ale (CAMRA) fully support the inclusion of all the pubs in your July document.</p> <p>Do I have to support each one individually? Or can you take this email as confirmation that we support them all?</p> <p>Thanking you in anticipation of you agreeing to the former.</p> <p>Pubs Preservation Officer for Enfield &amp; Barnet branch of CAMRA</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. Individual responses will not be required and this email will be taken as support for them all.</p>	Actioned
129	05/09/2019	<p><b>Midland Hotel - HT01292</b></p> <p>Please would you protect the Midland Hotel in Station Road, NW4 4PN, from demolition / development by reason of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 architectural interest, historical interest.</li> <li>2. Social and communal value.</li> <li>3. Landmark qualities</li> <li>4. Intactness</li> <li>5. Age and rarity</li> <li>6. Aesthetic merits.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>It is my local pub, and any attempt to redevelop it will kill the community it serves. Even if it were “reconstituted” into a modern building with living units above that are independent of the pub, in time the residents will complain and the pub will be forced to close. This is not good enough.</p> <p>The only way to ensure its future is to protect the pub from any development.</p>		
130	05/09/2019	<p><b>24 Holden Road - HT01086</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter regarding the above property. I agree with the proposed comments and support those sent you. The four houses are, I believe, unique in their design and representative of the architectural change from Victorian to Edwardian styles. The quality of the craftsmanship is remarkable, as Michael mentioned in relation to the brickwork pointing. The huge loft space also shows how the builders used substantial timbers to support the roof which is lined with tongue and groove planking. In the centre of the roof is a flat area accessed via a heavy trap door.</p> <p>Our house, also retains the original metal mantelpiece in what was the kitchen. This probably originally contained a range but when we moved in, it held a very old cast iron water heater.</p> <p>Not for the listing but your local historians and architects may be interested in the attached photo of the upstairs toilet wall. This writing was revealed when I removed the original wooden backing for a high level cistern.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed.	No action
131	05/09/2019	<p><b>Proposed nomination. Unfortunately, the property was not nominated during the consultation period.</b></p> <p>I would like to nominate the Grand Arcade, Rex House and Kidz Escape building N12 for local listing. Additionally I would like to put forward 1,082 people who have signed the below petition to save the Grand Arcade from Barnet Council's N.Finchley SPD that wants to see the buildings demolished to make way for 12-storey flats.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Unfortunately, the property was not nominated and the closing date to receive nominations has now closed. In regard to notifying the public about the consultation for nominations to the local list, the council placed an article in Barnet First magazine, placed</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>The period for nominations is closed.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p><a href="https://www.change.org/p/cllr-r-cornelius-barnet-gov-uk-save-the-grand-arcade-n12-from-demolition?recruiter=97472520&amp;utm_source=share_petition&amp;utm_medium=twitter">https://www.change.org/p/cllr-r-cornelius-barnet-gov-uk-save-the-grand-arcade-n12-from-demolition?recruiter=97472520&amp;utm_source=share_petition&amp;utm_medium=twitter</a></p> <p>400 people have also signed paper petitions bringing the total to 1,482 people.</p> <p>The campaign is further See:  <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/music/2019/aug/27/kinks-dave-davies-grand-arcade-finchley-london">https://www.theguardian.com/music/2019/aug/27/kinks-dave-davies-grand-arcade-finchley-london</a></p> <p>Barnet Council were supposed to do a borough-wide consultation on Barnet's Historic List which would include a review of the listing criteria and an opportunity for Barnet residents to nominate buildings of historic importance. This was a Capita core service agreement, but instead it became a 'survey' using volunteers and there was no opportunity or invitation for the public to get involved in a real consultation. A survey is not a consultation.</p> <p>The Grand Arcade subsequently failed to get listed. The Council said that it wasn't listed because it wasn't nominated, but nobody knew they could nominate it! It was grossly unfair and a very underhand way for this Council/Capita to act. Barnet Council live in denial, believing that they invited the borough to engage as the FOI request below demonstrates. Perhaps they can tell us how many public nominations they actually got?</p> <p><a href="https://www.barnet.gov.uk/foi-requests/5568512">https://www.barnet.gov.uk/foi-requests/5568512</a></p> <p>The Grand Arcade was designed by T. Spencer Rutter in 1937, the same year that the Gaumont cinema was built next door. It was designed in the same style. The last Barnet historic list review occurred in 1986 and Barnet Council failed to list the Gaumont then, it was demolished a year later! The demolition of the Gaumont and the art deco bus station between it and the arcade destroyed some of the context of the arcade, but it forms part of the history of our town centre nonetheless, it was part of something much larger and that history should be explained and illustrated, the development of the town centre demonstrates various architectural styles from Victorian and</p>	<p>a public notice in the local press and advertised the consultation on the Engage Barnet website, details of which can be found here: <a href="https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/new-local-list">https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/new-local-list</a></p> <p>All local amenity societies and resident's associations were informed of the consultation.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

# Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Edwardian through the art deco era and the 40s/50s/60s etc. The 1930s were clearly an important era in the development of North Finchley.</p> <p>The Arcade is an example of art-deco inter-war architecture, it is a glass-covered (flat-glazed) shopping arcade that has served the N12 community for 82 years. It holds many special memories for the people who grew up in the area, particularly the old music shop. The developers that want the Arcade demolished do not consider that it has any historic value, but I disagree, it is an individual, independent, bohemian space, unique for the area, it oozes aesthetic charm, it is easily on a par with the Grade II listed art deco underground stations of the Piccadilly line such as Arnos Grove, it has wonderful character it is a historic building that has survived the blitz, survives despite High Street decline, it is living history, it was used by famous musicians. Its contribution to North Finchley has been and continues to be huge.</p> <p>Definition of the word 'History' according to Wikipedia: "History" is an umbrella term that relates to past events as well as the memory, discovery, collection, organization, presentation, and interpretation of information about these events.</p> <p>Barnet Council approved the demolition of the Art Deco styled Gaumont, Finchley open air swimming pool and the National Institute of Medical Research in Mill Hill and 1930s architecture in Barnet has become rarer. Examples of glass covered, art deco shopping arcades are rare in London as a whole. It is important that we have a mix of character and history in our buildings and the 1930s art deco era must be represented and cherished. It may not be Burlington Arcade, but it is OUR arcade and local people and former residents love it and want to see it restored and retained. Given lottery funding the arcade could be even more of a draw than it currently is.</p> <p>In the North Finchley SPD statutory consultation with Historic England, Historic England said (27th Nov 2017) that the Arcade should be 'retained'. This was further confirmed to me and to MP Mike Freer by the CEO of Historic England. They also said that the Arcade was of local importance and that it was a highlight of the town centre. Historic England were a partner in the above mentioned Historic List 'survey' so I am surprised that they did not flag up the Arcade and assist in ensuring its survival through local listing.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Historic England further stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a clear opportunity in North Finchley to promote its future vibrancy and vitality through enhancement of its heritage.</li> <li>- There should be explicit reference to conserving and enhancing existing townscape and heritage.</li> <li>- The Grand Arcade is identified in App A (A11) as contributing to local character. Its art deco style and domestic scale make it one of the highlights of the town centre, its qualities brought to the fore by recent investment from the outer London commission funding. This should be retained in any development proposals. Likewise we recommend assessment of the early Victorian detached building 'Kidz Escape' (former Cricketers/Coach Stop pub) which appears to be of some historic interest.</li> <li>- The lack of assessment of these buildings and their potential future contribution is concerning.</li> <li>- The Grand Arcade and the former Owen Owen department store (Argos) are both noted as contributing to the character of the area (Para A11), but in the case of the Grand Arcade this is not discussed or identified in Figure 24.</li> <li>- Historic England have said that the Grand Arcade should be identified as a building of 'Merit'.</li> </ul> <p>Instead, Barnet Council have ignored everything Historic England have said because, I quote: 'retention of the Grand Arcade in the site development strategy is not considered appropriate as it has continued to underperform in terms of its retail offer and retention of the site would restrict the necessary comprehensive development of the site'. In other words, it is in the way! That's no reason to demolish our architectural heritage and our history. The arcade continues to perform well and long may it continue. Redevelopment of the site is not 'necessary' and in the SPD consultation more people strongly opposed the development than supported it.</p> <p>49 people (29%) STRONGLY OPPOSED the development strategy for KOS1 37 people (22%) strongly agreed</p> <p>22 people (13%) 'tended' to oppose. 41 people (24%) 'TENDED' to support the plans</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>71 people opposed in total and 78 people supported the plans. That's a majority of 7! Hardly the consensus of opinion described in the SPD consultation review document. 1,482 people want the Arcade saved.</p> <p>The Arcade, Rex House and Kidz Escape building are historically important (the Kidz Escape was a former pub, I have been told it is the oldest building in the area) and I further suggest that they form a new 'Conservation area' and are granted every possible protection from demolition. They should all be locally listed and I hereby nominate them all.</p> <p>Merton Council have recently locally listed a 1936 building by T. Spencer Rutter, I would argue that if they are able to protect Rutter's designs, then why can't Barnet? I invite you to discuss this with Merton Council and the C20 Society and RIBA. Rutter lived in NW10, he was relatively local, a North London architect and that is worthy of celebration. Other notable local residents included Harry Beck (the designer of the underground map), Terry Thomas, the great Joseph Grimaldi, Charles Dickens, John Henry Parr, jazz clarinetist Monty Sunshine, Margaret Thatcher, Rt. Hon. Lord Wills of North Swindon and Woodside Park, David Jason and Spike Milligan who was very interested in local history and I'm sure would have strongly supported the arcade.</p> <p><a href="https://hidden-london.com/gazetteer/fallow-corner/">https://hidden-london.com/gazetteer/fallow-corner/</a></p>		
132	05/09/2019	<p><b>Proposed nomination. Unfortunately, the property was not nominated during the consultation period.</b></p> <p>I have read your list of Buildings of local interest. I would like to add the following. The building at 402 Finchley Road NW2 2HR. This building was erected in the early part of the 20th century – exact date not known. I enclose photos of the building with is owned by the HFAF Fraternity. This is a building of considerable local interest and is quite unique. There is a proposed development which would require to this building to be demolished (see 19/4221/FUL). Currently this building is used as a meeting hall.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Unfortunately, the property was not nominated and the closing date to receive nominations has now closed.</p>	Actioned
133	05/09/2019	<p><b>Railway Tavern, East Barnet Road - HT00966</b></p>	<p>Consideration will be given to the comments made, although</p>	No action

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>I write with reference to the intended inclusion of this property on the local listings. I would question its suitability based on the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landmark qualities – I would question that the reference property has standout qualities; it is dominated by the adjoining building on the left hand flank elevation and is subsequently diminished in terms of scale and street scene presence.</li> <li>Intactness – the property has been significantly altered internally and extended over time such that the original form and history has limited integrity.</li> </ul> <p>I would respectfully ask that these matters be considered when making any final decision.</p>	<p>it is acknowledged that it is not a landmark building.</p>	<p>The material considerations raised against the selection criteria have been considered.</p> <p>Adjust the criteria in light of the comments made.</p> <p>The building meets the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
134	05/09/2019	<p><b>54 Station Road, New Barnet - HT01188</b></p> <p>I have been advised that it is proposed to add the property to the Schedule of Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic Interest (The Local List). I have looked at the draft Local Heritage List and found the Reference is HT01188.</p> <p>The entry in the draft list states that the selection principles applied are 'Intactness' and 'Aesthetic Merits'. Whilst Aesthetic merits are very subjective the Intactness of the property is a matter of fact.</p> <p>In the Description section of the draft list it is stated that "Two tall chimneys remain intact as do the sash windows." This statement is in fact completely incorrect. Even from a cursory look at the property it should have been clear that all of the windows at the front of the property are Upvc double glazed replacement windows. The Description goes on to say "The central doorway is set in an impressive red brick doorcase with pilasters and stone detailing above." Once again insufficient attention to detail, the main entrance is in fact via a powder coated aluminium replacement door and frame, see attached picture entitled 'Picture 1'.</p> <p>In addition, the central doorway porch area was the subject of an insurance claim made by the previous freeholder because the porch was not structurally tied in to the main body of the front elevation and so remedial</p>	<p>Comments noted and will be considered in due course.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>The material considerations raised against the selection criteria have been considered.</p> <p>They have not provided evidence to support comment about the chimneys. Noted the additional photographs to support the evidence of the extension.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>works were carried out. Some of the brickwork above the door and under the first-floor windows is not original.</p> <p>Given the lack of attention to detail in the entry in the Local List I have attached pictures showing that the rest of the building is not intact, these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Picture 2’ (rear extension) – this shows a full width flat roof extension added by the previous freeholder. The brickwork in the extension bears no resemblance to the original brick work, the windows and external doors are Upvc double glazed units. You can also see on the left-hand side the outline of an original pitched roof. I have no idea what this structure was. On the right-hand side you can see the arched brickwork of two small windows which have been filled in and a modern rectangular window which has been inserted. You can also see a large dormer window in the roof.</li> <li>• I have attached two pictures of the West elevation. ‘Picture 3’ shows what appears to be a doorway that has been bricked up and a modern window that has been inserted.</li> </ul> <p>‘Picture 4’ shows an original window that has been bricked in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have attached ‘Picture 5’ showing the East elevation with a modern window that has been added.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to alterations to the exterior there have been extensive alterations inside including the removal of walls and fireplaces.</p> <p>With Upvc windows, modern windows and bricked up original windows using ‘Aesthetic Merits’ as a principle for including the property in The Local List is inappropriate. Similarly, as detailed above, claiming the buildings inclusion on the basis of ‘Intactness’ is fundamentally incorrect.</p>		<p>were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Add to the description the VC winner Captain Cyril Frisby who was born in the property. One of only 3 VC winners in WW1, which further adds to the Historical interest of the building.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
135	05/09/2019	<p><b>83 Northway - HT00521</b></p> <p>As co - owners of 83 Northway, we were only advised recently of the adding of 83 Northway to the local Heritage list, and understand that we only have until 9th September to respond.</p> <p>We understand that both houses have some architectural merit, 81 more so than 83.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This building was placed onto the list in 2010 along with many neighbouring houses and is still considered to meet the adopted selection criteria.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>However, having considered the matter very carefully, we would prefer that this property will not be added to the list.</p> <p>Looking forward to receiving acknowledgement of our email, and your positive reply to our request.</p>		
136	05/09/2019	<p><b>Proposed nomination. Unfortunately, the property was not nominated during the consultation period.</b></p> <p>Local Listing application for the Grand Arcade, Rex House and Kidz Escape building N12</p> <p>I write in support of well argued plea for listing. I have nothing of substance to add to it except that on a personal note, I spent much of my teenage years in the music shop in the Arcade [and at the Gaumont]. It was an important part of my youth and I am sure it played the same role for thousands and thousands of others. As such it is an essential part of the heritage of North Finchley and this suburban heritage is as deserving of preservation as any other. There are other ways to meet the unmet need for housing than the wanton destruction of our history that is being proposed.</p>	Comments noted	<p>No action</p> <p>The period for nominations has now closed.</p>
137	06/09/2019	<p><b>705 High Road - HT00302</b></p> <p>We are instructed by the freehold owners of 705 High Road to submit a letter in support of the removal of 705 High Road from the Local List. Please keep me posted as to a decision on this matter.</p> <p>A letter was attached to the email to further detail why the building should not be included on the local heritage list.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The property is an existing entry and has been on the local list since 1986. The inclusion of the property on the list does not add any additional requirements over and above normal planning permission. It is still considered to meet with the adopted selection principles.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria.</p> <p>Noted the material considerations and evidence produced.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

				<p>The building is of architectural merit, an intact.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
138	06/09/2019	<p><b>Avebury Cottage, Arkley Lane - HT00902</b></p> <p>Local Heritage List Review</p> <p>We received your letter at the end of July, which was neither dated, nor made out to us personally, telling us that you have been asked by the various stakeholders to consider our house for addition to the Local List of historically important buildings.</p> <p>However, we have now looked at your listing in detail and find that the description is misleading and factually inaccurate – to our knowledge the house possesses none of the qualities that make it suitable for inclusion on the list. Therefore, following receipt of your letter we have been advised to engage a Historical Consultant to investigate further.</p> <p>You will see from report (attached) that our initial suspicions were correct and the Architectural Historian's qualified opinion is that "There is no case for the building's inclusion in the Local List on the basis of Intactness, architectural, historic merit or any of the five sections set out in the Council's Criteria for Local List"</p> <p>We would be grateful for your confirmation that in this knowledge you will not be considering the matter further and that you will remove the property from the list of properties suitable for local listing.</p> <p>A heritage statement was attached to the email and a hand delivered letter was also submitted.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and will be considered in due course</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria and evidence produced.</p> <p>The evidence confirms that the building is not intact.</p> <p>Remove from draft list</p>
139	06/09/2019	<p><b>Nos 1- 51 (consecutive with the exception of no 49) Finchley Garden Village, Village Road - HT 00749</b></p>	<p>Comments noted. Response as follows</p> <p>1. 51 and 53 Cyprus Avenue have their own</p>	<p>Actioned</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>I am writing on behalf of the FGV Residents Association to correct errors in the information the council hold on the local heritage list in respect of Finchley Garden Village N3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. FGV conservation area consist of all the houses in Village Road plus nos 51 &amp; 53 Cyprus Avenue</li> <li>2. The houses according to documentation held in Hendon Library were built in 1908 - 13 and not 1909 - 14 as stated in the list. The exception to this is the pair of houses 40/41 which were built much later.</li> <li>3. FGV conservation area house numbering is not consecutive from 1-51 - the houses on the lower green side of Village Road are numbered 1 - 24, the Bungalow, 25 &amp; 26. Numbers 51 &amp; 53 Cyprus Avenue are the houses next to 26 Village Road. On the opposite side of the road (the upper green) the houses are numbered 31 - 51. Thus nos 27/28/29/30 do not exist and have never done so</li> <li>4. No 49 Village Road, is a consecutively numbered house in Village Road and is paired with no 50. However around 15 years ago, Barnet Council gave permission for a house to be built on what had been the side garden of either 47 or 51 Cyprus Avenue. That house is no 49 Cyprus Avenue - prior to this, there was no house numbered 49 in Cyprus Ave, numbering went directly from 47 to 51. I understand that it was decided by the planning department at the time, that the new house would not be part of the conservation area. It seems that the council documentation then confused 49 Cyprus Avenue with 49 Village Road which is and always has been on the upper green in Village Road and is a locally listed house like the rest of Village Road houses.</li> </ol> <p>Much of this information is already held by the Council in the character appraisal of the village, so it is surprising that the heritage list is in error.</p> <p>The residents association is also concerned that no mention is made in the listing of the close link to the Garden City movement which was so influential in the early 20th Century and led to the building of Letchworth and other towns. We have visited the Garden City Institute in Letchworth. There is a reference book - Paradise Planned, The Garden Suburb and the Modern City</p>	<p>entry on the list at HT00126</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The comments are noted and text will be amended.</li> <li>3. The numbering of the properties will be corrected.</li> <li>4. The text will be amended.</li> </ol> <p>A reference to the Garden City movement will be included into the description.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>by Stern, Fishman &amp; Tilove - which has a listing for Finchley Garden Village as an example of this movement.</p> <p>Please let me know if I can be of further assistance and also please confirm that these amendments will be made</p>		
140	06/09/2019	<p><b>27 Oakwood Road - Ref HT00539</b></p> <p>I am surprise that we have been nominated to be a locally listed heritage building within the London Borough of Barnet.</p> <p>To be honest I see no reason why our house should be locally listed.</p> <p>There is nothing architecturally appealing about these houses. We have even had a modern extension at the rear and the adjacent house 25 Oakwood Road &amp; 29 Oakwood Road have flat roof extensions at the rear.</p> <p>The house has been built with no specific features which I feel would benefit to the local authority making these houses of any heritage.</p> <p>If you consider and compare these to other buildings in Barnet there are far superior of interest and design.</p> <p>I would therefore appreciate if you withdraw our house from this list or 25-31 Oakwood Road locally listed heritage list.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The property, along with neighbouring properties in Oakwood Road were placed on the local list on its inception in 1986. It is considered that the properties still meet with the adopted selection criteria.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
141	06/09/2019	<p><b>45-53 Lodge Lane - HT00427</b></p> <p>In response to your recent letter regarding the above subject, No.47, was part of a family who had been born and brought up in their house. Over the years I knew them, before they passed away, they gave me a lot of very interesting information regarding the cottages. Although they were all initially rented accommodation, being described as workers' cottages, according to the Deeds, my house was first sold in 1903.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No action</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>If you would be interested in any further information please do not hesitate to contact me but in the meantime, I am happy for my property to be included in the Local Heritage List.</p>		
142	06/09/2019	<p><b>8 Oakleigh Avenue - HT01135</b></p> <p>I am writing to make an objection to having my house be placed on the Local Heritage List. The property does not have any architectural or historical interest.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We consider the property to meet the relevant criteria.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
143	06/09/2019	<p><b>17 Avondale Avenue - HT00904</b></p> <p>As residence of Avondale Ave we are delighted that our beautiful Edwardian family homes are getting this status. They are such beautifully built homes with such unusual features and a character which you do not find in today's buildings. They are so attractive to look at from the outside as well as being fabulous homes to live in. It would be wonderful if this status helps to preserve this heritage that we are so lucky to have in our borough.</p> <p>It is wonderful to see such a long list spread throughout the borough and such a mix of buildings, houses and structures. It is so important to maintain our heritage.</p> <p>We feel, that in the present building climate the look of a building or house does not seem of any importance at all so it really important that we appreciate the craftsmen of the past and maintain these buildings for future generations, and the history of our borough.</p> <p>It is such a shame that we see beautiful old buildings being demolished for modern unattractive buildings.. The older buildings are so well built and can be transformed into wonderful flats and homes of character.</p> <p>Thank you for championing this Heritage status and we hope it is a great success.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>No action</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

144	06/09/2019	<p><b>78 and 80 Finchley Park - HT00981</b></p> <p>I refer to your letter advising of your intention to include nos 78 and 80 Finchley Park in the Local List. I note your advice 'Under Review and New Criteria' that 'The following principles of selection were applied; Age and Rarity, Aesthetic Merits, Landmark Qualities, Intactness, Group Value and Social and Communal Value'.</p> <p>I would confirm that no 80 would fail the said tests and in particular the test of Intactness: I attach an image of no 80 (from my website) showing its front facade in the early 2000 prior to undertaking extensive work to bring back the front of the property to an appearance that would be similar to that of the original 1880s cottage. These works included, the restoration of the fenestration as original including size of openings, cills and stucco surrounds; timber pilasters in a typical Victorian idiom were introduced in the restored bay window to support its roof and entertain its appearance while avoiding the unsustainable expenditure of restoring the long lost cast iron supports seen in the other half of the pair (no 78). The works at the time included the introduction of a narrow side extension with a fully glazed roof behind a front, which replicated a typical setback entrance of the period with fanlight and stucco surround to front entrance, to enable remodelling of the interior.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to the inclusion of the pair in the local list as it evidently fails the relevant selection test. Nevertheless, all the same I am delighted that as a Conservation Architect I have remodelled to appear quite convincingly as original!</p> <p>I trust this clarifies the position</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you and to your deliberations.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and clarification that the building has been restored in a sympathetic manner. Consideration will be given to your comments in due course.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria.</p> <p>Commend the correspondent for their sensitive refurbishment of the property that enhances the building.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
145	07/09/2019	<p><b>31 The Loning - HT01211</b></p> <p>I received this letter in the post and am alarmed to see that you are looking to convert my property to a listed building.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. No additional permission is required over and above existing planning permission. The existing permitted development rights will still</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>I do not want this to happen as I am unaware of the implications and impact to my financial circumstances.</p> <p>The property is already extremely expensive to maintain and to add it to a local register will mean building works and improvements will be at least 150 percent more expensive than normal.</p> <p>I would like for you to take my property if this list as it is causing me considerable stress and anxiety!</p> <p>London is already expensive as it is and I take in lodgers to help me survive.</p> <p>The property is already in need of work and local tradesman charge a significant mark up when they quote for works.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>apply to your property and consequently there should be no additional increase in expense in regard to the proposed local listing. It should be noted that the property is proposed to be added to the Local Heritage List and not Historic England's Statutory List.</p> <p>Respondent contacted.</p>	<p>The building is intact.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
146	07/09/2019	<p><b>62-80 Woodside Avenue - HT01246</b></p> <p>I am writing in response to the consultation on the Local Heritage List Review.</p> <p>Specifically regarding the above properties Ref HT01246 – As a resident of Woodside Avenue and of one of these properties, I would welcome their inclusion on the Local Heritage List as a means to maintain and cherish our local architectural heritage, character and history.</p> <p>These are a unique group of 10, intact, double-fronted, semi-detached, residential Edwardian properties with mature front and rear gardens, that are surviving examples of the architectural heritage of Woodside Avenue, and indeed the wider neighbourhood of Woodside Park and Barnet. Given their location, they are recognised not only as a local landmark, but also for their aesthetic qualities contributing to the character of Woodside Avenue whilst retaining its historical legacy.</p> <p>In addition for similar reasons, I would also support inclusion of the following properties on the Local Heritage List :</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>No action</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HT00892 : 42 Woodside Avenue N12 8AX</li> <li>• HT01255 : Corinthian Capital, Woodside Avenue N12 8AS</li> <li>• HT00893 : 1-11 Woodside Lane N12 8RD</li> <li>• HT01248 : 82 Woodside Park Road N12 8RY</li> <li>• HT01247 : Holmewood School Woodside Park Road N12 8SH</li> </ul>		
147	07/09/2019	<p><b>4 Loring Rd - HT01100</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter informing me about the heritage list. Unfortunately this is my only opportunity to answer your letter. I strongly object to having my house being put on the heritage list. I really do not approved of being on this list at all. I would appreciate being taken off the list.</p>	Comments noted. It is considered to meet with the adopted criteria.	<p>No action</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The building is intact.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
148	08/09/2019	<p><b>51 Lyonsdown Avenue - HT01106</b></p> <p>I write regarding the above matter and hereby register my objection to my property being included/added on the Local Heritage List for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It may seriously interfere with any future development of my property having regards to your admission that it may be a consideration in planning decisions.</li> <li>2. Any future development of my property should be unfettered and so I should not be required to go over and above the normal planning regulations available to the general public</li> <li>3. There is no public interest to be achieved by such inclusion of those limited number of buildings that you are attempting to include. Any such interest cannot outweigh the collective interest of those owners whose properties will face the inclusion.</li> </ol>	Comments noted and will be given due consideration although the property is considered to meet with the adopted criteria.	<p>No action</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria.</p> <p>The property meets the selection Criteria</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>4. The progressive reduction in the need for large homes of this nature that attracts Heritage Listings runs contrary to the possibility of my property being converted to smaller units in these modern times.</p> <p>5. The absence of any environmental impact of this proposed action constitutes a dereliction of duty to inform those of us who will be impacted.</p>		
149	08/09/2019	<p><b>13 The Avenue - HT01202</b></p> <p>Thank you for writing to us about the Local Heritage Review.</p> <p>I am just writing to say that I am pleased (and proud!) to have our property included in the list.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed	No action
150	08/09/2019	<p><b>1 &amp; 2 Clyde Villas, Hadley Green Road - HT01031</b></p> <p>I would like to object to it being included in the local Heritage list. These houses are very standard Victorian villas typical of the time of which thousands were constructed and I see no merit in them being listed.</p>	Comments noted. It is considered that the properties meet with the adopted selection criteria.	<p>No action</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
151	08/09/2019	<p><b>6 Loring Road - HT01101</b></p> <p>We have recently been informed that it is nominated to be locally listed.</p> <p>We would like to make it known that we strongly object to this listing, as we are not happy about the restrictions that this may impose. Whilst the property does have some original features, these are not uncommon in the surrounding area.</p>	Comments noted. It is considered to meet with the adopted criteria. There are no additional requirements to apply for any additional permissions over and above normal planning permission.	<p>No action</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The building is intact.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

152	08/09/2019	<p><b>The Cottage, 10 Longland Drive - HT01099</b></p> <p>I am writing to object to (The Cottage, 10 Longland Drive, N20 8HE) being included on the local heritage list.</p> <p>I do not agree that the picture included on the list provides an accurate representation of the aesthetic merit of the property as it does not include the electricity sub-station next door. I do not believe that the property is of aesthetic appeal when the sub-station is included in the photograph.</p> <p>I also do not agree that any case has been made that the property reflects local traditions of design, craftsmanship and materials. My understanding is that it was built as a standard estate office with no local design features and no intention that it should be lived in on a long-term basis.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Due consideration will be given to the issue even though it is considered that the property meets with the adopted selection criteria.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>There are no material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>The building is of historic importance.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
153	09/09/2019	<p><b>The Midland Hotel Public House - HT01292</b></p> <p>We are pleased to support this nomination. The Midland Hotel Public House is very local to us and we are proud to have such an historical gem to call our own. It is architecturally interesting with many original features externally and internally. The cellar tour is especially revealing with its low ceiling and original brick work. It is also of great historical interest and a reminder of the introduction of the railway to Hendon.</p> <p>The Midland is well used by the community and has seen many generations celebrating many happy and sad events in its rooms.</p> <p>It is one of the highlights of Station Road on an otherwise unremarkable road and a well known landmark for pedestrians, public transport and motorists. One would note how close one was to one's destination when passing the Midland Hotel.</p> <p>It is well maintained and a typical English pub and one we are proud to bring our foreign friends to visit.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>No action</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>Please confirm that the Midland Hotel Pub will be designated a local heritage listing.</p> <p>It deserves recognition for its value and its importance to the local area.</p>		
154	09/09/2019	<p><b>The Midland Hotel Public House - HT01292</b></p> <p>The Midland Hotel Public House is only 5 minutes down the road to us and we are extremely fortunate to have such an historical and architectural building to show off to our friends and visitors.</p> <p>Many original features have been preserved externally and internally. There is an old service bell near the front bar fireplace and it is a talking point for new patrons of the pub.</p> <p>The green tiles on the front lower walls of the building, the ornate plaque above the front doors, the balconies and the ironwork seen in the pub are great reminders of an era gone by.</p> <p>It is also interesting to note the two other doors on the sides of the building - they were entrances for different clients in the days when the railway was built; ladies and workmen had separate entrances and separate areas.</p> <p>It is also of great historical interest and a reminder of the introduction of the railway to Hendon.</p> <p>The Midland is very well used and cherished by the community.</p> <p>It is a well known landmark sitting magnificently at the top of the M1 bridge, coming into view as one comes up or down Station road.</p> <p>This is a real traditional English pub and one that deserves to be recognised and preserved for future generations to enjoy.</p> <p>We are pleased to be supporting this nomination.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed.	No action
155	09/09/2019	<p><b>Edgware Station - HT01184</b></p> <p>Edgware Station: Representations on the proposed Local Heritage List 2019</p>	Comments noted. As requested, confirmation provided that representations had been received.	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>We are acting on behalf of our client Aberdeen Standard Investments (ASI) in respect of the Council’s proposal to add Edgware Station to the Local Heritage List, published on July 2019.</p> <p>ASI is the asset manager for The Broadwalk Centre and associated car parking areas, which is situated adjacent to Edgware Station. ASI is currently exploring the potential of development of land in and around the Broadwalk Centre and the railway and bus stations, in conjunction with other stakeholders including the Council and Transport for London. For clarification, as the station sits on a north-east to south-west alignment, we have chosen our cardinal points for reference throughout this letter as west for the principal façade (facing Station Road) and north and south for the station wings.</p> <p>ASI is not challenging the inclusion of Edgware Station on the list in principle, but we are proposing alterations to the scope of the local list to provide greater clarity on what is included. In doing so ASI wishes to ensure the addition of the station to the local list doesn’t unnecessarily inhibit much needed renewal of the area around it.</p> <p>Edgware Station was constructed in 1923-24 as part of the above ground ‘Hampstead Tube’ extension from Golder’s Green to Edgware. The architect of this extension was Stanley Heaps who also designed Brent Cross, Hendon Central, and Burnt Oak (which also proposed for local listing). Heaps adopted variants of a neo- Georgian style for each of these stations and the main ticket hall at Edgware has a simple colonnade with shallow side projections, original neo-Georgian doors and a dentilled architrave on the interior. The station was originally designed with two wings which defined a rectangular forecourt; the north wing was demolished in 1938 and the south in 1988-9.1 The building was extended to the east between 1951 and 1963.</p> <p>The north wing was replaced in the 1990s on a different alignment from the original wing. Edgware retains many of its neo-Georgian features, the main ticket hall is largely intact (albeit with an additional south entrance) and it is read as part of Stanley Heap’s design scheme of which two of the stations</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>are listed. The main ticket hall and west façade seem to meet the General Principles of Selection of architectural and historic interest outlined in the Local Heritage List consultation document. However, while the ticket hall and west façade contribute to the local character of Barnet, the site has been much altered since it was constructed and the whole site is not of local listing quality. The proposed local listing description includes mention of the north wing, shops and forecourt which are all modern additions within the last 30 years of no architectural merit. The General Principles of Selection requires that no assets within the last 30 years are considered eligible, that assets dating from post-1910 require great selectivity and that “only high-quality examples from the inter-war and post-war period will be selected”. On this basis, the east wing and forecourt should not be included in the description for the site. Furthermore, the additional elements of the station to the east of the ticket hall added between 1951 and 1963 are of no architectural interest and do not merit inclusion on the Local List.</p> <p>Based on our understanding of the building and in order to retain the integrity of the Local List in accordance with the General Principles of Selection, the scope of the local list entry for Edgware Station should be specified to only include the main ticket hall and west façade.</p>		
156	09/09/2019	<p><b>High Barnet (p.324) HT01265, Edgware (p, 325) HT01184 Finchley Central (p.326) HT01264</b></p> <p>Transport for London Commercial Development Response: Consultation on LB Barnet Draft Revised Local Heritage List Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the proposed additions to your Local Heritage List of buildings. Please note that our representations below represent the views of the Transport for London Commercial Development (TfL CD) planning team in its capacity as a significant landowner in the borough and do not form part of any response from TfL City Planning or London Underground Ltd. We acknowledge that the Council proposes to add a number of London</p>	<p>Comments noted. Confirmation provided that representations had been received as requested</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

	<p>Underground stations in the borough to the local list, including three Northern Line stations where we are currently proposing commercial development at High Barnet, Finchley Central and Edgware</p> <p>The proposals to ‘locally list’ these transportation infrastructure assets must not inhibit either TfL / London Underground’s essential transportation functions and operations, or our ability to deliver the housing-led regeneration of adjacent land that we own.</p> <p>TfL CD (together with its partner Taylor Wimpey) is working with Barnet Council’s planning, design, transportation and regeneration officers to bring forward regenerative, housing-led development around both High Barnet and Finchley Central stations.</p> <p>The area around Finchley Central station has been identified for a number of years as a strategic opportunity site - in the ‘We Made That’ town centre strategy and also earlier strategies. This is strengthened by the Council’s draft Growth Strategy (which is subject to a concurrent consultation) commitment to prioritising significant growth in town centres and key thoroughfares and, in particular, to “work with TfL to shape developments at High Barnet and Finchley Central” (page 51).</p> <p>Our schemes for these places will optimise housing delivery, as well as new jobs and community facilities, within new public realm and landscaped settings which will benefit the immediate and wider settings to the station buildings. They will provide enhanced public realm and access to the stations, ensuring a better customer experience for London Underground passengers and the wider local community. We will continue to work with Barnet officers to ensure that the design of the respective proposed developments preserve and enhance the settings of both station buildings. We do not currently propose any work that would impact upon the actual fabric of any of the historic station buildings.</p> <p>With other local land owners and the Council, TfL is currently exploring the potential for development at and around the railway and bus stations as part of wider transformative change in the area. We acknowledge the borough’s intention to add the station building to the local list and would need to ensure that this would not inhibit the positive changes that the area so badly needs. We look forward to continuing to work with the borough to shape the delivery of development in this location.</p>		
--	--	--	--

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>We are aware of the representations submitted by Lichfields on behalf of Aberdeen Standard Investments. We concur with their view that not all parts of the site are worthy of local listing. Accordingly, we suggest that it is made clear that the following later additions to the site are not covered by local listing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the north wing, shops and forecourt; and</li> <li>• the east wing and forecourt.</li> </ul> <p>Concluding Remarks We trust that we have provided sufficient information for the Council to be able to consider our representations. However, if you require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>		
157	09/09/2019	<p><b>No.16 The Bishops Ave - HT00664</b></p> <p>We are writing with regards to the Local Heritage listing proposal letter . We can not agree to this proposal and strongly object to this as it has no basis and all the information supplied is wrong and therefore your intention is based on false data and totally inaccurate.</p> <p>1- Your undated letter regarding this matter was addressed to No. 16A which is a property on the other side of Deans way. The owners of that property are different, they were on holiday and just passed this letter to us .</p> <p>2- The Site refrence number HT 00664 on the letter refers to; 'SITE ; No. 16 (Deansgrath) The Bishops Avenue, NW2 0AJ'</p> <p>The post cost is totally different to ours, our post code is N2 0AN.</p> <p>3- The details on the list is inaccurate and not correct.</p> <p>4- The house does not fall under any of the categories you have list being;' age, Rarity, Aesthetic Merits, Landmark Qualities, Intactness, Group Value and Social and Communal Value ' . We have consulted the expert local Architect , Nicholas Brill who has confirmed the same that this is an ordinary house with no special features and that it certainly does not fall within above selection principals.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be considered in due course. The property has been on the local list since 1986 and is still considered to meet with the adopted criteria. Where there are inaccuracies in the details, such as the postcode, these will be amended.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria and evidence produced.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>5- In the last 25 years or so, the house has been subject to several major changes of Extensions , additions and other changes (By consent) and therefore it is not original in that respect.</p> <p>6- The property is already under strict control and restrictions by HGST and of course local planning and therefore any further restriction will only be viewed as a way of making future applications more complicated and expensive with no logical or justification. We have also been advised by expert local valuers that such added listing will strongly the pricing of the property as most buyers will not want to be bound by so many restrictions.</p> <p>Above are only some of the main reasons as to why this proposal is not acceptable or correct . Kindly make sure no such restriction is applied to above property as it will be desisted and objected to vigorously and officially adding cost and time to the issue without any gain.</p> <p>Thanking you in advance for this reconsideration and we await your confirmation of the same.</p>		
158	09/09/2019	<p><b>40 Oakleigh Park South - HHT01141</b></p> <p>This firm acts for the freeholder of the Property, and this email is in response to your (undated) letter to the occupant which has only recently been passed on to us, on 19th August, by the tenant. It is unfortunate that the consultation period is so short and also coincides squarely with the holiday season. In some respects we are fortunate that the tenant passed on the correspondence at all. In light of the council's decision to write only to the occupier there must be a number of properties where the freeholder remains unaware of the decision to list.</p> <p>Be that as it may, we have the following comments in relation to the Property's proposed listing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Property is provisionally listed for its Architectural Interest on the grounds of Intactness</li> <li>2. One of the chief aspects of the external appearance of the Property is the render covering the first floor levels and above on the front, rear and side elevations. We doubt that this render is original to the Property albeit that the</li> </ol>	<p>The property has been assessed as meeting the selection criteria and is considered to be of architectural interest and is intact of many of its original features. However, the property is also considered to be of aesthetic merit. We will consider your comments in due course. Any further historical information on the property would be gratefully received.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>Considered the material considerations raised in relation to the selection criteria and evidence produced.</p> <p>The project was undertaken by volunteers who were only able to view potential and existing assets from the public highway. As such based on this the building met</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>limited time available has not permitted the necessary research to be carried out within the timescale.</p> <p>3. It is noteworthy that Aesthetic Merit has not been selected as the criterion for listing under the Architectural Interest heading. In light of the (in our view correct) lack of perceived aesthetic merit, we would argue that inclusion under the Intactness heading, if at all, should be a high bar, requiring that original design and building materials have in all material aspects demonstrably been preserved. We do not consider that the Property meets that bar.</p> <p>4. As in 1986, when the compilers of the Local List presumably came to the view that the Property was not of the quality of its neighbours, we would contend it remains the poor relation in relation to other properties in the near vicinity.</p> <p>5. Being from a period which is not particularly old (Late Victorian) again we would argue: that the bar for inclusion in the List should be a high one; that the Property is not an example of quality architecture from that period; and that the Property does not meet that bar so as to justify Listing.</p> <p>We should be grateful if you could either reconsider your decision in light of these comments and remove the Property from the provisional List or, if nonetheless minded to proceed with listing, permit more time to enable research into the history of the Property to be carried out by our client.</p> <p>In the meantime we reserve our client's position generally.</p>		<p>the criteria and continues to do so.</p> <p>The building appears to be intact.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
159	09/09/2019	<p><b>Midland Hotel - HT01292</b></p> <p>I was pleased to learn the "Mids" has been nominated. It is an authentic community pub and music venue, without which life would be much poorer. I often travel from the other side of the borough to go here! Long may it stay.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed	No action
160	09/09/2019	<p><b>Comments from the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust</b></p> <p>We've had a quick look through the draft local list document and have picked up the following errors:</p> <p>1-2 Fairway Close HT00157 has no architect or date. I believe these are C.H. James houses 1929.</p>	Comments noted. Amendments will be made to the text.	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>1 Romney Close HT 00590 is down as Quennell, 1923- this should be Harriss &amp; Harriss, 1909.</p> <p>2 Romney Close HT00591 is down as Soutar, 1911- this should be Wrightson Bateson, 1911.</p> <p>3 Romney Close HT00592 is down as Gould, 1922- this should be Quennell, 1922.</p> <p>Bishop's Court HT00680 should have Sutcliffe as the architect.</p> <p>Kind regards Assistant Architectural Adviser , Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust</p>		
161	09/09/2019	<p><b>General comment. No address supplied.</b></p> <p>Why was this consultation not on at <a href="https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/">https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/</a>? How are we to know that you are consulting on this? I only found out through a friend of a friend, despite checking <a href="https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/">https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/</a> regularly. And now it is nearly too late.</p> <p>It would have been helpful if there was also a list of buildings, water-troughs, markers, .... that had been nominated but not included, with the reason why not.</p> <p>Why was The Arcade in North Finchley not included? Or the buildings that formed the Finchley Electric Light Company Buildings, including the building in Victoria Park near Ballards Lane and the small building (looks like a garage) in Regents Park Road not far from the Holiday Inn and I understand that there is also something at Pentlands associated with this?</p> <p>However, I am pleased that among others nominated that Finchley Central Station is and the Midland Hotel, both of which have historical interest and communal value.</p> <p>Will this list be updated yearly now? It should be. Better communication regarding this is needed. The Lodge in Victoria Park should have been</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The original consultation for nomination for inclusion to the Local List can be found on the Engage Barnet website at <a href="https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/new-local-list">engage.barnet.gov.uk/new-local-list</a>, running from the 21st July 2017 to the 21st October 2017, offering the community the opportunity to identify heritage assets.</p> <p>Various local residential associations and amenity societies were also aware of the consultation exercise.</p>	Actioned

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>included for its age, communal value (could have been used as park of the park) and for the architectural historical interest as a building by the Victorians when they acquired Victoria Park. The different park-keepers buildings were reasonably unique in design and now hardly any from the Victorian Era are left. Shame.</p> <p>Why not re-open this consultation and place it at <a href="https://engage.barnet.gov.uk">https://engage.barnet.gov.uk</a>?</p>		
		<b>Comments received after consultation had closed</b>		
162	10/09/2019	<p><b>The Midland Hotel - HTO1292</b></p> <p>I am writing to support calls for the listing of the Midland Hotel on 29 Station Road in Hendon in my capacity as London Assembly member for Barnet and Camden, as well as having known the area extremely well when MP for Hendon between 1997-2010.</p> <p>The Midland is an attractive 1860s building, with later additions in keeping with its original design. It is a major building of note and a physical reminder of the coming of the railway to Hendon over 150 years ago and of the heyday of the Welsh Harp as pleasure-grounds for Londoners. The Midland was a popular pub and community centre for Victorian residents, and it continues to be so to this day.</p> <p>The Midland was recently threatened with demolition, but the developers- after considerable local protests- decided to withdraw that application. However, the building remains under threat. New proposals suggest that the pub (with over-powering new blocks of flats behind it) would be allowed to remain, but only with additions and alterations to its structure. These plans would make the functioning of the Midland as a pub impossible, and ultimately lead to its demise. That would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Pubs are important to local communities as places where all manner of people can meet in friendship. They are landmarks, and visible reminders of how areas have come into being. In the thirty years that I have represented Hendon, most of its pubs have either been demolished or turned to other uses, which is an extremely sad loss. The Midland is a good building and a much-loved pub: it must be preserved.</p> <p>Labour London Assembly Member for Barnet and Camden</p>	<p>Please note that the consultation period is now closed. However, your comments are noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

163	10/09/2019	<p><b>62 Avondale Avenue - HT00906</b></p> <p>I write as the owner of 62 Avondale Avenue in respect of the proposal to include my property on the Heritage list.</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to the proposal. Whilst I appreciate that there is architectural merit in the properties on the road many of the properties have been altered or extended over the years. My concern is that any listing will make future alterations more difficult. Either alterations will not be permitted because of the listed status or the process for obtaining approval will be elongated which will naturally come with additional costs.</p> <p>People such as myself who have purchased properties with the intention of making alterations that would either result in us staying at the property for a longer period of time or resulting in an increase in value of the property will be denied the opportunity to do so. It would be unfair to deny recent purchasers of properties on the road that opportunity which those who have been there for a longer period of time, have enjoyed.</p> <p>I hope that you will take these comments on board and would be grateful for confirmation that they will be considered as part of this consultation process.</p>	<p>Please note that the consultation period is now closed. However, your comments are noted. There are no additional requirements to apply for any additional permissions over and above normal planning permission. Any existing permitted development rights still remain and there should be no additional costs over and above that which would be incurred under a standard planning application. The consultation letter also makes it clear that requests to remove an asset will generally only be considered if, for example, the building is not as described or is factually misrepresented in the selection criteria.</p>	<p>Actioned</p> <p>No material considerations raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
164	11/09/2019	<p><b>Lyttleton Court - HT00430</b></p> <p>I am replying to your letter regarding the local heritage list. Please forgive the late response as I misplaced this letter and only just found it, I would be most grateful if you could still consider my comments.</p> <p>I am a owner of a property in Lyttleton court which is listed for Architectural interest with principles including aesthetic interests.</p> <p>As a part of this 'aesthetic' I understand it demands that its original single glazed, wood framed windows are to be maintained. This affects me directly as it was due to these difficult to maintain windows that my property suffered significant damage from damp. I personally believe that it is unfair to expect such old fashioned windows to be maintained in this current age. Not only are they energy inefficient (particularly important given the number of</p>	<p>Please note that the consultation period is now closed. However, your comments are noted.</p>	

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>properties in these buildings), they are also poor at insulating from noise (given that we are situated off the A1 this is very much an issue), in addition to this they are inferior in terms of security to our properties and (I believe) they are more of a fire risk compared to a PVC alternative.</p> <p>PVC windows in the same style can give a very comparable aesthetic to the naked eye, whilst being superior in terms of insulation, noise reduction, security and fire safety.</p> <p>I understand that a lot of money is needed to maintain these wooden frames which are susceptible to water damage and often require replacement, repair and repainting which is a cost that our Property management take on but is ultimately paid for by us (the leaseholders) in the form of service charge.</p> <p>Im not sure whether this was the type of feedback you were after, but I am keen that my voice and the voices of other property owners are heard as the issues I listed above (cost, safety, warmth, noise) are of more relevance to our day to day life than the importance of aesthetics and architectural interest. Plus, I do not believe that using newer technology necessarily needs to compromise the aesthetics of the building.</p>		
165	29/07/2019	<p>Letter received. <b>38-86 (even) Temple Fortune Lane - HT00657</b></p> <p>Letter of support for the Local Heritage List review.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed	No action
166	04/08/2019	<p>Letter received. <b>Nos. 1 - 33 (Odd) Raydean Road - HT01159</b></p> <p>Letter stating interest in the possible listing of the properties.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed	No action
167	undated	<p>Letter received. <b>1-38 Needham Terrace - HT00498</b></p> <p>Letter informing of inaccurate text description for Needham Terrace.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. Amendments to description have been made. Respondent contacted by phone.	Actioned
168	12/09/2019	<p><b>15-16 Raeburn Close - HT00583</b></p> <p>I called the planning department this morning to explain that my 94 year old mother who lives at the above address has been away for a while</p>	Comments noted. The property has been on the local list since 2010. Inclusion of a property on the list does not	Actioned  No material considerations

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>recuperating at mine and the letter had not been received. I was told that would accept a late comments submission.</p> <p>My mother, has asked me to write on her behalf. She is not happy for her house, to be included in this list.</p> <p>The factual description in your entry states "Balcony to first floor front with punctured brick balustrade". This is not an original feature. In fact the whole left side of the house was extended in the 1960s with a 2 storey extension showing in your photo as the garage and rooms above. Number 2 Raeburn Close which is opposite, copied this design many years later.</p> <p>For this reason, she does not accept that her house is a building of local architectural interest as it looks totally different from the original and does not match her neighbour's also on the list. A porch has also been added, changing it further.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you and thank you for accepting this late submission.</p>	<p>remove any permitted development rights or prevent alterations to the building. It is still considered that the property meets the adopted criteria and should remain on the list.</p>	<p>raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Make sure the listing description is correct.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
169	21/09/2019	<p><b>The Grange - HT00200</b></p> <p>Firstly I have received your letter this morning 21st September which is a little late to make comments as your deadline is in two days time. Other interested parties may feel this too.</p> <p>The Grange is a well proportioned building which sits very well in its situation and it would be a shame if any alterations or additions were ever made to jt.</p> <p>So I make these comments with basically the aesthetic merits of the building uppermost.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>No action</p>
170	23/09/2019	<p><b>The Grange - HT00200</b></p> <p>I was informed on Saturday by a neighbour that the deadline is today.</p> <p>I am very happy for the building to remain as it is with no changes. It is in a beautiful setting and I wish it to remain this way.</p> <p>Thanking you kindly</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>No action</p>
171	30/09/2019	<p><b>35-37 Station Road - HT01186</b></p> <p>We have received the attached letter regarding 35-37 Station Road on proposal for entry onto the Local Heritage List. As 37 is vacant and 35 tenanted we have only just received the letter and we understand the</p>	<p>Response received after the close date of the consultation.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No material considerations</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

		<p>consultation window has now closed. Whilst we understand the deadline has passed we would ask for your consideration to remove the property from the list please.</p> <p>We have received planning permission for future development and are looking at a sale in the near future so wish to contest the properties' entry at this time.</p>		<p>raised against the selection criteria.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>
172	03/10/2019	<p><b>1 Hendon Avenue - HT00284</b></p> <p>Dear S. Sowerby</p> <p>I have just received your letter Ref HT00284</p> <p>The house is freehold and is also in the name of my husband.</p> <p>For some reason un be known to me, it only arrived in the post yesterday. and I am responding immediately.</p> <p>It seems my house is locally listed, and I cannot think why.</p> <p>It is a 1908 built house, unlike the house opposite which is the original estate gate house and built around 300 years ago,</p> <p>IF that house ,is being locally listed and of architectural interest, I can perhaps understand.# But not mine.</p> <p>We even have the problem of our front door being on the street.</p> <p>Noise, and litter to say the least.</p> <p>Across the road from stands a fairly new build;next to us on both sides, are new builds - houses and flats and around us generally</p> <p>are so many buildings, homes of more aesthetic merit and interest than our property that have been demolished.</p>	Response received after the close date of the consultation.	<p>No action</p> <p>Noted the material considerations and evidence produced.</p> <p>Remain on list</p>

## Appendix 1 – Draft Local Heritage List (TABLE OF RESPONSES)

	<p>Hendon lane has lost so many beautiful homes - flats built in their place. We are surrounded by new build, so any interest in preservation of our property becomes meaningless.</p> <p>We are hampered by this local listing and really need to have this rescinded. It seems that the local listing border is just falls next t our house - south of our boundary the listing stops.</p> <p>We have approached Barnet before - not successful, but on seeing this letter I would hope that things have moved on and we might have some success.</p> <p>I would be pleased to have a meeting here to discuss the matter if that would be possible and hope to hear back.</p>		
--	---	--	--