

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
1	24/05/2021	<p><b>969 Finchley Road - HT01304</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter regarding the Local Heritage List Review.</p> <p>I have now seen how you have described our above house. You mention 'Original oak joinery re boundary wall and entrance gate'. I regret this is incorrect as we had to renew everything about 10 years ago when a car smashed into the front and destroyed a great deal. At the same time, the front of the house was changed to a carriage-drive.</p> <p>I am somewhat unclear for what purpose the list has been made. If eg we had to renew the roof, could a grant be obtained?</p>	<p><b>Officer response 03/06/2021</b></p> <p>We note the comments in reference to the wall and entrance gate. This will be corrected.</p> <p>The purpose of the Local Heritage List is to identify and list those buildings and structures in Barnet of local architectural or historic interest. There are many such assets which fall below the threshold to be worthy of statutory listing, but nevertheless have local interest. Most Councils have such a list, which is encouraged by government. There are, however, no additional planning permissions required as a result of being included on the List. Unfortunately, no grants are available for building or other works.</p>	<p>Text to description amended. Nomination to remain.</p>
2	Original email received 02/06/2021	<p><b>98 Torrington Park - HT01330</b></p> <p>With reference to your letter signed by Cllr Stephen Sowerby regarding a proposal to include our property on the Schedule of Buildings of Local Architectural Interest we wish to inform you that we do not consent or wish our property to be included on the Heritage List.</p> <p>Our house, in which our family has lived for many years, is one of a number of houses in the immediate area of Torrington Park built in the same historical era, and has no particular special</p>	<p><b>Cllr. response sent 02/06/2021</b></p> <p>Any person or society can nominate a building for inclusion on the local list of heritage assets and I genuinely have no idea who nominated your home.</p> <p>The letter in my name provides the building owner/s with a Council email address to direct objections or further questions. However, for these objections to be considered materially relevant they will need to articulate planning reasons as opposed to simply stating you</p>	<p>Selection Panel considered that the nomination satisfied the approved criteria.</p> <p>Nomination to remain.</p>

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>architectural value or historical significance over those other properties. We therefore request the nomination for listing to be withdrawn. We would be interested to know where this proposal originated from.</p> <p><b>Follow up email sent 03/06/2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for your email dated 2 June in reply to our emails. of 2 June to London Borough of Barnet Strategic Planning Consultation and yourself in reply to your initial letter.</p> <p>Barnet Council’s website states that Barnet’s Local Planning Authority produces the local list under advice received from Historic England, which provides, in Barnet Council’s words, “a good practice guide for local heritage listing, which explains why and how buildings are selected.”</p> <p>Within that 2021 Historic England guidance, paragraph 55 says:</p> <p>“55 - The responsibility for assessing any requests not to list could fall to the selection panel or local authority staff, but it is important that a procedure is put in place for handling requests from owners not to designate, and this procedure is adequately publicised”</p> <p>We have two questions:</p>	<p>object.</p> <p><b>Officer response sent 07/06/2021</b></p> <p>In reply to your email of the 3rd June to Cllr. Sowerby, I would respond to your questions as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Following completion of the consultation exercise, any responses received to the proposed nominations will be presented to the Review Board/selection panel for their consideration.</li> <li>2. All the proposed nominations would need to satisfy the adopted Selection Criteria, details of which can be found on page 2 of the Local Heritage List Nominations 2021 document, which can be found here: Microsoft PowerPoint - Nomination draft presentation (barnet.gov.uk) . This document sets out for each nomination what individual interest and criteria the nomination is considered to meet for inclusion on the Local Heritage List. Any objection to a proposed listing should state clearly how or why the nomination does not meet the indicated criteria.</li> </ol> <p>I trust this clarifies the issue.</p>	

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>1. Please can you let us know what is the procedure for handing requests not to designate? It does not appear this has been adequately publicised.</p> <p>2. In your email you state “for objections to be considered materially relevant they will need to articulate planning reasons as opposed to simply stating you object.” Please can you direct us to what specific “planning reasons” would be considered, and where that specific requirement has come from?</p> <p>In our view, for a person to propose that our property is included on the Heritage list and then for it to be included on the list without our consent seems an unfair and unreasonable process. We would wish to ensure that the proper process is followed.</p> <p><b>Follow up email and letter received 4/7/2021</b></p> <p>Further to the undated letter we received from Barnet Council in late May 2021 we write to provide planning reasons why we object to the proposal to include our property on the local heritage list.</p> <p>We also attach a report from Dr. Peter Wardle, one of the country’s local listing and heritage experts, whom we have instructed in this matter and who has provided detail on the planning reasons why this proposal should be rejected by the Council.</p>	<p><b>Comments made to individual items below</b></p>	

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>In addition to the points made by the expert in that attached report, we also set out some summary comments below in relation to each of the nomination criteria:</p> <p>1. Intactness</p> <p>As explained by the heritage expert, the building is not intact and has had various alterations and extensions over the last 100 years, including:</p> <p>(i) major alterations comprising a conservatory, conversion of second floor flat in 1949 and addition of garage;</p> <p>(ii) new front window added in 1960s to ground floor in different style and size to other windows;</p> <p>(iii) new dormer window at front of the house in different style and size to the other house windows added at time of the second floor conversion in 1949;</p> <p>(iv) plastic guttering throughout replacing the original iron guttering;</p> <p>(v) the second floor flat is entirely separate to the ground and first floor maisonette and has a different style and size front door and separate stairs;</p> <p>(vi) all original roof tiles have been replaced across</p>	<p>It is not considered that any subsequent external additions or extensions to the property have proven to be detrimental to the overall appearance of the property and the building form can still be fully understood.</p> <p>Internal works or alterations have no bearing on the decision to include the property on the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>It can be reasonably expected over time that some materials may be replaced but this has not been to the detriment of the appearance of the property.</p>	

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>the whole of the house;</p> <p>(vii) there is replacement of many original ornamental tiles to new tiles (now visibly in a different colour and material);</p> <p>(viii) the conservatory built in 2000 used different colour and style bricks to the colour of the main house.</p> <p>2. Aesthetic merits The house is not aesthetic for the reasons described by the heritage expert report. A further point we would like to add is that there is an unsightly modern block next door which is very evidently visible when looking at the back of the house from the back garden, and this greatly removes any aesthetic merits. The block of flats next door is extremely close and overpowering on 98 Torrington Park from the rear side. Any aesthetic reasons being given as a reason for listing are subjective to a nominator and they are not objective or reasonable, especially with this view from the back which the nominator will not have seen.</p> <p>3. Architectural interest The house does not have architectural interest, and as the heritage expert states no detailed reasoning has been given for this description. In addition, the house was not designed by a known architect.</p>	<p>As the report indicates “beauty is in the eye of the beholder” and the board took a view that the property was attractive and makes a positive contribution to the streetscene.</p> <p>The unsightliness of nearby development is immaterial when considering the aesthetic merits of this property.</p> <p>The property is considered to be an attractive local example of a suburban late-Victorian property built in in the Arts and Crafts style.</p>	

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>4. Other selection criteria</p> <p>As the heritage expert has also identified in his report, the house does not have any of the other criteria to make it suitable for listing, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no age and rarity (there are a number of other houses of a similar age in the immediate area of this road not on the nomination list);</li> <li>• No Landmark quality;</li> <li>• No Group value; and</li> <li>• No Social and communal value (and it also does not have connection to a well-known or famous person)</li> </ul> <p>5. Process</p> <p>The second floor flat (which has its own separate council tax and utilities) was not notified by the Council about the proposal to list the entire building, and this is another reason why the proposal should not be carried forward. Furthermore, we do not believe that sufficient and reasonable notice and time to respond was given by the Council to us in relation to this process generally (the undated letter was only received at the end of May 2021, with request for response to the Council only a few weeks later by 5 July 2021 – and this was the very first time we knew anything about this nomination proposal). We are not sure why our property was nominated, or who</p>	<p>The comments received do indicate that the property has local heritage significance, being over 120 years old.</p> <p>The consultation period was 6 weeks in duration, which is considered sufficient time for any objections or comments to be made, particularly in light of the lengthy correspondence submitted in relation to this nomination.</p> <p>The council regret the omission of a letter to the second flat but were unaware that there were two properties when the nomination was submitted. Subsequently a letter was sent to the second floor flat on the 7<sup>th</sup>/July 2021 extending the date for submission of any comments until the 11<sup>th</sup> August 2021.</p>	

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>nominated it and why.</p> <p>Therefore, in conclusion for the above-stated reasons (both for planning reasons and process) and for the planning reasons given in heritage expert report, we kindly request that this proposal is removed from the local listing proposals.</p> <p><b>The submitted report, dated the 4<sup>th</sup> July 2021, authored by Dr. Peter Wardle from the Historic Environment Consultancy and, due to its length, a relevant portion of it is included here, including Dr. Wardle’s conclusion:</b></p> <p>Aesthetic merits  Aesthetic is defined by the Little Oxford Dictionary as Sensitive to beautiful or tasteful. This building is not beautiful. Equally modern conservation is not about facadism but about the whole building - the rear and sides of the building are far from aesthetic.</p> <p>The protection regime for buildings is not purely about protecting pretty buildings it is about protecting buildings which have an architectural or historic value. It is suggested that on its own the aesthetic merits are a weak reason to locally list a building.</p> <p>It does have to be said that detached houses, which are more expensive to build, are generally, “nicer” houses than mass built houses and have greater detail. The addition of dormer windows with different tiles, and the extensions, as</p>		

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>well as the detracting 1930s garage and the attic conversion greatly diminish the architectural and aesthetic merits of the building. It is noted that Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.</p> <p><b>Architectural Interest</b> What is the architectural interest in the building is not stated in the Nomination document. The architect or designer is not known.</p> <p><b>Intactness</b> The building is not an intact Victorian Building – it is in fact much altered by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conversion of loft space to a separate flat in the 1950s with separate stairs and entrance as well as dormer windows added</li> <li>• Stairs to the attic added and a replacement main stair, radically altering the plan form of the building</li> <li>• Non Victorian windows in the entire house</li> <li>• Addition of two Extensions – detracting garage built in the 1930s and the conservatory</li> <li>• Replacement roof and hanging tiles of a different type and colour</li> <li>• Replacement of cast iron Rainwater goods with plastic</li> <li>• Lack of Victorian outbuildings such as coach house, greenhouse, coal store, outside toilet.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Criteria</b> It is agreed that the other criteria do not apply that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age and rarity</li> </ul>		



# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landmark qualities</li> <li>• Group value</li> <li>• Social and communal value including association with noteworthy owner.</li> </ul> <p>Conclusions In my view the building does not merit inclusion on the Barnet List of Heritage Assets because the degree of alteration reduces the architectural interest and aesthetic merits to a great extent.</p> <p><b>Email received 05/08/2021 in regards to Second floor flat, 98 Torrington Park - HT01330</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter to the second floor flat which I received on 11 July 2021.</p> <p>For all the reasons previously already given in the letter sent to you on 4 July 2021 (including in the report of the local listing heritage expert Dr Peter Wardle), the proposal to include 98 Torrington Park on the local heritage list should be rejected by the Council.</p> <p>The house is not at all intact (not least because of a major conversion of the house to separate flats in 1949, which means that the second floor flat (also known as 98A) is totally separate, with a separate front door and stairs and no access to the rest of the house, a separate lease and all separate utilities. It also has a dormer window at the front and front door in different style to the rest of the</p>	<p>Acknowledged receipt of the email on the 6th August 2021.</p>	<p>Selection Panel considered that the nomination satisfied the approved criteria.</p> <p>Nomination to remain.</p>

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>house. It is also not reasonable to say that the house is intact, as it has also had other extensions with garage and also conservatory.</p> <p>In addition, for the reasons outlined by the heritage expert Dr Peter Wardle in the letter previously sent to the Council on 4 July 2021, the house also does not have architectural interest or aesthetic merit and this is supported by photographic evidence already supplied.</p> <p>I kindly request therefore that the Council reject this proposal.</p>		
3	03/06/2021	<p><b>163 Victoria Road - HT01331</b></p> <p>Thank you for your recent letter which proposes adding my house to The Local Heritage List. I was interested to read the description of my property in the Local Heritage Nominations 2021 document which I found via your website. I concur with this description and the views it expressed about the property.</p> <p>The house was built in 1892 and is a fine example of a bourgeois Victorian Villa. It has never been significantly modernised internally and contains many original interior features. It also has connections to local trades and occupations as its longest-term resident ran a small woodwork factory which still stands at the end of Victoria Road, close</p>	<p>Response sent 04/06/2021</p> <p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>In response to your questions:</p> <p>There are no restrictions on changing the windows to double glazing as permitted development allows such works to dwelling houses.</p> <p>An extension may or not require planning permission, depending on its size and siting. This is no different whether the house is locally listed or not.</p> <p>Any planning application to make changes</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Nomination to remain.</p>

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>to Warwick Close. When built, the factory was in the grounds of the property which extended from the house as far as the end of Victoria Road, close to Warwick Close. So I could in time provide more details to add to the current description in your Local Heritage Nominations 2021 document.</p> <p>However, I have some questions about the implications of having the property listed on The Local Heritage List to which I seek a reply. Maintaining the building is clearly expensive. For example, the complex wooden windows and other external wooden features need to be repainted regularly. So would a listing on The Local Heritage List prevent an owner from changing the windows in favour of a more modern system of double glazing? Or would it prevent the granting of an extension? Such issues are important because any future buyer might acquire the building/site with a view to a radical redevelopment, such as an apartment block. Would a listing on The Local Heritage List prevent any such radical redevelopment?</p> <p><b>Additional email sent 09/06/2021</b></p> <p>Thanks very much for your prompt reply to my e-mail of 3rd June. For the avoidance of any doubt on the matter, I am pleased to confirm that I am happy for my house to be included on the Local Heritage List. It remains my aim to retain the property's original</p>	<p>involving demolition and replacement with a new building would be assessed against a variety of policies, including the effect on the heritage value of the building.</p> <p>In general terms, local listing does not mean that alterations cannot be made, simply that when planning permission is applied for the heritage value and significance of the building will be taken into consideration.</p>	

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>features as best as I can, and without modernizing the exterior if this can be avoided.</p>		
4	03/06/2021	<p><b>The Grand Arcade, North Finchley - HT01297</b></p> <p>We are managing agents for Summercourt Holdings Ltd, who have the freehold interest in 1-19 Grand Arcade, N120EH including Apex House, Industrial House, Rex House and 2-4 Nether Street. 1-6 Grand Arcade fronts onto High Road, North Finchley, 16-19 Grand Arcade fronts onto Ballards Lane, North Finchley and Rex House and 2-4 Nether Street on Nether Street.</p> <p>We have been forwarded a letter addressed to 9 Grand Arcade stating that the property is subject to inclusion in the Local Heritage List. So that we are able to take instructions from our client, could you kindly confirm what extent of our client's freehold interest is proposed to be included on the Local Heritage List</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you further on this.</p> <p><b>Further email with letter received 02/07/2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for your email dated 7th June 2021, clarifying that the local heritage listing would only apply to the internal areas of the Arcade and not those units fronting Ballards Lane, High Road and Nether Street. Since my initial letter it has come to light that most, if not all of the units, have received</p>	<p><b>Officer response sent 07/06/2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 3rd June.</p> <p>The extent of the Grand Arcade that has been provisionally accepted for inclusion on the Local Heritage List is the covered pedestrian shopping arcade. The jewellers at no.9 lies within the arcade.</p> <p>The local listing would exclude those units that do not have a physical presence within the covered part of the arcade, which front the High Road and Ballards Lane.</p> <p>The issues relating to the arcade's state of disrepair, lack of maintenance and incidents of anti-social behaviour are not considered to justify omitting the Grand Arcade from nomination to the Local Heritage List. However, only the covered shopping arcade including units 7-15 will feature on the List. Any future proposals for the redevelopment of this part of</p>	<p>No material justification has been provided not to include on the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>Clarification that only the covered pedestrian arcade to be included.</p> <p>Nomination to remain.</p>

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>a copy of this letter informing that the property is subject to local heritage listing, even those that sit outside of the 'covered pedestrian shopping arcade'.</p> <p>Having consulted with our client, we have serious reservations in placing the Grand Arcade into a Local Heritage listing. The Arcade is, generally, in a bad state of repair and in desperate need of renovation. The property is old and has many challenges in keeping up with maintenance.</p> <p>Furthermore, having liaised with many of the locals in the area, the general consensus is that the Arcade looks 'dingy and scary' and that they would not feel safe walking through there, even during the daytime.</p> <p>The Arcade has been subject to several instances of anti-social behaviour in the recent past. Walls have been vandalized, almost as soon as they are made good. There have been fights, which people are too frightened to break up. On 20th October 2020 one of our tenants was stabbed inside his shop, requiring hospital treatment, thankfully he has made a full recovery but next time we may not be so fortunate. There have been instances of homeless people, often with dogs, using the area to seek shelter at night and leaving an unpleasant mess behind them in the morning. A few of our tenants think they have also witnessed drug deals taking place in the Arcade. Again this is not something anyone feels comfortable in confronting but all adds to a negative impression.</p> <p>We have tried to improve the lighting and improve</p>	<p>North Finchley will require a balanced planning judgement, including consideration of the scale of any harm, the significance of the asset and the merits of the scheme including any public benefits that result.</p>	

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>the appearance, even submitting a planning permission to make improve the external appearance, which was subsequently rejected. We have tried to improve the calibre of tenants but not many tenants are keen to rent a shop in an area with such a small footfall.</p> <p>We appreciate the Arcade is a long standing, iconic part of North Finchley but considering the above, we feel that it is no longer functional in its current state and a Local Heritage listing for the Arcade would further jeopardies the future of the Arcade and be detriment to the area in the long term. Any future plans we have for the site would always look to preserve the heritage of this iconic building and we would always look favourably to work with the local authority to achieve this but by placing such a restriction on the site would be detrimental in the long term, especially in relation to the North Finchley Town Centre Framework published by Barnet Council on October 2017.</p> <p>On 7.10.22 a Statement of Significance on The Grand Arcade was submitted on behalf of Regal JP North Finchley Limited (Regal JP). This concluded that ‘the property holds some local heritage value .... and is likely to be sufficient to meet the low threshold to be identified as a non-designated heritage asset.’</p>	<p>Comments on the significance of the Grand Arcade and its local heritage value are noted.</p>	<p>Nomination to remain.</p>

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
5	14/06/2021	<p><b>Winyatts, Leecroft Road - HT01321</b></p> <p>We were pleased to receive notification that our house is being reviewed for inclusion in The Local Heritage List, and fully support its nomination.</p> <p>We have lived at Winyatts for 23 years and are the first new owners of the property other than the family who originally purchased the land and built the house in 1885. It was passed down the generations until the last surviving descendent passed away and we were successful in securing the house in the subsequent probate sale. it wasn't listed on the Land Registry at the time of our purchase.</p> <p>This house is of local historic interest and value for a number of reasons you may or may not be aware of.</p> <p>1. This house was built in 1885 by George Wetton Cowing, the founder of the Barnet Press for himself and his family. It was passed on to Winifred Emma Cowing who later married Edward Herbert Jukes. It was subsequently passed on to their three children, Hazel, Kathleen and Trevor, none of whom married. Trevor Jukes was the last of his family.</p> <p>2. As a result of 103 years in continuous ownership by one family this house is highly original both externally and internally, we consider ourselves</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Text has been amended to include pertinent relevant facts.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Text amended.</p> <p>Nomination to remain.</p>

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>custodians and have been careful that any modernisations we have carried out have been sympathetic.</p> <p>Externally; all original external windows, including stain glass windows, front and back doors, roof and guttering. Original veranda with metal lattice and encaustic tiled floor.</p> <p>Internally; original encaustic tiled entrance vestibule, stain glass hall doors, all internal doors, architraves, skirting boards cornices and Bakelite door furniture.</p> <p>Original parquet flooring, floorboards, fireplaces and staircase. Original 'butter and servant' bell box and Bakelite light switches.</p> <p>Gardens are also very original; we have just continued to maintain it.</p> <p>Attached is a plan of Winyatts we acquired at the time of purchase which contains some interesting historical information.</p> <p>We also have of the original Deed of Covenant for the Leecroft Road Estate, which is still a private/unadopted road and in itself of historical interest given the road looks, we imagine, much as it did when Winyatts was built. I can mail drop you this to you if you would like to have a copy (it's a large file)</p>		



# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>If I can help further, please let me know and you'd be more than welcome to arrange a visit if that is something which could help The Heritage Review further.</p>		
6	28/06/2021	<p><b>Rowley Lodge, Rowley Lane</b></p> <p>I write in connection with a letter concerning the local heritage list review. I wish to object to the inclusion of Rowley Lodge in this list using the 4 criteria which I have found on your listing as included in 2021 local heritage list</p> <p>1. Architectural Interest, Historical interest The original Rowley Lodge was purchased by Victor Green in 1998, he tried to refurbish, but the building was in such bad condition that it had to be completely demolished in 1988 and new foundations were laid resulting in a c. 25% larger footprint. This the house was completely rebuilt on new foundations and completed in late 1989. Approval was obtained from Barnet planning department. It was rebuilt in a similar style to the demolished property. Thus, there is little historical interest in a 30-year-old building.</p> <p>2. Intactness As it is a new building it will understandably be in good condition</p> <p>3. Aesthetic merits I think the rebuild is in a similar format to the demolished building</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that a planning application for demolition and re-construction was submitted in 1989 as the respondent states. Therefore, as the property is a more recent re-construction of an earlier building and not the age that the nominee originally thought, it is recommended that the property should be omitted as it does not meet the criteria for inclusion on the Local Heritage List.</p>	<p>This nomination has been found not to meet the selection criteria.</p> <p>Nomination to be omitted.</p>

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>4. Age and Rarity As noted about the building is a little of 30 years old and is clearly not an old building. It is clearly rare give the overall size and additions of recent years.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Given the fact that it is a new building it cannot be classified as heritage as it does not meet the definition of heritage which I believed relates to buildings passed down through the generations.</p>		
7	02/07/2021	<p><b>Carlstone Lodge, Oakleigh Park North - HT01325</b></p> <p>I am the owner of Carlstone Lodge. BTW, the address in your document is incorrect. It should be 50 Oakleigh Park North, N20 9AS.</p> <p>I am concerned about having my house in the Local Heritage List, due to the change it will likely be subjected to in terms of planning criteria.</p> <p>When I bought the house, it was very important that it was not a listed building so I could redevelop the house as I saw fit, and of course subject to planning.</p> <p>The next buyer of the house will feel the same.</p> <p>Therefore, I do not consent to my house being</p>	<p>Address has been amended.</p> <p>Local listing does not provide the same level of protection as statutory listing and does not remove any permitted development rights.</p> <p>It is considered that no material planning justification has been put forward in regard to the building meeting the selection criteria and therefore the property is recommended to remain as a nomination for inclusion on the Local Heritage List.</p>	<p>Text changed to the address.</p> <p>No material justification has been provided not to include on the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>Nomination to remain.</p>

# Appendix 1 – Local List New Nominations 2021

No.	Date	Comment Received	Officer Response	Action
		<p>included in the Local Heritage List.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt of this email and confirmation that my house will not be included in the Local Heritage List.</p>		