

Draft Table of Comments and Responses for the Local list Changes Consultation October 19th - November 30th 2018

Comment ID	Property	Support/Object	Comments	WBC Response	Changes
001	Cassiobury Drive, 44	Object	Seen as penalising as it would restrict a modern facelift of the building or demolition and rebuild and it therefore obstructive to value.	We would be happy to work with you on this. There are many different ways to increase the modern functionality of a building whilst retaining its heritage value.	None
002	Cassiobury Drive, 44	Object	Single brick construction with no insulation is seen as burden. This may prevent external cladding being applied to improve thermal efficiency.	This type of construction can be effectively insulated without demolition and we are happy to provide advice on this point.	None
003	Cassiobury Drive, 44	Object	Roadside wall requires repair and is seen as burden. Description in the entry is not accurate.	This can be agreed subject to details and using sympathetic materials	None
004	Cassiobury Drive, 44	Object	Concern about tree in front garden, would they be prevented from cutting it down as it is damaging the wall.	The surveyors report has been amended.	Text changes to entry
005	Cassiobury Drive, 44	Object	2 flat roof dormers, we don't have a flat roof nor do we have dormers.	The surveyors report has been amended.	Text changes to entry
006	Cassiobury Drive, 44	Object	You mention 2 chimneys, I believe we have 4.	The report has been amended.	Text changes to entry
007	Cassiobury Drive, 44	Object	Our windows are not original as your report implies.	The report has been reviewed.	Text changes to entry
008	Cassiobury Drive, 44	Object	There is probably more that is incorrect in the description but does not specify what.	The surveyors report has been amended.	Text changes to entry
009	Cassiobury Drive, 94	Object	What restriction is this likely to place on any further extension and alteration of the property? Are any restrictions legally binding?	Subject to details a subservient and subordinate extension would be considered positively. Once the local listing has been agreed by the Council this becomes a material	None

Draft Table of Comments and Responses for the Local list Changes Consultation October 19th - November 30th 2018

Comment ID	Property	Support/Object	Comments	WBC Response	Changes
				consideration in determining planning applications.	
010	Cassiobury Drive, 94	Object	The front wall is not original but I had it built to match the brickwork of the house.	The report has been amended.	Text changes to entry
011	Cassiobury Drive, 94	Object	There is no hedge.	The report has been amended.	Text changes to entry.
012	Cassiobury Drive, 94	Object	There was originally a garage which has now been converted to a downstairs study.	Noted.	None
013	Cassiobury Drive, 94	Object	I do not understand the reference to being "one of a pair with 92". This house is quite different to 92 Cassiobury Drive.	The report has been amended.	Text changes to entry
014	Cassiobury Drive, 94	Object	In the streetscape section, the house is referred to being in Cassiobury Park Avenue which clearly it is not.	The report has been amended.	Text changes to entry
016	Cassiobury Park Avenue, 3	Support	builders Brightman and Co. built by grandfather of the singer Sarah Brightman and was the first built on the estate for his grandmother's occupation in 1906	Noted.	None
017	Cassiobury Park Avenue 5	Object – support principle	Don't wish to have over-cumbersome restrictions placed on our house. Perimeter wall is low and would like to construct a boundary gate and fence to our property and believe that adding to the list would restrict options regarding security.	If the wall is below 1 metre, you may not need permission. We will be happy to advise further.	None
018	Cassiobury Park Avenue 5	Object – support principle	Implications of listing is not clear	Further information is available on the website and we are happy to discuss this further with you. We will provide further information when we	Letter of notification should include more detailed explanation of

Draft Table of Comments and Responses for the Local list Changes Consultation October 19th - November 30th 2018

Comment ID	Property	Support/Object	Comments	WBC Response	Changes
				contact property owners once Cabinet has confirmed any additions to the local list.	what the local list designation means.
019	Cassiobury Park Avenue 5	Object – support principle	Bought property 3 years ago and if had known that would be included on the list then would not have bought the property	Noted.	None
020	Cassiobury Park Avenue, 11	Object – support principle	Support the principle but Object. Are pleased that you consider our house of enough interest to wish to list it and also to protect the character of our area. We are unable to support this initiative outlined and do not wish to be included on this list as we consider the limitations and criteria generally listed as too prescriptive, limiting and possibly subjectively enforced.	Noted.	None
022	Cassiobury Park Avenue, 11	Object – support principle	Council already has enough planning controls to maintain character of local environment.	Noted.	
023	Cassiobury Park Avenue, 11	Object – support principle	Windows have been replaced so the description needs amending	The surveyors report has been changed.	Text changes to the entry
024	Cassiobury Park Avenue, 11	Object – support principle	Clarification to final description to include reference to rear extension.	The entry has been changed.	Text changes to entry
025	Cassiobury Park Avenue 24		Object – Heritage Collective letter 1. Architectural: claim that the quality is not as good as the description suggests; that the building is more significantly altered than the entry suggests and that this diminishes the property and makes it difficult to discern the original plan form. The	1. This house is of local interest being designed by an architect practising in the area. The architect was born in Watford and It has had some small alterations to the rear but it is considered that these have not compromised	No Change proposed property should be added.

Draft Table of Comments and Responses for the Local list Changes Consultation October 19th - November 30th 2018

Comment ID	Property	Support/Object	Comments	WBC Response	Changes
			<p>architect mentioned in the entry is not notable as suggested when compared to other architects for buildings of local interest (of the ones cited, the house designed by the Smithsons is now nationally listed and will be removed from the local list and this is referred to in Appendix 2 of the consultation document).</p> <p>2. Historic: No 24 cannot be said to form a significant part of the development of the town or locality; it is an innocuous house which does not stand out and lacks significance.</p> <p>3. Streetscape: streetscape has changed considerably in late 20th and 21st centuries; significant number of buildings which have a modern construction date; lack of design consistency along the road; not designed by a single architect.</p> <p>4. Does not meet the criteria for local listing.</p>	<p>its significance; the plan form is discernable and the house appears to have its original windows. The external features are little altered and the roof form not altered. The features are simple but typical of the period of design.</p> <p>2. This property is one of a number constructed in the early part of the 20th Century and are good examples of the key period in town expansion in around London. There is a strong relationship with the extension of the Metropolitan Line into this area (the Met Line station is nationally listed).</p> <p>3. In our view, this house does sit well in the street scape which is characterized by a consistent building line a plot size; generally two storey vernacular style properties which are of differing style but which have a consistent coherence and make for a very typical Metroland streetscene.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p>	

Draft Table of Comments and Responses for the Local list Changes Consultation October 19th - November 30th 2018

Comment ID	Property	Support/Object	Comments	WBC Response	Changes
026	Cassiobury Park Avenue, 36	Object	House has been altered has supplied evidence – original porch removed and a new room to the side of the house. Rear of house altered	This is noted.	The house will not be added to the local list.
027	Langley Way, 69	Object	Evidence to prove later date – 1950s	This is noted.	The house will not be added to the local list
029	Shepherd's Road, 23	Support	Some minor amendment to text required. Front gate is wrought iron and description of garage is wrong	Noted and these amendments will be made.	Relevant text changes
030	Shepherd's Road, 7	Object	The front entrance and roof over it is not part of the original house. Your details state the sloping roof are a main character but that was modified to look that way. The original entrance was set back nearly two meters from where it is now. The current brick front is all an extension.	This has been noted and WBC planning records concur with this.	Do not add to the list due to degree of alteration from the original plans. Include within proposed conservation area
031	Shepherd's Road, 7	Object	The house had a double storey extension done to it too, on the left if looking straight at it. The windows in that new and made to look like the old brick windows.	Noted	See above
032	Shepherd's Road, 7	Object	The double glazed windows are all new.	Noted	See above
033	The Gardens 42	Object	Heritage Collective Letter: 1. Building is altered – replacement windows and dormers 2. Building does not contribute to the streetscape other than by its size and presence in the street;	1. Dormers were shown on the 1934 alterations plans and to a design by the original architect; so can be regarded as almost contemporary with the original design.	None proposed

Draft Table of Comments and Responses for the Local list Changes Consultation October 19th - November 30th 2018

Comment ID	Property	Support/Object	Comments	WBC Response	Changes
			<p>3. Architects are not a significant firm and do not provide the building with historic interest</p>	<p>Replacement windows is not a sufficient reason to remove a building from the list – if they are not appropriate future management can ensure a more appropriate window is used. The building does have good and striking features.</p> <p>2. The building does have a strong presence in the street scene and adds to the character of this area.</p> <p>3. The architects firm involved is of note and Max Lock does have connections to Watford (information was obtained from the Max Lock Centre in relation to Little Stratford); the original plans show the house to be designed for Mrs Lock (further research may reveal more about this connection)</p>	

