

REVIEW OF THE LOCAL LIST OF BUILDINGS OF ARCHITECTURAL OR HISTORIC IMPORTANCE

Cabinet Member	Councillor Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio	Planning and Transportation
Officer Contact	Nairita Chakraborty/ Sarah Harper, Planning and Community Services
Papers with report	Appendix 1 – Proposed Local List Appendix 2 – Assessment of new entries suggested during public consultation

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report	The review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance has been completed and this report informs Cabinet of the results of the consultation exercises. The report also seeks approval of the revised Local List for adoption (Appendix 1).
Contribution to our plans and strategies	Hillingdon's Emerging Local Development Framework Hillingdon Design & Access Statements Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Polices 2007) Sustainable Community Strategy Statement of Community Involvement
Financial Cost	The total costs of advertisement, notification and updating GIS would be approximately £1,100 which will be met from the budget for Planning and Community Services 2010/11.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents and Environmental Services Policy Overview Committee
Ward(s) affected	All wards in the Borough

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Cabinet:

1. Agrees the proposed Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance as attached in Appendix 1;
2. Instructs officers to notify all the owners/occupiers of the buildings included in the list, and;
3. Instruct officers to update the GIS to include the new entries and to provide this information as an online database, available to council staff, councillors, the public and other users.

INFORMATION

Reasons for recommendation

The Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance recognises buildings that are considered to be of local architectural and historical importance that contribute significantly to the unique character and sense of local distinctiveness of the Borough. Between January and February 2010 a borough wide public consultation exercise was undertaken to seek views on a revised Local List. All the comments and suggestions received were considered by officers and assessed using the agreed eligibility criteria and scoring system. A further consultation with owners and occupiers was carried out during March and April 2010. Following this, the draft list has been revised.

Alternative options considered

- Not to revise the existing Local List, leaving buildings worthy of local designation unrecognised and vulnerable to insensitive development, and the concerns of Members and residents unaddressed.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1. The London Borough of Hillingdon has an adopted Local List, which pre-dates 1990 and includes limited information on each of the entries. Since that time, a number of the buildings have been statutorily listed; some have been significantly altered, or in extreme cases, demolished. The list, therefore, requires revision to accommodate these changes and to include new additions. A review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance was undertaken following Cabinet member approval on 19th February, 2009.

2. As part of the adopted review programme, a period of pre-consultation with local councillors, Conservation Area Panels and other local groups, including the Local Strategic Partnership, was agreed. This consultation was carried out during March-May 2009 and a draft Local List was prepared following assessment of all the entries received during this exercise.

3. On the 19th November 2009, Cabinet approved the draft Local List for borough wide public consultation. This took place in a six week period between January and February 2010 and was undertaken in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

4. The consultation was widely publicised, including a public notice in the Uxbridge Gazette, an article in the Hillingdon People and posters in all the Libraries and also the Civic Centre. The draft Local List was also made available on the Council's website, together with the agreed eligibility criteria. Drop in sessions, attended by officers were also held in Uxbridge, Hayes End, Ruislip Manor Farm and Northwood (Oakland Gate) Libraries. Letters were also sent to local groups and residents associations inviting their views.

5. Once the responses had been assessed and the draft Local List updated to take account of this, a further consultation was carried out with the owners and occupiers of all the buildings included in the list. These letters were sent through the

post and were addressed to the individual properties to ensure that there would be minimal errors in delivery.

6. The results of the two consultation exercises are detailed below.

Summary and assessment of responses to public consultation

7. There was a positive response to the public consultation exercise, with constructive comments and 30 new suggestions for additions to the list.

8. The Ruislip, Northwood and Eastcote Local History Society noted some anomalies with reference to dates of construction. These have been checked and, where applicable, descriptions have been corrected. The Society also advised that the Ruislip Lido building (Water's Edge Bar) was demolished and rebuilt in 1994-96. The building has been re-assessed and because of its local historical and social links, has been retained on the draft list.

9. Officers were also informed that the Old Post Office building, West Drayton (52 Station Road), proposed in 1990, had not been assessed as part of the review. This has been rectified and the building has been assessed and included in the list.

10. Appendix 2 includes a summary of the additional nominations following the public consultation.

11. A number of requests for buildings to be reconsidered were received. These were re-assessed on the basis of any additional information provided. It was felt that these did not meet the agreed eligibility criteria and have, therefore, not been included on the list. Details of these are included in the following table:

Reconsiderations	Recommendation	Comments
Pete's Cottage, 15-17 High Road, Ickenham	Not to be included	Significantly altered Included within Ickenham Village Conservation Area
Dolce Domum, King Edwards Road, Ruislip	Not to be included	Not enough architectural quality. Included within Ruislip Village Conservation Area
Beddingfield Cottages, West End Road, Ruislip	Not to be included	Substantially altered, not enough architectural quality
Westways Farm, Charville Lane, Ruislip	Not to be included	Not enough architectural quality

12. In addition, supportive comments were also received from public bodies such as Theatres Trust and British Waterways.

Summary of responses from owners and occupiers

13. Following advice from the Council's Legal Team and English Heritage; and as planning policies relating to the Local List would apply to these properties, owners and

occupiers were consulted. This was carried out during March and April 2010. Individual letters and the eligibility criteria were sent to all the properties, together with guidance explaining the implications of inclusion on the list.

14. The response rate was poor and whilst there were two positive responses in support of the Local List, there were nine respondents who voiced their concerns regarding planning restrictions and the possible negative effect on property values. Whilst these comments have been considered, unlike statutory listing, buildings on the Local List are not subject to any additional planning controls over demolition or alteration. There are also no changes to the owner's Permitted Development Rights under the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (as amended). However, Council policies do support the retention and enhancement of buildings which contribute to the Borough's local distinctiveness.

15. Responses were also received with regards to larger privately owned sites. These are summarised in the table below:

Respondent	Comments received	Response
RAF Uxbridge Site (GVA Grimleys)	Objected to the inclusion of Institution Building as it has been proposed for demolition. No objections to the inclusion of other sites.	Given the imminent redevelopment of the site, the Institution Building is excluded from the List. All other sites to remain in the List.
Heathrow Buildings (BAA)	Requested reconsideration of inclusion of Central Control Tower and the Chapel as the context of these buildings has been altered since proposed in 1990. The sites are also being considered for redevelopment.	It is considered that the Central Tower and the Chapel warrant inclusion in the list on the basis of their architectural interest. The description has been amended accordingly.
Laboratory Buildings, Library and Lecture Building (Brunel University)	Objected to the inclusion of the Laboratory buildings as these are 'unsuited for their evolving needs' and the University would be looking at their redevelopment; Library building has undergone substantial internal alterations with a large modern extension on one side and is not eligible for inclusion; reconsider inclusion of only the northern section of the Lecture building as this is the only part which is authentic and 'robust'.	Whilst it is noted, that the buildings proposed have been altered, the degree of internal alteration is of less significance when considering locally important buildings. It is felt that these buildings are good examples of their age, style and design and are associated with the Borough's educational and social history. These should, therefore remain on the Local List.
Ruislip Lido (Water's Edge)	Objected to the inclusion as the original group of Lido buildings were demolished and rebuilt during 1994-96. The buildings are, therefore, modern and lack authenticity.	Whilst the building has been rebuilt, its significance is derived from its association with the Lido. In addition, the new building itself is unique in its architectural design and, therefore, warrants inclusion.

Hayes Cottage Hospital and Stockley Park	Commented on the future planning implications as the building has been extended in the past and would need further alterations.	Local listing is unlikely to have a significant impact on future plans as there are no additional statutory controls over buildings in the Local List. It is, however, a material consideration in determining planning applications and Saved Policies (Sept 2007) Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan would apply.
Douay Martyrs School	Objected to inclusion of the Cardinal Hume Campus, as the buildings are varied and are not unique to the area. Queried which building in particular has been proposed for inclusion.	The proposed building fronts Long Lane. It is typical of its period and architectural style and makes a significant contribution to the street scene and townscape of the area. It should, therefore, remain on the list.
Church of St Jerome, Hayes	Objected to inclusion of the building as future alterations may be difficult to achieve.	The building is robust and unique in its architectural design and acts as a key landmark. The building was proposed in 1990, and it should remain on the list given its townscape and architectural significance.
Corporate Properties	Whilst there were no objections in principle, concerns were raised with regards to planning restrictions that may affect future proposals for these sites.	
Green Spaces and Highways	No comments	

Revised Local List

16. Following consultation and assessment, the draft list has been revised and the finalised document forms Appendix 1 of this report. The following table summarises the number of suggestions received during the various stages of consultation and the proposed entries for inclusion in the Local List.

Year	Total buildings included in the list	Total buildings proposed	Buildings since listed/demolished	Buildings already listed, included in the local list or not enough information provided	Buildings not satisfying eligibility criteria	Total buildings excluded	Total buildings proposed
1973	107		17		6	23 (17+6)	84 (107-23)
1990		66	6		5	11 (6+5)	55 (66-11)
2009		301		99	49	148 (99+49)	153 (301-148)
Total buildings proposed to be included in the Local List							292 (84+55+153)

17. Once adopted, the information will form an online database available to council staff and members, as well as for public use. The development of the database will be undertaken inhouse by the Council's Web Officer with assistance from the Conservation Team. It will contain a location map, photographs and a description of each of the entries. The Council's Geographical Information System (GIS) will also be updated accordingly. Given the requirement of the emerging Heritage Protection Bill for all local authorities to provide and maintain a publicly accessible Historic Environment Record, it is likely that this work will form the basis of this database.

Future revisions

18. The Local List review should be considered as a rolling programme, with updates at regular intervals using the procedure and consultation methodology agreed as part of this exercise.

CONCLUSION

19. In order to protect and promote the Borough's heritage, it is important that the Council continues to maintain and update the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance. Paragraph 15 of the new Planning Policy Statement (PPS 5) Practice Guide states that 'In addition to the national and statutory designation, local authorities may formally identify heritage assets that are important to the area, for example local listing as part of the plan-making process'. The Local List is, therefore, an important tool in identifying such assets within the Borough.

20. The inclusion of a building on the Local List would not necessarily prohibit its future development, but would give the building local recognition based on its architectural, townscape and historic merits. There would be a presumption in favour of retaining these buildings and proposals for new alterations and extensions should take its special architectural and historic interest into account.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

21. There will be advertisement and notification costs of £1,000, and the cost of updating GIS would be up to £100, which will be contained within Planning and Community Services budgets.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS AND COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

22. The aims of the recommendations are to recognise buildings and structures which are considered to be of local architectural or historic importance, and which contribute positively to the Borough's local distinctiveness and heritage. Inclusion on the Local List would have no statutory implications for residents, property owners or other stakeholders. Local Listing is, however, a material consideration when decisions are made on planning applications relating to the development and alteration of such buildings. The planning policies contained within the London Borough of Hillingdon

Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies 27th September 2007) and incorporated into the emerging Local Development Framework documents would apply.

Consultation carried out or required

23. The report includes the details of consultation.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

24. A Corporate Finance Officer has reviewed the report and the financial implications within it, and is satisfied that the financial implications properly reflect the direct resource implications on the planning service and any wider implications for the Council's resources as a whole.

Legal

25. Consultation must be undertaken when proposals are still at a formative stage, must give sufficient reasons to permit the consultee to make a meaningful response, and must allow adequate time for consideration and response. In considering the consultation responses, decision makers must ensure there is a full consideration of all representations arising including those which do not accord with the officer recommendation. The decision maker must be satisfied that responses from the public are conscientiously taken into account.

26. Fairness and natural justice requires that there must be no predetermination of a decision which goes beyond a legitimate predisposition to a certain conclusion: see *R (Wainwright) v Richmond upon Thames London Borough Council* [2001] EWCA Civ 2062, [2001] All ER (D) 422, and *Bovis Homes Ltd v New Forest District Council* [2002] EWHC 483 (Admin).

27. The recent Planning Policy Statement on Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS 5) provides for greater recognition of non designated heritage assets such as locally listed buildings. Policy HE8 of the document states that 'The effect of an application on the significance of such a heritage asset or its setting is a material consideration in determining the application'.

Corporate property

28. There are few properties on the list that are Council owned and there are no objections to their inclusion in the list.

Relevant Service Groups

29. Relevant service groups were consulted as part of the consultation process, and any comments have been taken into consideration.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- Cabinet Member report dated 19th February, 2009.
- Cabinet report dated 19th November, 2009.
- Existing Local List
- Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS 5): Planning for the Historic Environment, 23rd March 2010
- PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide- 23rd March 2010
- Heritage White Paper- Heritage protection for 21st Century, March 2007, DCMS
- Heritage Bill- April 2008, DCMS
- London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies 27th September 2007)
- Statement of Community Involvement, November 2006