

**Appendix 2**  
**Responses to Consultation on the Draft Loudwater Estate Conservation Area Appraisal**  
**June 2013**

Name/Address	Comment	Officers Response	Changes to Document
001	<p>Thank you for your letter of 1 February.</p> <p>Further to our telephone conversation yesterday when I advised you I had read the draft appraisal and you clarified a few points for me I now write with some observations on and corrections of the draft which I hope may be of assistance to you. With apologies therefore if in a number of instances I am telling you what you know, these by reference to paragraph numbers are as follows:-</p> <p>2.1.1: Loudwater (Troutstream) Estate Limited is the correct name of the Estate Company</p> <p>2.12; Although it is or no immediate relevance, only of historical interest, Gertrude Fransiska McNamara bought the house known as the Rose Garden from Cameron Jeffs in 1930.</p> <p>2.16 &amp; 5.13: A couple of years ago or so I made some submissions on behalf of the Estate Company in respect of a planning application relating to Watersmead and in which I made particular reference to the garage which I had been advised, I think by one of your colleagues, was almost unique. It had been built specifically to a design that housed the Austin 7 motor. I think that enquiry might reveal that there were only one</p>	<p>Paragraph to be amended to show the correct title.</p> <p>Comment noted and additional information has been included at paragraph 2.12.</p> <p>Watersmead is recognised as a potential addition to the list of Locally Important Buildings, however, it is already afforded great protection by reason of its location in the Conservation Area. Officers have been made aware by the Loudwater (Troutstream) Estate Limited for potentially proposing to English Heritage to recommend statutory listing. Officers will continue to liaise with the Loudwater</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.11 now reads 'The heart of the Estate of centred around Troutstream Way and Trout Rise. Many original architect's drawings for the dwellings survive and an electronic archive has been made available to the Council by Loudwater (Troutstream) Estate Limited'.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.12 now has the following additional sentence 'Gertrude Fransiska McNamara bought the house known as the Rose Garden from Cameron Jeffs in 1930.</p> <p>No further changes required.</p>

	<p>or two other garages of that kind. Query therefore whether it is of sufficient interest for some degree of listing. Otherwise how best it can be preserved?</p> <p>2.18: You may want to clarify that the Kingfisher Lure entrance in the only <u>public</u> entrance. There are others to Sarratt Lane and Loudwater Drive which are locked and available only to those issued with keys; basically residents and the emergency services. The Estate owns also other land such as areas within roundabouts, woodlands such as Barnes Wood and the Spinney opposite the end of Trout Rise and some cordons sanitaires around edges of the Estate.</p> <p>3.3: From a quick reading it might be thought that control of chimneys and windows applies only to thatched McNamara house.</p> <p>4.1: Please see my observations in para 2.18 above. There is access from all Estate gates, albeit restricted, to all parts of the Estate.</p> <p>4.5 &amp; 4.6: I personally would like to see Trout Cottage and the Dovecote listed either at National or at local level. Your draft states that the former contributes significant historical value to the development of the area. In the case of the latter it is, in the words of your draft, “a remarkably attractive building”. I remember when the “ornate detailing to the front projecting gable” was home to a colony of doves. I appreciate that later alterations may have made listing impossible, but about that I have not made any investigation. Other buildings that come to mind are the Old Farmstead and some of the unaltered McNamara houses. Maybe there are other</p>	<p>(Troutstream) Estate Limited.</p> <p>Comments noted and paragraph 2.18 to be amended accordingly to include this additional information.</p> <p>Amend for clarification.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1 makes specific reference to the western region of the Conservation Area. Kingfisher Lure is the only access point to this part of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>These properties are recognised as potential additions to the list of Locally Important Buildings, however, they are already afforded great protection by reason of their location in the Conservation Area. Officers have been made aware by the Loudwater (Troutstream) Estate Limited for potentially proposing to English Heritage to recommended statutory listing. Officers will continue to liaise with the Loudwater (Troutstream) Estate Limited.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.18 now reads ‘The public entrance to the Estate today is via Kingfisher Lure which provides access to Troutstream Way, Trout Rise and Violet Way, with Loudwater Heights accessed from Sarratt Lane. The freehold of all verges, roads and woodland such as Barnes Wood within the Estate is vested in the Company, which means that none of the roads is a public highway’.</p> <p>Remove ‘which are subject to Article 4 Direction control’.</p> <p>No changes necessary.</p> <p>No changes necessary.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>buildings/structures that qualify. If my concerns are shared I would suggest that attention be paid to this particular issue before the “vandals” get at them!</p> <p>4.9: In noting that you say there are also views across each side of the valley from other points; sometimes quite narrow, but nevertheless nice to see, for example if one is passing along the upper part of Trout Rise and looks between the houses. In that context I was very concerned when about six years ago planning permission was granted for a garage on the front boundary of Holly Trees, Trout Rise, as an amendment of an application that had been put in and upon which I think I had commented to TRDC in my capacity as a then director of the Estate Company. I managed to talk to the owners out of building it in terms of the Estate covenants, but nevertheless planning permission had been granted and legal action for breach of covenant is very expensive. Such a structure would have stood prominently on the front boundary and would not have enhanced the street scene one iota. In another more recent case the owners of Stamhus, Troutstream Way produced to the Estate Company plans for a similarly placed structure, but the Company managed I think to get them to amend them so that the garage would lie adjacent to the front of the house. In both cases there was more than adequate space to keep the building further away from the road frontage. There is a garage at Broadoaks in Trout Rise, but it is set a bit further back and the ground falls sharply away so the building is much less prominent. In these circumstances I would ask the Council to consider the imposition of suitable controls to protect the road scene accordingly.</p> <p>5.9: These were the coach houses for Loudwater House. Adjacent to them lies Rose Garden</p>	<p>Proposed development is subject to national and local planning policy. Relevant Local Policy includes the Saved Policies of the Three Rivers Local Plan, the adopted Core strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies LDD. It is not considered necessary, at this current time, to impose further restrictions on development, through Article 4 Directions for example. Furthermore, the Conservation Area Appraisal will add further weight to the Council’s decision making, when adopted.</p> <p>Officers visited the site to which reference is made here. The comments are noted, however,</p>	<p>No changes necessary.</p> <p>No changes necessary.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Mews, once the stables of Loudwater House, later becoming the famed “Harry’s Garage” and now a block of flats. There is one particular aspect which may be of interest from a conservation point of view. At the eastern end and overlooking the north courtyard there is a window which overlooks the flat roof of the rather unattractive ground floor structure below. Not very long ago there was talk of selling the airspace above the ground floor projection to enable it to be built over. I pointed out at the time that I thought the window had a certain interest because there was clear visual evidence that it might have been used in former times for the hoisting of material items to first floor level. One possible idea that came to my mind was straw and hay for the horses staged below. It might therefore be useful if the Conservation Officer were to have a look to see what he thinks.</p> <p>5.19: Not Cobb Cottage, but Cob Cottage. I have checked the house sign.</p> <p>6.6: I think your sentence is incomplete.</p> <p>6.21: The plan dates for Whisperwood Cottage and Whisperwood House are October 1933 and October 1936. Both are built to the traditional style which helps to give the Estate its particular character. The dates of building are immaterial therefore, but in any event and for what it is worth my own gut feeling, having lived here for nearly forty years, is that both would have been built pre-</p>	<p>the feature was not considered of sufficient architectural/historical/special interest to warrant recording in the appraisal.</p> <p>Sentences amended to reflect the correct spelling.</p> <p>The text box has been enlarged to reveal the whole text.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.19 now reads Cob Cottage, as does the associated caption to the photograph.</p> <p>The sentence now reads ‘The Cottage is of exemplary design and its attractive features have been preserved. The dwelling benefits from a particularly dense sylvan setting. The front elevation has retained its original fenestration and the symmetrical thatched roof is still in place’.</p> <p>No further change necessary.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>war.</p> <p>7.1: I support wholeheartedly the concerns about unsuitable gates and increased hardstanding. Most gates which in my view impact in a negative way on the rural character of the conservation area by reason of height or design were erected as permitted development before the Loudwater Estate Conservation Area No 3 Article 4 Direction 2002 came into force and in cases since then when gates have required planning permission I suspect that so long as design has more or less conformed with that of other existing Estate gates there has been no particular reason to support a challenge.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above there are several entrance gates which would fit well into any well heeled North London borough. The majority of them appear along the upper level of Trout Rise. They are too high and impact even more predominantly on the street scene when situated on rising ground above the level of the road. They are of no practical use for usually they lie on a front boundary along the length of which there lies no more than a much lower hedge and/or fence, often of post and chain link, through or over which a seven year old could clamber, not to mention a burglar. One must assume therefore that the gates are the result of the tasteless of the owners of the houses in question. In the case of Burnside, Troutstream Way a metal fence stand on top of an ugly red brick wall abutting the carriageway outside. I remember challenging its construction, but the owners got in just before the Article 4 Direction came into force. Recently another brick wall abutting the carriageway has been constructed in Kingfisher Lure. In this case it may be said with justification that it is necessary to retain the earth bank behind, but whether or not</p>	<p>Comments noted. The existing Article 4 Direction places restrictions on gates, walls and fences. Matters relating to design and suitability of gates, walls, fences and hardstanding will be considered as part of the development management/enforcement process, where necessary. Planning decisions will be supported by the relevant Saved Policies of the Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011, the adopted Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies LDD and the Loudwater Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (when adopted).</p>	<p>No further change necessary.</p>
--	--	---	-------------------------------------

	<p>that is correct I have no idea. I would be grateful therefore if consideration could be given to the tightening up of planning restrictions affecting both height and design. For example might there be a complete bar on walls, gates, fences and pillars exceeding a height of say 5 feet? In the case of design could it be left to the planners to determine the suitability of the design of a fence/gate within the rural environment? For example why should one be inflicted by a solid brick wall?</p> <p>Hard surfacing may be a more difficult issue in times when car ownership is far greater than before. It would become a practical problem were residents obliged to have to park on the narrow Estate roads. However I am conscious of the difficulties I experienced as a director of the Estate Company in persuading your Council to try and ensure that hard standing should be landscaped so as to help preserve the rural feeling of the Estate. By way of example why should it be necessary to extend surfacing up to a boundary fence or hedge when it might be softened by some planting of shrubs or flowers at its edge? Some visual alleviation would I imagine be appreciated.</p> <p>Other concerns for me have from time to time been:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Roof extensions which block views of sky and vegetation;</li> <li>(b) Building too close to boundaries or from boundary to boundary. A case in point was Wychwood, Troutstream Way, which the applicant won on appeal;</li> <li>(c) The overlooking of other properties and</li> <li>(d) Huge extensions which cause one to worry about the motives driving the applicant. In a recent instance permission was granted for a nine bedroomed house</li> </ul>	<p>These issues that are associated with proposed development will be dealt with by officers as part of the planning application process.</p>	<p>No further change necessary.</p>
--	---	---	-------------------------------------

	<p>with two kitchens at Woodlands, Whisperwood whereupon the successful applicant sold the house and moved. Why does any house in single occupation need two kitchens? I am aware that houses may be bought by those of different cultures who bring extended families with all the paraphernalia that this entails, such as for example more noise and more traffic. I know from long experience how difficult it can be to define a house in single occupation.</p> <p>I am conscious that there are some residents in Loudwater who see their houses as milk cows. I am worried by a remark made to me by one of your colleagues that he saw Loudwater going the same way as Moor Park, but ten years behind. In my humble opinion Loudwater is far more beautiful than I ever remember Moor Park. I feel therefore it is even worthier of protection against those whose convenience or greed overrides the need to preserve one of the most impressive parts of the area administered by your Council.</p> <p>Appendix 3: The colouring of the plan is difficult to distinguish, but you have confirmed that the green colouring of Beechengrove Wood and Millfield Plantation is supposed to indicate Important Open Space with the green colouring within the red edging on the plan indicating a TPO area. In fact some of the space within the red edging should be shown as important open space since it is Green Belt. Trout Rise Farm is uncoloured but should be shown as Important Open Space because it is Green Belt and in part of an archaeological site. I do not understand why some buildings are coloured yellow. No explanation is given.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Some of the reproductions of this earlier map have made it difficult to distinguish the different shades of green. The majority of the dwellings are coloured yellow as a basic legend, the pink colouring distinguishes the Listed Buildings, and brown the Locally Listed Buildings.</p>	<p>No further change necessary.</p> <p>No further change necessary.</p>
--	---	--	---

<p><b>002</b></p>	<p>I have no problems with the document as a whole but there are one or two minor details, which I would like to draw to your attention.</p> <p><u>Flint Cottage, Troutstream Way</u> – this was not a gamekeeper’s cottage but the Laundry for Loudwater House and occupied by the laundress and her family. It is listed as the Laundry on both the 1871 and 1881 Censuses. There is no indication on the censuses that a gamekeeper was employed on the Estate.</p> <p><u>The Walled Garden, Troutstream Way</u> – this was the kitchen garden for Loudwater House in Mr Panmure Gordon’s time. The present house was built at the time when the Estate was being developed by Cameron Jeffs. It’s a shame about the dragons but the ones on the outer wall were stolen and, when the then owner had them replaced, they were stolen again. My children loved them and called them Idris and Olwen after the dragons in Ivor the Engine.</p> <p><u>Trout Cottage?, Troutstream Way</u> In the forty years I have been resident here, this property has always been called Troutcott. There is no name board showing at present, so I don’t know if this has been changed.</p> <p>Incidentally, is the third lodge, The Lodge at the junction of Sarratt Lane and the access to Long</p>	<p>Comments noted. This historical information is welcomed and the record will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Council records indicate that the names ‘Troutcott’ and Trout Cottage’ have been used interchangeably, however, upon reflection of recent records, Troutcott would appear to be used more frequently and the paragraph will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Loudwater Lodge, to which reference is made here, is located in the Outer Loudwater</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.3 amended to read ‘Sited approximately 70m from Troutstream Way and out of view from the general streetscene, Flint Cottage was once the Laundry for Loudwater House and occupied the laundress and her family. It is listed as the Laundry on both the 1871 and 1881 Censuses. It was constructed in the 1820s with mid 19<sup>th</sup> Century and 20<sup>th</sup> Century additions and alterations. The building is set in spacious grounds, the boundaries of which border the River Chess and Little Lady’s Wood’.</p> <p>No further changes necessary.</p> <p>Numerous paragraphs amended to remove ‘Trout Cottage’ and replace with ‘Troutcott’.</p> <p>No further changes necessary.</p>
-------------------	--	---	--

	<p>Ridings, included in the Conservation Area? It has been much altered and extended but, I think, still retains the pillared arcade within the curtilage.</p> <p>Lastly, I think it would be helpful if, in section 10, there were a brief explanation of which features are included in an Article 4 designation and a list of which properties on the Estate are included in this designation.</p>	<p>Conservation Area.</p> <p>For purposes of clarity, the comprehensive Article 4 Direction is included as Appendix 4, which sets out the features and dwellings subject to the Direction.</p>	<p>Appendix 4 contains the full Article 4 Direction.</p>
<p><b>003</b></p>	<p>My family and I currently own and reside at Wychwood, Troutstream Way, and I write with regard to the Loudwater Estate Conservation Appraisal Draft.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Firstly can I draw your attention to the attached photo of our property. From the photo it would seem that neither Old Tiles or the Bench House, our neighbouring properties existed. It is also unlikely from where the photo was taken, that Little Petherick, the house opposite, existed. We know Wychwood was a McNamara design as we have a copy of the original plans dated 1935. As you can see from the photo the house was hedged at the front. We believe the hedge was most likely Wych Elm, hence the house name, commonly used for this purpose until the blight of the late 1960's early 1970's. We would also like to draw your attention to the 'arts and crafts' style gate, indicative of the period. Other examples of such gates are still in existence in The Clump, Valley Road and The Drive. I would</li> </ol>	<p>Comments welcomed – the picture to which reference is made has been included at paragraph 4.18, which is of particular interest.</p> <p>The Arts and Crafts style gate is also a notable feature of this early picture, and reference is made to it in the associated paragraph 4.18.</p>	<p>To the east of Old Tiles lies Wychwood, also a McNamara property dating to 1935, the east and west elevations of which have been extended. A notable feature of Wychwood when it was first constructed, as shown in the photograph below right, is the arts and crafts style gates, typical of the era in which it was built..</p>

	<p>therefore like to make the point that 'arts and crafts' style gates are an authentic gate style for the property and the Loudwater area and that they were in use prior to the farm style, five-bar gates now used on our two neighbouring properties.</p> <p>2. Secondly, as a formal document endorsed by the Local Planning Authority and therefore Three Rivers District Council I find the use of subjective language such as "attractive", "charming", "strikingly attractive", "remarkably attractive" and "tastefully extended" inappropriate. The inclusion of such opinion demeans the professionalism of the report and its author. I would like to see a document that accurately reports on the facets of the area without giving an individual's unsupported opinion. I therefore request all such subjective commentary be removed.</p> <p>3. Finally, the report refers in a negative manner to the "desire for increased hardstanding eroding the rural character of the area". It is not unreasonable for residents to have occasions where several guests arrive in different vehicles. Typically drives can accommodate 2 to 5 vehicles, of which the household may own 2 or 3. Guest parking in our section of Loudwater is difficult, as any overflow onto the road may be deemed an issue of road or, given the lack of pavement, pedestrian safety, it also causes contention between residents and indeed, even planning inspectors are not free of verbal abuse when they park on the road! A more pragmatic rather than dogmatic approach to this issue is necessary in order to find a sensible balance between retaining the character of the area and serving the needs of residents. Use of vehicles in</p>	<p>Comments noted and accepted. Whilst it is important to provide a detailed account of the features of special historical/architectural interest as part of the appraisal process, these comments are acknowledge and some adjectives have been removed accordingly.</p> <p>Whilst it is indeed recognised by officers that the use of vehicles today is much different from the time when the estate developed, it must also be acknowledged that hardstanding is a prevailing feature of urban areas. An Article 4 Direction exists that directly applies to hardstanding.</p>	<p>Removal of some descriptive word throughout the document.</p> <p>No further changes necessary.</p>
--	---	---	---

	2013 is simply very different to when the estate was conceived and this needs to be acknowledged and worked with.		
<b>004</b>	<p>The draft Loudwater Estate Conservation Area Appraisal is an excellent overview. We have no major comments.</p> <p>On page 21, 4.21 Dovecote has been sympathetically extended by one storey and the front gable has openings (presently closed) for roosting doves.</p> <p>On page 16, 6.6 the last sentence is incomplete.</p> <p>On page 18, 6.16 The Old Farmstead was first built, we have been informed by a previous owner, in 1850 with much extension building since. Cross reference para 2.16.</p> <p>On page 3, 1.2 there are the words “preservation and enhancement”. On page 22, 10.1 there is mention of “dormer windows”. Interestingly enough planning permission was very recently been granted to Stamhus, Troutstream Way for 4 dormer windows to be built into its roof.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to make further amendments to the description of Dovecote.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.6 has now been amended to reveal the whole supporting text.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.16 to be amended to include additional information.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.6 now reads ‘The Cottage is of exemplary design and its attractive features have been preserved. The dwelling benefits from a particularly dense sylvan setting. The front elevation has retained its original fenestration and the symmetrical thatched roof is still in place’.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.16 now reads ‘Constructed in 1850, The Old Farmstead is sited towards the north-western corner of Farm Lane, lying directly to the south of Trout Rise which is at a considerably higher ground level than the dwelling’.</p> <p>No further changes necessary.</p>