



24<sup>th</sup> May 2013-05-22 LB.of Camden

Planning and built environment

For the attention of Victoria Pound.

Your ref: 2013/2365/L

Dear Ms Pound,

Fencing at main entrance to Holly Village.

I enclose my response to about the above proposal for fencing at Holly Village.

I do not agree with the proposal as it stands.

Yours sincerely

Diana Brown



**RESPONSE TO No2 PLANNING APPLICATION No 2013/2365/L**

Registered 01/05/2013 (Notice 3/05/13)

Planning Officer: Victoria Pound

May 24<sup>th</sup> 2013

Response from:- Diana Brown

[REDACTED]

**Response to the proposed planning permission**

As an equal participant in the renovation and repair of the front posts I cannot support the current application for planning permission. Any scheme submitted needs to embrace both sides of the main entrance to Holly Village.

The drawings and supporting evidence submitted are not accurate, and miss out some relevant information..

Both the design and the construction need to reach the required standard of Holly Village's Grade II\* status and last for a reasonable amount of time. The proposal does not address the difficult areas that require special attention and will not work, as presented. I do not support this proposal.

I challenge the current planning proposal for No 2 Holly Village submitted by Andrew Willmott for planning permission for the following reasons: -

No reference to No 1 Holly Village:-

1. No consultation with owner of No1 .
2. No agreement or involvement sought from No 1.
3. The proposal is for the work on No 2 freehold only.
4. Work on No 1 freehold has been shelved indefinitely and will be compromised by the work carried out at No 2 Holly Village.
5. The proposed work has not been ratified by the Holly Village Freeholders Association at their meetings

In preparation for the renovation/repair:-

6. No survey has been carried out to enable one to see or understand the varying condition of the posts and their relationship to the ground conditions.
7. No information about any posts that will require replacement.
8. No scale drawing of the proposed timber fence
9. No elevations submitted of finished scheme.
10. No information about English Heritage consultation.
11. The 'test' post was never completed and without a survey impossible to evaluate.
12. No mention of original design of posts with iron collars and chain.

Work process

13. No information has been given for achieving a consistent height for the 21 posts.
14. No information about how the granite setts will be used to hide the steel tubes if the distance between the post and the ground exceed 10cm.
15. No information as to how to deal with the junction of the posts and fence where they meet at an acute angle.
16. The Chestnut fence is set too close to the teak posts to enable maintenance to be carried out without disturbing the teak posts.
17. Service provider selected lack the relevant expertise and experience required for this type of job.

There are four main areas for my concern with the application.

**1. The formal entrance to Holly Village forms part of the freehold property of both No 1 and No 2 Holly Village.**

. Andrew Willmot - *"The fence posts in question fall within our property at 2 so we are the ones applying for consent"*

- Planning Permission in this area needs to be considered as one scheme covering the freeholds of both No1 and 2 Holly Village.
- The renovation and repair needs to resolve the problems presented by both freeholds to assure that the topographical differences between the Chester Road, Swains lane and pathway are taken into account. This is especially important at the junction of Swains Lane and Chester Road

where the posts meet a fence forming an acute angle. This detail will compromise the success of any proposed plan if not resolved to match the exacting standards of Holly Village before any work commences.

- The proposal submitted by No 2 for planning permission has not been discussed or agreed with me, the owner of No 1 Holly Village.
- The Holly Village Freeholders Association have not ratified the proposal submitted for planning permission at any bi-annual meeting. It has been decided without consultation or agreement from myself by the secretary and hedge/fence monitor with Andrew and Alma Whitten only.

## **2. The fencing style' at the front entrance**

- The decorative posts at the entrance to the Gateway into Holly Village were designed to set off and present the architectural features of the whole scheme.
- The Posts form a triangular space in front of each gatehouse. A holly tree grows in the middle of each space.
- The design of the front entrance to Holly Village is distinctive. Restoring the recently installed wooden fence would be incorrect.
- Large granite stones mark the boundary line with the pavement at ground level separated by the teak posts.
- The posts have iron collars on which an iron chain is fixed to visually join them together. (Some of the chain is still in existence as are the iron collars).
- The posts are of a different design and shorter than the larger ones on the boundary wall and without mortis joints.
- A low privet hedge was introduced after 1920.
- The crisscross fence was introduced, in 1990's, as a temporary measure to keep out dogs and litter.
- The proposed scheme does not take into account the reduction of size of the posts, or the iron collars or the chain.

- No Quality Control has been applied.

No alternative adviser or contractor have been approached. Holly Village Freeholders Association stipulates that a minimum of three contractors are asked to be approached for quotes. The design solution was the suggestion of the service provider. No alternative ideas have been considered.

### **3. The condition of the posts**

- The condition of the posts due to the topographical differences between No 1 and No 2 Holly Village affect the renovation/repair of the posts.
- The submission needs to acknowledge the posts in worst condition when establishing the height of the restored posts. The measurement given in the drawing is 110cm.
- The height of 10 posts range between 105 - 98 cm. in the ground  
The height of 10 posts range between 97 - 85 cm.
- The posts will need to be trimmed to remove rotten base making them shorter .
- The discrepancy in height will affect the visual look of any additional wooden fence and crisscross pattern that has been proposed since only 10cm of granite sets has been allowed for to make up the sizes.
- The submission makes no reference to the posts that will need to be replaced.
- No reference has been made about the original iron collars and the chain link fence.

### **4. The changes of appearance at the entrance to due to the proposed work to the posts.**

- The restoration, repair needs to be in keeping with the very precise aesthetic of Holly Village.

- The fixing detail submitted does not indicate how the granite sets will allow for the different heights of the teak posts.
- The large granite slabs set in the ground between each post denoting the boundary is likely to be disturbed by re- setting the posts and the introduction of small granite sets of varying heights. Visuals of this are required.
- The drawings do not take into account the relationship of the boundary to the junction with the pavement on Chester Road where the ground slopes.
- The boundary fencing referred to is not part of the essential character of Holly Village because it was introduced in 1990 due to the deterioration of the posts. No rotation of the fencing has taken place and was never intended.
- The privet hedge is not part of the original design. It has contributed to the deterioration of the condition of the posts. Where it completely covers the posts, it has given rise to moss and mould.

I profoundly disagree with the claim that the proposed repair would be a small visual change.

The proposal has not got the approval of the Holly Village Freeholders Association because the necessary discussion and agreement with No 1 has not yet taken place.

I am greatly concerned that the proposal submitted by Andrew Willmott does not address some of the major problems presented to us in the renovation of the front entrance to Holly Village. It would be disastrous to proceed without acknowledging the full nature of situation and anticipating possible problem areas before we start work.

I do not consider the appointed service providers as suitable because they lack expertise and experience for this type of job. The workmanship throughout Holly Village is of a very high standard and the consequences of ill conceived plans and poor workmanship and could be a disaster.

Yours sincerely

Diana Brown