

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0975/L	Dr John M Slater	28 Swains Lane London N66QR	20/03/2017 16:06:47	COMMNT	<p>1. While there is a case for returning to the original design from the 1870's, as shown in the application, it would be unfortunate if the areas in front of Nos 1 and 2 Holly Village were not broadly similar in design.</p> <p>2. It is understood that the introduction of the lattice fencing and hedging was approved by the appropriate environmental body many years ago. Similarly, restoration work, designed to reflect that updated design, was accepted by Historic England, and approved by the Council for the area in front of No. 2 Holly Village, in 2013.</p> <p>3. The entrance is an important feature, and Holly Village is an environmental asset not only for all the freeholders but also for the local community. It would be unfortunate if the Council has to decide on an application when there appears to be a lack of agreement among those most affected. Added to which, the Council has very limited powers to enforce conformity. There are Covenants on the Freeholders and a Committee system designed to maintain the important features of Holly Village. It would seem desirable, therefore, for efforts to be made by the 12 freeholders to consider further whether a compromise could be reached to avoid long term damage to the area in front of the entrance.</p> <p>4. It is clear that there is common ground on the renewal or restoration of the Oak posts and it may be that the lattice work or the original linked chains would not be significantly noticeable if the hedging was allowed to grow through the fencing. Some of the features of re-alignment may well be acceptable to all parties and it may generally be regarded as a good idea to re-establish the boundary lines of the properties.</p> <p>5. Looking at the current application and the objections, the most significant area of disagreement appears to be on the hedging. This Application incorporates a low hedge of Japanese holly, which is not actually part of the design in the 1870s photo. The hedging in front of No.2 is higher and thicker privet. It would seem that the hedging on the boundaries in front of the entrance need not necessarily be identical to that along the other boundaries and perhaps this is an area for discussion, as a different variety of hedging could well add to the features of the entrance.</p>
2017/0975/L	Dr John M Slater	28 Swains Lane London N66QR	20/03/2017 16:06:31	COMMNT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0975/L	Judith Rosen	11 Holly Village Swains Lane London N6 6QJ	17/03/2017 16:12:03	OBJ	<p>I oppose the application by 1 Holly Village. The garden boundary of 1 Holly Village should match the front garden boundary of number 2 Holly Village that was granted listed building consent in 2013 (Application Ref 2013/2365/L) by Camden Council, this would ensure a balanced Victorian landscape to the entrance of Holly Village.</p> <p>No 1. &amp; No 2 are split gardens to the main entrance of Holly Village and should therefore be identical.</p> <p>Holly Village consists of grade 2 star listed buildings and the gardens are included in the listings.</p> <p>The existing posts should be repaired. and not replaced.</p> <p>Under the Holly Village covenant fences Gates and paths are the responsibility of freeholders who meet twice a year to decide maintenance and repairs and collect funds from each freeholders.</p> <p>Holly village was awarded listed building status in 1952 and the fence that was authorised by Camden planning for No 2 Holly Village remains as it was in 1952. No 1 Holly Village should match NO 2 Holly Village</p> <p>No1's changes to their fence since 2013 (removal of hedge, removal of trellis sections, removal of fence posts), which have led to it looking so different from the No 2's side, should have required planning permission,</p> <p>since permission would be required for any change to a listed demise.</p> <p>In conclusion. The application made by 1 Holly Village is inappropriate and it should be restored as it was in 1952 and match the fence of 2 Holly Village that was authorized by Camden Council planning (Application Ref 2013/2365/L) The fence should contain rusticated trellises no chains and no low metal mesh fence</p>

---