

Printed on: 29/01/2019 09:10:04

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0105/T	David Gal	28/01/2019 22:23:47	OBJNOT	<p>We [REDACTED] are writing to object to the application to fell the holly tree outside No 1 Holly Village.</p> <p>The application has not been made by the legal owner of No 1 Holly Village but by Colin Taylor who we understand is a lodger at the property. This notwithstanding, any application to fell the holly tree outside No 1 Holly Village should be rejected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The tree is 150 years old forming part of the original planting dated back to when the houses were constructed in 1865. As such it forms part of the heritage of the village and the area.</li><li>- The tree is one of a pair with an identical tree planted outside No 2 Holly Village. This pair of signature holly trees frame the entrance to Holly Village and are highly visible adding significantly to the aesthetic appearance of the entrance.</li><li>- It is clear from the construction of the buildings at No 1 &amp; 2 Holly Village and from older photos of the front gardens that the architect intended the entrance appearance to be symmetrical. Felling this tree would further destroy the aesthetic symmetry that has already been eroded over recent years by the changes No 1 has made to the property's front garden.</li><li>- The tree is in good health and is well maintained giving no grounds for it to be felled. It is the joint responsibility of the twelve Holly Village owners to maintain the trees and larger bushes in the village. The holly tree that is the subject of this application is therefore regularly inspected and pruned by qualified tree surgeons.</li></ul> <p>Before any decision to fell the tree is taken, I would strongly recommend that a site visit be made so that the damage this would cause to the appearance and character of Holly Village can be seen at first hand.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/0105/T	Anthony Jayes	28/01/2019 22:43:41	COMMENT	<p>The owner of No. 1 Holly Village in making this application seeks and has for some time sought to confront and act in direct contradiction to the wishes of the majority of the 12 owners of Grade II* listed properties comprising Holly Village and alter the ways lawn, fences and shrubberies of No 1 Holly Village so that it is inconsistent with and not in keeping with the remainder of Holly Village.</p> <p>This has, in respect of the bizarre, irresponsible and wrong decision of the Council in Application reference 2017/0975L, resulted in the entrance to Holly Village being asymmetrical for the very first time since it was built in 1865 and this application risks yet further damage to the appearance of the entrance to Holly Village which the Council has a responsibility and duty to protect against the callous and capricious acts of vindictive owners and in this case the owner of No 1 Holly Village.</p> <p>The terms for the management of inter alia the fences and shrubberies of Holly Village are determined by a Deed of Covenant dated 26th July 1922 which is registered at HM Land Registry and is a charge on the register of No 1 Holly Village and the owner. It is therefore a public document and therefor a Deed of which the Council has notice.</p> <p>The Deed specifically states that ..'the following matters shall be under the control of the Owners generally (that is to say): (a) The repair maintenance and upkeep of all roads paths steps ways gates approaches lawns fences shrubberies and flower beds ...'.</p> <p>In granting planning permission for works that are under the control of the Owners at large the Council are interfering with the contractual arrangements of the parties and have done so already in respect of the permission granted under Application reference 2017/0975L and are responsible for the damage caused by the owner of No 1 Holly Village and will be further responsible should any further permission be granted.</p> <p>This application is made in bad faith and with wanton disregard for the integrity and appearance of Holly Village. The owner of No 1 Holly Village has been registered as proprietor of the property since 13th February 1985 and in the succeeding 33 years up until Application reference 2017/0975L has abided by the integrity of the symmetrical appearance to Holly Village. This application is made by the owners former husband who has no interest in the property according to the entries at HM Land Registry and himself has shown violence to and intimidated others within Holly Village and has been the subject of complaints of anti-social behaviour which is exemplified by this application. In the request to remove the Holly Tree Mr Taylor purports to state the intention of the Architect in 1870 which is fanciful and unsupported. Nor is there any provenance to the claim that the photograph he refers to is (a) a photograph at all or (b) of or in 1870. The properties were listed in 1954 in any event. In further support of maintaining the status quo is Mr Taylor's own drawings and diagrams 5/10, 6/10, 7/10, 8/10, 9/10 in Application reference 2017/0975L all of which clearly show the Holly Trees to the height that they are now and as they should remain.</p> <p>The application is fiercely opposed by the majority of the owners of Holly Village who together seek to maintain the integrity and symmetry of the entrance to Holly Village and the removal of one of two matching mature trees should be refused as should any further acts of vandalism to the posts and fencing to the boundary of 1 Holly Village. The Council has an obligation to act responsibly in maintaining the integrity of the listed buildings as a whole.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on:
2019/0105/T	Andrew Willmott	29/01/2019 01:18:00	OBJ	<p>We live at [REDACTED] Holly Village, a semi-detached high-gothic Grade 2* building [REDACTED] No 1, the property the tree-felling application has been made for.</p> <p>We wish to object to this application under the following grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The application's photo is cropped to avoid showing this, but the holly tree in question is one of a pair, the other being in our front garden. If you google "holly village entrance" you will find various images of the frontage, and can judge for yourself how the removal of one would leave the front aspect unbalanced. For example:   <a href="https://www.alamy.com/stock-photo-main-entrance-to-holly-village-in-highgate-london-built-in-1865-by-111754103.html">https://www.alamy.com/stock-photo-main-entrance-to-holly-village-in-highgate-london-built-in-1865-by-111754103.html</a></li> <li>2. As far as I'm aware, both these trees were planted when Holly Village was first constructed, and are hence 150 years old. They are maintained by the twelve Holly Village freeholders communally, along with other trees on the property, and the boundary hedges. They have not changed in size since we have been here, ten years, and I gather from other neighbours they've been much the same size for decades. Hence, the claim that the tree has grown "too large" seems highly questionable -- why was this not an issue forty or fifty years ago? Or indeed in 1950 when the village was first listed?</li> <li>3. To use a photo of the freshly-constructed buildings from 1870, before any of the planted trees in the grounds had had any chance to grow to their intended size, is ridiculous. If taken at face value, this photo could be used to justify cutting down every tree in Holly Village.</li> <li>4. The applicant is not the freeholder, rather, a tenant.</li> </ol> <p>I feel we have been let down by Camden Council over the recent changes to the appearance of #1. Please don't allow further vandalism to our frontage.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to point out that the Camden gateway does not show the full application, only a screenshot containing the first half of the submission. Everything after "2.5 metres" is inaccessible.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Andrew Willmott and Alma Whitten</p>	29/01/2019 09:10:04