

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0814/P	Eser Torun	05/04/2021 11:19:05	JUST	<p>Two points that require further clarification:</p> <p>1) None of the plans and documents provides the current height of the shed on the east side, and there is also no information about the height of the proposed new shed (including a garden on top). We would like to make sure the new shed (including the green area on top) is not higher than the existing shed.</p> <p>2) There is also no detail about what 'the green area' on top of the shed roof constitutes: is it a real plantation? what type of plantation? how tall are they supposed to grow? how is it going to be maintained on top of the roof? or is it just a garden impression (e.g. synthetic) rather than a real garden.</p>
2021/0814/P	D Peck	05/04/2021 14:16:45	OBJ	<p>I object to this because of the proposed removal of trees as part of the redevelopment.</p> <p>It is essential to view this in the context of the history of tree management in the synagogue and next door in the grounds of St Peters. Trees have recently been cleared in the latter for a substantial development of townhouses which seems to have been put on pause. In the synagogue itself there are several relevant issues to point out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Application 2020/4726/T was approved in October 2020 for the removal of 2 mature sycamore trees T1178 and T1179 without any proposal to plant saplings to replace them.</li> <li>- Eight further trees are mentioned as targets for removal in this current planning application. However the survey is incorrect. Fig 1 Tree Constraints Plan of the document 20-7582 arboricultural report show T2 and T3 - two of the trees slated for removal - standing in isolation. In fact there is a third tree in that position. It is to be assumed this third tree would also be targeted for removal as the other 2 trees are in good health and the only reason for removal, according to the report, is "to facilitate design footprint"</li> <li>- These three trees were replacements for a mature tree cut down c10-15 years ago. The survey labels them "of low quality". Further on in the report, the category to which they've been designated (category C) is defined as: "Trees of low quality and value, or young trees with a stem diameter &lt;150mm." They are young trees. If they are of low quality it would indicated they have been badly managed.</li> </ul> <p>It is hard to understand why these three trees in particular are being targeted for removal. They are not part of the hall area which is the main site of the proposed development. The trees are adjacent to the pre-existing bin area. Neither the existing or proposed development for the bin area show the trees, nor do they show the area where those trees are situated being materially affected. Are three young trees which are only now entering into a mature phase to be cut down because they're next to a few bins? Given the wider context of tree depletion in the square this seems heavy-handed, unimaginative and unnecessary.</p> <p>There is no mention in the proposal of a plan to re-plant trees on the site. This may be because there's no room which would support the argument that this proposal would lead to over-development on the site. Given the planned development for St Peter's vicarage, this argument should be extended to Belsize Square in general.</p> <p>NB In addition to the apparent accuracy of the tree survey, it should also be noted that the documentation on the planning portal was not available for many days due to technical issues, effectively shortening the period of consultation. In addition there are very few notices on the North side of the square - the one notice that is up has been obscured by parking suspension signs due to broadband roadworks. All these limit the fair dissemination of the notice for this development during the standard time-frame.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0814/P	D Connell	07/04/2021 09:02:00	OBJ	The development of this site will involve cutting down a number of trees. This is on top of the two trees they cut down last year. They did not replant any replacements. Some of the trees targeted in this planning permission were planted to replace a mature tree cut down about 15 years ago. A lot of Belsize Park residents demonstrated at the time. I can't see reference to the destruction of trees in the Description. Planning Permission should not be given as they will promise to replant but never will.

---

2021/0814/P	Dr Ramin Ghaffari	05/04/2021 15:30:31	OBJ	<p>I object to this because of the proposed removal of trees as part of the redevelopment.</p> <p>It is essential to view this in the context of the history of tree management in the synagogue and next door in the grounds of St Peters. Trees have recently been cleared in the latter for a substantial development of townhouses. As for the site of the synagogue, there are several relevant concerns to point out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Application 2020/4726/T was approved in October 2020 for the removal of 2 mature sycamore trees T1178 and T1179 without any proposal to plant saplings to replace them.</li> <li>- Eight further trees are mentioned as targets for removal in this current planning application. However the survey is incorrect. Fig 1 Tree Constraints Plan of the document 20-7582 arboricultural report show T2 and T3 - two of the trees slated for removal - standing in isolation. In fact there is a third tree in that position. It is to be assumed this third tree would also be targeted for removal as the other 2 trees are in good health and the only reason for removal, according to the report, is "to facilitate design footprint"</li> <li>- These three trees were replacements for a mature tree cut down c10-15 years ago. The survey labels them "of low quality". Further on in the report, the category to which they've been designated (category C) is defined as: "Trees of low quality and value, or young trees with a stem diameter &lt;150mm." They are young trees. If they are of low quality it would indicate they have been badly managed.</li> </ul> <p>It is hard to understand why these three trees in particular are being targeted for removal. They are not part of the hall area which is the main site of the proposed development. The trees are adjacent to the pre-existing bin area. Neither the existing or proposed development drawings for the bin area show the trees, nor do they show the area where those trees are situated being materially affected. Are three young trees which are only now entering into a mature phase to be cut down because they're next to a few bins? Given the wider context of tree depletion in the square this seems heavy-handed, unimaginative and unnecessary.</p> <p>There is no mention in the proposal of a plan to re-plant trees on the site. This may be because there's no room which would support the argument that this proposal would lead to over-development on the site. Given the planned development for St Peter's vicarage, this argument should be extended to Belsize Square in general.</p> <p>NB In addition to the apparent inaccuracy of the tree survey, it should also be noted that the documentation on the planning portal was not available for several days due to technical issues, effectively shortening the period of consultation. In addition there are very few notices on the North side of the square - the one notice that is up has been obscured by parking suspension signs due to broadband roadworks. All these limit the fair dissemination of the notice for this development during the standard time-frame.</p>
-------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0814/P	Danielle Peck	06/04/2021 22:57:10	OBJ	<p>Further to my previous comment objecting to the application because it proposes felling more trees on the site, my neighbour has just provided the following information:</p> <p>The documentation states that these trees do not have Tree Preservation Orders on them. Unfortunately there seems to have been a mistake as these trees do have TPOs.</p> <p>The trees were originally sycamores. please find confirmation from the then Tree Preservation Office Alex Hutson that TPOs applied to these. One was felled in 2005, without being replaced and the other in 2008. After considerable intervention by Belsize Residents assisted by councillors Chris Knight and Tom Simon these trees were replaced by a sweet chestnut tree and a tulip tree which are those referred to in the planning application. A Government document 'TPO A guide to the law and Good Practice' clearly states in section 11 "When planted the replacement tree is automatically protected by the original TPO even if it is a different species"</p> <p>The Synagogue should be aware of this. there was considerable correspondence with them as late 2014 on this subject. The responsibility with Camden had changed to Paul Nuckley, who was also made aware.</p>

---