

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0814/P	susan greenhill	07/04/2021 10:53:21	INT	<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	Kyrylo Sukhanenko	07/04/2021 19:16:41	OBJ	

To whom it may concern:

We object to the planning application (2021/0814/P) due to the following material planning considerations:

Refuse site changes.

- The planning application indicates that multiple trees are subject to removal to accommodate the new platform for refuse. These are young and growing trees which provide privacy, noise isolation from the synagogue and fresh air as well as help to limit CO2 pollution from cars on the street.
- The location change of the refuse site would impact smells for the neighbouring houses and for Oliver's nursery (the playground is right next to the proposed new refuse site). It will also increase the noise and disturbance resulting from use of those bins and the use of the new gate.
- The proposed new location of the refuse area will have material visual amenity implications for the residents of neighbouring properties (45,44,43,42 Belsize Square) as well as for Oliver's Nursery.
- Current location of the refuse site (right under the streetlights) provides auxiliary benefits for bin men (additional light during bin collections) and it provides an element of security for the neighbours. The proposed new site does not have any of those benefits.

Extention of windows.

- Extention of windows will inevitably lead to the loss of privacy for all neighbouring properties and, in our opinion, represents excessive development for the site.
- The extention of windows will also be out of character with other developments in the area.

Installation of AC units.

- The Noise Plant Assessment report for the installation of 7 AC units has not been extended to the North Side of Belsize Square. Specifically, based on the Plant Noise Assessment report (prepared by Syntegra Consulting), the only Noise Sensitive Receptor identified was 11 Belsize Square. We believe this assessment to be incomplete as it does not incorporate other Noise Sensitive Receptors such as 42 - 45 Belsize Square.
- The plant noise assessment notes that AC units are expected to be operational only during the week from 1100 hrs – 1600 hrs Monday to Thursday and 1100 hrs – 1400 hrs on Fridays. These are not legally binding terms, there is no control framework (for council or local residents) for these terms to be adhered to by the Synagogue and there is no proposed recourse if the terms are not adhered to. For example, the Synagogue frequently organises weddings and other large gatherings outside of the hours mentioned in the report (including weekends and late evenings during the week) where these AC units may be used. Without an agreed governance framework, we are very concerned that these AC units will be used outside of the expected hours which will have material impact on the wellbeing and noise pollution in the area.
- There are 7 proposed AC units, yet there is only one noise assessment report. Each installed unit is likely to impact neighbouring properties differently due to the difference in their locations. Give that the different AC units' locations will directly impact the direction of noise travel, there should be 7 independent reports. For example, as part of the provided Noise Assessment Report, only one Noise Sensitive Receptor has been identified. This may be correct for one AC unit but it cannot be correct for all 7 proposed AC units due to the abovementioned difference in their locations. Precise locations of all 7 AC units and their facing angles, the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0814/P	Andrew Robins	07/04/2021 23:13:19	INT	<p>overall layout and density of these units will have material impact on noise levels which has not been considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline noise levels have been taken between 1300 hrs on Tuesday 15th December 2020 and 1200 hrs on Wednesday 16th December 2020. It is noted that one hour of measurement is missing from 1200 hrs – 1300 hrs on Wednesday 16th December 2020. These are not representative times for when the system is intended to be used. The proposed purpose of AC units is cooling and noise levels should therefore be taken during representative months of the year (i.e. summer months). The baseline noise level report was conducted during COVID19 induced lockdown therefore base noise levels provided in the report are not representative of reality or typical use. The noise from Keren's nursery and Oliver's nursery during the day (especially when the kids are outside) is much larger taking into account typical occupancy rates which was not taken into account in this report.</li> <li>• The Plant Noise Assessment Report does not cover statutory inspection requirements, such as those which cover health and safety requirements, nor does it cover inspection under the Fluorinated Greenhouse Gas Regulations and associated requirements.</li> <li>• No impact on road safety has been considered or included in the analysis and no consideration for the maintenance of these AC units nor has the impact on character with other development in the area been considered – we strongly believe that the installation of the 7 AC units is out of character with other development in the area.</li> <li>• The Synagogue has several AC units installed already. These are located at the back of the Synagogue (North Side) and are in a confined space, close to the ground which limits the noise impact and the visual impact of these AC systems for the residents whose properties face them. The proposal to increase the number of AC units and to move them to the roof is an excessive development for the site in terms of visual impact on residents. There are more efficient and aesthetically considerate models of AC systems available on the market which have not been considered in the proposal, if more cooling power is needed.</li> <li>• There is not a single roof-based AC unit installed on properties around Belsize Square. The impact of installing 7 individual AC on the visual amenity has not been taken into account and reflected in the planning application. In fact, the design, appearance and materials of these AC units has not been taken into account at all as part of this submission which is concerning.</li> </ul>

---

2021/0814/P	Andrew Robins	07/04/2021 23:13:19	INT	<p>I have looked at this and can see the trees (documents above) My advice is that this is not a very sensible place for a playground and ask if the Jewish security have been consulted with regard to a risk assessment as it is very close to the road. This is stated as being connected to the nursery and is therefore a business proposal. A risk assessment needs to be conducted. This is not mentioned in the proposal. I have been in the main hall and it is very much fit for purpose, a beautifully fitted space with a wonderful atmosphere. The application offers to find space for "greenery" this really needs to be clearer and a more concrete offer. Overall I think this whole proposition needs to be investigated and assessed more deeply with concrete commitments. While balancing the needs of the local Jewish community, have the Synagogue conducted a consultation with the local Jewish Community? if so what was the result? No explanation for why the trees need to be removed has been given, if this is a Montessori School I would have thought that the trees would have been welcome. As they would for functions. Perhaps a modest trim is all that is required rather than removal?</p>
-------------	---------------	---------------------	-----	---

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2021/0814/P	Michael white	08/04/2021 07:27:18	OBJ	I understand that this application includes the removal of a number of mature trees on the site, to which I strongly object. The needless destruction of trees in London is environmentally irresponsible and unacceptable.
2021/0814/P	Karen Russell	07/04/2021 15:20:16	OBJ	I object to the proposal in these plans to remove 2 trees which are protected by TPOs only for the reason on adding bins to the site. Trees are referenced as T2 Tulip Tree and T3 Sweet Chestnut. These were only planted in 2009 after Sycamores were removed in 2005 and 2008. Existence of TPOs on these trees was confirmed by Alex Hutson, Tree and Landscape Officer in 2008. However, planting of replacement took considerable insistence from North Belsize Square residents and assistant of Cllrs Chris Knight and Tom Simon. Camden also had to intervene at least twice to make sure the trees were properly looked after...perhaps the reason for them now being described as low quality. These are semi mature healthy trees that are protected under TPO legislation. Installing bins does not seem a good enough justification to destroy them. Although these are at the back of the Synagogue they are at the front of ours and very important aspect of our outlook in this Conservation area.