

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1842/L	Patrick Stagg	23/07/2022 19:45:22	COMMNT	<p>There are too many inaccuracies and misleading statements in this application, and on these grounds the application should be rejected.</p> <p>Holly Village is a group of 12 Victorian Grade II * houses arranged around a central lawn and grounds. Holly Village is self-managing, and all the freeholders are invited to a 'Freeholders' management meeting every six months. The main access to the village is via the entrance which area is the subject of the application.</p> <p>This entrance represents an important part of the general landscaping of the Village, and as part of the architectural importance of the Village the entrance should be considered as a whole – and not on an individual householder or individual freeholder basis.</p> <p>The majority of the Freeholders would like to see a consistent approach to the entrance outside No 1 and No 2. When we say consistent, we imply standard fencing type, standard hedging type, standard height, and standard posts with chain links, so as all to be consistent.</p> <p>Together with these requirements there are also some important civil works required to overcome flooding problems associated with recent changes to speed humps and disabled access</p> <p>So overall an integrated plan is required to solve all the problems and aesthetic requirements. The current application is only a small part of the solution. It seems pointless and inefficient if the current application involving new posts and chain links, makes the flooding position worse or has to be re-done in several years.</p> <p>Thus where we say the application is in error – is that this whole scheme has not even been discussed fully – let alone costed accurately. Whereas the application reports that the scheme has been discussed and agreed. This is far wide of the real position.</p> <p>Some of the queries relating to the detail of the specific application are as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The hedge species specified in the application is not consistent with the hedge that is already there (privet) and not consistent with the hedge outside No 1 (privet). Consistency is a virtue in Victorian design. 2. The height of the hedge is not specified. Historically the height of the hedges on both sides of the entrance have been the same height. Aesthetically equal heights are more acceptable. 3. The fence style is not specified. Again consistency and symmetry are a major component of a Victorian garden. Historically and since the initial designs the fence has always been a cross pattern of Pine or Chestnut. <p>Generally I am not against improving the front entrance, but we need to see</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A total solution taking into consideration the recent flooding 2. A consistent symmetrical design signed off by all parties taking into account the rest of the Village. 3. A full costing in order to help make a decision.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1842/L	Nicholas Sutton	23/07/2022 20:52:39	INT	<p>As a resident of one of the 12 Houses of Holly Village I wish to comment on application 2022/1842/L for Listed Building Consent for No.1 Holly Village.</p> <p>1. I am supportive of parts of the current application specifically the installation of replica oak posts together with iron collars and linking chains with new hedge and reset stone plinth as outlined in the current application. The proposals for this boundary treatment appear in line with the original 1865 design as illustrated in the application and the current very dilapidated condition of the existing boundary treatment underlines that the work needs to go ahead as a priority. I urge the planning authority to give listed building consent to this aspect of the proposal.</p> <p>2. I wish to contest the second element of the application, namely the installation of two new timber bollards and coloured tarmac and stone paving. This design appears somewhat random in nature and is not reflected in either of the historic photographs attached in support of the application. Further consultations and a revised and more appropriate design would be of benefit.</p> <p>3. The applicant states in the form that the application was 'discussed and agreed with other Holly Village owners' at the April 2022 Freeholders meeting. This statement is not altogether an accurate reflection of what I understood to have been agreed and recorded in my contemporaneous notes. There was qualified support by a majority of owners to aspects of the proposals, specifically the reinstatement of the oak posts. I was supportive of this at the meeting and remain supportive. This majority support was in the context of a need for a general visual symmetry with the other half of the entrance elevation and the need to remediate the very dilapidated appearance of part of the Holly Village entrance facade. There was a majority objection to the coloured tarmac path and bollard element of the design.</p> <p>4. The drawings and design statement lodged appear ambiguous about the retention of the holly tree planted within the curtilage of No1. This tree is one of two symmetrical holly trees planted as part of the original design for Holly Village and is visible in both the 1870 and late 19th century photographs attached to this application. Clarification of its retention is important. In conclusion I wish to state my support for the element of the proposal to install the oak post and ironwork boundary treatment to No1 Holly Village and make clear my objection to the other elements of the proposal, including entrance path and bollards that were not agreed with the majority of other owners.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Nicholas Sutton FRIAI 4 Holly Village N6 6QJ</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1842/L	Nicholas Sutton	23/07/2022 20:52:29	INT	<p>As a resident of one of the 12 Houses of Holly Village I wish to comment on application 2022/1842/L for Listed Building Consent for No.1 Holly Village.</p> <p>1. I am supportive of parts of the current application specifically the installation of replica oak posts together with iron collars and linking chains with new hedge and reset stone plinth as outlined in the current application. The proposals for this boundary treatment appear in line with the original 1865 design as illustrated in the application and the current very dilapidated condition of the existing boundary treatment underlines that the work needs to go ahead as a priority. I urge the planning authority to give listed building consent to this aspect of the proposal.</p> <p>2. I wish to contest the second element of the application, namely the installation of two new timber bollards and coloured tarmac and stone paving. This design appears somewhat random in nature and is not reflected in either of the historic photographs attached in support of the application. Further consultations and a revised and more appropriate design would be of benefit.</p> <p>3. The applicant states in the form that the application was 'discussed and agreed with other Holly Village owners' at the April 2022 Freeholders meeting. This statement is not altogether an accurate reflection of what I understood to have been agreed and recorded in my contemporaneous notes. There was qualified support by a majority of owners to aspects of the proposals, specifically the reinstatement of the oak posts. I was supportive of this at the meeting and remain supportive. This majority support was in the context of a need for a general visual symmetry with the other half of the entrance elevation and the need to remediate the very dilapidated appearance of part of the Holly Village entrance facade. There was a majority objection to the coloured tarmac path and bollard element of the design.</p> <p>4. The drawings and design statement lodged appear ambiguous about the retention of the holly tree planted within the curtilage of No1. This tree is one of two symmetrical holly trees planted as part of the original design for Holly Village and is visible in both the 1870 and late 19th century photographs attached to this application. Clarification of its retention is important. In conclusion I wish to state my support for the element of the proposal to install the oak post and ironwork boundary treatment to No1 Holly Village and make clear my objection to the other elements of the proposal, including entrance path and bollards that were not agreed with the majority of other owners.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Nicholas Sutton FRIAI 4 Holly Village N6 6QJ</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1842/L	Julia Irvine	23/07/2022 12:48:47	COMMNT	<p>As the owner of No 6 Holly Village, I was present at the bi-annual meeting of Holly Village householders on Saturday, 9th April 2022 when the subject of No 1's front garden and posts came up for discussion. I have only owned my property since October 2019 but when I moved in, I realised that the debate about the front garden and the posts had been going on for years. As I wasn't party to any of it before, I cannot comment on past history but I do feel that the current state of No 1's garden, which is in complete contrast to the neatness of No 2's garden, does detract from the overall beauty of the Holly Village entrance.</p> <p>During the discussion at the April meeting, it was clear that the Holly Village householders would like the issue to be resolved. However, most were insistent that any proposal to carry out work on the front entrance needed to aim for symmetry with No 2's front garden. The current application for planning permission does not comply with our express wishes. The height of the hedges is just one example. The hedge round No 2's triangle of garden, for example, is much closer to the height of the hedge in the historic photo submitted with this planning application than Ms Brown's proposed low hedge.</p> <p>Ms Brown's proposals for the work, which she summarised at the meeting, were extensive and there were objections raised about a large part of them, on the grounds of symmetry and expense.</p> <p>We ended up voting on three motions on the hope of reaching a compromise. Two – the first to go ahead with the full proposal for front path works and the second to go ahead with the plan to recreate iron collars on all front area posts – were rejected. The only one which was carried was to go ahead in principal with repairing the posts, subject to a reasonable budget being agreed. Ms Brown is due to be bring back an updated budget to the next Holly Village meeting in October 2022.</p> <p>As a Holly Village householder, I would be happy to see the posts restored but I am objecting to the rest of this planning application on the grounds of lack of symmetry. Nor do I believe that the proposal to rebuild the front pathway necessary.</p>
2022/1842/L	Barry Rosen	23/07/2022 10:44:57	OBJ	<p>I, Barry Rosen of 11 Holly Village object to the planning application.</p> <p>Holly Village has not agreed with the listed planning changes at the April 2022 bi annual meeting. Just to correct the record, we only voted in principle on replacing the posts, subject to a budgeted plan we can agree on, at that meeting. There were significant objections to the plans particularly on grounds of symmetry and cost, and it did not gain an approving vote.</p> <p>The council cannot and must not assume that these plans have the agreement of the 12 houses of Holly Village.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1842/L	Andrew Willmott	22/07/2022 23:38:56	OBJ	<p>Firstly, in my capacity as the current secretary of the Holly Village Freeholders, I need to correct the claim in the application form, under "Neighbour and Community Consultation", that this application has been "Discussed and agreed with other Holly Village owners at the April 2022 bi-annual meeting."</p> <p>At said meeting a number of proposals from Diana were discussed in an attempt to resolve the ongoing issue of #1's frontage. The one proposal that was successfully passed was the replacement of the fence posts in principle, subject to an acceptable costed budget being proposed and agreed upon at the next meeting (which will take place in October). A majority of freeholders support this part of the application.</p> <p>However, the remainder not only has not been agreed, but parts of it are highly contentious, and were specifically rejected at the meeting by vote. There were also a number of comments from freeholders on how the symmetry of the village entrance is important and has been affected by recent changes by #1, and how proposals that respected that symmetry would find more favour.</p> <p>(More specifically, none of us had seen this application beforehand, and we were not notified of it, either by the applicant or Camden Council, which has left us with little time to comment.)</p> <p>As an individual freeholder, and particularly one who owns the connected (semi-detached) property referenced a number of times in the application, firstly I would respond to the following:</p> <p>"The proposal therefore does not repeat changes to the fence at no.2 Holly Village, carried out in 2013, because they are not appropriate."</p> <p>There were no substantive changes to the #2 frontage in 2013. The only work was to remove, refurbish, and then replace the fence posts. Otherwise the goal was to maintain the appearance as it had been since well before our purchase of the property in 2009, and this is what happened. You can confirm this from Google street view's history function, and from the planning application 2013/2365/L. The only thing that has changed during that time is the further deterioration and removal of #1's posts, and the chopping and changing of their hedging, something that was retroactively approved by 2017/0975/L, over the objections of a majority of neighbours.</p> <p>We have maintained our external boundary in the manner in which the freeholders had collectively agreed since well before our time, and will continue to do so.</p> <p>"Attempts to engage other freeholders in discussion of the way in which this should be achieved have been made over the last five years but have not proved successful. Note that the measures taken at no.2 were not discussed with Diana Brown despite concern being shown."</p> <p>The plans for refurbishing the front posts, as proposed by the fence monitor Patrick Stagg, were discussed extensively with everyone, and particularly with Diana, as she raised numerous and ever-shifting objections. This occurred over a number of years leading up to 2013, and can be confirmed from the 2013 planning application and the minutes of the various HVF meetings from that time. Diana has failed to get a majority (or even a significant minority) of freeholders to support her views. (Also, the first sentence here is at odds with the claim of blanket approval in the main form.)</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

"In summary, the proposal seeks to revive the original image of one continuous building mass facing the junction, in full view, unhidden by foliage."

The buildings are hardly hidden by foliage. There is a clear view from the street of the buildings over one metre hedges, much clearer than any other buildings in Holly Village. The main visual obstruction is the holly trees, but Camden Council have thankfully rejected the proposal to remove #1's holly tree.

Secondly, in general I find large parts of this application highly confusing as to exactly what is being proposed, particularly the images:

- On the #1 side there are a variety of hedge heights, and in one case bluish railings are shown. Some of the heights are taller than the 2017 application. Are the railings part of the application?
- The #2 side is consistently shown with no hedging, despite the fact that it has remained in its current state for a long time, and certainly our entire time here. This is an area with heavy foot traffic, and even if we were of a mind to ignore the freeholder covenant, we would maintain our hedges at the current height to avoid even more front-garden litter than we currently have to deal with.
- In various images the holly tree on the #1 side is missing; I want to point out that it is the subject of a tree preservation order.
- There are various images from the 1870s showing no vegetation, apart from the nascent holly trees, because nothing had grown yet. Recreating these photos seemed to be the goal of the 2017 application. In this application, however, there is also an image from 1929 showing hedges close to the height they are now, and what looks like some variant of the current panelling. (It is hard to make out given the murkiness of the photo.) So what is the justification for replacing the privet hedges that have been there for over 90 years? The image also shows a postbox and lamp post that have since been removed, which again speaks to how heavy street traffic has become over the subsequent century.
- The images show two posts on the boundary between the footpath and the village entrance path, whereas, before its removal by #1 some years back, there was a single post there, as can be seen in the 1929 photo. Is this change intended? If so, why? I fear it would make it more difficult for larger items to be moved in and out of the village, e.g., furniture.
- There is a lot of verbiage in the application, but very few specifics on how the posts are to be replaced, and how they are to be seated. (In contrast with the detail that had to be given in 2013/2365/L.) There is even less detail on the front path changes mentioned, beyond a single paragraph, and these will materially affect all freeholders. E.g., what is the stone paving in strips mentioned? Will it cause accessibility issues? It's clearly not in keeping with historical photos or the current visual sensibility of the village, so how does that fit with that being the main justification for various other changes proposed? Frankly, I think it would look bizarre and out of keeping with the current aesthetic.

Finally, I have filed this comment as an objection, due to the need to correct the record as above, and I do object to the frontage changes proposed, notably the hedging, rails, and almost wilful lack of symmetry or respect for the current Holly Village Freeholder boundary plan. I would repeat though that specifically the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1842/L	David Gal	24/07/2022 13:48:53	OBJ	<p>replacement of the posts has been approved by a vote of freeholders, and hence the majority of the village do support that part of the application.</p> <p>Really though, this should be its own targeted application, as 2013/2365/L was, without co-mingling it with all these other factors. So my preferred outcome would be for another application to be submitted, covering just what the April freeholder meeting agreed to, and expected to be proposed.</p> <p>Andrew Willmott</p>
				<p>As a Holly Village freeholder, I can categorically refute the statement in this application that the freeholders haven't over the years tried to engage with No. 1 on the repair and renovation of the front entrance to the village. We would all like to see the appearance improved and the subject has found itself on the agenda of many of the freeholder meetings that take place as per the deed of covenant.</p> <p>No. 1 and No 2. where both involved in the discussions that led to the design implemented at No. 2 and the intent was that the same design also be implemented at No. 1. This design was agreed and largely paid for by the freeholders jointly with a budget having been set aside at that time to also cover the work at No. 1. It is No.1 who refused to have the work done and have made no attempts to otherwise maintain their part of the front entrance.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that we now find ourselves in a position where, as claimed by No. 1, they have let things deteriorate so much that they are unable to renovate the original posts as we were able to do at No. 2 and will need to source replacements.</p> <p>The entrance is an important part of the overall design and aesthetic impression of Holly Village. It is clear the original intent of the architect was that this should be symmetrical. This application doesn't achieve that as it deviates from the design at No. 2 that was approved and implemented under listed planning consent.</p> <p>A consistent design to the front entrance should cover all aspects including the posts, any cast iron collars and chains, fencing material and design and agreement on the hedge type and maintained height.</p> <p>The application as it stands should be rejected on the grounds laid out above.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1842/L	Nicholas Sutton	23/07/2022 20:52:34	INT	<p>As a resident of one of the 12 Houses of Holly Village I wish to comment on application 2022/1842/L for Listed Building Consent for No.1 Holly Village.</p> <p>1. I am supportive of parts of the current application specifically the installation of replica oak posts together with iron collars and linking chains with new hedge and reset stone plinth as outlined in the current application. The proposals for this boundary treatment appear in line with the original 1865 design as illustrated in the application and the current very dilapidated condition of the existing boundary treatment underlines that the work needs to go ahead as a priority. I urge the planning authority to give listed building consent to this aspect of the proposal.</p> <p>2. I wish to contest the second element of the application, namely the installation of two new timber bollards and coloured tarmac and stone paving. This design appears somewhat random in nature and is not reflected in either of the historic photographs attached in support of the application. Further consultations and a revised and more appropriate design would be of benefit.</p> <p>3. The applicant states in the form that the application was 'discussed and agreed with other Holly Village owners' at the April 2022 Freeholders meeting. This statement is not altogether an accurate reflection of what I understood to have been agreed and recorded in my contemporaneous notes. There was qualified support by a majority of owners to aspects of the proposals, specifically the reinstatement of the oak posts. I was supportive of this at the meeting and remain supportive. This majority support was in the context of a need for a general visual symmetry with the other half of the entrance elevation and the need to remediate the very dilapidated appearance of part of the Holly Village entrance facade. There was a majority objection to the coloured tarmac path and bollard element of the design.</p> <p>4. The drawings and design statement lodged appear ambiguous about the retention of the holly tree planted within the curtilage of No1. This tree is one of two symmetrical holly trees planted as part of the original design for Holly Village and is visible in both the 1870 and late 19th century photographs attached to this application. Clarification of its retention is important. In conclusion I wish to state my support for the element of the proposal to install the oak post and ironwork boundary treatment to No1 Holly Village and make clear my objection to the other elements of the proposal, including entrance path and bollards that were not agreed with the majority of other owners.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Nicholas Sutton FRIAI 4 Holly Village N6 6QJ</p>