

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2016/1479/P	Gaudio	36-37 Chester Terrace	31/05/2016 07:54:30	OBJ	This will significantly impact on traffic flow out of Chester Gate.  Having only one lane of traffic exiting Chester Gate will therefore impact on exiting Chester Terrace.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1479/P	j mclaren	30 Chester Court Albany St London NW1 4BU	23/05/2016 15:05:42	OBJ	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.</p> <p>I have four concerns that I hope will be considered and lead to this application being refused.</p> <p>Firstly, the application's assumptions on the traffic impact take no account of two major forthcoming changes to traffic on Albany Street; the introduction of the Cycle Super Highway and the proposed routes for construction traffic for HS2.</p> <p>Both of these will have a marked impact in increasing traffic onto Albany St. Any move therefore that reduces a current two way highway to single lane will impact on this creating an even bigger bottleneck that would occur under the existing conditions.</p> <p>My second concern is about the loss of current public space and it being given over to a private user. Despite the applicants' claims that they are in some way doing a public service by re-instating an Historic garden, all they are actually doing is taking land that the public currently have a right of access to and given it to those who own 6-10 Cambridge Terrace. The garden will be entirely private with no public right of way. There is therefore no public benefit to this application.</p> <p>My third objection is to the application itself and the handling of it by those employed by the applicant. Their submissions summarising the consultation that took place gloss over the key fact that, throughout their colourful brochures and hoardings they forgot to mention that the "historic garden" would be private property and that a public right of way would be removed. Hence, the casual observer would summarise that this application was in some way giving the public something back rather than taking away a public right of way.</p> <p>Likewise, it was only at the end of the consultation that a few of the consultation materials were amended to make clear that, despite how it had been presented, the Crown Estate was not in favour of this proposal. Things that were said at the consultation meetings and which were reflected in the pre-amended website implied that the Crown Estate were in support of the application. For example at the consultation meeting, Mr Tim Simpson (a representative of the Candy's) said that the idea was the CEPC's and had their backing.</p> <p>I genuinely believe that, if these two facts had been explicit from day one, there would have been even more objection to the proposal. Indeed their failure to quantify the level of support in the consultation suggests that opposition may have outweighed support in the consultation as was.</p> <p>My final objection to this proposal is that it will create a genuine safety risk for cars and pedestrians through the narrowing of the public right of way. Cars parked in the garages under Albany St that need to exit onto Chester Gate will have even less view than they do now and what is already a very narrow stretch of road will lose a significant amount of its sight and space.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
					Thank you

---