

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6782/P	John Sunderland	1 Hall Close Harrold MK43 7DU MK43 7DU	08/03/2017 11:22:54	INT	<p>I object to the proposal as Chairman of Kendal Court Residents Association and as owner of flat 11 in Kendal Court the adjacent property. The proposed parking arrangements are not acceptable for the following 5 reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Due to the fall of the land from Warwick Lodge (WL) towards Kendal Court(KC) the ground level of 5 the new proposed parking lots between them will have to be built up by ~1.5m adjacent to the KC boundary wall such that the wheels of the parked cars will be ~ 4 m above the KC ground level. This will impinge unacceptably on the privacy of the occupiers of the 2 adjacent ground and first floor Kendal Court flats as the eye level of the car drivers on leaving or entering their cars will be some 6m above ground level on the KC side. The cars will be parked only 4m from these flats adding to noise and pollution levels associated with cars .</li> <li>2. Creation of these 5 parking places will require the removal of bushes and shrubs and the reduction or removal of two trees which will further reduce the privacy the Kendal Court flats. The removal of greenery and replacing with hardstanding is surely a retrograde move in the eyes of the public as well as the occupiers of the KC flats .</li> <li>3. A new wall on Warwick Lodge land will be required to retain the infill as the existing boundary wall owned by Kendal Court is not high and probably not strong enough to carry the infill and weight of the cars parked above it. The new wall must also be strong enough to carry crash barriers to eliminate the possibility of a driver misjudgement causing a car to overshoot the parking lots and dropping ~4m onto Kendal Court property with potential for damage to car, driver and property..</li> <li>4. A similar objection to that above applies to the echelon parking proposed in front of Warwick Lodge. In that case the risk to be considered is to the public on the pavement some 2-2.5m below the parked cars. The visual degradation that would result from the construction of the required ~3m high retaining wall adjacent to the pavement is to be deplored.</li> <li>5. The proposal to enter the car park from Mill Lane within ~ 5m of the traffic lights at the Shoot-up Hill intersection seems poorly thought out as cars turning into Mill Lane from Shoot-up Hill from either direction run the risk of running into the back of a car braking and turning unexpectedly before entering the car park. The turning indicators of the car entering may not have cancelled indicating its right or left turn at the lights before it turns into the car park . This increases the chance that the following car will not anticipate the left turn of the car into the car park . An accident at this busy location could prove serious.</li> </ol> <p>Apart from the above reasons it appears there may be grounds for a 6th objection as it is possible that part of the land required for the car parking between KC and WL belongs to Kendal Court. The Kendal Court Residents Association copy of the Title Plan for Kendal Court will be checked.</p>
2016/6782/P	Jade	Flat 30	08/03/2017 17:26:04	COMMNT	<p>I'm all for this but I'm a university student and I'm worried that the building work noise will affect my revision. After May and June will probably be best for most people.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2016/6782/P	John	24 Kendal Court Kilburn nw23pd	08/03/2017 23:26:15	COMMNT	<p>I would object to this application for two issues.</p> <p>1) That the two story dwelling house to be erected at the rear of the property would be a major eye sore and totally not in keeping with any of the surrounding area at all. It would in fact "stick out like a sore thumb". The surrounding area apart from the high mansion blocks are all one storey garages or flat garden, so this would be a ugly view for any nearby residents.</p> <p>2) The change in the parking plans would be detrimental to the area, as it would remove a number of trees from the area. The supporting wall would not be able to support the weight and from numerous views anyone parking there would not be able to park correctly as they would go over the wall as often residents parking in the spot already drive into the garden sometimes before parking correctly.</p>

---