

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Jameela Bilgrami	Jameela Bilgrami 88 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London N W 6 1JT	09/07/2017 22:45:16	JUST	<p>I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds:</p> <p>It is factually incorrect: the form submitted by BAM estate states a) there are no hedges or trees on the proposed development site (section 15) and b) it is not in an area at risk of flooding (section12). Both these are untrue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed wall is oversized, the pillars are too high, they darken the road, reducing light to basement flats.</li> <li>• Hedge removal also removes pollution protection</li> <li>• The Applicant's own Tree Protection Methodology Report does not suggest that there are any problems with the existing hedges.</li> <li>• Behind the railings already constructed prior to planning permission being applied for, the hedges have not grown back as claimed.</li> <li>• The proposal involves the destruction of mature hedges.</li> <li>• The beauty of the roads will be affected, in contravention of the Council's own guidance (see West End Green Conservation Area appraisal and Management Strategy 28.2.2011).</li> <li>• Non-street level views of the gardens and hedges, e.g. from residents' windows, have not been taken into account.</li> <li>• The Council has planted more trees on these roads to help reduce flood risk, so taking out metres and metres of hedges will increase the risk.</li> <li>• Council consultation has been very limited; placing notices on just a few lamp posts is inadequate and elderly and disabled residents are unlikely to see them.</li> </ul> <p>Online consultation is not accessible to many older and disabled residents.</p> <p>I trust you will take these significant objections into account and refuse planning permission.</p>
2016/7150/P	MADHURI PAI	Flat 67 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill NW61JT NW61JT	07/07/2017 21:18:45	COMMNT	<p>The proposed action has little merit. All lower ground floor flats will suffer while the construction goes on - but far more importantly - everyone will suffer in the pulling down of well grown hedges and then hoping new ones grow with the higher walls. It seems like a random exercise -conceived for unclear reasons. Hopefully not as a means to spending budgets in random acts of construction and, in this case, destruction.</p> <p>As a resident, I would like to oppose unequivocally this proposed action</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Mari Sved	Flat 5 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JP	09/07/2017 09:14:43	OBJEMPER	<p>I strongly object to planning permission being granted for the above project because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There has been no consultation by the council. None of the residents have received a letter warning of the application</li> <li>2. The project involves removing well established hedges which enhance the appearance of the road.</li> <li>3. The walls already replaced are tall and unsightly, the greenery will take many years to become aesthetically pleasing - if, indeed, they are able to grow behind the walls</li> <li>4. There seems to be no urgent structural need for this project. Indeed, the new walls will restrict light, the lack of hedges will reduce oxygen levels and will prove environmentally unfriendly.</li> </ol>
2016/7150/P	MADHURI PAI	Flat 67 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill NW61JT NW61JT	07/07/2017 21:19:01	COMMNT	<p>The proposed action has little merit. All lower ground floor flats will suffer while the construction goes on - but far more importantly - everyone will suffer in the pulling down of well grown hedges and then hoping new ones grow with the higher walls. It seems like a random exercise -conceived for unclear reasons. Hopefully not as a means to spending budgets in random acts of construction and, in this case, destruction.</p> <p>As a resident, I would like to oppose unequivocally this proposed action</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Katrina Chowdhury	7A Buckingham Mansions 353 West End Lane	09/07/2017 20:24:38	OBJ	

I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds:

It is factually incorrect: the form submitted by BAM estate states a) there are no hedges or trees on the proposed development site (section 15) and b) it is not in an area at risk of flooding (section12). Both these are untrue.

- The proposed wall is oversized, the pillars are too high, they darken the road, reducing light to basement flats.
  - Hedge removal also removes pollution protection
  - The Applicant's own Tree Protection Methodology Report does not suggest that there are any problems with the existing hedges.
  - Behind the railings already constructed prior to planning permission being applied for, the hedges have not grown back as claimed.
  - The proposal involves the destruction of mature hedges.
  - The beauty of the roads will be affected, in contravention of the Council's own guidance (see West End Green Conservation Area appraisal and Management Strategy 28.2.2011).
  - Non-street level views of the gardens and hedges, e.g. from residents' windows, have not been taken into account.
  - The Council has planted more trees on these roads to help reduce flood risk, so taking out metres and metres of hedges will increase the risk.
  - Council consultation has been very limited; placing notices on just a few lamp posts is inadequate and elderly and disabled residents are unlikely to see them.
- Online consultation is not accessible to many older and disabled residents.

I trust you will take these significant objections into account and refuse planning permission.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Anthony McGowan	7 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill	09/07/2017 21:18:31	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds: It is factually incorrect: the form submitted by BAM estate states a) there are no hedges or trees on the proposed development site (section 15) and b) it is not in an area at risk of flooding (section12). Both these are untrue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed wall is oversized, the pillars are too high, they darken the road, reducing light to basement flats.</li> <li>• Hedge removal also removes pollution protection</li> <li>• The Applicant's own Tree Protection Methodology Report does not suggest that there are any problems with the existing hedges.</li> <li>• Behind the railings already constructed prior to planning permission being applied for, the hedges have not grown back as claimed.</li> <li>• The proposal involves the destruction of mature hedges.</li> <li>• The beauty of the roads will be affected, in contravention of the Council's own guidance (see West End Green Conservation Area appraisal and Management Strategy 28.2.2011).</li> <li>• Non-street level views of the gardens and hedges, e.g. from residents' windows, have not been taken into account.</li> <li>• The Council has planted more trees on these roads to help reduce flood risk, so taking out metres and metres of hedges will increase the risk.</li> <li>• Council consultation has been very limited; placing notices on just a few lamp posts is inadequate and elderly and disabled residents are unlikely to see them.</li> </ul> <p>Online consultation is not accessible to many older and disabled residents. I trust you will take these significant objections into account and refuse planning permission.</p>
2016/7150/P	Mari Sved	Flat 5 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JP	09/07/2017 09:21:32	COMMEM AIL	<p>I strongly object to planning permission being granted for the above project because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There has been no consultation by the council. None of the residents have received a letter warning of the application</li> <li>2. The project involves removing well established hedges which enhance the appearance of the road.</li> <li>3. The walls already replaced are tall and unsightly, the greenery will take many years to be aesthetically pleasing - if they are able to establish themselves being these walls.</li> <li>4. There seems to be no urgent structural need for this project. Indeed, the tall walls will block light, reduce oxygen levels and are environmentally unfriendly.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Zoltan Szalai	61 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JS	08/07/2017 15:55:00	OBJ	As a resident of Marlborough Mansions, I strongly object against this proposal. To replace the beautiful hedges with brick walls and metal railings is absolute madness! Nowadays, when pollution is one of the most pressing problems of London (which is fast becoming Europe's most polluted capital), the council must not allow the removal of plants unless it is essential. In this case, it is clearly not essential. The estate has existed for a very long time without these boundary walls and railings, and there is absolutely no reason why they should be erected now. The planned structures would also fundamentally and negatively change the look of Cannon Hill.
2016/7150/P	Natalia Ustinova	Flat 36 Buckingham Mansions 353 West End lane	10/07/2017 17:08:17	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds:</p> <p>It is factually incorrect: the form submitted by BAM estate states a) there are no hedges or trees on the proposed development site (section 15) and b) it is not in an area at risk of flooding (section12). Both these are untrue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed wall is oversized, the pillars are too high, they darken the road, reducing light to basement flats.</li> <li>• Hedge removal also removes pollution protection</li> <li>• The Applicant's own Tree Protection Methodology Report does not suggest that there are any problems with the existing hedges.</li> <li>• Behind the railings already constructed prior to planning permission being applied for, the hedges have not grown back as claimed.</li> <li>• The proposal involves the destruction of mature hedges.</li> <li>• The beauty of the roads will be affected, in contravention of the Council's own guidance (see West End Green Conservation Area appraisal and Management Strategy 28.2.2011).</li> <li>• Non-street level views of the gardens and hedges, e.g. from residents' windows, have not been taken into account.</li> <li>• The Council has planted more trees on these roads to help reduce flood risk, so taking out metres and metres of hedges will increase the risk.</li> <li>• Council consultation has been very limited; placing notices on just a few lamp posts is inadequate and elderly and disabled residents are unlikely to see them.</li> </ul> <p>Online consultation is not accessible to many older and disabled residents.</p> <p>I trust you will take these significant objections into account and refuse planning permission.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Tanweena Chowdhury	24 Avenue Mansions Finchley Road London	10/07/2017 15:53:07	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds:</p> <p>It is factually incorrect: the form submitted by BAM estate states a) there are no hedges or trees on the proposed development site (section 15) and b) it is not in an area at risk of flooding (section 12). Both these are untrue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed wall would be oversized, the pillars would be too high, and they would darken the road, reducing light to basement flats.</li> <li>• Hedge removal would also remove pollution protection</li> <li>• The Applicant's own Tree Protection Methodology Report does not suggest that there are any problems with the existing hedges.</li> <li>• Behind the railings already constructed prior to planning permission being applied for, the hedges have not grown back as claimed.</li> <li>• The proposal involves the destruction of mature hedges.</li> <li>• The beauty of the roads will be affected, in contravention of the Council's own guidance (see West End Green Conservation Area appraisal and Management Strategy 28.2.2011).</li> <li>• Non-street level views of the gardens and hedges, e.g. from residents' windows, have not been taken into account.</li> <li>• The Council has planted more trees on these roads to help reduce flood risk, so taking out metres and metres of hedges will increase the risk.</li> <li>• Council consultation has been very limited; placing notices on just a few lamp posts is inadequate and elderly and disabled residents are unlikely to see them.</li> </ul> <p>Online consultation is not accessible to many older and disabled residents.</p> <p>I trust you will take these significant objections into account and refuse planning permission.</p>
2016/7150/P	Rebecca Campbell	7 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JP	06/07/2017 10:31:07	COMMNT	<p>I would like to object to this proposal on the grounds that the management of the BAM estate have failed to consult the residents of this proposal. I am a resident of 7 Marlborough Mansions, and thus will (via my service charge) be paying for this work.</p> <p>The management committee of BAM has not consulted the residents properly about this work – with something as controversial as this proposal at a minimum the management committee should have provided an opportunity for residents to say if they supported this. If we had been consulted and there had been a majority approving it, I would not be voicing by objections here.</p>
2016/7150/P	Gabor Sitanyi	43 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JS	10/07/2017 14:54:34	OBJEMPER	<p>It looks like a very expensive and disruptive vanity project with no obvious benefits to residents and potential downsides in terms of noise and air pollution especially for those living in the lower parts of the building. By refusing the permit the council would at least force the Directors who made the decision to spend a vast amount of the residents' money without any consultation with them to explain to their thinking which so far they refused to do despite repeated appeals.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Tibor Pfeiffer	5 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JP	09/07/2017 20:39:03	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds:</p> <p>It is factually incorrect: the form submitted by BAM estate states a) there are no hedges or trees on the proposed development site (section 15) and b) it is not in an area at risk of flooding (section12). Both these are untrue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed wall is oversized, the pillars are too high, they darken the road, reducing light to basement flats.</li> <li>• Hedge removal also removes pollution protection</li> <li>• The Applicant's own Tree Protection Methodology Report does not suggest that there are any problems with the existing hedges.</li> <li>• Behind the railings already constructed prior to planning permission being applied for, the hedges have not grown back as claimed.</li> <li>• The proposal involves the destruction of mature hedges.</li> <li>• The beauty of the roads will be affected, in contravention of the Council's own guidance (see West End Green Conservation Area appraisal and Management Strategy 28.2.2011).</li> <li>• Non-street level views of the gardens and hedges, e.g. from residents' windows, have not been taken into account.</li> <li>• The Council has planted more trees on these roads to help reduce flood risk, so taking out metres and metres of hedges will increase the risk.</li> <li>• Council consultation has been very limited; placing notices on just a few lamp posts is inadequate and elderly and disabled residents are unlikely to see them.</li> </ul> <p>Online consultation is not accessible to many older and disabled residents.</p> <p>I trust you will take these significant objections into account and refuse planning permission.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Olga Proctor	12A Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill	11/07/2017 07:25:46	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is factually incorrect: the form submitted by BAM estate states a) there are no hedges or trees on the proposed development site (section 15) and b) it is not in an area at risk of flooding (section12). Both these are untrue.</li> <li>• The proposed wall is oversized, the pillars are too high, they darken the road, reducing light to basement flats.</li> <li>• Hedge removal also removes pollution protection</li> <li>• The Applicant's own Tree Protection Methodology Report does not suggest that there are any problems with the existing hedges.</li> <li>• Behind the railings already constructed prior to planning permission being applied for, the hedges have not grown back as claimed.</li> <li>• The proposal involves the destruction of mature hedges.</li> <li>• The beauty of the roads will be affected, in contravention of the Council's own guidance (see West End Green Conservation Area appraisal and Management Strategy 28.2.2011).</li> <li>• Non-street level views of the gardens and hedges, e.g. from residents' windows, have not been taken into account.</li> <li>• The Council has planted more trees on these roads to help reduce flood risk, so taking out metres and metres of hedges will increase the risk.</li> <li>• Council consultation has been very limited; placing notices on just a few lamp posts is inadequate and elderly and disabled residents are unlikely to see them.</li> <li>• Online consultation is not accessible to many older and disabled residents.</li> </ul> <p>I trust you will take these significant objections into account and refuse planning permission.</p>
2016/7150/P	Mari Sved	Flat 5 Marlborough Mansions Canon Hill London NW6 1JP	09/07/2017 09:24:58	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to planning permission being granted for the above project because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There has been no consultation by the council. None of the residents have received a letter warning of the application</li> <li>2. The project involves removing well established hedges which enhance the appearance of the road.</li> <li>3. The walls already replaced are tall and unsightly, the greenery will take many years to be aesthetically pleasing - if they are able to establish themselves behind these walls.</li> <li>4. There seems to be no urgent structural need for this project. Indeed, the tall walls will block light, reduce oxygen levels and are environmentally unfriendly.</li> </ol>