

| Application No: | Consultees Name:           | Consultees Addr:   | Received:           | Comment:      | Response:   |
|-----------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------|---|
| 2016/7150/P     | Dr DR GERHARD<br>L BEHRENS | 33 Avenue<br>Mansions<br>Finchley Road<br>NW3 7AX<br>NW3 7AX   | 14/07/2017 10:24:02 | AMEND         | <p>I join other opponents by posting this letter. 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     | Clive Cawley               | 66 Yale Court<br>Honeybourne<br>Road<br>London<br>NW61JQ       | 16/07/2017 17:53:47 | COMMEM<br>AIL | <p>The mansion blocks of West Hampstead are characterised by privet hedges. Such a feature provides a valuable natural sound "soaker" as well as a habitat for wild life. There has been a recent trend to denaturalise entrances and gardens which has had adverse repercussions for the local environment. Such a project should not be undertaken.</p>   |
| 2016/7150/P     | J Roe                      | 89 Marlborough<br>Mansions<br>Cannon Hill<br>London<br>NW6 1JT | 14/07/2017 12:10:47 | OBJ           | <p>We live at ground level directly next to the proposed new wall. The removal of the existing wall and hedgerow and construction of a new wall would have an immediate and potentially significant impact on our enjoyment of the street and of our front living space. We strongly believe that there should be consultation with all affected residents. Our objection is that there should be full disclosure to, and consultation with residents before embarking on such a project.</p> <p>In particular, there should be information on any impact on the street view, flood protection, and the alternative choices with an opportunity to ask questions and have them addressed.</p>   |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr:   | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2016/7150/P     | Prem Tulsiani    | Flat 84<br>Marlborough<br>mansions<br>Cannon hill<br>Nw6 1jt | 14/07/2017 16:37:36 | APP      | <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     | Professor,Doris<br>Abouseif | 33 Avenue<br>Mansions<br>Finchley Road<br>London<br>NW3 7AX | 14/07/2017 10:29:03 | 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     | Mehdi Hessabi    | 21 Marlborough Mansions<br>Cannon Hill                      | 17/07/2017 18:34:19 | 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> <p>The proposed wall is oversized, the pillars are too high, they darken the road, reducing light to basement flats.</p> <p>Hedge removal also removes pollution protection</p> <p>The Applicant's own Tree Protection Methodology Report does not suggest that there are any problems with the existing hedges.</p> <p>Behind the railings already constructed prior to planning permission being applied for, the hedges have not grown back as claimed.</p> <p>The proposal involves the destruction of mature hedges.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Non-street level views of the gardens and hedges, e.g. from residents' windows, have not been taken into account.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Online consultation is not accessible to many older and disabled residents.</p> |
| 2016/7150/P     | William Oulton   | 58 Marlborough Mansions<br>Cannon Hill<br>London<br>NW6 1JS | 17/07/2017 17:54:15 | INT      | <p>Our flat on the BAM Estate is on the Lower Ground Floor and directly affected by this proposal. The large privet hedges which this application proposes to uproot provide privacy for the front rooms of our flat which would otherwise be completely visible to passers by. Combined with the privacy they ensure, the hedges also provide an effective deterrent to intruders. They help to absorb pollution and reduce traffic noise. The hedges are in good condition and have reached their present dimensions after many years. Any new plantings would take at least 10 years to achieve the same benefits. We therefore object to the proposal which has not been the subject of internal consultation by BAM management with interested parties.</p>  |
| 2016/7150/P     | Tom Bentham      | 77 Marlborough Mansions<br>Cannon Hill<br>London<br>NW6 1JT | 17/07/2017 22:53:21 | OBJ      | <p>I object to this proposal on the grounds that beautiful existing mature hedges will be removed and replaced with a characterless wall and railings. This proposal is in contradiction to Camden's planning policy to encourage urban greenery.</p> <p>The privacy that the current hedges afford to lower-ground-floor flats will be lost, and more importantly, so will the various environmental benefits (reduction in urban heat island, habitat for wildlife, reduced storm water runoff) that mature plants bring to the city.</p>   |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr:  | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2016/7150/P     | Shona Miller     | 83 Harvard Court<br>Honeybourne<br>Road<br>West Hampstead<br>NW61HW | 17/07/2017 17:49:11 | OBJ      | <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> |