

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Sabrina Blakstad	44 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill NW6 1JS	12/07/2017 08:39:40	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">• 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. <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	M.KOUSSARI, 19 BUCKINGHAM MANSIONS , NW6 1LR	19 BUCKINGHAM MANSINS WEST END LANE NW6 1LR	14/07/2017 02:57:33	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"> • 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. <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	Dale McGregor Learie	52 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JS	13/07/2017 14:48:21	OBJ	<p>'I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. <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	Carolyn McGregor Learie	52 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JS	13/07/2017 14:46:34	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	Mrs. Sharafi-Mohebbi	1-9 BM	11/07/2017 14:56:35	OBJ	I STRONGLY OBJECT every single bit of this application. I support every objection comment given by other residents and reiterate that in summary of those points, it would destroy everything about BAM- aesthetically and for residents, especially the lower ground floor residents. Its a travesty to suggest such an application.
2016/7150/P	Mrs. Sharafi-Mohebbi	1-9 BM	11/07/2017 14:56:21	OBJ	I STRONGLY OBJECT every single bit of this application. I support every objection comment given by other residents and reiterate that in summary of those points, it would destroy everything about BAM- aesthetically and for residents, especially the lower ground floor residents. Its a travesty to suggest the application.
2016/7150/P	Mrs. Sharafi-Mohebbi	1-9 BM	11/07/2017 14:56:01	OBJ	I STRONGLY OBJECT every single bit of this application. I support every objection comment given by other residents and reiterate that in summary of those points, it would destroy everything about BAM- aesthetically and for residents, especially the lower ground floor residents. Its a travesty to suggest the application.
2016/7150/P	Jinliang Chen	53 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill	13/07/2017 14:28:03	OBJ	<p>I am writing to express my strongest objection to planning application 2016/7150/P</p> <p>One of the greatest feature of Cannon Hill is the green belt formed by the continuous lines of hedges. The high pillars and railings in the design will definitely break the continuity of this wonderful green belt . Thus, it will totally destroy this nicest feature even if hedges can be replanted in the future.</p> <p>The applicant argued the high pillars and railings were part of the original feature when the estate was built in the early 1900s. However, Cannon Hill is no longer the empty street as shown in the these old photos (no. 1-3) submitted in the planning application, rather it is now packed full of cars on both sides of the street. There is really no merit to build the pillars and railings because of this “original “ feature that is outdated with the current situation. Adding the extra high pillars would only add the heaviness and darkness into the landscape rather than doing any conservation, while the railings might prevent the hedges to grow naturally. If anything, we should redress the issue by shortening the high pillars and removing the railings already built</p> <p>The hedge plays a vital role in maintaining the calm and clean environment on Cannon Hill. It takes year to have the hedges grow to the current mature and healthy status. Seeing these hedges being destructed in such a brutal way makes me feel devastated. I sincerely urge the estate manager/ directors /planning officer to visit the stretch of work carried out last year in front of 38-47 Marlborough Mansions, the replacement hedges have been re-planted for more than a year now, but they are non-comparable to the original hedges (contrary to what the applicant claims).</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Susan Atkinson	88 Yale Court Honeybourne Road London NW6 1JH	13/07/2017 14:39:54	OBJ	<p>'I strongly object to the Application (2016/7150/P) on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>I trust you will take these significant objections into account and refuse planning permission.'</p>
2016/7150/P	Felix Economakis	27 Avenue Mansions Finchley Road	13/07/2017 21:58:59	COMMEM AIL	Hedges are better than walls

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Marion Malik	23 Buckingham Mansions West End Lane London NW6	11/07/2017 15:49:20	COMMNT	<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">• 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. <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>
