

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Emily Keyte	18 Cholmley Gardens West Hampstead London NW6 1AE	20/07/2017 15:05:11	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.

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	Sandra Miller	55 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JS	20/07/2017 19:43:41	COMMEM AIL	<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	MM	6Buckingham Mansions	20/07/2017 14:25:51	OBJLETTE R	<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 of trees on the proposed development site (section 15) and b) it is not in an area at risk of flooding (section 12). Both of these are untrue. - The proposed wall is oversized, the pillars are too high, they darken the road, reducing light to the basement flats. - Hedge removal also removes pollution protection - The application's own tree application methodology report doesn't 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 aparaisal Anf Management Strategy 28.2.2011). - Non-street level views of garden and hedges, e.g from residents Windows have not been taken into account. - The council has planted more trees on this road to 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 lampposts is inadequate and elderly and disabled people 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	Scheherazade Daneshkhu	21 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JR	21/07/2017 06:21:19	OBJ	I object to this application.
2016/7150/P	Jean-Michel Sylvestre	29 Buckingham Mansions 353 West End Lane LONDON NW6 1LS	20/07/2017 18:09:22	OBJ	<p>very bad idea ! Would take away light from ground floor flats and reduce the overall value of the estate.... not to mention then look of the façade.</p> <p>I also fear, this will ultimately bring the sidewalk closer to the wall, with the intention to make space for more parking on the street.</p> <p>I STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS PLAN ON BOTH GROUNDS (we do NOT like parking, cars sitting in front of my door are ugly and in the Uber® age, not needed)</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Claus Thierbach	57 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill Nw6 1 js	20/07/2017 21:08:56	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 Jim and Linda Archer	1 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JP	20/07/2017 13:43:06	COMMNT	<p>Although it does make sense to make the boundary wall uniform and have brick throughout, the added cost of the iron railings in most places is not necessary in our opinion. And, the existing plastered and white painted dwarf walls could be carefully removed and replaced with similar sized brick walls without uprooting the hedges. Or, the old white plastered walls could simply be demolished and the hedges retained and trained back to cover the removal of the walls.</p> <p>The existing hedges are a major contribution to the beauty and green nature of BAM Estate. They also reduce vehicle noise and air pollution to the residents, especially those at ground level. Removing them should not be done unless absolutely necessary, and when replacement hedges are agreed to. Where brick dwarf walls and brick pillars and iron railings have been recently rebuilt, the hedges have not all grown back, resulting in a stark and bleak appearance in some areas. Some basement level residents have argued that they have lost considerable light, and their concerns need to be adequately addressed.</p> <p>According to one comment online, the application is in contradiction to three specific Local Plan Policies: if so, we believe that the application should be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Robert Spigel	95 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill London NW6 1JT	20/07/2017 07:11:57	OBJ	<p>As a resident of Marlborough Mansions and a shareholder in Bam Estates 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>
2016/7150/P	Freya Bonafoux	52 Marlborough mansions West Hampstead Nw6 1js	20/07/2017 20:56:34	COMMNT	<p>Seems a very unnecessary plan when the walls standing are perfectly good and have hedges which have taken years to get to the stage they are now. The hedges provide greenery and absorb air and noise pollution, and will not look or grow the same with the new higher sections of wall.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Dr Kate Young	Flat 67 Marlborough Mansions Cannon Hill West Hampstead NW6 1JT	20/07/2017 23:25:57	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	Emily Stewart	55 Marlborough mansions Cannon hill London Nw61js	20/07/2017 23:46:14	COMMNT	<p>(Written on behalf of Sabina Miller - a resident for 50+ years). Absolutely disagree with this on many levels: no consultation, noise and dust disturbance (which are of significant concerns to an asthma sufferer), will block out light, reduce beauty of the road, negatively affect our air quality, reduce greenery, and are a waste of our service charge, of which I am confident there are far better local uses.</p> <p>Simply reprinting and cleaning the existing walls would be more than sufficient and I believe this will very negatively affect all residents and the appearance of the road. There has never been a reason to build high walls and I don't believe there is sufficient cause to do so now. I do hope the significant local opposition is enough for this application to be recinded.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/7150/P	Richard Thexton	67 Marlborough Mansions West Hampstead London NW6 1JT	20/07/2017 20:50:18	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>
