

**From:** John Malet-Bates [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 March 2020 23:16  
**To:** Walsh, Jennifer [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Planning [REDACTED] 'Andrew Dutton-Parrish'  
[REDACTED] Blenheims John [REDACTED] Carolina  
[REDACTED] David Milne [REDACTED] 'Esi Cakmakcioglu'  
[REDACTED] John Malet-Bates [REDACTED] John Weston  
[REDACTED] 'Mark Nevard' [REDACTED] Martin Humphery'  
[REDACTED] 'Mojgan Green' [REDACTED] Nancy  
Mayo' [REDACTED] 'Patricia Orwell' [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 2019/6277/P: 62 Frognal

Dear Jennifer,  
HCAAC Objects to the removal of existing trees even under conditions of proposed replacements.

Also the replacement gates appear to be unnecessary and in the case of the south gate causing an unwelcome channel to accommodate the gate's opening against the gradient. Also, such scheme should not be used to increase car accommodation on the site, which is often the goal of 'improved manoeuvrability'

It is no longer good enough to propose tree removal to aid development, particularly when such 'development' is questionable. At least one existing or proposed new tree would be at risk from the south gate detail.

Best regards and apologies,  
John

Regards,  
John Malet-Bates  
For Hampstead CAAC

