

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0457/P	Dr Richard Friend	Ground Floor Flat Leavesden Branch Hill London NW3 7LY	11/03/2015 07:34:32	OBJ	I strongly object to the proposed development for 17 Branch Hill. This is a conservation area right across the road - just metres from the part Constable painted in his famous paintings of Branch Hill - when there was a large pond here. That leads on to my next point that this part of the Heath is the source of the River Westbourne and has been the source of much flooding in the area as experienced in recent years at one of the adjacent properties: Leavesden Cottage. Extensive piling and a new outdoor swimming pool may well have a huge and damaging impact on the soil stability here. This part of Hampstead Heath is used by many people in London and the positioning of a new higher rise building (with an extra storey - and a roof looking (from the plans) like an aerodrome for space rockets, would be completely out of character with this part of Hampstead Heath. I particularly and most strongly would also like to object to the proposed outdoor swimming pool. As a peaceful conservation area, the noise levels related to the outdoor swimming pool would be out of keeping. The garden at 17 Branch Hill is a relatively small enclosure and yet surrounded by many residences housing scores of people (these include Savoy Court, Holme Vale House, The Chestnuts, Leavesden Cottage, Leavesden and Oakhurst.) Noise pollution would also not be very pleasant for the many visitors to the Heath, who come to appreciate the serenity of the area - one of the rare pockets of serenity so close to the centre of London. This proposed building could not be more out of character with the locale and a planned 2 year build is although I feel unacceptable.
2015/0457/P	S Gough	Leavesden Cottage Branch Hill	10/03/2015 17:55:25	OBJ	I would like to object to the planning application for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The design and materials to be used are out of keeping with the surrounding buildings (which are all of a brick construction) and therefore detrimental to a conservation area.</li> <li>2. The increase in size of the property is a massive overdevelopment of the site and will be detrimental to the area and on neighbouring properties' privacy. For example, the proposed change to a living area on the south aspect on the first floor will directly impact on and look into both my livingroom and kitchen (this is currently configured as bedrooms and so not an issue). The location of the outdoor pool will also directly adversely affect noise levels and view.</li> <li>3. The proposed piling and swimming pool may impact on soil stability. This is not adequately addressed in the reports. For example the fact that an underground river (the Westbourne) is located nearby is not dealt with.</li> <li>4. The siting of condensers will adversely affect neighbours' peace and tranquility in an otherwise quiet area.</li> <li>5. The traffic issues caused by such a development are inadequately dealt with. Contrary to the report, Branch Hill is extremely busy at certain times of the day and the narrow road and turn off from West Heath Road is a traffic issue.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0457/P	Claire Newbrook	High Holborn House 52-54 High Holborn London WC1V 6RL	11/03/2015 09:50:17	OBJEMAIL	<p>17 Branch Hill – Planning Application</p> <p>We, Faraday Property Management Ltd, are the managing agents for Firecrest Management Co Ltd who are the Freeholders of 1-9 Savoy Court, 1-21 St Regis Heights, 1-6 Firecrest Drive and 1-12 Birchwood Drive, NW3. We are also the Managing Agents for Spedan Tower Management Company (1-9 Savoy Court) and St Regis Heights Management Company Limited (1-21 ST Regis Heights).</p> <p>With regard to Planning Application 215/04574/P, for 17 Branch Hill NW3, we would like to OBJECT to the current Planning Application on the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tree report from Landmark Trees dated 15th July 2014. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) As per 6.1.1 of the report, it advises that the new development would have a low impact on the tree T9 (the Sycamore) in Savoy Court’s garden, however they then stated that further investigation is required. As a result, we would not agree to the extension of the basement due to detriment of the tree in Savoy Court.</li> <li>(b) Section 6.1.3 states that there is no discussions about the driveway and whether they are going to replace this – it stipulates that they need to keep the sub-base so not to disturb the trees in Savoy Court’s Garden as indicated as trees 13, 14 &amp; 15.. There is no report as to whether the drive is to be resurfaced and we are extremely concerned that if this was the case then the roots of my clients trees will be compromised.</li> <li>(c) Section 6.1.4 of the report states that they have concerns that T9 (the Sycamore) would be affected by the works to the property due to the close proximity of the tree and its roots to the new building. They have advised that there should be adequate supervision over the work and this tree to mitigate the loss of the tree. This is unacceptable and contradicts the item 6.1.1</li> <li>(d) Appendix 2 stipulates that my client at Savoy Court should reduce the 2 Sycamores (G8) and prune them by 1.5m to facilitate the development (we recently carried out tree works and these trees are in a good state of order and therefore no work will take place to these trees. Why my client should have to compromise the rural area of their estate to facilitate the development is baffling.</li> <li>(e) From the documentation a pathway is going to be laid around the garden and building. There is insufficient documentation to advise how this pathway is going to be built. Whilst Landmark Trees stipulate that they must take due care and hand dig around roots etc, this has not been specified within the construction plan or any further documentation. WE therefore cannot agree to this work.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Site Analytical services – Basement Impact Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) As per 2.5 of the report that they have concerns about the ground stability and recommend sheet piling but further investigation is required. We are aware that they are proposing a sheet piling system but we would request further information on this as this could affect the roots of neighbouring trees and</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

impact the retaining walls of neighbouring properties.

b) AS per 5.5 there is significant potential that the basement will incur movements through the ground and that there should be a proper design and the Party Wall Act should be taken into consideration at the design stage. At no point has Spedan Tower MCL, Firecrest Management Co Ltd, or 1 Firecrest Drive received any correspondence in relation to this.

c) The report also stipulates that the Planning Application 214/2288/T received no objections with removing the Cedars along the driveway. This is totally incorrect as per the attached email sent to Camden Council. Furthermore, the removal of these trees was carried out prior to the application completion date. Our complaint was not taken into account nor my clients views about noise and aesthetic's. If the planning application is granted then the removal of these trees will now increase the dust and noise that Savoy Court Residents will endure.

d) Also there has been no report on the pathway, the condensing units, the extractor on the plant room. All are within a few meters of my clients land if not a meter so we are concerned about what impact these will have on noise and vibrations.

e) The plans also show that there is a soak away in the lower part of the garden. We are concerned about this as we believe the drainage of the soak away will lead to movement of the retaining wall and thus cause considerable damage to my clients Estate..

### 3. Construction Report:

a. Section 3.2 states that the traffic along Branch Hill is light. This is certainly not the case. During peak times, from 8am to 10am and 3pm to 6pm, there is heavy traffic along this route due to it providing a short cut from West Heath Road to Frognall/Hampstead Village.

b. Report advises that lorries will reverse onto the current site. This is not appropriate as it will cause congestion. Further to this, whilst the demolition to the ground floor is being undertaken, it states that lorries will be on site at least 7 times a day. This needs to be restricted and traffic control introduced. There is heavy congestion in this area and therefore lorries would have to be restricted between the hours of 10am and 3pm.

c. The Report states that the dust generated will be high and stipulates that meetings should be held with residents that are within 500m of the site boundary. There has been no discussion with our clients on the Firecrest Estate and therefore we are concerned with regard to the amount of dust that will be circulated in the air, not only for Savoy Court and Firecrest residents, but also St Regis and Birchwood Drive.

d. Further to this report, it stipulates that the site contractor will have to carry out daily inspections of neighbouring properties and vehicles within a 100m boundary of the site. Once again, we have received no correspondence in relation to access to my client's property or with regards to the

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

inspection. We believe that this property, as stated, will cause a significant amount of dust and we need to know what procedures are going to be in place to compensate the residents in relation to the dusty atmosphere within the development.

e. This document also states that they have delivered consultation letters to adjoining properties. This has not been carried out. We also have not received letters from Camden Council about this planning application and therefore feel that there is a lack of communication.

f. After the first set of works and the installation of the superstructure, the welfare facilities and office are to be placed next to the boundary fence of Savoy Court. We believe that this would be impractical, as this will be within close proximity of the flats of Savoy Court and therefore they will be disturbed by the smell and noise.

g. The engineer's report does not mention anything about the retaining wall on Firecrest Drive, Savoy or 1 Firecrest Drive. This is extremely important as this is a 5m high wall and if damaged could cause substantial damage to Firecrest and their residents.

Acoustic Report:

a. 2.4 of the report shows a mechanical plant room which is going to be located near to the boundary wall of Savoy Court. There will be an external condenser also in the rear garden store. There are no details about the rear garden store condensers in the entire documentation and therefore we object to this installation.

b. 2.6 of the report states areas A and C are the anticipated nearest noise sensitive areas which is Savoy Court – Flat 4 and 1 Firecrest Drive. However no acoustic test was carried out in these areas.

c. As per 3.4 of the report, it stipulates that the acoustic test was taken at the start of the driveway of 17 Branch Hill. We would like to advise that if the report stipulates that there are grave concerns about the noise impact on locations A and C, then the acoustic test should have been provided for both of these areas, as this is rural area with less traffic and pedestrian through way.

Based on all of the above, my client Speden Tower Management Co Ltd, Firecrest Management Co Ltd and St Regis Heights Management Co Ltd OBJECT t to this planning application.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0457/P	Patricia Carvel	Top flat, Leavesden Branch Hill London NW3 7LY	10/03/2015 13:21:57	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I object to this project as being damaging and destructive.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It interferes with the course of the Westbourne river (painted by Constable), which rises in Judges Hollow opposite where I and others live (Leavesden, The Chestnuts, Holme Vale, Oakhurst).</li> <li>2. The pile driving when Spedan Towers was built caused the stone steps to the garden flat here to crack.</li> <li>3. We had a seismograph on the house and Wiltshire's (the developers who built Spedan Towers) offered compensation. This pile driving will be much nearer.</li> <li>4. Enough distress has already been caused by the applicant sending his tree surgeons (in 2012) to cut the branches of our beautiful Horse Chestnut back - not to his fence but to the trunk of the tree. This ancient tree stood on our side of the fence where the two proposed swimming pools and associated buildings will be built, and as a result of this pruning fell down!</li> <li>5. The development is estimated to take 91 weeks and may go on for longer. The noise, dust and associated traffic will greatly disrupt the tranquil atmosphere of this quiet, secluded neighbourhood.</li> <li>6. In 1975 a man was killed in West Hampstead, in his basement, when the water from the Westbourne rose unexpectedly and drowned him. Other people in Westbourne Terrace etc. have had problems with this river. It is carried overhead at Sloane Square Station in a massive cast iron pipe. It is no mean river!</li> </ol> <p>I would like to be notified of the committee date.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

---